

a convenient scapegoat for the consequences of its own actions.

Actually, I have a better idea: Democrats could stop setting off inflationary spirals, stop proposing massive tax hikes on the brink of a recession, stop waging a holy war against American fossil fuels, and stop applauding the pain that working families are feeling as part of some grand, leftwing “transition.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

NATIVE AMERICAN BOARDING SCHOOLS

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, last month, the U.S. Department of the Interior released an investigative report on our country’s Indian boarding school system. From 1819 to 1969, more than 400 of these schools operated across what today are 37 States. The Indian boarding school era is one of the darkest periods in American history and one that we as a nation have not properly reckoned with.

For nearly two centuries, the U.S. Government took Native American children as young as 6 from their families and sent them to boarding schools, but these schools were not solely for the purpose of teaching the children. They humiliated these children, and they harmed them. Indian children were forced to change their names, to cut their hair, to stop speaking their Native languages. They did military drills three times a week. Every day, they were assigned hours of grueling work that violated child labor laws: They had to raise livestock, sew clothes, work on the railroads. Those who resisted were punished with whippings and solitary confinement. Those who resisted were punished with whippings and solitary confinement. Often, older children were forced to punish the younger ones.

The conditions of these schools were awful: three to a bed, dirty water, no working plumbing. Disease and malnourishment were common. Physical and sexual abuse was rampant. We don’t know how many children died at these U.S. Government-funded and -run schools, but the Interior Department estimates that the number is in the tens of thousands.

And all of this occurred for one reason—to steal Native land.

As far back as the 1700s, U.S. Government policy was officially to dispossess and break Tribes so their territories could be taken for American expansion. Erasing Native culture through assimilation was key to this.

As one official said, “The love of home and the warm, reciprocal affection existing between parents and children are among the strongest characteristics of the Indian nature.”

So the Federal Government acted accordingly. The Departments of War and Interior oversaw this forced assimilation. Congress passed laws appropriating school funding to “civilize” Native children. When families refused to send their kids to these schools, Congress made the food rations that

were negotiated in treaties contingent on their doing so. To fill the schools, the government enlisted religious organizations, paying them on a per-child basis. A majority of this money came from Federal Indian trusts—money that was supposed to help the Tribes—and the Supreme Court ruled that all of this was legal at the time.

The result of these actions was a multi-generational trauma for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian communities and families that continue to this day. Adults who attended boarding schools are more likely to have everything from arthritis to depression. They are three times as likely to have cancer. Studies have found worse health outcomes for the ancestors of people who went to these schools, and there are 53 known child burial sites and an unknown number yet to be discovered.

We can’t undo this history, but we have to acknowledge it. That starts with examining the full scope of this atrocity unflinchingly, with clear minds and with fresh eyes. We need to keep investigating Indian boarding schools, and the findings should be taught in every school and be known by every future generation of Americans. As recommended in the report from the Department of the Interior, we must also support Native language revitalization. We cannot continue to neglect these programs and further erase Native culture.

We have to understand and undertake a path toward healing, not in the abstract but in a concrete and meaningful way. We must work hand in hand with Native communities on a respectful and restorative process. We have to empower these communities through increased Federal investments in Native healthcare and housing and economic development. We must reject our centuries-long pattern of Native suppression and, instead, begin one of reconciliation. We owe the survivors of the Indian boarding school era, their families, and their communities nothing less.

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

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

45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE SYSTEM

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this morning to recognize and commemorate the 45th anniversary of the first oil moving through the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. We actually reached that milestone on Monday so I am here to speak this morning about what this 800-mile-long pipeline continues to mean for Alaska, our Nation, and really the world itself.

TAPS, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, is truly a modern marvel. It is the backbone of my home State’s economy. It supports great jobs for Alaska. It helps generate critical revenues for our State. It ensures that our energy is transported safely, and it really is a vital component of America’s energy security. But I think it is kind of nice, as we reflect on decades past, to appreciate some of the history behind the Trans-Alaska Pipeline because, for a period of time, there was a question of whether or not this extraordinary energy infrastructure would be built at all.

After oil was discovered in Prudhoe Bay, there was vigorous debate as to how we were going to move this resource, how we were going to transport it. Some wanted to use trucks or tankers; others actually thought that massive jets would be the way to go. There were some who wanted to build an overland pipeline across Canada. That would have been about a 3,200-mile line in length. But, thankfully, it was an all-Alaska pipeline route that prevailed.

So when you look at the map of Alaska and where our pipeline sits today, it truly does just bisect the entire State of Alaska. From Prudhoe to Valdez at Tidewater is an 800-mile line. Thankfully, an all-Alaska pipeline route was the one that ultimately prevailed over all of the alternatives that were considered. Congress authorized it in 1973—an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis of authorization.

There is an interesting side story—it is actually not a side story; it is pretty pivotal—in terms of whether or not this Trans-Alaska Pipeline actually came into being. But it was a tie-breaking vote cast by Spiro Agnew that really helped to facilitate the line because it effectively determined that there would be no further litigation about the line moving forward.

The preconstruction process for TAPS lasted for about 6 years, mostly concurrent with the final passage of its authorization act; and as part of that, the Federal Task Force on Alaskan Oil Development—this is a group that we should probably be bringing back—completed a six-volume environmental impact statement, so a six-volume EIS.

And that EIS, along with Congress’s decision to shield TAPS from litigation—again, this tie-breaking vote that I have alluded to—allowed the construction to begin. So it did.

Several companies joined together to form a joint venture, called Alyeska, and they set forth to build and operate the line. And Alyeska ultimately acquired 515 Federal permits, along with more than 832 from the State of Alaska, in order to proceed.

Now, at that time, TAPS was the largest private construction project of its kind. It had a pricetag of more than \$8 billion. In October of 1975, more than 28,000 people were working to make it a reality, and together they turned over 100,000 pieces of 40- to 60-foot pipe in a

48-inch diameter that runs from, again, Prudhoe to Valdez in the south central part of our State.

I have had many opportunities to show visitors our Trans-Alaska Pipeline. If you look at it from the air, it is just this silver ribbon, again, that bisects the State. You look at it from the ground, and, again, it is truly, truly an engineering marvel.

Now, I saw an old criticism that TAPS was an “engineer’s nightmare.” The occupant of the Chair here might be interested in this given your background, but, in reality, it is a testament, truly, to world-class engineering and the genius, the creativity, and the pioneering spirit of all who worked on it.

TAPS crosses three mountain ranges, including Atigun Pass in the Brooks Range that has an elevation of 4,739 feet. It reaches a grade of 55 degrees at Thompson Pass in the Chugach Range. It crosses more than 530 streams and rivers. It accommodates some 579 animal crossings. And it operates at temperatures ranging from 95 degrees above zero to 80 degrees below zero, and that is not counting the windchill factor.

And when you are talking about Alaska, of course, you have got to account for seismic activity. So TAPS’ engineers also had to account for that. You have got mountain ranges. You have got extreme weather. You have got animals, wildlife that you have to accommodate. You have the rivers, the streams, but you also have to accommodate seismic hazard.

The pipeline crosses three fault lines, including the Denali Fault. In that area, engineers built the pipeline on slider beams with Teflon shoes. So if you look at these supports here, these vertical support pillars here and the slider beams are on Teflon shoes that allow the pipeline to move laterally up to 20 feet—up to 20 feet laterally—and up to 5 feet vertically. So this pipeline can absorb the give-and-take and the hard shake of a significant earthquake.

And it is pretty important that the engineers worked this into this extraordinary infrastructure. We had a magnitude 7.9 earthquake that struck in 2002 right on that Denali Fault. The pipeline handled it well. It remained intact, and it did exactly what the engineers designed it to do: It moved back and forth on these lateral supports. It moved up and down, and it allowed that pipeline, that piece of steel pipeline, to have the flex that it needed to avoid any—any—issues.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System was built in just over 3 years. This was between 1974 and 1977. I was a young person growing up in Fairbanks at the time, and that was a time and place of great energy and intensity as we were involved in this extraordinary oil construction boom. And the men and women who were working on the project at that time had this saying: “They just didn’t know that it couldn’t be done.” And they not only met their

goal of first oil moving through the pipeline by July 1, 1977; they beat it by 10 days.

And the rest, they say, is history. Over the past 45 years, TAPS has not just been a pipeline, not just oil pipeline infrastructure; it has become Alaska’s economic lifeline. I say it is like the artery for our State. It has helped us create jobs to the point where our oil and gas industry either employs or supports about one-third of Alaska’s workforce. It has generated billions of dollars in revenues for our State—for everything from roads and schools to essential services.

TAPS has allowed us to create and now grow our Permanent Fund. This Permanent Fund has really turned our oil resources into an enduring source of prosperity for Alaskans. We not only have a Permanent Fund, but spun off from that Permanent Fund and the investment on those earnings are dividends that are returned to each and every Alaskan in this State. If you lived in Alaska from 1982, when they first started the dividends, until today, you would have received nearly \$45,000 in annual dividends that go to offset the high cost of living in a high-cost State like Alaska. This year, Alaskans are set to receive a pretty hefty Permanent Fund dividend: more than \$3,000 more.

So it has been an economic benefit, most certainly, to Alaskans. It has also enabled us to keep our State tax burden low. We have no income tax in the State. We have no statewide sales tax. We have the lowest gas tax in the country.

As the economist Scott Goldsmith has noted, revenues from TAPS also enable us to keep taxes on other industries like our tourism, our fisheries—it allows us to keep those taxes lower than they might otherwise be.

But really, from day one, TAPS has strengthened our energy security. And when I talk about energy security, I am referring not just to the security of those of us in Alaska but to our Nation’s energy security. It helped tide America over during the 1979 oil crisis. It has insulated us from OPEC and OPEC Plus and lessened our dependence on nations that do not share our interests, and it has dramatically reduced the dollars that go overseas to purchase oil.

It has certainly provided reliable and affordable energy for tens of millions of Americans up and down the west coast because it is the west coast where Alaskan oil is primarily directed.

But it is hard to imagine Alaska without TAPS, without the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. It is hard also to imagine the consequences that America would have faced without the 18.4 billion barrels of oil that it has now safely moved over these past 45 years. And I think it is no exaggeration to say that while we built a pipeline, that pipeline has helped us build our State.

And in the midst of all this—something that the folks at Alyeska Pipeline are very, very proud of—Alyeska has accrued a remarkable safety record. From 2017 through 2020, the company reported a total of just 5.1 barrels of oil as spilled. Yet over that same time period, from 2017 to 2020, more than 733 million barrels of oil have moved through TAPS. So not 1 in every 1 million gallons, not 1 in every 10 million gallons, not even 1 in every 100 million gallons was spilled during this time period. That is a pretty darn good record. And that is something that Alyeska can be proud of, and I think it speaks to the kind of company that it is.

And, at its core, the reason why TAPS has been successful are its people. They focus on safety first. There are more than 700 people who work directly for Alyeska on the North Slope, at the pump stations, at its Anchorage control center, and in Valdez. And you are probably not going to find a more dedicated group. They are just so committed to their mission, and it certainly makes me proud to know that 95 percent of those who work at Alyeska are Alaskans.

TAPS is an economic engine for our State. But as we are standing here in 2022 celebrating its 45th anniversary, the fact of the matter is, this pipeline faces a real challenge. TAPS’ technical capacity is 2 million barrels per day. We have achieved that years ago. But right now—right now—the pipeline is moving just a quarter of that. They are moving about 500,000 barrels a day. So what that means is that the line is about three-quarters empty, and that can create some difficult operational challenges.

We have had many of the briefings about what it means when you have a pipeline that isn’t completely full. The throughput moves slower. And when you have hot oil coming out of the ground in an arctic environment, moving 800 miles through a cold piece of steel, if it doesn’t move quickly and it is allowed to cool down, it can build up waxy buildup on the inside that needs to be scrubbed and cleaned. We call it pigging. It is just an operational thing. Alyeska deals with it, but it is something that is an issue.

When you have less than full throughput, it moves differently. So when you are going up mountain ranges and down the other side, now what happens as you see that pipeline, which is designed to flex, when you don’t have your full operational capacity? And Alyeska has been working to work through some of these challenges, and they have been doing a good job.

But in fairness, this is not Alyeska’s fault here. If you want to know why TAPS is a quarter full, you can probably look to some people in this Chamber, some who have been serving in this Chamber before. You can look down the street to Pennsylvania Avenue at the current administration as well as some who preceded the Biden administration.

We have the resources—Alaska has the resources to fill TAPS up. What we have lacked is access to our lands, access to our leases, and access to the permits to help make this a reality. And this is despite various Presidents telling Alaskans that, look, you are going to be able to develop your resources. They say it, and the promises are broken over and over and over again. And it continues to this day.

The Biden administration is breaking the law by refusing to carry out the oil and gas program that Congress mandated for the non-wilderness 1002 Area. We did that in the 2017 law.

Millions of acres in our National Petroleum Reserve are being taken off the table with this administration through, effectively, administration whim. And with one of the best projects within the Petroleum Reserve right now, we are dealing with some redtape here; but, effectively, the excuse is that more studies need to be done. These are studies that have been done already, and we are being told you have to do them again.

With gas prices averaging more than \$5 a gallon across the Nation, it sure would be nice to fill up the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. It not only gives us more product domestically; it would certainly help us in Alaska. We would have more jobs in Alaska and more revenue to help us improve the quality of life in every community in our State, help offset the very high fuel costs in our State. We averaged \$5 and above a long time before many in the lower 48 here.

But we would also be bringing less foreign oil to the West Coast, including California, where imports have risen in almost direct proportion to our production decline. As you are seeing less oil coming out of Alaska to the West Coast, particularly California, they are getting it from somewhere, and they are bringing it in. They are importing that. And whether it is from countries that don't like us and don't really care about their environmental track record or their human rights issues, we get it from there.

We would also have an alternative to Russia, which continues to sell its energy and bring in billions of dollars a day to finance its bloody war against Ukraine. And then across the Nation, you could anticipate that prices would be lower at the pump, which would reduce the pain that families and businesses are experiencing.

I know that there is not a dial on this extraordinary energy security asset where we can just ramp it up, but this is an important discussion to be having, again, in context of what value the oil resources in Alaska can contribute to our country.

And when you have in place policies that say it is not important to keep this thing full—even though in Alaska, you have the resources to keep it full—when you say it is not important and you put in place pressures and obstacles and barriers to increase produc-

tion, you are going to see that. You are going to see that impact, what happens in this country to our supply. Right now, we are all reading about it. We are all watching the news.

There is a lot that President Biden is saying that this is what we are going to do to bring down your gas prices, but I will go on record to suggest that a full TAPS would do a heck of a lot more to reduce gas prices than many of the other suggestions out there like price gouging probes and suspension of the Federal gas tax, the proposal to hand out gas cards. These are temporary—almost momentary—blips that might make somebody feel OK for a month or 2 because maybe I get a few cents more off the price at the pump if we have a 3-month Federal gas tax holiday like President Biden is suggesting. But, you know, it is not right to put in place—I mean, you can call it a gimmick, but are you addressing the fundamentals of supply and demand if you just say for a few months: “Here, we are going to take the pressure off you so you won't be so mad”? Well, people are going to continue to be so mad if it doesn't help alleviate the problem, if it doesn't help address the pain that American families are feeling.

It is pretty simple out here. We need supply. We need supply to keep up with the rising demand and the falling output from around the world. This is where we need to wake up because it is not as if we don't have options. It is not as if we don't have the supply. Alaska has the supply right in the vicinity of a world-class pipeline that has room for an additional 1.5 million barrels per day.

It is just beyond me why anyone would contemplate oil from Iran or Venezuela or other members of OPEC+ over a State like Alaska. It is just beyond me; yet that is what we hear. That is what we hear from the President. That is what we hear from the administration that somehow we have to get this resource and it is going to have to come from somewhere, so we are going to go asking. We are going to go asking outside of our country. We are going to go to Iran, Venezuela.

The President is going to make a trip to Saudi Arabia, yet they are not asking Alaska to do more. In fact, they are not only not asking, they continue to put up impediments and barriers for us to do more, and that just defies logic. It degrades the environment. It makes the world a more dangerous place every time we look to other countries for resources that we need, knowing full well that we have a better environmental record here. We have the ability to make us less vulnerable, less energy-insecure, and yet we are not taking advantage of that.

There is a section on Alyeska's website titled “Memories and Mileposts,” with historical information about TAPS, and I would suggest that it is well worth visiting and recognizing what an incredible asset this pipeline has been since first oil was

moved through it on June 20, 1977. Forty-five years is a good long time, but even as we thank all who have made TAPS such a resounding success, I would encourage all of you to maybe mark your calendars for June 20, 2027. That will be the 50th anniversary.

I would hope that we could all be honest and realistic about our global energy needs in the meantime and ensure significantly greater throughput is running through that pipeline when we reach the next milepost. That would be good for Alaskans; that would be good for the country. I think it would be good and important for the world. And we know the men and women who operate TAPS at Alyeska and their contractors will ensure that every last molecule moves safely through it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I just want to echo what was said by my colleague from Alaska because what we are now hearing from the administration are ideas that they think will help ease the pressure on gas prices in this country, but they are all gimmicky. I mean, it is all rebates—gas card rebates or doing away with the gas tax temporarily until September, like that is going to do anything meaningful long term to address this supply-demand crisis that the Senator from Alaska just alluded to.

I have to say that this administration, from the time they came into office, has demonstrated an open hostility to oil and gas production in this country—energy production, more generally.

The Senator from Alaska was talking about the oil pipeline. We have one in South Dakota—that was going to run through South Dakota—the Keystone XL Pipeline, which was killed the first day in office by the Biden administration and, again, sent signals to those who produce energy in this country that we are not interested in what you have to offer. We want to move in a different direction. And that different direction, of course, is electric vehicles, which I am not against. Everybody might want an electric vehicle. It is a free country. But the fact of the matter is, we will be dependent upon liquid fuels in the foreseeable future. Since that is the case, we ought to produce it right here in Alaska. We have vast resources.

It is an issue, fundamentally, of supply and demand. As the Senator of Alaska pointed out, you look at Alaska, now we are talking about getting oil from Saudi Arabia, from Venezuela, from countries, other places around the world—in some cases run by dictators—instead of producing it right here in the United States of America. That is just tragic. It is just tragic, and the American people are paying the price for it.

Why? Because in places like Alaska where we have abundant resources, they shut it down. They shut down

Federal lands. They started denying permits to drill, and they killed the infrastructure that supports, in many cases, energy production in this country.

A pipeline, for example, is not only the most efficient, but the safest way to transport liquid fuels in this country. We need liquid fuels. We know that. It is a fact, and we have the supply—abundant supply is right here in the United States. All we have to do is simply access that. Instead, we are talking about gimmicks like rebates, gas card rebates or temporary suspension of the fuel tax in this country which, by the way, would rob the Highway Trust Fund of the resources that we need to build out the infrastructure in this country and to maintain it.

There are just so many reasons and on so many levels why these are bad ideas—so bad, in fact, that Speaker PELOSI in the House of Representatives has previously referred to this kind of idea that the administration is now proposing as a gimmick and something that isn't going to provide long-term relief.

It is fundamentally an issue of supply and demand, and all we simply have to do is turn it on. We have to get the energy producers in this country off the sidelines, back into the game, producing oil and gas in America in a way that will meet Americans' daily needs when they fill up their cars and trucks with gasoline at the pump, which right now they are being punished unnecessarily by an economy where we have constantly rising gas prices. The average price is around \$5 nationwide, literally a doubling of the gas price since this President took office. There is a direct correlation—direct correlation—connect the dots—to policy decisions this administration has made, which they are now realizing and trying to come up with these gimmicky ideas to try to deal with an issue that fundamentally could be fixed simply by sending the right signals and encouraging and incentivizing the type of energy production in this country that we ought to be encouraging.

And the energy producers in this country are up to it. They will meet the demand if we simply give them the opportunity. That is what needs to change. That is what this administration needs to be focused on, not on shutting down gas and oil and energy production here in the United States.

PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT

Mr. President, the Dobbs case will be decided by the Supreme Court in a matter of days now. I pray that it will be decided in favor of life and that *Roe v. Wade*, a case that even pro-abortion constitutional scholars criticized, will be overturned.

But however Dobbs is decided, the work of the pro-life movement will continue. That work, of course, includes advocacy—attempts to change laws that ensure that human rights of unborn human beings are protected.

But perhaps most of all, it includes the daily work of providing help to

moms in need. Helping moms and their babies are central to the pro-life movement. Pregnancy resource centers and other pro-life organizations provide a variety of resources to help women in challenging circumstances. They provide supplies for moms and their babies. They offer prenatal and parenting classes. They assist moms with housing. They help them connect with State and local resources, and they provide friendship and support and a listening ear to mom going through a difficult time.

They provide agency referrals for mothers who choose to make an adoption plan for their babies. They provide places for moms and their babies to live while they complete their education or get back on their feet.

During the current formula crisis, pregnancy resource centers have helped moms struggling to find what they need to feed their babies by providing them with free formula.

You would think that helping out moms would be pretty uncontroversial. You would think that everyone, including individuals who are pro-abortion, could get behind helping a struggling mom find housing or access to prenatal care. But apparently the pro-abortion movement finds providing material help to moms in need and letting them know they have alternatives to abortion somehow to be pretty threatening.

Pregnancy resource centers have frequently been a target of pro-abortion politicians in the pro-abortion movement, which have sought to undermine their work. But things have gotten very serious in recent weeks. Since a draft of a possible opinion in the Dobbs case was leaked in May, pro-abortion extremists have conducted a campaign of vandalism and violence against pregnancy resource centers and churches. Just a few blocks away from here, one pregnancy resource center was egged and graffitied and had its door covered in red paint. A number of others have faced similar vandalism, and multiple pregnancy resource centers have been the victim of arson.

A group claiming responsibility for a number of the attacks, Jane's Revenge, released a chilling letter last week in which it declared "open season" on pregnancy centers and stated:

We promised to take increasingly drastic measures against oppressive infrastructures. Rest assured that we will, and those measures may not come in the form of something so easily cleaned up as fire and graffiti.

Well, perhaps it is not entirely shocking that some members of the extreme abortion movement have responded to the possibility of *Roe* being overturned with vandalism, arson, and threats of further attacks.

This wave of violence is deeply troubling, and these attacks need to be taken seriously. I hope Attorney General Garland is developing a strategy to confront this wave of vandalism and violence and to prevent future and more serious attacks.

Earlier this month, I joined a number of my Republican colleagues in sending

a letter to the Attorney General asking about his plans for dealing with these attacks and preventing future ones. I am disappointed that we have yet to receive a reply to our letter. And the President—not merely his spokesperson but the President himself—should be out there strongly condemning these attacks and letting everyone know that violent responses to the Dobbs decision will not be tolerated.

After one pregnancy resource center was vandalized, its director said:

We are not going to let intimidation change what we are doing. It failed. It was pretty unanimous from the volunteers and staff here that this is not going to change how we will do business here one bit at all.

I know that attitude is reflected at other pregnancy resource centers, and I know that, despite threats of violence, the work of helping moms and their babies will continue.

The work of the pro-life movement represents the best of our American tradition: providing a voice to the voiceless, standing up for the human rights of those who have been denied them, and providing a helping hand to neighbors in need. I am grateful to all the pro-life Americans standing up for the human rights of unborn human beings and helping moms and their babies get the resources they need, and win or lose at the Supreme Court, I know that work will continue.

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.

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

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

NOMINATION OF MARY T. BOYLE

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, later this afternoon, we are going to vote on Mary Boyle to be a Consumer Product Safety Commissioner. This organization, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, works on the frontlines to protect consumers from dangerous and defective products, and Ms. Boyle's confirmation will give the Commission a full complement of Commissioners to complete its important work.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is responsible for regulating the safety of more than 15,000 everyday products and helps keep hazardous products out of our homes and away from our families. The Agency is responsible for investigating hazards, effectuating product recalls, issuing and enforcing product safety standards, and informing consumers and manufacturers about potential dangers and how to avoid them. The CPSC's work literally saves lives and prevents injuries.

We know that Ms. Boyle is well qualified for this position and that she will make consumers a top priority and their safety a top priority.

Now is an important time for the Consumer Product Safety Commission

to be well equipped to fight for these consumer safety issues. We need it to remain a strong force in keeping unsafe and defective products, including children's toys, infant rockers, household appliances, and other issues in the development space, like elevators and space heaters, out of the market.

When it comes to recalls, for example, this year the Consumer Product Safety Commission and three residential elevator manufacturers announced the recall of 70,000 residential elevators that posed a serious risk of injury and, tragically, death to small children. I am encouraged to see that the Consumer Product Safety Commission is taking action on this heartbreaking issue. There is more to be done, and we need a Commission that will follow through.

The Commission is also responsible for investigating tragedies, such as home fires that might have been caused by defective products. In fact, the Consumer Product Safety Commission was quickly on the scene in the Bronx earlier this year when a fire from a space heater caused the death of 17 people, including 8 children. When I sent a letter to the Consumer Product Safety Commission asking them to look further into this issue, they acted quickly and knew that we had to investigate.

While these investigations are still ongoing, we need assurances that if a defective product is found to be the cause, that the Consumer Product Safety Commission is going to be fully equipped to take action.

I also want to mention with respect to the Consumer Product Safety Commission's rulemaking authority that the Commerce Committee recently passed the STURDY Act, a bill that would speed up the Consumer Product Safety Commission's rulemaking process to deal with furniture tipovers.

Unfortunately, many furniture items are designed in such a way that they can tip if a child grabs or climbs upon them, with the potential of very tragic consequences. The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been undertaking a rulemaking to ban unsafe furniture items by imposing strict tipover testing requirements. I hope we will see a safety standard for this very soon.

Over the course of more than a decade at the Commission, Ms. Boyle has worked on these issues in senior positions across the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including as General Counsel and Deputy General Counsel before assuming her current role as Executive Director.

As the Consumer Product Safety Commission's General Counsel, Ms. Boyle served the Agency's chief legal officer—providing legal, policy, and strategic advice on a multitude of regulatory, statutory, fiscal, litigation, and enforcement issues—and examined proposed product safety rules and standards. So I think she is well qualified for this job. She worked with the

Department of Justice on Federal court litigation in which the Commission was involved.

In her current role as Executive Director, she is the chief operating officer of the Agency, ensuring that it meets program and operational and administrative functions. She is more than well-versed in the Agency's processes and eminently qualified to hit the ground running as a Commissioner.

Over 90 different organizations have written to my office in support of her nomination, including the AFL-CIO, the Consumer Federation of America, the National Consumers League, Kids in Danger, and many, many more organizations.

I want to say to all my colleagues, I hope you will vote to confirm Ms. Boyle to ensure that the Consumer Product Safety Commission can move forward so that these important issues can be addressed and Americans can find safer products in their homes.

I look forward to working with Ms. Boyle at a critical time for the Agency in making sure that these products are safe and that Americans are protected from dangerous and defective products.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today, the Senate vote on the motion to discharge the Freeman nomination; further, that immediately following that vote, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Boyle nomination as under the previous order; and that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

RECESS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now recess until 2:15.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:45 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 236 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cramer Toomey

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mary T. Boyle, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

VOTE ON BOYLE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Boyle nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell