

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 297 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Romney
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cardin	Inhofe	Rubio
Carper	Isakson	Sasse
Casey	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Coons	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Leahy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—25

Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Smith
Cantwell	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tester
Duckworth	Murray	Udall
Durbin	Peters	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—9

Blackburn	Harris	Tillis
Booker	Jones	Warren
Graham	Sanders	Whitehouse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 66, the nays are 25.  
The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:06 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to address an issue for my colleagues, something a lot of Senators have been talking about more recently, and none too soon—the Mexico-Canada agreement with the United States, a very important trade agreement.

President Trump and the leaders of Mexico and Canada signed the USMCA on November 30, 2018, which was 43 weeks ago. More than 3 months have passed since Mexico ratified the USMCA, and Canada's ratification is well underway. However, the U.S. Congress must do its part, and time is running short.

We have a limited opportunity to ratify the USMCA before election politics get in the way of securing this very critical win for literally every broad industry sector in America. I therefore urge the administration and House Democrats not only to intensify discussions on the USMCA but also to expedite those discussions and to present USMCA to the Congress.

By now, everyone should know very well that Mexico and Canada are by far America's most important trading partners. In 2017, America sold more than a half trillion dollars of exports to Mexico and Canada. Those were more exports than we sold to the next 11 largest export markets combined. For Iowa, my State, 130,000 jobs were supported by the \$6.6 billion of exports to Mexico and Canada in the same year of 2017.

These numbers are not just academic statistics. During the August State work period, I completed my 39th year holding Q and A's in every one of Iowa's 99 counties, and I consistently heard from Iowans that passing the USMCA ought to be a very top priority for the Congress.

I joined the former Governor of Iowa and former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, at a dairy processing plant in Des Moines. This meeting, with one Republican and one Democrat appreciating the great contributions of Iowa agriculture to our Nation and to exports, demonstrated what I heard at my town meetings—that passing the USMCA should be a bipartisan priority.

In Cedar Falls, IA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Under Secretary, Bill Northey, and I held a roundtable discussion with various commodity groups about the farm economy and the certainty that passing USMCA would bring to the agricultural community, particularly to the family farmers.

USMCA was also a focal point when I held meetings at manufacturing plants, such as Altec in Osceola, IA, and AIM Aerospace in Orange City, IA. I can state firsthand that people in the real world—people living outside of the Washington Beltway—want Congress to pass the USMCA as soon as possible.

My county meetings help me better represent Iowans, and it is clear to me

that Iowans support the USMCA. We can't squander this opportunity to update NAFTA, which has been critical to American farmers and businesses but is now a quarter century old. Issues negotiated in the USMCA were not issues 25 years ago, showing just how out of date NAFTA is, as well as the importance of the USMCA.

USMCA will bring greater market access for agriculture and important new commitments in areas such as customs, digital trade, intellectual property, labor, the environment, currency, and nontariff trade barriers. These updates and upgrades will translate into higher wages, greater productivity, and consequently more jobs for Americans.

In fact, the independent U.S. International Trade Commission found that USMCA will create nearly 176,000 new American jobs while adding more than \$68 billion to America's GDP.

Let's not forget, USMCA was a hard-fought negotiation. For Mexico, two Presidents worked across opposing administrations to get this job done. Canada initially held out of the agreement altogether, only to sign on at the last possible opportunity.

It is easy for Members of Congress to talk about how we would have negotiated the agreement differently. There is some talk like that going on. That would be true whether you are a Republican or Democrat. However, as the U.S. International Trade Commission report made very clear, USMCA is a major advancement from the 25-year-old NAFTA agreement. This is certainly true for labor and the environment, which were mere side agreements to NAFTA 25 years ago. Now these issues addressed in USMCA are some of the strongest obligations ever to have been included in any U.S. trade agreement. Simply put, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, and calling the USMCA "good" would be a serious understatement.

The administration did its job and brought us a modernized trade agreement. Nevertheless, the administration has listened to the concerns of House Democrats and has proposed actions to address those concerns. For my part, I have kept an open mind throughout this process, and I welcome any workable, bipartisan solutions. However, given the political calendar that lies ahead, I need those solutions promptly. We simply don't have any more time to spare.

Iowans and all Americans deserve some much needed certainty on access to our half-trillion-dollar export markets in Mexico and Canada, and it is the job of this Congress to deliver. The time for USMCA is right now.

I yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise to call attention to our Federal Government's unsustainable fiscal path.

Earlier this month the Congressional Budget Office reported that Federal

revenues are up 3 percent, or \$102 billion, compared to the same time period last year. The problem is that Federal spending grew by 7 percent, or \$271 billion, over that same period. CBO projects the deficit for this year to reach \$960 billion, which means that 22 cents of every dollar the government spends is borrowed.

All of that borrowing doesn't come cheap. In the first 11 months of the year, net interest payments on the public debt totaled \$391 billion. That is up \$48 billion, or 14 percent, over the previous year.

To put that in context, \$391 billion is roughly 2½ times what we spend each year on the U.S. Air Force. It is more than 12 times the size of the budget of the entire U.S. Department of Justice and more than 5 times the size of the budget for the U.S. Department of Education. That is \$391 billion spent with nothing to show for it. It is just like running up credit card debt and owing a whole bunch of interest without getting anything for it. That is what our future generation is really going to have to worry about.

What is worse, unless something is done to change our current trajectory, annual net interest costs are projected to more than double in the next 10 years. CBO projects that over the next decade we will spend more than \$5.8 trillion on net interest costs. All the while, our debt will continue to mount. That doesn't pay down anything; that just pays the interest, and that is calculated at a pretty low interest rate. We could be faced with higher interest rates, which could easily double what we are paying right now.

We have been fortunate that despite Congress's spendthrift ways, the U.S. dollar remains the dominant global reserve currency, which allows our government to borrow more cheaply than anybody else. But what if that changes? What if foreign interests decide that our fiscal dysfunction is simply too great and the dollar is no longer a safe bet?

The threat of a fiscal crisis is not something anyone should take lightly. Last month, the CBO—that is the Congressional Budget Office, which does all the calculations—warned: “If Federal debt as a percentage of [gross domestic product] continued to rise at the pace the Congressional Budget Office projects that it would under current law . . . [t]hat debt path would [ultimately] pose significant risks to the fiscal and economic outlook.”

While the Congressional Budget Office notes that those risks are not currently apparent in financial markets, it goes on to warn that the projected path of rising debt would increase “the risk of a fiscal crisis . . . in which the interest rate on federal debt rises abruptly because investors have lost confidence in the U.S. government's fiscal position.”

As a father and a grandfather, this is a concern that keeps me up at night. What kind of burden are we placing on

our children and on our grandchildren? They could face a future of less growth and economic opportunity as a result of our refusal to make difficult fiscal decisions.

What if we actually had to make massive cuts? We don't make cuts at all. What if we had to do massive cuts? Of course, we could raise revenue, but there is always the side effect of raising revenue, which costs jobs and then reduces revenue. There are a lot of tricky balances that have to be done.

This problem didn't arise overnight, and it will not be fixed overnight either. Congress should be working together with the administration now to begin the long process of fiscal course correction. Unfortunately, we are not off to a great start.

Prior to the August State work period, Congress passed the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019, which increased discretionary spending caps for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 by a combined \$322 billion. That is the increase. This essentially marks the end of the Budget Control Act period of federal budgeting. In a form that was all too common, a tool that was meant to bring fiscal constraint met its end with a whimper, when it probably should have been a scream.

The last cap deal—which CBO tells us will cost nearly \$2 trillion over the next 10 years if we continue spending at those levels over that time period—featured \$77 billion in offsets.

What is an offset? That is finding some money to cover the amount of spending. I think you heard correctly there. The cap deal put us on a path to spend nearly \$2 trillion over the next 10 years with \$77 billion—billion with a “b”—in offsets, which is money to cover the debt. To make matters worse, those offsets will not even begin to kick in until the latter part of the next decade. In other words, we are saying there is a little patch of money out there that we haven't spent in the future yet, and it isn't going to come in for 10 years, but let's go ahead and spend it right now, and we will call that an offset to reduce the amount of debt we are creating. Boy, everybody wishes they could do that with their own spending, I am sure.

The offsets—the money to cover the debt, which is the mere \$77 billion on \$2 trillion—will not come in until the latter part of the next decade. In other words, we are spending money from 10 years down the road right now and calling it payment on the money we are spending.

Even with this turn of events, everyone seems to agree that discretionary spending is not the main source of our budget challenge. The Congressional Budget Office projects America's debt will continue to increase rapidly over the next several decades because of mandatory spending.

What is mandatory spending? That is spending we don't make a decision on at all. Those payments go on no matter what, and they are pretty important

ones because they include things like Social Security and the major health programs and interest on the debt. That is mandatory. We can't bankrupt on paying the interest, so Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest on the debt are some of the main expenditures we make, and we never make any decisions on them. We do not change them. We don't improve them.

For decades, nonpartisan experts warned of budget pressures we would face as baby boomers aged and began to retire. That is already happening, but that crisis is always tomorrow. We only handle today's crises. I can't imagine how tomorrow's people are going to handle the crisis that is being created at the present time. The combination of aging population, longer lifespans, and rising per beneficiary healthcare costs put enormous pressure on our budget.

These warnings from the Congressional Budget Office, the actuaries, and many other people, you name it, continue to be ignored. We are now in a world where these pressures are very real and something we will need to face before we go off the cliff in a few short years.

We know the Social Security trust fund and Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund are now paying out more than they are taking in. We also know Social Security's combined trust funds will be exhausted in 2032. “That is way down the road.” No, it is not. The Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund—which covers inpatient hospital services, hospice care, skilled nursing facilities, and home health services—is projected to be depleted in 2026. That is not very far. If we continue to do nothing once their respective trust funds are exhausted, these programs will still be able to pay out some money, but they will only be able to pay out as much in benefits as they have coming in. I mentioned that we have a lot less coming in than we are paying out. For Medicare, that means we will only be able to pay 86 percent of hospital-related Medicare spending. For Social Security, revenue is projected to cover only 76 percent of scheduled benefits. I don't know many seniors who can afford a 24-percent cut.

I want to make sure Social Security and Medicare are able to provide benefits to current beneficiaries, as well as those who need them in the future. That will require being clear-eyed about the problem and working together in a bipartisan manner to ensure that these programs are solvent. The normal technique on trying to solve any of these problems is to point the finger at the other side and say it is their fault and they are not doing anything about it. Well, we are all going to have to do something about it. We are talking about a 24-percent cut in Social Security.

The longer we wait to address the imbalance, the more severe the changes will be and the fewer options we will have. I remember looking at these

problems in the year 2000, and at that time there were quite a few options, but all were rejected. Today there are a lot less options and a bigger cliff. We need to change the way we do things in Washington. We simply cannot afford to continue ignoring the challenges our country faces.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise to talk about a topic that is boring at times but is absolutely critical, as you just heard in the last few minutes. My good friend from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, is a certified public accountant. He lived in the real world before he came here, like I did. He is chairman of the Budget Committee. When he speaks about this, he speaks with the level of experience and current information that we all should listen to.

I want to highlight some things he has already talked about but then talk about the potential we are looking at this week in terms of having our 187th continuing resolution since the 1974 Budget Act was put into law. Why is this important? As Senator ENZI just pointed out, our problem in America is twofold; one, we have a global security crisis, and we have a financial crisis. I use the word "crisis" in both because the world has never been more dangerous in my lifetime.

Today we have \$22 trillion in debt. Let me put a little history behind it. In the year 2000, we had \$6 trillion on about a \$12 trillion economy. At the end of President Bush's time, it went to \$10 trillion of debt—again, on something like a \$14 trillion or \$15 trillion economy. At the end of President Obama's term, it went to \$20 trillion. Under that administration, this government doubled America's debt to \$20 trillion. After just a couple of years of President Trump, we are now at \$22 trillion.

The projection is very draconian over the next decade, even though, by growing the economy in the last couple of years, the Trump administration has actually lowered the debt curve by an estimate that CBO says is about \$3 trillion over the next decade. That is not good enough. That is only a fraction of our problem.

This chart on the right talks about the problem. I call it the LAMAR ALEXANDER chart because when we talked about it 2 years ago, we started bringing this chart up. Working on the budget process is one of the ways we deal with this. This burgeoning debt that we have to talk about is really made up of one major contributing factor; that is, mandatory expenses.

This chart tries to explain that. It shows that the top line here is total U.S. spending. Today we spend about \$4.5 trillion—a little bit more—but about \$4.5 trillion funding the Federal Government. That includes everything: Military, Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—the whole bit. The Federal Government spends about \$4.5 trillion on everything.

The red line is today. Today, however, we only spend \$1.3 trillion on discretionary spending. Yet in terms of the total, in 2000 we spent less than \$2 trillion. Now we are spending more than \$4 trillion. That has doubled in the last two decades. These are constant 2019 dollars.

In the next 20 years, this is projected to go from \$4 trillion to \$12 trillion per year, each year. In 1 year projected out here, we would almost double the amount of debt we have. This is untenable under anybody's estimate. It can't happen. It will not happen. Here is why. The world can't let it happen.

Today we have about \$200 trillion in total debt. Only \$60 trillion of that is sovereign debt, which is government debt. We have one-third of that. This says that because of mandatory spending, primarily, we will go to almost half of the world's debt with 5 percent of the population. That is not going to happen.

Yet what will happen to keep us from doing that or becoming that will be really draconian unless we act today. Senator ENZI is right. The sooner we act, the more alternatives and options we have. Let me try to explain the situation. We are actually spending less today in discretionary spending at \$1.3 trillion as a percentage of our economy than we did in 2011. In 2011, we were spending 9 percent of our total GDP on discretionary spending.

What is in discretionary spending? That is the military, most of the VA, and all discretionary spending, such as Health and Human Services, Labor, Agriculture, Justice Department, Treasury. All of the above are included in that. That is \$1.3 trillion today, which is about 6 percent. We have gone from 9 percent GDP to 6 percent GDP. Discretionary spending has actually been brought down.

What is the problem? The problem is in mandatory. What is in mandatory? As Senator ENZI just said, mandatory is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, pension benefits on Federal employees, and the interest on the debt. Just in the next 2 years alone, mandatory spending goes up \$420 billion. I can project that. That is within range of understanding. What I don't understand is how this really explodes out of control. This is because the baby boomers are maturing and going into the later years of their lives. As you just heard, both Social Security and Medicare—major trust funds—go to zero in a very short period of time. Medicare happens in 2026 and Social Security in 2032.

I am here to tell you this is the crisis of our time, and we have to deal with it. Yet today we are about to go into our 187th continuing resolution. Why? Because we don't have an agreement to fund the government. We are at the end of our fiscal year, which is September 30. We have 2 working days left, the way the Senate works, before that happens. It could still be fixed, but the reality of today is that we have not ap-

propriated one dime for the Federal Government yet.

Last year, going into August break on July 31, we had only funded 12 percent of the Federal Government. Because we stayed here in August, we funded up to 75 percent of the government. That was the first time in 22 years that we had gotten that far. As a matter of fact, in the last 45 years, this Congress has only funded the Federal Government on time four times. We have actually shut the government down 21 times because of the lack of funding. That is almost once every 2 years. It is unbelievable.

This year, in July, we had an agreement. We did a caps deal between the Democrats and Republicans. It was a bipartisan deal. Everybody went kumbaya and said: Yes, this is what we agreed to. We agree to this topline number. Appropriators had already been working all year. We had agreements in committee. All we had to do was come back in September and appropriate these bills, go to conference on the NDAA, and get the Defense Department funded along with the other major departments and go ahead down the road and get the government funded.

Here we are at the end of September. That obviously did not happen. Why? Our good friends across the aisle violated what we thought was a good-faith agreement in July that there would be no poison pills when we started appropriating. We see clearly now that wasn't the case. They are holding this up over \$5 billion that the President wants to move from military spending over to border security spending. It is almost like they want open borders. I just don't understand this.

We know President Obama built 135 miles of wall, and we know one thing now. We know that where President Obama built a wall, where President Bush built a wall, where President Clinton built a wall, where President George H. W. Bush—in every single case, illegal crossings at the border went down 95 percent.

By voting no on this spending bill, we are now getting into a situation where we have to go into a continuing resolution. Last week, we voted on the Defense bill, and Democrats voted it down. They voted against a 3.1-percent pay increase for our military brethren.

What is even worse than that, by going into a continuing resolution and by voting no last week, the Democrats are encouraging the Defense Department to actually spend \$4 billion. We did an audit last year. It was the first one in the history of the United States. President Trump ordered it. We had a law in 1991 that required it. Now we had that audit. This is the first pass. This is the tip of the iceberg. Because of that, we know that we found at least \$4 billion that they don't want to continue spending, yet are going to be obliged to continue to spend against those obsolete programs under a continuing resolution, in addition to not

getting a pay raise to our people in the military.

We should not have been here in the first place. We had a joint select committee last year, and we have been working on this for 5 years. It is time to fix this budget process once and for all. We have to hold Congress accountable, though. In most States, we don't have this problem. In 44 States, No. 1, you have a balanced budget law, but more importantly than that, in States like Georgia, if the legislature doesn't fund the government by the end of the legislative session, by law, the legislators don't go home.

Senator LANKFORD and I and others have bills that would require the same thing here. As a matter of fact, some of us have actually put in bills that would stop the pay for staff and employees and would stop Members' compensation until we get this done. A requirement of our job here is to get the government funded.

It is very simple. It is time for Congress to do its job. I am chagrined that we face another continuing resolution that we have educated people about and will cost hundreds of billions of dollars over a decade because of the damage it will do to the supply chain when we are trying to get readiness and recapitalization back in our U.S. military and talk about rationalization. It keeps us from doing each of those three things right now.

Anybody in the military who is before us in committee tells us over and over and over of the damaging effects a continuing resolution has on our military at the very time when we are trying to stand up to peer pressures in a unique, new way. We have five threats across five domains. We have never faced that before. Yet here we are, hamstringing our military once again.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, last weekend, the world watched as an attack was launched on the oil processing infrastructure of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The attack initially reduced Saudi Arabia's daily output capability by half, and that represents about 5 percent of the daily global production. Oil prices around the globe spiked by as much as 19 percent before starting to fall on the news that there was enough oil in reserves around the world to deal with any short-term reduction from Saudi Arabia. One of those reserve nations they were talking about, of course, included this great Nation, the United States.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is important to maintain. I think we all

recognize that, especially in light of the attack on Saudi Arabia. Yet I have always believed and had the mindset that we need long-term energy supply solutions in this country. As the attack on Saudi Arabia has displayed, there is no foreign substitute for American energy.

Should this attack on Saudi Arabia have happened before our Nation's energy renaissance, we would have been in a much worse situation. The near monopolistic control other nations once had on the oil and gas market no longer exist—a credit to American ingenuity and innovation. Over the last decade, we have had a turning point in this country on energy, which is something that leaders around the world talk to and point to in the United States. We have produced more oil and gas, we have improved energy conservation, and we have diversified our energy sources.

In 2015, we got rid of another handcuff to securing energy independence. We lifted the export ban on oil. That policy change both boosted America's domestic energy industry and is helping today to settle markets after the attack in Saudi Arabia. Lifting the ban has unleashed millions of barrels of oil into the marketplace, which has kept prices steady and reduced the influence of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, or OPEC, and Russia. Think about that, what the United States has done to reduce that influence.

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, U.S. petroleum and natural gas production increased by 16 percent and 12 percent respectively in 2018. These totals combined established a new production record. The United States surpassed Russia in 2011 to become the world's largest producer of natural gas and surpassed Saudi Arabia in 2018 to become the world's largest producer of petroleum. Last year's increase in the United States was also one of the largest absolute petroleum and natural gas production increases in history from a single country.

The United States continues this trend toward energy independence, and that is a good thing. Yet, despite these successes, there are those who want to not just stop this trend but who fully intend to reverse our energy independence. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have endorsed a Federal fracking ban. They want to ban the very production that gave us energy independence, that gave us independence from OPEC and Russia. They have endorsed ending fossil fuel exports, and they have endorsed eliminating energy development on Federal land. Yet, tell me, do any of these policies actually result in more affordable energy prices? Do these policies make energy more reliable? Do these policies keep the price at the pump down? Do these policies keep our allies across the globe safer? Do these policies keep our troops safer?

Let's take gas prices. If my Democratic colleagues were truly concerned about the impact of gas prices on their constituents' pocketbooks, I am curious if any of them would come up with a calculation of what gas prices would be after the ban of hydraulic fracturing, the stopping of exporting fossil fuels to the global market, and the stopping of energy development on Federal land. What would the price be? I guarantee you that there wouldn't be very much opportunity or at least very much comfort for their constituents.

Over 20 percent of the crude oil produced in this country in 2018 came from Federal land. There is little doubt that eliminating 20 percent of the supply of oil would have a significant impact on gas prices. Yet that is exactly what several have called for. Fracking has extended the productive life and resource recovery at the Bakken, Eagle Ford Shale, Marcellus Shale, Niobrara, and Permian Basin formations, just to name a few.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. Geological Survey published an updated assessment of the Permian Basin's resources in 2018. By itself, the Permian already produces one-third of the Nation's oil, and the updated assessment estimates that over 46 billion barrels of oil, 280 trillion cubic feet of gas, and 20 billion barrels of natural gas liquids are trapped in these low-permeability shale formations. The Nation's supply of oil and gas reserves essentially doubled in the blink of an eye, according to that report.

Colorado's Western Slope is home to the Piceance Basin. In 2016, the USGS issued a similarly larger reassessment of the recoverable resources in the Piceance. The USGS estimated mean volumes of 66.3 trillion cubic feet of gas, 74 million barrels of oil, and 45 million barrels of natural gas liquids.

The Uinta-Piceance Basin that covers western Colorado and eastern Utah has an abundant supply of natural gas that could be exported through a west coast liquefied natural gas terminal, like Jordan Cove, to our allies in the Pacific.

We have enough energy resources to meet our domestic needs and to meet the needs of energy overseas. So let's relish that fact. Rarely do we have a chance to provide economic opportunities here at home, to provide energy security to our partners abroad and make sure our allies have those opportunities as well, and to use the innovation and the investments we have made here to weaken our enemies all in one area, like in energy production.

Let's think about what the world would look like if we had not moved in the direction of increased domestic production in recent years.

The decline of Venezuela's oil production over the last 12 years and the resulting political instability in the country would have hurt the import ability of the United States. OPEC and Russia would have a significantly larger role than they do today in determining the global production levels,

and we have seen how that has played out for the United States in the past. We could very well be where China is today—overly dependent on imports from Saudi Arabia and terrified at the slightest hiccup in its production ability, which could have far-reaching consequences for our economy or, rather, we would find ourselves exactly where we were in 1973.

That is where we will end up if my colleagues get their way and ban energy production, hydraulic fracturing, or pass the Green New Deal, as they would like. These policies would make us once again dependent on foreign sources of energy and make us vulnerable to the geopolitical manipulation that comes with that dependence.

As recently as 2005, we were dependent on imports for two-thirds of our oil consumption—more than twice what we were reliant on in 1973 when we had a supply crisis during the embargo. If that were still true today, this attack on Saudi Arabia would be a significant cause of concern for the United States and for the U.S. oil supply. Yet, because of the pursuit of energy independence in the United States and the security we have achieved through these innovations and developments, we are confident that we can weather short-term supply disruptions in the global market.

Banning production, banning the development of energy in Colorado, or implementing policies like the Green New Deal would kill not only our opportunity to be energy independent and weather the storm of a global supply crisis, but it would also kill millions of jobs around the United States that pay far above average wages. The oil and gas industry supports over 10 million jobs in the United States, and it accounts for almost 8 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States. The jobs have an average salary of over \$100,000 a year. These are good-paying jobs that enable people to provide for their families, contribute to domestic energy security and our goal of energy independence, and they will allow us the ability to send a responsibly developed resource to our allies overseas who want a dependable trade partner.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, though, simply want to do away with this industry, those jobs, those salaries, that freedom, the independence, and the prosperity that it brings.

Instead of talking about putting our traditional energy sources out of business, why don't we talk about hardening our energy infrastructure, protecting these critical assets, and continuing to responsibly produce those resources for us, the environment, and for the world? Doing so is a win for the United States. It is also a win for our communities and those who wish to partner with us in order to fuel the world's economy.

It is incredibly important that we have energy independence, and I can't think of a more disruptive crisis the

world could have faced had this happened in a country in which we no longer had the production that we do today. I hope we can work together on energy policies that continue to create jobs and grow the American economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Colorado.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. CON. RES. 10

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, several months ago, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had the opportunity to sit down with the Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, to talk about a number of concerns around the globe, including our concerns about Huawei and ZTE and the fact that Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies.

At the time, there had been a lot of discussion about what was happening in Europe and other places around the globe and about whether Huawei would be allowed to participate in our allies' networks and what that could mean for U.S. national security and our ability to continue to engage in national security conversations, intelligence operations, sharing of information, and the like.

In that conversation, Secretary Pompeo said—and this was the entire group of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both Republican and Democratic Members—in that conversation, Secretary Pompeo said that what would help would be to let Congress's voice be heard when it comes to Huawei and ZTE and that we should send a strong message to our allies that our concern with Huawei and ZTE is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue, it is not just a one-term-of-Congress concern, but it is an ongoing concern that we have with the security of our systems, our information, the lack of security and the vulnerability that Huawei and ZTE networks and equipment pose to the United States; that we send a message to our allies in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion that if they go forward and allow Huawei or ZTE to have access to their critical infrastructure networks, then that is going to pose problems for the United States; that we may have to tell them: Look, this kind of action could have consequences; that perhaps we don't share as much information with them as we otherwise would, or it could mean that certain facilities we were going to build together won't be built but all because of our concern over Huawei and ZTE.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators COONS, MARKEY, CRUZ, and RUBIO, who have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution.

I want to thank Chairman RISCH and Ranking Member CARDIN for working with my office to get this resolution condemning and making a very strong statement against the actions of Huawei and ZTE back in July.

Again, Huawei and ZTE pose a serious threat to the United States and our

allies around the globe. This resolution makes clear many of the longstanding and bipartisan efforts we have made together to warn about the threats these companies pose to our critical telecommunications infrastructure. It further makes clear that the United States should reiterate to countries choosing to incorporate Huawei or ZTE into their new telecommunications infrastructure that the United States will seek to limit the risks posed to our government and military from use of such compromised networks.

This is an issue that shouldn't be bound by partisanship; it ought to cut across the Members of this Chamber who agree on condemning the actions of Huawei and ZTE and standing up for our national security. That is why I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 136, S. Con. Res. 10. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the Gardner amendment at the desk to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, Huawei presents a very real threat to the security of every American, both individually and collectively. I have long been concerned that the Trump administration was going to let Huawei off the hook in order to get a politically useful trade deal. As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over trade matters, that concerns me greatly. In addition, I am concerned that the resolution being offered does not go far enough to protect America's national security and hold the Trump administration accountable.

Tomorrow there will be another bipartisan measure offered that, in my view, will better address the concerns I have just mentioned, and therefore I must object this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, tomorrow I plan to vote for the motion to instruct, which is in regard to language within the Defense Authorization Act that talks about the importance of protecting our national security interests against Huawei and ZTE. But when we are objecting to resolutions that are bipartisan because of motions to instruct that have no binding nature, I am concerned that perhaps we are not doing enough work to

find those bipartisan solutions in this Chamber.

So I hope, as I come back to this floor again to consider S. Con. Res. 10, to warn our allies that if they use Huawei or ZTE, there will be repercussions.

The resolution itself is bipartisan. I hope we can come together as a Senate and recognize that motions to instruct are fine, but actual messages, condemnation, and understanding of our allies that actions will be taken are important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss the need to bolster our Nation's energy security following the recent attacks on Saudi Arabian oil.

Having read the classified briefing in full, I am convinced that Iran is absolutely behind the attacks. Now, Iran wants to drive up world oil prices to hopefully, in their mind, increase the amount of revenue they would get from selling their oil. Basically, they need the money, and that is because the sanctions that the United States has imposed on Iran have worked. They have been punishing. That is why President Trump, I believe, made the right call in adding even tougher sanctions. The sanctions have been biting, and Iran's currency has been significantly devalued. Now is the time to step up our own American energy production.

Since my Senate arrival in 2007, I have worked to advance pro-growth energy policies throughout that entire time. My goal has always been to promote American energy, to safeguard U.S. workers, and to protect this great Nation.

Today, the United States is the world's top energy producer. We are a global leader in oil, as well as in natural gas. In fact, the United States is poised to become the world's top energy exporter, as well, and my home State of Wyoming has been a key driver in all of this success.

To reach this goal, we are going to need to leverage our energy sources. This includes zero-emission nuclear power, as well as renewable energy. We need it all. In the Senate, I believe both parties want Americans to use more carbon-free energy. So both parties should embrace sensible, scientific solutions. Yet Democrats, once again, are pushing more of their radical proposals. That is what we have to deal with.

Two weeks ago, House Democrats passed several anti-energy bills. These measures would lock up key offshore and Alaskan oil reserves. The majority of House Democrats have cosponsored these scary schemes that would damage our economy.

If the House Democrats' anti-energy bills ever were to become law—and I assure you that the Republican Senate

and President Trump will never allow that to happen—they would be a real gift to our foreign enemies and to our adversaries, like Russia, because Russia routinely uses natural gas as a geopolitical weapon.

Still, 2020 Presidential candidate ELIZABETH WARREN, a Member of our Senate, recently unveiled a plan to ban hydraulic fracturing. This revolutionary technique has led to a renaissance for American energy production, and she wants to ban it.

Last year, Senator WARREN's home State of Massachusetts imported Russian natural gas. Where did they import it from? People all across the country and the world saw the Russian natural gas tanker in Boston Harbor. Let me repeat. Let me be very clear. Last year, Senator WARREN's home State of Massachusetts imported Russian natural gas through the Boston Harbor. At the same time, the Senator has denounced U.S. pipelines and other U.S. energy infrastructure projects—this, as her own State pays one of the highest utility rates anywhere in the country.

Not only do the Democrats' politicized policies dramatically increase Americans' energy costs, but they are also a threat to our national security. No matter, Senator WARREN also wants to ban nuclear power. She doesn't like fracking. She doesn't like natural gas. She now wants to ban nuclear power. Has she forgotten that nuclear energy is America's chief carbon-free power source? Twenty percent of U.S. electricity comes from nuclear power. These reckless Democrat proposals would make the United States more dependent on unstable foreign energy markets.

Working families here in the United States should never overpay on their energy bills due to foolish policies—and that is what they are, foolish policies that make us all vulnerable. The American public is not going to stand for it.

According to a recent Washington Post-Kaiser Foundation poll, more than 70 percent of Americans have said they don't want to pay even \$10 more on their monthly electric bills to lower carbon emissions. We want to lower carbon emissions. How much are families willing to pay? Seventy percent say not \$10 a month. How about \$2 a month? A majority said, no, that is too much to pay.

So we need to pursue a commonsense energy strategy—one that keeps working families' costs down, one that keeps the economy strong, and one that helps keep our Nation safe.

Republicans are committed to protecting and advancing America's energy independence. President Trump understands how important this is. In the wake of the attacks on Saudi Arabia, not only is the President working to expand sanctions, but he is moving to approve major pipeline projects as well.

One of the energy issues I am addressing now in the Senate is reform-

ing the permit process for American energy exploration. Earlier this Congress, I introduced a piece of legislation called the ONSHORE Act. It stands for Opportunities for the Nation and States to Harness Onshore Resources for Energy. The ONSHORE Act will simplify the process for Federal onshore oil and gas permits. Whether we are talking about promoting energy exploration, utilities, carbon capturing, or nuclear power, we must engineer our way to American energy solutions.

Republicans recognize our Nation's unique ability to fill in the gaps from global supply disruptions. So our focus needs to be on promoting American energy independence. It is time to reject the Democrats' extreme schemes once and for all. What the Democrats are proposing is a real threat to our U.S. energy security, and they are offering a gift to American enemies.

We need to continue our America-first energy policy. That is what we are going to continue to do to keep us strong, to keep us safe, and to keep us prosperous as a nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ROSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McGuire nomination?

Ms. ROSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 298 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Cantwell	Cramer
Baldwin	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cardin	Cruz
Bennet	Carper	Daines
Blackburn	Cassidy	Duckworth
Blumenthal	Collins	Durbin
Blunt	Coons	Enzi
Boozman	Cornyn	Ernst
Braun	Cortez Masto	Feinstein
Burr	Cotton	Fischer



Gardner	McConnell	Schumer
Graham	McSally	Scott (FL)
Grassley	Menendez	Scott (SC)
Hassan	Moran	Shaheen
Hawley	Murkowski	Shelby
Heinrich	Murphy	Sinema
Hirono	Murray	Smith
Hoeven	Paul	Stabenow
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Sullivan
Inhofe	Peters	Tester
Isakson	Portman	Thune
Johnson	Reed	Toomey
Kaine	Risch	Udall
Kennedy	Roberts	Van Hollen
King	Romney	Warner
Klobuchar	Rosen	Wicker
Lankford	Rounds	Wyden
Leahy	Rubio	Young
Lee	Sasse	
Manchin	Schatz	

NAYS—6

Brown	Gillibrand	Merkley
Casey	Markey	Warren

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Jones	Tillis
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT RECEIVED ON AUGUST 12, 2019, BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED IMMEDIATELY TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OF THE SENATE AND THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in August a public servant inside the intelligence community found the conduct of the President of the United States alarming enough to file an official whistleblower complaint. The inspector general of the intelligence community found this whistleblower complaint both credible and urgent. By law, the Director of National Intelligence must forward such a complaint to the congressional intelligence committees within 7 days of receiving it. Congress has been informed by the inspector general of the intelligence community in writing that the Trump administration is preventing that complaint from being sent to the relevant committees in Congress.

Those are the facts. The situation they describe is unacceptable. We know that the executive branch is blocking the legislative branch—a coequal branch of our government—from performing its constitutional oversight duties. The fact that the whistleblower complaint concerns our national security, our foreign policy, and potential misconduct by the President makes the situation even more serious.

In a short time, I will ask my colleagues' consent to pass a simple resolution. It essentially says "that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall be transmitted immediately to

the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives."

I cannot imagine any legitimate or straight-faced reason for an objection to this unanimous consent request. The only reason for any Senator to object would be to shield the President's conduct from scrutiny by the public and the representatives they elect to represent them; that is, to protect the President from accountability.

In a moment, I hope this resolution will pass without a single dissenting Senator, and it should.

The request, despite its non-controversial nature, speaks to the issues that go back to the founding days of our Republic: checks and balances, the separation of powers, and the constitutional duty of the President and the executive branch to faithfully execute the laws of the United States. The Senate, today—right now—should speak with one unified voice to reaffirm those time-honored principles and defend the grand traditions of our democracy.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 325, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 325) expressing the sense of the Senate that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, all of us share the concern for protecting whistleblowers who use appropriate, established channels to raise legitimate concerns. The Senate's obligation is to treat such allegations in a responsible and deliberate manner, to avoid racing to judgment based on media leaks, and to not fuel media speculation with reckless accusations.

There is much we do not know about the complaint lodged with the intelligence community's inspector general, including whether the complaint involves intelligence activities at all.

Before the Democratic leader elected to go to the media yesterday, the chairman and vice chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence had already been working together in a bipartisan manner—free from politicization—to get more information from both the Acting Director of National Intelligence and the intelligence community's inspector general. Given the progress the committee was making, I don't believe this made-for-TV moment was actually necessary. I

would have preferred the committee be allowed to do its work in a quiet and methodical manner. It doesn't serve the committee or its goals to litigate its business here on the floor or for the television cameras.

Nevertheless, I agree that the DNI should make additional information available to the committee so it can evaluate the complaint consistent with the statute and other procedures that exist to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

I also want to express my appreciation for President Trump's announcement that the White House will release tomorrow the "complete, fully-declassified, and unredacted transcript of [his] phone conversation with President Zelensky." I hope this will help to refocus the conversation away from reckless speculation and back toward the facts.

So, stipulating that our objective here is simply to conduct the kind of bipartisan oversight of intelligence matters that the committee has successfully conducted in the past, I have no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, three brief points. First, this resolution is not aimed at the Senate Intelligence Committees. Senators BARR and WARNER do a diligent job in trying to figure out what is going on. It is aimed at a thus far recalcitrant executive branch which has blocked the ability for the committees to see the complaint even though law requires it.

Second, it is welcomed that we can join together to do our job of oversight. I want to thank the majority leader for not blocking this request, because I think every one of us in this Chamber realizes the importance of oversight and the need to prevent an overreaching executive from going that far. Getting the transcript is a good step, but it is the complaint we need.

That is the gravamen of this resolution. It is the whistleblower's complaint, not the transcript, that we need and are asking for in this resolution.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 325) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the Cella nomination.