

Sullivan	Udall	Wicker
Tester	Van Hollen	Wyden
Thune	Warner	Young
Tillis	Warren	
Toomey	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Lee

Paul

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the Message from the House.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 195) entitled "An Act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.", with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

I ask unanimous consent that there now be up to 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the motion to concur and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would simply like to read a statement from Dana W. White, chief Pentagon spokesperson:

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

The leader wants to move that very CR that the Pentagon objects to even without a 60-vote margin. I strenuously object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Roy Blunt.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with an amendment numbered 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1904 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 1904 to amendment No. 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1905

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions, being amendment numbered 1905.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 1906 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1907 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 1907 to amendment No. 1906.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "4" and insert "5"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, to delay a vote on cloture makes no sense when we all know the outcome. The government's funding expires tomorrow night at midnight. Let's vote tonight on cloture so we can move forward so, perhaps, we can bring the President to the table—if not, so we can undergo serious negotiations to get things done.

You have just heard from the Pentagon. The Pentagon thinks this CR is wrong for our military. This is again the statement from Dana White, the chief Pentagon spokesperson. I want to repeat it so my colleagues can all hear it.

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

Because of the urgent needs we face—the military and so many of the others: opioids, veterans, pensions—we should not delay any further. We should move cloture tonight and see the outcome—I think we all know it will be defeated—and start serious negotiations tomorrow morning. That is what we should do.

I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion filed on the motion to

concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 ripen at 10 p.m. on Thursday, January 18—10 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the leader addressed extensively what was happening before the vote on the motion to proceed. I would like to address that now.

The House of Representatives has sent the Senate a continuing resolution that has been constructed by the Republican Speaker and passed without the consultation of House Democrats or Senate Democrats, whatsoever. The Republican leader is now saying to us: Take it or leave it.

Here is why Members from both sides of the aisle want to leave it. We have been skating by on continuing resolution after continuing resolution for almost 6 months. First, we passed a 3-month CR. Then we passed a 2-week CR and then a 1-month CR. Now we are offering another month-long delay of the inevitable.

We cannot keep kicking the can down the road and shuffling our feet after it. In another month, we will be right back here at this moment with the same web of problems at our feet and in no better position to solve them. The government of the most powerful nation in the world should, simply, not be run this way.

These successive, short-term funding bills hurt our military, as I have mentioned. Just ask Secretary Mattis if this is what he would prefer we do—another continuing resolution—or an honest to goodness budget that allows our Defense Department to plan ahead and meet its obligations. We all know he would prefer the latter.

That is why some of my Republican colleagues have already said they join with Democrats to reject this bill. They know, like I know, that this is no way to do our business. This is not a partisan issue. We should be united in trying to come to a solution, not just kick the can down the road.

The truth is that we don't have to do it this way. In his speech earlier, the majority leader, my friend, tried to reduce this to a binary choice: Take my bill or else shut down the government.

That is not the case. It is simply not. These aren't the only options available to him or to any of us. Democrats and Republicans have been negotiating for months about several issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach on lifting the caps for both defense and domestic spending, on healthcare issues, on disaster relief, on immigration issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach. I have been a part of those negotiations on all of these issues, and now is the time to reach it, not a month from now.

One reason we haven't gotten one already, frankly, is that the President

has been impervious to compromise for several months. Another is that he cannot maintain a consistent position. We all know that. He accepts bipartisan overtures on one day only to reject them on the next. He makes and then rescinds and then remakes demands. He encourages compromise one day only to thwart it the next by saying he will only accept a deal that gives him 100 percent of what he wants. That is not what a great deal maker does.

Folks, the people in Congress in his own party don't even know what he wants. I feel for them. I feel for our leader. He is in an awful, difficult position. I know that. We all know that. Yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL said that he is still trying to figure out what the President is for. Only a few moments ago, the leader said the President's views have not been made fully apparent yet. Letting this ambivalence and chaos continue for another month is just not the answer. It is not a good way to get a deal. It is not the right way to run our country—our dear, beloved country.

Tonight or tomorrow, the President will see—I had hoped it would be tonight; we cannot waste any time—that this approach was rejected on a bipartisan basis. Hopefully, he will see the light, come to the table, and negotiate seriously for the first time in this lengthy process.

Ultimately, the answer here might be to pursue an idea that has been floated by a few of my Republican colleagues—pass a clean extension of government funding for 4 or 5 days to give us a hard, final deadline to finalize a deal. Passing a short-term continuing resolution ensures that both sides remain at the table and can quickly reach a deal that funds our military, our domestic priorities, like the fight against opioids, that protects Dreamers, and that funds healthcare and aid for those harmed by recent disasters. Everyone in this Chamber wants some of those things, if not all.

Frankly, I think we can still solve this by the deadline tomorrow. As my friend from South Carolina said: We could solve all of this in 30 minutes if only folks were willing. It may not quite be 30 minutes, but knowing the negotiations as I do, we could do it rather quickly. Certainly, it wouldn't take us 30 days.

Hopefully, after the CR goes down, folks will be willing, and with a little more time on our hands, maybe the majority leader—we are trying to help you, MITCH—can pin down just what President Trump wants in order to get a deal. Nobody wants to shut down the government. Democrats don't want to shut down the government, and Republicans don't want to shut down the government. I believe that sincerely. The only person who has ever rooted for a shutdown, frankly, is our President, who said our country could use a good shutdown. Only President Trump could come up with that phrasing. Nobody

else thinks it is a good shutdown. Of course, no shutdown can be good for the American people. Let us strive to avoid one.

I urge my colleagues to reject this measure for the reasons I mentioned. It was not fair. We were not consulted. It was take it or leave it. That is not how it should work. That is how almost none of us want this to work.

If we cannot figure this out by tomorrow night, I urge the majority leader, in particular, and the majority to support a clean extension of funding for a few days so that we can finally come to a resolution and get down to so many of the other things that we need to do in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this is not terribly complicated.

We have been in discussions for a couple of months on all of the issues that are urgent—the funding of the government, the Children's Health Insurance Program—and other matters that we all know need to be dealt with.

My good friend, the Democratic leader, is saying we have had too many continuing resolutions but suggests we pass yet another one, and the bill that is before us that we just voted to proceed to, I believe, enjoys the support—every element of it enjoys the support of almost everybody on both sides of the aisle. So it is appropriate to ask the question, Why are we where we are? There is only one reason: the continuous interjection of an issue, about which there is no urgency, into a discussion about how to deal with a potpourri of issues that do need to be urgently met, and that is the issue of illegal immigration.

So what our friends on the other side are saying is, they are prepared to shut down the government over the issue of illegal immigration. On that issue, there is a bipartisan interest in solving the DACA problem, but the President has given us until March. The last time I looked this was January. My colleagues, where is the urgency here? There isn't any.

So the reason these talks have gone on so long is because they have insisted, continuously, on throwing the illegal immigration issue into the pool of these other issues and are now saying to the American people: We are going to shut the government down if we can't have our way on this issue right now, even though it only becomes a problem in March.

So I hope the American people understand why we are where we are. No amount of trying to obfuscate this and confuse it with all of these other issues makes any sense at all. There is pretty broad bipartisan agreement that we need to address every single one of these issues, but the reason we are here right now is, our friends on the other side say: Solve this illegal immigration problem right now or we are going to shut the government down. That is a

fact. That is not spin. That is a fact. That is the only reason why we are where we are tonight. So I hope the American people will not be confused about this.

We want to fund the government. We want to solve the S-CHIP problem and a variety of other issues that almost all others agree on, and we wanted to do it before tomorrow night, but my assumption is at some point between now and tomorrow night, 41 Members of the opposition party are going to prevent us from passing a measure, the details of which they all support, because they can't get their way on this illegal immigration issue which really only becomes urgent in March.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just a brief rejoinder. First, there have been very good attempts, bipartisan attempts to solve this problem. Three Democrats and three Republicans met the problem right in the middle. It was the other side, your side, Leader, that didn't want to go along with that agreement. It was a fair and decent agreement in which each side gave. It is an important agreement. It is a vital agreement, and no one—no one—no one—has figured out a way to pass a bill independently in February. Any vote, any bill that might get a majority of the Republicans in the House on this issue will not get Democrats, and any bill that gets a majority of Democrats will not get a majority of the Republican side in the House and will not be put on the floor. So this is the way to go on that issue, but there are many other issues out here too. Make no mistake about it.

Opioids. Our national lifespan rate has declined, how long we live has declined because of opioids. We haven't funded it. Every one of us in our States knows we need that. This resolution does nothing on opioids.

Veterans. In my State and in your States, veterans are waiting in line for treatment after they risked their lives for us. This resolution doesn't fund it. You say: Well, maybe we will do it after a month, but we sure haven't done it for 6 months.

What about pensions? The millions of Americans, working people, who have paid in month after month who lost salary—they declined salary increases so they would know they could live a life of decency—hardly wealth—when they retire, that is being extinguished. We have an urgent obligation to deal with those people. We feel it, and I know many people on the other side feel it.

There are so many other issues. Healthcare issues. I see my friend from Maine. We had a discussion last night, and I talked subsequently to my friend from Washington State and my friend from Florida. We could come to an arrangement on that rather quickly and deal with that issue.

Disaster relief for Texas, for Florida, for Puerto Rico, and for the West. We

need to deal with that issue as well. So there are lots of issues to deal with, and on all of these important issues, all of them, this resolution kicks the can down the road and gives us no reason to believe it will be any different than the first CR, the second CR, the third CR, and the fourth CR.

What we are proposing is not original with us. It was proposed by three or four Members on that side of the aisle. A very short-term increase would force the President to the table, hopefully, because that has been the barrier, in the words of the majority leader, for solving the DACA problem and other issues and would get us to act. These are not such easy issues. Without a deadline, we may never get them done, and the fears of the Pentagon, so well stated tonight by the DOD spokesperson, will get worse and worse and worse.

So I would, in an act of bipartisanship—not accusing one side or the other—I didn't accuse one side or the other of shutting down the government. I am not trying to play for political points, even false ones. I am trying to get us to come together in a bipartisan nature to get something done. I hope all of us on both sides of the aisle rise to the occasion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader has mentioned a variety of issues, all of which were being discussed over the last 2 months in the hopes that we could reach an agreement to address them all. So now, I gather, he is saying he opposes the bill because it doesn't have everything we have been talking about in it, even though the things that are in the bill he does like. So the complaint now is, it doesn't have the other issues in it. The reason it doesn't have the other issues in it is because we haven't been able to reach a global agreement on how much we are going to spend.

These talks have been going on endlessly. Many of you have not been involved in them. We are exhausted. On and on and on we have been talking about all this—everything the Democratic leader has mentioned. Why will they never let us reach an agreement? Illegal immigration. That is what they shoehorned into all this—shoehorned that issue right into this and said: We will not solve any of this other stuff until we deal with this.

Now I gather the Democratic leader is questioning the good faith of some of us about whether we want to deal with the DACA issue. I do. I see Senator COTTON back here, Senator TILLIS—I think we all would like to deal with the DACA issue, but there are some serious problems with legal immigration, and this is a big enough issue to warrant being discussed all by itself without being shoehorned into a bill full of real emergencies because there is no real emergency in the immigration area. We have until March to deal with it.

So make no mistake about it, we are where we are for one reason and one reason only, within a day of a government shutdown, and that is the insistence of our friends on the other side that we deal with this nonemergency right now because they were unwilling to close out all of these other issues we have been discussing ad nauseam, literally for months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader clarifying for us what this is all about, and actually I have to thank the Democratic leader for clarifying that this is really about the issue of illegal immigration. That is the reason there has been no agreement on spending caps, because our friends across the aisle don't want to agree on spending caps because they want to use everything else as leverage in order to get an outcome on this dispute over illegal immigration.

As the majority leader pointed out, this isn't so much about what is in the bill as what they said should be in the bill because I presume our colleagues are for the 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which was voted almost unanimously out on a bipartisan basis in the Senate Finance Committee. The matter of veterans that the Democratic leader mentioned—well, veterans are going to be hurt by what they have done or will do tomorrow, I presume, in defeating this 1-month continuing resolution.

I find it rather disingenuous to say we are against this short-term continuing resolution because we want another short-term continuing resolution, guaranteeing that there will yet again be another short-term resolution. Once the spending caps are agreed to, it is going to take a couple of weeks for the bill to be put together so we can actually vote on it. So our colleagues across the aisle who say they want another 3- or 4-day continuing resolution, that guarantees yet another continuing resolution, and all of this is really camouflage to hide their true intention—as the majority leader pointed out—trying to force a decision where there is yet not consensus and a willingness of the President to support it on the issue of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. That deadline for people who can no longer re-sign up is March 5. In the meantime, nobody is in any jeopardy, none of the 690,000 young people who were brought here as children are in any kind of jeopardy, and we are having discussions on a daily basis. We had one today with Senator DURBIN. STENY HOYER, the Democratic whip; the majority leader in the House, KEVIN MCCARTHY; and I again met with the White House and Department of Homeland Security to try to make some progress, and I think there was the beginning of some real progress toward a resolution.

I find it disingenuous to try to claim that we are killing this 1-month CR,

continuing resolution, because we don't want to hurt the military. This damages the military because it creates further chaos and uncertainty when it comes to a long-term spending deal because our military has been underfunded for way too long. Why? Because our Democratic colleagues will not agree to fund our national defense until we agree to raise spending on nondefense matters. So it strikes me as very odd that you would say you are voting against this continuing resolution because you are against continuing resolutions only to guarantee that we will have at least two more and then to claim it is about something else, when really it is about the matter of illegal immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that what we are trying to achieve is fund the military and critical agencies of our government immediately and to do it with a budget, to do it with appropriations bills. I have to use that term and remind you, yes, we used to have appropriations bills in the U.S. Senate—not anymore. We deal with continuing resolutions, we lurch from week to week, day to day, month to month, and as the Secretary of Defense has told us, we are not doing the men and women of the military any favors with this kind of approach. Make no mistake about it, the Democrats are soundly behind national security, and we want to fund them properly rather than the way they have been funded to this date.

Let me address another issue that has been raised—and my name has been mentioned by my friend from Texas. It has been said on the floor tonight that there is no urgency. Where's the urgency when it comes to DACA? Where is the urgency when it comes to Dreamers? If you want to know the urgency, look into the Gallery behind me. Look at the people who have gathered here late this night, who are following every word that we are debating. Why are they here if there is no urgency?

There is an urgency. There is an urgency in their lives because of the uncertainty of tomorrow—whether tomorrow will mean deportation for themselves and their families, whether they will be able to work, complete school, have a life in America. Yes, there is a real urgency, and let me tell you what we have done about that urgency.

A group of us—three Democrats and three Republican Senators—sat down 4 months ago to answer President Trump's challenge to replace DACA. Was there a meeting of a committee in this Senate on the same subject? There was one public hearing, but no bill, no markup, nothing. The activity really came from and evolved from the six of us working together—three Democrats and three Republicans. We reached an agreement. It wasn't easy. Ask the Senators involved on your side of the

aisle or on our side of the aisle. We have presented it to the Senate, we have defended it over the last several weeks, and I want to thank the additional four Republican Senators who have joined us in this effort to finally enact a bipartisan solution to this. So to say that we have done nothing and we have so much time—let me tell you, there is a sense of urgency here.

Just this week, when the Secretary of DHS testified before the Judiciary Committee, she conceded the fact that the President does not have authority to extend this deadline of March 5, that we are going back and forth in court as to whether there will be any protection for these young people whatsoever, and she acknowledged that her Department has said that it will take them 6 months to write the regulations once we pass the law that will affect their lives and the lives of hundreds of thousands.

You know how I feel about this issue. Some of you have presided over the Senate, have seen the presentations we have made over the years. I have brought 107 photographs to the floor so that people could see the urgency and need for this issue now. It is sad; it is unfortunate that those who stand on the floor tonight continue to characterize these as illegal immigrants—illegal immigrants. Children, toddlers, infants brought to the United States, who have lived their whole lives here and are simply asking for a chance to be part of our future, are being swept away as illegal immigrants. They are more than that. They are the sons and daughters of America who want to be part of our future. They are people who inspire me every day. They are folks who guarantee us that the American Dream will be alive for another generation because they are willing to work for it, to study for it, and to fight for it. This is worth our attention.

We have produced this bipartisan measure. A lot of hard work went into it. We would simply ask that the Senate take up the measure that we produced or produce a better one, and the leadership has refused. That is part of the reason we find ourselves at this moment, but I want to assure you, it is an urgent matter. Their lives matter too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The majority leader.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Friday, January 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KING. I don't understand why we are adjourning when we are in this urgent situation. We could vote tonight on cloture and have an entire day tomorrow to work on this matter. This is irresponsible, and I just don't understand it, so I object to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request that I propounded earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 19, 2018, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

KENNETH STEVEN BARBIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE TODD A. BATTIA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THOMAS E. AYRES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GORDON O. TANNER.

JAMES N. STEWART, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE TODD A. WEILER.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

JOHN F. RING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2022, VICE PHILIP ANDREW MISCOMARRA, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICES

MICHAEL STOKER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR, VICE ALLISON BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FRANCIS R. FANNON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ENERGY RESOURCES), VICE JOHN STERN WOLF.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JOHNATHAN MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

JACKIE WOLCOTT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.