

been a place where the voices of all Senators—Republican and Democrat, majority and minority—have been heard. But lately, the Senate seems to have become nothing so much as an arm of the Democrats' campaign committee. Democrats have brought up bills designed to win votes, not solve problems.

The Democratic leadership has worked hard to protect its vulnerable Members from ever having to take challenging votes. They do not want Democrats in tough campaigns to have to choose between the American people and the Democratic Party's far-left political base.

One of Congress's most basic duties is to consider appropriations, yet over the past 2 weeks the majority leader has pulled not one but two appropriations bills from committee consideration because he did not want his Members to have to take votes on ObamaCare or on the President's national energy tax.

That is wrong. We are here to take tough votes. If you do not want to have to take hard votes, do not run for the Senate. There is a lot of stuff that—amendments get offered by our colleagues on the other side that I do not like to vote on either, but that is what we are here for. We are here to debate. We are here to take votes. We are here to offer amendments, to put legislation on the floor.

All of us have different ideas. I may not agree with some of the things that are offered up by my colleagues on the other side, but the fact of the matter is, they have a right, on behalf of the constituents they represent, to bring the issues to the floor that are important to their constituents, and for us to debate them, and for us to vote on them.

In fact, the majority leader has exerted such tight control over the Senate that over the past year he has not only blocked almost all Republican amendments, he has blocked almost all of his party's amendments as well.

Since July of 2013—almost a year ago—the majority leader has allowed votes on just 9 Republican amendments, and just 7 Democratic amendments—out of 1,500 amendments that have been filed on the floor of the Senate.

Think about that. The world's greatest deliberative body—open to amendment, open to debate—1,500 amendments get filed; Republicans get 9 votes. I understand the whole idea, the political motivation of the leader in trying to protect his Members from having to take tough votes. But how are you as a majority Member—how do the Democrats in the Senate go back to their constituents at home and say: It is advantageous for us to be in the majority in Washington, when you have only had votes on seven amendments? Think about that. How do you, with a straight face, go back to your constituents and say: Being in the majority matters in the Senate, when

Democrats here are only getting—in the last year—seven amendments voted on? It is outrageous. One a month—about one amendment a month—is what we are voting on here, roughly.

Senators were elected to speak for the people of their State and to make sure their concerns are represented in the Senate. When Senators cannot add their voices to the process, the American people's concerns are not getting heard.

The American people have had a tough time getting their voices heard over the past few years. Over and over, they have made it clear they need good jobs and more economic opportunity. Instead, they have gotten 5½ years of higher costs and low job creation, and the jobs that are being created are not the kinds of jobs that were lost—the good-paying jobs that provide opportunities for advancement.

Republicans have proposed numerous bills to expand opportunities for American families and workers. It is time for the Senate to vote on these bills. The American people have spent enough time being ignored. It is high time for the Senate to change the way it is conducting its business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### MINE BAN TREATY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday in Maputo, Mozambique, representatives of many of the 161 countries that have joined the treaty banning the production, stockpiling, export, and use of antipersonnel landmines convened the third review conference in the 15 years since the treaty came into force.

The impact of that treaty, once ridiculed as a naive dream by many in the U.S. defense establishment, has been extraordinary. The vast majority of landmine use and production has stopped. New casualties have dropped significantly. Many countries have cleared the mined areas in their territories.

Of the 35 countries that have not yet joined the treaty, including the United States, almost all abide by its provisions. We can be proud that the United States has been the largest contributor to programs to clear mines and to help mine victims. Those programs have saved countless lives. In fact, the Leahy War Victims Fund was first used in Mozambique.

But I remember during the negotiations on the treaty how officials in the U.S. administration at the time urged, even warned, their counterparts in other countries, including our NATO allies, against signing the treaty. In the end, every member of NATO except the United States joined it.

Some in our government said it was a meaningless gesture that would accomplish nothing. I think they resented that other governments, especially Canada, and nongovernmental organizations from around the world

could achieve something outside the U.N. negotiation process, which had utterly failed to address this problem.

Instead, the treaty has already accomplished more than most people expected, thanks to the extraordinary advocacy of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and three-quarters of the world's governments, many of whose people have suffered from the scourge of landmines.

But the problem is far from solved. There are still thousands of deaths and injuries from mines each year, and most are innocent civilians.

Twenty years ago this week, in a speech at the United Nations that inspired people around the world, President Clinton called for a global ban on antipersonnel mines. I was proud of President Clinton for doing that, but his Presidency, his administration, was outmaneuvered by the Pentagon, and it failed to join the treaty. Then, during the 8 years of the last Bush administration, nothing happened. In fact, during those years, the White House reneged on some of the pledges of the Clinton administration.

When President Obama was elected, I thought we would finally see the United States get on the right side of this issue. After all, we fought two long wars without using antipersonnel mines. All our NATO allies and most of our coalition partners have banned them.

But that has not happened.

Now we rightly condemned, and I do condemn, the Taliban for using victim-activated IEDs, which are also banned by the treaty, but we still insist on retaining our right to use antipersonnel mines.

Eighteen years ago, President Clinton charged the Pentagon to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines. Instead, the Pentagon has fought every attempt to get rid of these indiscriminate weapons, even if they do not use them.

As I have said many times, no one argues that antipersonnel mines have no military utility. Every weapon does. Poison gas has a military utility, but we outlawed it a century ago. Are we incapable of renouncing, as our closest allies have, tiny explosives that are the antithesis of precision-guided weapons, weapons we have rightly not used during two long wars, weapons that kill children and innocent civilians, and weapons that should bring condemnation to anybody using them?

We talk about the importance of avoiding civilian casualties. We all believe in that. We have seen how civilian casualties can turn a local population against us. We do not export antipersonnel landmines. We do not use them. We can drive a robot on Mars by remote control, but we say we cannot solve this problem. It begs credulity.

This is not an abstract issue. This girl is who I am talking about. I have met countless people like her. She is lucky. She survived, even though without hands and legs. Many others like her bleed to death.

I have been to clinics in poor countries where, instead of soccer balls, they make artificial limbs like these. We support them with the Leahy War Victims Fund. I am glad we can help, but I wish there was absolutely no need for that.

I visited a young girl in a hospital after the Bosnia war. Her parents had sent her away so she could be safe. The war ended. The soldiers returned home. She was running down the road calling out to her parents, and she stepped on a mine. Both her legs were blown off. The war was over, but not for her.

We recently sent people to that part of the world after flooding. Why? Because thousands of landmines still in the ground had washed up and moved around. Schoolchildren now face the danger again, because even though they had mapped where the landmines were that was before the floods.

As in the past, the White House hides behind their failure to act by pointing at North Korea. Who is not concerned about North Korea? But are we so dependent on antipersonnel landmines that we cannot develop war plans to defend South Korea without them? I reject that just as former commanders of our forces in South Korea rejected it long ago.

Last week, after a cursory 2-minute debate that inaccurately described the landmines in the Korean DMZ as U.S. mines, which they are not, and that inaccurately asserted, based on erroneous press reports, that the White House is about to join the mine ban treaty, which it is not, the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee adopted by voice vote a prohibition on the use of funds to implement the treaty.

The amendment's sponsor even claimed that the one thing—the only thing—stopping a North Korean invasion is U.S. antipersonnel mines. Balderdash. Did the Pentagon tell them that? Of course not. I wonder how many, if any, Members of that subcommittee have even read the treaty.

One would think, 61 years after the Korean war, that the Pentagon would not still be arguing that the defense of South Korea depends on tiny, indiscriminate explosives that would pose a threat to U.S. forces if we counter-attacked. It makes you wonder.

This country, with the most powerful army, that spends far more money on its armed forces than any country in the world, has to rely on antipersonnel landmines? Oh, come on.

President Obama can still put the United States on a path to join the treaty, but time is running out. It will require some revision of our Korea war plans. That can be done in a manner that protects the security of South Korea and our troops. It needs to be done, because without the participation and support of the United States, the most powerful Nation on Earth, no international treaty can achieve its potential.

I commend the participants at the Maputo review conference. I regret the

United States is there only as an observer, as it has been since the Ottawa process began 18 years ago. We sit on the sidelines as though we have no role in this. What a missed opportunity, what a stain on the country that should be the moral leader.

The next review conference is in 2019, the 25th anniversary of President Clinton's speech. What an anniversary it would be if that next review conference were held in Washington, with the United States attending as a party to the treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that a June 22 article in the Boston Globe and a June 23 article in the New York Times on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 22, 2014]

FORMERLY A LEADER ON LAND MINE BAN,  
OBAMA NOW BALKS  
(By Bryan Bender)

WASHINGTON.—In 2005, then-Senator Barack Obama wrote to a constituent that he would use his influence to help advance an international treaty banning land mines, decrying what he called the “horrific injuries and loss of life” among civilians long after wars end.

But in his five-plus years as president, Obama has not asked the US Senate to ratify the pact signed by 161 other nations, showing an unwillingness to take on military officials who assert that the devices, which the Pentagon last used in battle in 1991, are still needed. Instead, his administration has repeatedly delayed a review of the issue initiated early in his first term.

Senator Patrick Leahy, the Vermont Democrat who has spent more than two decades directing federal funding to clear minefields and provide victims with wheelchairs, prosthetics, and job training, is so frustrated at Obama's lack of action that he is complaining bitterly and publicly about it.

“I think of children who have gone to something shiny on the side of the road thinking it was a toy and instead having their legs blown off,” Leahy said in a blunt floor speech in late March, the first in a series he has delivered to focus attention on the issue. “President Obama, you know what you should do.”

Indeed, what is most vexing to many treaty supporters is that the United States has done more than other countries to address the problem, but still hasn't taken up the treaty.

In addition to spending more than \$2 billion over the last two decades to reduce the threat and aid victims, the United States has halted the production and export of so-called “persistent” or “dumb” mines that have no disarming mechanism and can remain a danger for unsuspecting villagers for decades.

“The United States has actually probably lived up to about 90 percent of the requirements of the treaty,” said Lloyd Axworthy, the former foreign minister of Canada who hosted the treaty negotiations, expressing incredulity that the United States has nonetheless long resisted giving up the weapons.

Although it was among the first to call for a treaty banning land mines, the United States is now the only member of the NATO military alliance that has not joined the pact. The only other nation in the Western Hemisphere to refuse is Cuba. When treaty signatories meet on June 23 in Mozambique to discuss ways to accelerate the destruction

of mines as well as strengthen the pact, the United States will attend only as an observer.

“It was US leadership that really got the ball rolling,” said Bobby Muller, president of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, who was a key organizer of the original movement to ban the weapons. “But the United States is shamefully behind the curve.”

#### THE KILLING CONTINUES

In late May, a six-year-old girl was killed and five other villagers wounded in Myanmar when they came upon a land mine near the border with Thailand.

The same week the US State Department dispatched a “quick reaction force” to Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina where flooding had dislodged land mines left over from the civil war in the former Yugoslavia.

Advocates for the ban believe America's continued reluctance to embrace the treaty is slowing momentum to render politically unacceptable a weapon that kills or injures an estimated 10 people every day in the 60-some countries where they remain in the ground. For example, US allies Ukraine and Finland have recently signaled they might withdraw from the treaty out of military necessity.

Three dozen countries still remain outside the treaty, according to a recent report by the Arms Control Association, a nonprofit advocacy group, including the United States, China, Russia, India, and Pakistan. Together they collectively account for an estimated stockpile of 160 million landmines, while experts say there is no reliable way to estimate how many landmines are still littering global battlefields.

#### AT FIRST, SOME HIGH HOPES

The “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction” was proposed in 1997, requiring member nations to no longer use land mines, destroy all remaining supplies, and remove those planted on their territory.

The so-called Ottawa Treaty was heralded as the first global arms treaty to emerge from civil society, as opposed to governments. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of 1,400 nongovernmental organizations from around the world—led by American Jody Williams—was awarded the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for spearheading the effort, which also benefited from high-profile advocates like the late Princess Diana.

The treaty's unique evolution is viewed as a possible reason why the American military brass is still resisting; the thinking goes that commanders fear that giving up land mines could encourage similar efforts by human rights groups to seek to ban other types of controversial weapons, such as drones.

The United States initially was a leading advocate of the pact; then-US President Bill Clinton called the land mine problem “a global tragedy.”

“In all probability, land mines kill more children than soldiers, and they keep killing after wars are over,” Clinton said.

But he opted not to sign the treaty and seek its ratification after US military leaders insisted that they needed time to develop alternatives to mines.

The Bush administration also adhered to that position, while the US Army began developing so-called “smart” mines as a replacement, devices officials say are now ready to be part of the arsenal.

One alternative, called the Spider, is designed to detonate only by command and to self-defuse after a limited period. It is designed and built in part by Textron Systems

in Wilmington, Mass. Textron officials did not respond to a request for comment.

When Obama came into office in 2009 there were high hopes that he would seek to join the treaty; he instead ordered up a review that has gone on for five years.

Asked about the assessment, Edward Price, a spokesman for the White House's National Security Council, said, "We are pressing forward to conclude our review of US land mine policy" but declined to provide details.

"The United States shares the humanitarian concerns of the parties to the Ottawa Convention," Price added, noting that "the United States is the single largest financial supporter of global humanitarian demining efforts."

A Pentagon spokeswoman, Lieutenant Commander Amy Derrickfrost, defended the military's position. She said that in addition to ending the use of so-called "dumb" mines in 2010, the US military also no longer uses plastic mines, which cannot be identified with a metal detector or other mine surveillance technologies.

But the military continues to say that it must have the ability to use anti-personnel land mines.

"I consider them to be an important tool in the arsenal of the armed forces of the United States," General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March, especially on the Korean peninsula, where they are intended to help blunt an invasion by the North Korean army.

The Pentagon position has its share of supporters on Capitol Hill, including Representative Randy Forbes, a Virginia Republican, who calls land mines "vitally important to the defense of South Korea." Fearing that Obama will sign the treaty, he has proposed an amendment to a new defense bill that would prohibit the administration from implementing the treaty.

Many observers, however, remain surprised at the extent of opposition at the Pentagon to the treaty.

"Some of the guys that wrote the [Korean] war plans were advocates of the mine ban," said retired Army Lieutenant General G. Robert Gard, who traveled to South Korea in the late 1990s at Leahy's request to make an assessment.

Gard, who is chairman of the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, a nonprofit think tank, said commanders asserted "we could accomplish the things that land mines were purported to do for us by other means."

A veteran of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, Gard believes that the continued Pentagon resistance is driven by fear that giving in could embolden human rights groups to try to ban other weapons.

He described the argument: "If you give in to those flaky nongovernmental organizations they will try to to make us get rid of other weapons we really need."

Meanwhile, the ongoing land mine policy review—the third such assessment since the Clinton years—has treaty advocates such as Williams, the peace prize recipient, deeply frustrated.

She said in an e-mail that she "does not understand why this review has taken place at all and even less do we understand or accept why it has taken five years already and President Obama still seems unable to bring it to a conclusion that can be shared with the American public."

'LIFE FOREVER RUINED'

The gruesome photographs, blown up to nearly life size for maximum effect, line a small, cluttered office of the Senate Appropriations Committee. One depicts a pair of legless men looking up from their wheel

chairs, another a woman hobbling along with the help of a stick.

The images were all captured by Leahy, an amateur photographer who has personally chronicled dozens of innocent war victims from Central America to Southeast Asia.

His crusade against land mines began more than two decades ago in a jungle village in Nicaragua, at the height of its civil war.

"There was a little boy, probably 12 years old, one leg, homemade crutch. He'd lost his leg from a landmine," Leahy recalled in an interview in his Senate office, where some of his war victim photos hang at eye level above his desk.

Leahy asked the boy if he was injured by the forces loyal to the Sandinista government or the so-called Contra rebels. "Well, he had no idea. He just knew that his life was forever ruined."

Leahy later used his perch on the panel overseeing the State Department budget to establish a US fund to help the most vulnerable victims of war, which was later named the Leahy Victims Fund. He also provided money for mine clearance groups around the world.

Leahy later proposed legislation prohibiting the United States from exporting land mines. To help convince a skeptical Senate, he persuaded DC Comics to publish a Batman comic edition in which the caped crusader, in his effort to rescue a child, had to walk through a minefield.

The last panel depicted the child reaching for a shiny object and being warned by Batman not to pick it up before there was a "Kaboom."

Leahy provided a copy of the special issue to every senator; his legislation passed by voice vote without opposition. He now remains optimistic that if Obama would sign the land mine treaty and send it to the Senate for ratification it has a good chance of garnering the required two-thirds, or 67 votes, to pass—despite the overall partisan rancor.

"I don't want to sound like I am on a crusade but nothing has gripped me as much since I have been here," Leahy said, tearing up when recalling how he lifted a Vietnamese landmine victim into his wheelchair. ("He grabbed my shirt, he pulled me down, and he kissed me".)

"This is today's poison gas," Leahy said. Failing to join the treaty, he believes, "is a moral failure of our country."

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2014]

TREATY IS MAKING LAND MINES WEAPON OF PAST, GROUP SAYS

(By Rick Gladstone)

Despite the conflicts in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, the armed uprising in Ukraine and turmoil in other hot spots in the Middle East and Africa, one of war's most insidious weapons—antipersonnel land mines—have been largely outlawed and drastically reduced, a monitoring group said in a report released Monday.

In the 15 years since a global treaty prohibiting these weapons took effect, the use and production of the mines has nearly stopped, new casualties have plummeted, and more than two dozen countries once contaminated by land mines buried since old wars have removed them, said the report by the group, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

"The Mine Ban Treaty remains an ongoing success in stigmatizing the use of land mines and mitigating the suffering they cause," said Jeff Abramson, the project manager of Landmine Monitor, the group's research unit.

The group, which won a Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its work, released the report to co-

incide with the Third Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty, which convened Monday in Maputo, Mozambique, where representatives from its 161 signers and other participants will spend five days discussing how to further strengthen enforcement of the agreement.

Antipersonnel mines are hidden explosive devices that are buried in the ground and designed to be detonated when a person steps on or near them, causing indiscriminate death and grievous injury. They can lie dormant for decades, long after a conflict has ended. Many of their victims are children.

The United States, which was among the original countries to call for a treaty banning mines and has done much to help other countries purge them, has not signed the treaty. It is among the 36 countries that have not signed it and is the only NATO member outside the treaty. (Russia and China also have not signed.)

An American delegation is attending the Maputo conference only as observers.

Human rights advocates criticize the United States for what they call a conspicuous lapse that may be dissuading other countries from joining the treaty.

The Obama administration, which says it has been evaluating the treaty's provisions since 2009, has issued conflicting signals about its intentions.

"It's going to be embarrassing for the U.S. to have to explain to the high-level officials at the summit meeting why it has been reviewing its land mine policies for five years without making a decision," said Stephen Goose, the executive director of the arms division at Human Rights Watch and the chairman of the United States Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of groups that has been pressing the United States to join.

American defense officials have resisted a blanket renunciation of land mines. Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March that he considered such weapons "an important tool" in the American arsenal, citing as an example their use in South Korea to deter an invasion from North Korea.

Others, however, have expressed frustration over what they regard as an inexcusable American refusal to join the treaty. Senator Patrick J. Leahy, a Vermont Democrat and a prominent supporter of the treaty, has pressed the administration in speeches this year to endorse it.

"If land mines were littering this country—in schoolyards, along roads, in cornfields, in our national parks—and hundreds of American children were being crippled" like children in Cambodia, Mr. Leahy said in an April 9 statement, "how long would it take before the White House sent the Mine Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification."

Despite its apparent reluctance to join the treaty, the United States has spent more than \$2 billion in the past two decades to help clear mines and aid victims, more than any other country.

The United States also has stopped production and export of so-called dumb mines that cannot be disarmed, and it no longer uses plastic materials that can foil metal detectors used to decontaminate mine-infested areas.

The report by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines said that only five countries—Israel, Libya, Myanmar, Russia and Syria, all nonsigners of the treaty—had used antipersonnel land mines since 2009.

But it also reported that Yemen, which has signed the treaty, disclosed last November that it violated its pledge against land mine use in 2011.

The report said global stockpiles of mines had dropped sharply, with 87 signers of the

treaty having completed their promised destruction of a total of about 47 million mines, since the treaty took effect. Twenty-seven nations contaminated with mines have proclaimed themselves mine-free during that period.

Casualties from leftover mines have also declined by more than half since the treaty took effect, the report said. Yet in the roughly 60 countries where contamination from land mines and other explosive remnants of war remains a problem, an estimated 4,000 people a year are killed or wounded.

The report said nearly half the victims were children. In Afghanistan, it said, children constitute 61 percent of all such casualties since 1999.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 11 a.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

### NOMINATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I inform the Senate that the three judges from Florida we are about to vote on have the support of Senator RUBIO and I. It is as a result of a bipartisan process. It is actually a nonpartisan process as to how we select our judges in Florida. Senator RUBIO and I appoint a judicial nominating commission in the three judicial districts in Florida. They then, when there is a vacancy of a judge or U.S. attorney or U.S. marshal, receive the applications, do the interviews, and make—for one vacancy—three recommendations. Senator RUBIO and I then take these three recommendations, the two of us together interview the applicants. The arrangement we have with the White House—and of course we know the President could select whomever he wants, but the White House has graciously agreed, and this has been a longstanding practice with the Federal judge selections from Florida, the White House has agreed they will pick from among the three we send.

Senator RUBIO and I send comments to the White House about the three, even though what we primarily do is tell the White House if we have an objection to any one of the three who come through the judicial nominating commission process.

Therefore, what we do is we take politics out of the selection of judges.

I highly recommend to the Senate Paul Byron and Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, both of the Middle District, and Beth Bloom of the Southern District.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH).

Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF PAUL G. BYRON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

#### NOMINATION OF CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

#### NOMINATION OF BETH BLOOM TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

#### NOMINATION OF GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida; and Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the Byron nomination.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

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

#### VOTE ON BYRON NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES).

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

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Coburn	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

#### NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Johanns	Rockefeller
Heinrich	Pryor	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON MENDOZA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Mendoza nomination.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, just to remind the Senate, this judge and the next one—as was the previous one—were done by the Judicial Nominating Commission process that Senator RUBIO and I use in order to take any kind of politics out of the selection of judges. It has worked very well for years, and this judge and the next one are part of that process.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator