

have made their lives easier. We strengthened the military. We have given healthcare flexibility to our veterans. We have protected our communities from harm.

Of course, there is more work that needs to be done. Just before the State work period concluded this last week, the Senate voted to proceed to a conference on the farm bill. This bill is of great importance to the people of my State. City dwellers may not fully appreciate it, but according to the 2012 census, agriculture employs one out of every seven working Texans. With 28 million Texans, that is a huge number of farmers and ranchers directly affected by what we do in the farm bill.

What people don't realize, however, is that nutrition programs—not agriculture funding—account for almost 80 percent of the cost of the farm bill. This includes the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as food stamps.

Although I was proud to support the Senate's version of the legislation, I was somewhat disappointed it did not include stronger reforms to some of these nutrition programs, including work requirements for people who are able-bodied or training requirements for people who need additional training or community service for people who can't work or don't want the training but at least provide some service to their local communities.

I appreciate what the House has done to provide for those work requirements in the bill that my friend Chairman CONAWAY included in the House version. These reforms are not last-minute additions. There was a long, thorough process leading to the introduction of the House farm bill. Chairman CONAWAY held more than 20 hearings on these nutrition programs, including some during the Congress, and afterward he put together some very commonsense work requirements that were based on broad stakeholder input.

During this record of low unemployment across the Nation, it is not unreasonable to try to use this opportunity, which comes only once every 5 years, to take a look and ensure our Federal dollars are being spent wisely, that able-bodied adults are getting the training they need in order to earn good pay, and that Federal assistance is only used to provide for those who are unable to provide for themselves.

A scholar from the American Enterprise Institute, Michael Strain, wrote about this recently. He wrote that the question of “[w]hether there should be a mandatory work component in public policies designed to assist low-income households is in part a question of . . . economics,” but it is also moral and philosophical as well.

Whom should we expect to work in our society? Should a healthy person in the prime of their life who doesn't have young children at home be working—yes or no? In other words, does that person owe some share of his or her energy, ability, and intelligence to the

rest of society from which we all benefit, including them? Some think it is nobody's business but the individual's whether they work or not and still receive these benefits, but I disagree with that.

When the question involves Federal benefits that are paid for by all taxpayers, whether to work or not is no longer just a private, personal decision. We as a country have decided that part of our social contract with each other will be providing a safety net where needed, and that is important. The flip side is, to benefit from that safety net, there also ought to be certain obligations. In other words, you can't have rights without responsibilities. One of them should be to work, if you are able to do so.

While I wish the members of the conference committee my best as they try to reach consensus on the farm bill, I encourage them to take another look at Chairman CONAWAY's ideas on work requirements. I hope my colleagues will be willing to revisit this issue in the conference committee on the farm bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

REAFFIRMING THE VITAL AND INDISPENSABLE
ROLE THE FREE PRESS SERVES

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, we swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, including its First Amendment, which says, in part, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment, or religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.”

We can't let statements by the President declaring the press is the enemy of the people go unchallenged. Both parties complain about the media, but who can argue with Thomas Jefferson, who wrote that “our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost,” or with James Madison, who said that “the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments,” or with President Reagan, who said that “freedom of the press is one of our most important freedoms and also one of our oldest,” or with Justice Kennedy, who wrote that “the First Amendment is often inconvenient. But that is beside the point. Inconvenience does not absolve the government of its obligation to tolerate speech.”

These words of past leaders should inspire us to act, to send a message that we support the First Amendment, and we support the freedom of the press.

Senators SCHUMER, BLUMENTHAL, and I have introduced a resolution that does just that. It affirms that the press is not the enemy of the people, and it reaffirms the vital and indispensable role of the free press, serving to inform the electorate, uncover the truth, act as a check on the inherent power of the

government, further discourse and debate and advance our most basic and cherished democratic norms and freedoms.

This resolution also condemns attacks on the institution of the free press and views efforts to systematically undermine the credibility of the press as a whole as an attack on our democratic institutions.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 607, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 607) reaffirming the vital and indispensable role the free press serves.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 607) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF A. MARVIN QUATTLEBAUM, JR.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to express my disappointment that my Republican colleagues are not making better use of our legislative days in August. We could be working together to pass strong bipartisan bills that secure our elections and punish foreign nations and companies that hurt our national security. We could be working on healthcare and protecting people with preexisting health conditions and reducing the cost of prescription drugs. We could be working on legislation to strengthen our Nation's guns laws. My colleague, Senator NELSON, introduced emergency legislation to prevent the Trump Administration from allowing 3-D gun plans to be posted on the internet. We spoke on the floor and asked unanimous consent to have a vote on his bill, and Republicans blocked that effort.

Instead, we are here, voting on Judge Quattlebaum's nomination to the Fourth Circuit. Judge Quattlebaum was confirmed to his present seat, as judge on the district court a mere 6 months earlier. Republicans think it is more important to promote a novice judge than to work on legislation to secure our elections, protect our national security, or prevent dangerous people from accessing guns.

I urge Senator MCCONNELL to reconsider the August legislative agenda and bring substantive bills to the floor for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we are going to vote on Marvin Quattlebaum to be a circuit judge for the Fourth Judicial Circuit in Richmond, VA. He is a South Carolina native and a district court judge in South Carolina. I have known Marvin for well over 20 years. He is one of the most capable lawyers I have ever met. He has a great reputation as a district court judge.

I thank President Trump for nominating him. I thank my Senate colleagues for moving his nomination forward. He will be a great addition to the Fourth Circuit. He is a very sound, conservative judge who is incredibly fairminded. To my Democratic colleagues who moved his nomination through the Judiciary Committee, thank you.

Later in the day, we will vote on cloture on the nomination of Jay Richardson, also from South Carolina, to be on the Fourth Circuit in Richmond, VA. He was reported out of committee 20 to 1. Both gentlemen are rated unanimously "well-qualified" by the ABA. Jay is one of the great legal minds of our time, and I think he is going to be a great addition to the Fourth Circuit.

He prosecuted the Dylann Roof case, the man who killed the nine parishioners at the Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC. I recommend that you take time to listen to his arguments about that case if you ever get a chance. It is very eloquent.

Both of these fine men come from South Carolina, and I urge my colleagues to vote affirmative when that time comes. I do want to again thank President Trump. Senator SCOTT and I both highly recommend to our colleagues "yes" votes for Mr. Quattlebaum and Mr. Richardson in just a minute.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL for moving these nominations forward and Senator GRASSLEY for making sure they got out of committee.

With that, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the

Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Baldwin	Gardner	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hassan	Perdue
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Reed
Capito	Heller	Risch
Carper	Hoeven	Roberts
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Isakson	Sasse
Coons	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Jones	Shaheen
Cornyn	Kaine	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	King	Tester
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Leahy	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—28

Blumenthal	Harris	Schatz
Booker	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Lee	Tillis
Durbin	McCain	Toomey
Flake	Murray	
Inhofe	Rubio	

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Ex.]

YEAS—80

Baldwin	Feinstein	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Murphy
Booker	Gardner	Nelson
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Booker	Grassley	Perdue
Boozman	Harris	Peters
Brown	Hassan	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Reed
Cantwell	Heinrich	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cardin	Heller	Rounds
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Jones	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Smith
Cornyn	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Klobuchar	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Leahy	Udall
Daines	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Duckworth	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Young
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—10

Blumenthal	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Sanders	Wyden
Hirono	Schatz	
Markey	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Lee	Tillis
Durbin	McCain	Toomey
Flake	Murray	
Inhofe	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 10.

The motion is agreed to.