

these costs because we have decided that these are one-time events, but they just happen to be one-time events that are occurring more and more frequently and that are costing more and more.

Because of the leadership vacuum that Scott Pruitt and Donald Trump have created, States and cities and the private sector have been stepping up so that the United States can stay on track to cut carbon emissions and fight climate change. Yet the Federal Government still has a responsibility here, not just a moral responsibility but a legal one, for the climate will keep changing, the costs will keep rising, and more and more people will feel the effects. Instead of stepping up so that our Federal debt does not balloon and our coastlines do not erode and our security is not threatened, this administration keeps nominating people like Mr. Wehrum to deny that climate is an issue and that the government ought to act.

Throughout his career, Mr. Wehrum has demonstrated antipathy for the very laws that he is now going to be tasked with upholding. When he held this position in an acting capacity in the 2000s—in other words, he was filling in until he was confirmed but was never confirmed—he was sued dozens of times for not doing his job. Time and again, the courts found that, in fact, he was putting special interests over science and over the public good. This is not just a rhetorical statement. These are 27 times that Mr. Wehrum lost in court for exceeding his authorities under the law.

Here is where he kept getting specifically into trouble. Mr. Wehrum is a former lawyer for the very industries that the EPA regulates—chemical companies, utility companies, the auto industry. This is the experience that he relied on while he worked at the EPA, which is fair enough so far, but when the Agency started working on a rule that regulated pollution from powerplants, Mr. Wehrum took language from his former law firm—again, which represented powerplants—and gave it to the EPA to put into the rule. In other words, the EPA did not look to experts and scientists to decide how best to regulate powerplants; it looked to the powerplants' lawyers.

Mr. Wehrum's job was to protect clean air and public health, and he failed at that job by siding with special interests over that mission. The courts actually stepped in 27 times, and he lost 27 times. One case went all the way to the Supreme Court under Mr. Wehrum. The EPA said that it did not have the authority to regulate carbon dioxide from automobiles, but under U.S. law, the EPA must regulate all emissions that are damaging to human health and welfare, and the Supreme Court has acknowledged that carbon pollution fits that description.

Just to be clear, under the EPA's responsibility to administer the Clean Air Act, the EPA does not just have

the authority to regulate carbon emissions; it has the obligation to regulate carbon emissions. In other words, anything that is airborne that causes harm to people, to public health, must be regulated. The EPA does not simply decide which of these airborne pollutants must be regulated; it has to regulate all of those pollutants that cause damage to public health. Clearly, carbon fits that category on a commonsense level, but the Supreme Court also decided that. There have been more intense storms, as we have seen from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, and others, that are certainly bad for human health and well-being, and the Supreme Court has agreed. The EPA has the authority and the obligation to regulate these greenhouse gases.

We do not need to go through this again. Mr. Wehrum has already shown that he is not the right leader for the EPA. He will not commit to taking the necessary steps to address severe weather. He will not fight for clean air. He will fight for his former clients. This is not an accusation. It is based on exactly what he did when he was in the same position. It is the reason the Senate rejected him 10 years ago.

With this kind of information in front of us, there is no way we can put Mr. Wehrum back in charge of the office that is tasked with regulating carbon pollution, not when we are facing a planetary emergency, not when the fiscal and human costs of inaction are so clear. The EPA needs leadership that understands the crisis we are facing and that understands and is willing to do everything in its power to address it. Mr. Wehrum has clearly demonstrated that he is not the right person for this job. I will vote no on this nominee, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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.

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

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

There will now be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Colorado.

TAX REFORM

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a historic opportunity that will soon be before this body. It is an opportunity to bring real relief to the American people. It is an opportunity to jolt our economy into a higher gear and bring real, tangible benefits to America's hard-working families.

It has been over 30 years since this country last reformed its Tax Code. Over those 30 years, we have seen a lot of change. We have seen the country move from Ataris to smartphones and Wi-Fi. This photo shows a Ford LTD

station wagon, which rolled off the assembly line 30 years ago. It is a car that any of us would have been excited to drive 30 years ago. Today we have cars that drive themselves. Unfortunately, we still have a tax code that is made for this LTD.

So while the world has changed around us and other countries have learned to craft tax codes to entice businesses to grow, our code has gotten more and more out of date and more and more laden with special-interest giveaways. Our Tax Code has turned Main Street into a dead end and our overseas growth into a one-way street.

Reforming the code is not only a way to give us an opportunity to end those giveaways, but it can also boost our economy. I applaud our colleagues in the House, who last week introduced and are working on a proposal to overhaul the tax system. In the coming days the Senate Finance Committee will introduce their own legislation.

While I will mostly focus my comments today on one aspect of tax reform, I will note that on Friday the Tax Foundation released its analysis of the House tax proposal. This analysis concluded that the House proposal would create 975,000 full-time-equivalent jobs and push GDP 3.9 percent higher than it would otherwise be. Taking into account the economic feedback from the proposed reforms, this means taxpayers would end up with 4.4 percent higher income. In other words, they will make greater, higher income as a result of the bill that the House is working on today. Indeed, the Tax Foundation concluded that the total after-tax gain in income for a middle-class family would be nearly \$2,600.

Importantly, for my constituents in my home State of Colorado, the gain would be over \$3,000. These are serious gains that will bring real, meaningful benefits to hard-working Americans. This is just the starting point for our reform. This number is over \$3,000 of impact to the people of Colorado of additional income and tax relief. When a significant segment of Americans don't even have access within 24 hours to just a few hundred dollars, a \$3,000 a year gain is a significant amount of money.

Today I would like to focus on one part of the tax reform package, and that is the lowering of taxes on America's job creators. Because we have this clunky Atari-era Tax Code—this Ford LTD station wagon Tax Code, our tax rates are no longer competitive. They encourage companies to invest abroad rather than right here at home in the United States. Back in 1986, when this car rolled off the assembly line, our corporate rate was competitive. It didn't discourage companies from investing in the United States.

Things have significantly changed since 1986. Foreign countries have figured it out. They lowered their tax rates, and now the United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the

developed world—indeed, one of the highest tax rates in the world, period. Consequently, businesses have moved abroad more and more. They invested more abroad, and in the United States they have invested less and less.

It is not in the Republicans' view alone. I would draw your attention to this quote right here. President Obama noted this gradual deterioration of the corporate tax code in his 2011 State of the Union Address, saying:

[O]ver the years, a parade of lobbyists has rigged the tax code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all. But all the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

Those are the words that President Barack Obama spoke to a joint session of Congress in 2011 in his State of the Union Address.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that just moving the tax rates on corporations from the uncompetitive 35 percent to the middle-of-the-pack 20 percent and adding permanent full expensing of capital investments would increase GDP from 3 percent to 5 percent above what is currently forecasted. That increase would not just happen in a decade or two, it would be front-loaded, meaning that we would see a fast response from this economy, with 2.4 percent to 3.2 percent higher GDP in the first 3 to 5 years under this proposal. That boost will not just be to the corporate bottom line. It will increase the average American household income by \$4,000.

Let me say that again. It will increase average household income in America by \$4,000.

Since these estimates were released, since those numbers, statistics, and analysis have been done, opponents of pro-growth tax reform have thrown everything they can at the proposals and estimates to see what will stick to try to bring it down. They said these numbers are too rosy. They said that we can't possibly get a \$4,000 increase in average household income because that would mean more money would end up in bank accounts of American households than is raised in revenue by the corporate income tax.

They said that corporations have been "rolling in money" for a long time. So if they wanted to invest in America they already would have. Some opponents say we should tax corporations more—take the profit that is sitting overseas and spend it as the government wishes. When opponents of tax relief see a company with money, their reaction is to take it—to take it like it is the Government's money. But we know that doesn't work. Even our European friends, whose residents tend to be far more open to socialist experiments, have rejected this notion. They know that tax reform is about creating the environment that will cause companies to invest in America, not attempting to seize profits from compa-

nies that can easily move elsewhere. That is why France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and Greece—not exactly bastions of open economic innovation—have lower corporate tax rates than we do.

The chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Kevin Hassett, told the Joint Economic Committee recently:

This is not about right wing parties throwing money at rich corporations. It is about economically literate governments understanding that if we want wages to be higher, then we have to give workers capital to work with.

Let me say that again. This effort for tax relief is about "economically literate governments understanding that if we want wages to be higher, then we have to give workers capital to work with."

Let's go back to the first response we heard from opponents of tax relief: It is "absurd" to think the average American household will get \$4,000 more in income because that is more than the country raises in tax revenue.

In other words, if we took every dollar raised from corporate tax and handed it over to American families, they wouldn't get \$4,000. That is the argument opponents of tax reform are saying, but this response simply doesn't get it.

What is the economically literate perspective?

Recall that a lot has changed over the last 30 years, but one thing hasn't changed, and that is the U.S. corporate tax rate. As you can see on this chart, the average OECD tax rates have dropped over time. You see the blue OECD line, and the orange line on the chart is straight across. The average OECD tax rates have dropped over time, but the U.S. rate stayed right where it is. The U.S. advantages that made it the place to invest in 1986 have slowly faded away. Other countries have used their tax rates to become more competitive, and companies have responded.

Business investment now is unfortunately low. Indeed, Chairman Hassett warned that there is a crisis in our country because of the lack of what is called capital deepening, which is just an economist's term for the impact of capital stock—things such as equipment, structures, and intellectual property—on worker productivity.

Worker productivity is, in turn, what drives up wages. That is what makes wages increase. The more productive a worker is, the more the employer is willing to pay that worker to keep him or her in the job with rising wages.

Going to another chart, we can see the effects of that. Prior to 1990, when corporate profits were going up by 1 percent, workers' wages went up by more than 1 percent. Since that time in the 1990s, we have seen change. From 2008 to 2016, a 1-percent increase in business profits corresponded with only a 0.3 percent increase in workers' wages. One of the biggest culprits in this is the corporate tax rate. It is

what causes that disconnect between corporate profits and workers' wages.

When a company decides whether and where to invest in new buildings, equipment, and research, they look at the tax rate to know what return is needed to make that investment profitable. The higher the tax, the higher the needed return. So companies facing higher taxes either don't invest at all or they invest in another country. That is why experts say that workers bear 45 percent to 75 percent of the burden of corporate taxes, because businesses invest in them less and less, the higher the tax. It is as if the corporate tax rate casts a shadow on the entire economy.

We can see that shadow here. This is the way economists model the market for capital—factories, equipment, buildings, IP. The higher the price, the less the companies demand. The lower the price, the more the companies demand. This is a simple concept.

Suppliers of those things are the reverse. If they have to sell at a low price, they don't make very much, but if they can sell at a high price, they make more. These two should meet in the middle, but they don't meet in the middle today because the government has come in and imposed a corporate tax. So each unit of capital costs more than it should because of this tax system. That means businesses only want this much. The producers only get this much. The government takes the rest.

What is left? We can see right here what the government is taking. We can see the effect that taxes have on the economy. What is left is this dark-shaded triangle. This is what economists call deadweight loss. That is the stuff that doesn't happen because of the tax. This is the tax shadow—the deadweight loss. It is deadweight in our economy. In that shadow, business activity just doesn't happen, and workers just don't get the capital they need to be more productive.

Remember, businesses are deciding whether and where to invest that next dollar. If the cost is too high—reflected here—they won't invest, at least not here in the United States. They will decide not to expand at all, or they will expand in a country that has a lower tax rate, or they will simply shut down entirely.

I don't think the American people would be surprised by this. This is not news to them. They lived this for a long time. They know it well. They know businesses are not expanding here. They have seen businesses close. They have seen a slowdown in the startup of new businesses. They know wages haven't gone up in many years.

They understand this shadow. Businesses don't expand. Workers are laid off. Money moves abroad. It is because of this high tax that doesn't leave us with decreases in costs, creating a deadweight loss on our economy. They understand it, and they know that corporations pass that tax on to them in the form of lower wages.

But here is the good news. Help is on the way. Lowering the corporate tax rate lowers the rate of return needed to make investments work. It removes the shadow that blocks the economic sunlight. Suddenly businesses are operating here in the green.

More investment in factories, buildings, equipment, and IP means more Americans are more productive, and that makes total sense. You get more done when you have a new computer than when you have an old clunky one. You produce more when you have a new machine on the line. Workers become more productive, and the companies pay them more both because they are bringing in more and because they want to keep those workers to do more. That is what happens when you lift that economic shadow that we talked about that corporate taxes impose and cast on our economy. You create more jobs, and wage competition grows income.

This isn't just economic theory. As you can see here on this chart, wage increases are significantly higher in countries with lower corporate tax rates. We don't need just simple economic theory; we need economic results, and that is what this chart shows us. High-tax countries like the United States have weak wage growth. The United States is down here on this chart representing the highest statutory corporate rate countries. High-tax countries like the United States have weak wage growth—less than 1 percent, even close to zero percent. You can see that here. Low-tax countries—these are the lowest statutory corporate rate countries. These are the bottom 10 lowest rates. Low-tax-rate countries see a wage growth of 1 percent, 1.5 percent, 3.5 percent, even 4 percent, and that is because they don't live under that economic dead weight, that tax shadow, that deadweight loss zone of high corporate taxes.

It also matches my experience in talking with companies in Colorado. U.S. multinational corporations doing business in Colorado have told me that they want to expand here, but they just can't justify it when they look at the tax rates we have here versus around the world, especially in Europe. I have even heard from some foreign-based companies that do business in Colorado that this sort of reform—I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, it would entice them to invest more in the United States. This is real, and the American people need it.

It is good television to say that it is absurd to think that American families will get more money from lowering the corporate rate than the tax raised in revenue, but it is wrong. It is tempting to look at a stash of corporate profits and think that corporations just must not want to invest here or "let's just take that money," but that is wrong

too. The right move is to create the tax environment that tells businesses that they should invest here because they can make more money. That is why President Obama called for corporate tax reform. That is why former Treasury Secretary—and one of President Obama's economic advisers—Larry Summers said that reducing the corporate tax rate and lowering the competitive disadvantage faced by American multinationals is "about as close to a free lunch as tax reformers will ever get." That is what we do by lowering the tax rate. That is how American families end up with \$4,000 more in their pockets—and not just one time; once this fully takes effect, that increase is permanent.

Mr. President, we have a historic opportunity. The American people need and deserve a new and better Tax Code, a modern one designed for today's world, not an Atari world or a Ford LTD world.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us as we modernize our Tax Code and deliver real results for the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, a few moments from now, we are going to come to this Chamber to vote on the nomination of Peter Robb to serve as general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board.

Quite frankly, if we allow this individual to be confirmed, it will be a severe slap in the face to American workers. This is an individual who has made a career out of attacking the ability of American workers to get a fair share of the wealth they create. Yet here is a proposal to put him in a leadership position at an agency whose purpose is to fight to make sure workers get fair treatment. How does it make sense to take someone who has fought to undermine the ability of workers his entire life and put that person in charge of making sure American workers are treated fairly? Certainly, it is exactly the opposite of the argument Candidate Trump made when he said he was going to stand up for American workers. When push comes to shove, the President wants to shove workers down into the ditch.

It boils down to this: The National Labor Relations Board was established 82 years ago in the middle of the Great Depression to protect workers by encouraging and promoting their right to collective bargaining. Think of the power of association so that workers can have the opportunity to have a fair share, to have a basic foundation for their families to thrive. That ability of workers to organize has been behind every advancement we have made as a middle class in America. Be it the 40-hour workweek, safe working conditions, standard benefits, each and every advance was led by workers' ability to organize. Yet here the President wants to put in place an individual who

has done everything possible to take away that right, that ability to weigh in for basic fundamental fairness for workers.

The responsibility of the National Labor Relations Board is more important today than ever. We have seen the impact of policies on behalf of the privileged and the powerful—incomes stagnating while the wealthiest Americans see their riches grow right up to the skyline. We have seen that anti-worker forces throughout our country have led an assault in State after State after State against the right of workers to organize and to secure safe working conditions and fair wages.

Here we are at a time when America's workers have seen four decades in which their wages have been flat or declining while the rich and powerful have stripped off the growing wealth of this Nation for themselves. Income inequality has soared, wealth inequality is massive, and here is one more person being nominated to accentuate that inequality in wealth and in income.

Back in 1981, Mr. Robb was lead attorney on the case to decertify the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization. The union was striking, and Mr. Robb helped President Reagan break that strike, which resulted in the firing of 11,000 striking workers and, as a commentator at the time said, forever "undermined the bargaining of American workers and their labor unions."

When he last worked on the team at NLRB, this nominee was present for decisions that—and this is recounted in a book called "Right Turn"—"[a]ltered long-standing policy . . . narrowing the scope of activities subject to traditional National Labor Relations Board protections; broadening the permissible range of employer conduct in union representation campaigns; lowering the costs to employers of unlawful activity; and otherwise narrowing or excusing the employer to make changes subject to bargaining without informing unions before the change was made, or by permitting employers wider latitude to end the bargaining process by declaring impasse."

More recently, Mr. Robb represented Dominion Energy and successfully defeated a union organizing drive at the Millstone Power Station, bragging on his firm's website that he was able to delay the election for "more than two years after the day the petition was filed."

As many of you know, he does not want workers to have a fair chance to vote on organizing a union or to work to press for a first contract or to seek fair wages. He has spent his career fighting against workers having that fair shot and defending companies against allegations from union members regarding unfair labor practices—all kinds of unfair labor practices, including age and sex discrimination. Never once in this long career has he been on the side of the American worker—not once; therefore, he has no place

at the head of an organization intended to support the ability of workers to organize and to press for a fair share.

It is unthinkable that this nominee would ever even come to this Chamber. It is certainly part of an endless stream of attacks by the rich and powerful on working Americans that have kept their wages flat and declining for four decades. When are we going to see an end to this sort of oppression by the powerful class against the workers of the United States of America?

There is one act after another by this administration—President Trump and his team—undermining fair wages for workers in this Nation. It is outrageous. This nomination is outrageous, and I encourage my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM WEHRUM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, President Trump has been in office now for more than 9 months. He has laid out his agenda to cut punishing regulations, to grow the economy, and to help hard-working Americans.

President Trump's administration has already taken important steps to roll back the regulatory rampage of the last 8 years. During the last administration, the Environmental Protection Agency issued harmful and punishing, overreaching regulations that hurt workers in my home State of Wyoming.

According to the chamber of commerce, from 2008 to 2016, the EPA issued regulations that cost our economy over \$60 billion each year—significantly more than any other Federal agency. These rules had real-life impacts. The Obama administration's so-called Clean Power Plan would have closed powerplants and cost America jobs. We can have both clean air and a growing economy. We have proven it.

My goal is to make American energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs on American families. President Trump shares that goal. That is why EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has led the charge in cutting redtape. The EPA has taken important steps to roll back the Clean Power Plan and other punishing EPA regulations.

It is interesting. The annual cost of high-impact rules by agencies from 2008 to 2016—there were 13 rules by the EPA—in the red right here, billions and billions and billions—over \$60 billion.

Administrator Pruitt needs his full leadership team in place at the Agency to complete the task, so today the Senate is going to vote on cloture so we can consider the nomination of Bill Wehrum. He has been nominated to serve as EPA's Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation. Mr. Wehrum has more than three decades of experience in environmental policy. He has worked as an environmental engineer, a public servant at the EPA, and is an environmental

lawyer. His time at the EPA includes 2 years of service as the Acting Administrator of the Office of Air and Radiation—the same office he has now been nominated to lead.

EPA's Office of Air and Radiation is critically important in terms of a division within the Agency. It develops national programs, policies, and regulations for limiting air pollution and radiation exposure. One of the responsibilities of this office is implementing the Clean Air Act, and it is a big job.

Here is a chart. Most EPA regulatory burdens come from EPA air regulations; 94.5 percent from the Office of Air and Radiation regulatory burden in 2014; only 5.5 percent from all other EPA offices' regulatory burden of that same year. So under the Obama administration, the air office was one of the biggest regulatory abusers. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the EPA's air regulations were responsible for 95 percent of the cost of the Agency's regulations. Now Mr. Wehrum is going to play a key role in undoing this redtape.

The American people need a qualified leader in the EPA air office. Bill Wehrum is the right man for the job. Don't take my word for it; former environmental Obama Justice official John Cruden said this of Mr. Wehrum: "I believe he is committed to achieving clean air for all citizens and carefully following sound and current science." Marcus Peacock, an EPA Deputy Administrator during the Bush administration, praised Mr. Wehrum, saying that his "understanding of the Clean Air Act may be second to none. His desire to pull up his sleeves and actually make the Clean Air Act work as a practical matter is second to none."

Mr. Wehrum's expertise and experience will be tremendously helpful as he pursues policies that will protect America's air, undo regulatory overreach, and allow our economy to grow. I urge all Senators to vote for cloture on Mr. Wehrum's nomination.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as President Trump continues to undermine worker protections and prioritize corporate profits, it is very critical that the NLRB is independent and is committed to promoting collective bargaining.

When corporations try to take advantage of their employees, workers should be able to turn to the NLRB to intervene. Unfortunately, Mr. Robb's career as a corporate lawyer fighting against workers gives me great concern he will not have workers' best interest at heart in this role. So I will be voting no on this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for workers and do the same.

I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Isakson	Strange
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kennedy	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Udall
Coons	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	McCaskey	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Paul	Tester
Menendez	Roberts	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of William Wehrum to be EPA's Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.