

targets and causing Armageddon, either by accident or as a result of cyber interference.

I want to be clear that there is no “hair trigger” about our ICBMs. We have many safeguards put in place to ensure the system operates only as intended. For example, our ICBMs are actually targeted on the open-ocean spaces as a means of ensuring that, even if all of our safeguards failed and a missile somehow managed to launch by accident, it would land in the ocean and not accidentally start a nuclear war. The critics conveniently fail to mention this.

Former STRATCOM commander General Robert Kehler recently testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and he said: “It isn’t the same thing at all as thinking about a Wild West hair trigger It’s not the way it works.”

The high readiness of the ICBM force also provides an important hedge against uncertainty. Since we no longer maintain bombers on nuclear alert, the ICBMs and the submarines reinforce each other so that a technical failure in one leg of the triad does not render our day-to-day deterrent inoperative.

Those who advocate for doing away with the ICBM force must account for the fact that, under their proposals, in such moments there would not have been an additional leg of the triad to ensure our Nation isn’t left without a nuclear deterrent. As our nuclear forces continue to age, reliability challenges will only grow.

Critics often describe the ICBM force as being vulnerable, even going so far as to call our missiles sitting ducks. It is true that silos are not hidden, they aren’t mobile, and they can be targeted. But, again, this is a misunderstanding of what actually is the strength of the ICBM force.

In his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Hyten stated that the ICBM force “creates the most significant targeting problem for an adversary, because there are 400 separate targets across the United States. All would have to be independently targeted by an adversary. That targeting problem is hugely problematic and creates a significant advantage for us.”

Simply put, destroying 400 hardened and geographically dispersed silos is an extremely difficult proposition. Only Russia possesses the capability to destroy our ICBM force. No other nation on Earth can do so, and it would greatly diminish Russia’s arsenal in the process. That is not a vulnerability. As General Hyten clearly states, it is a significant advantage for our Nation.

For these reasons and many others, Republican and Democratic administrations alike have maintained ICBMs as part of our nuclear forces for decades. The role of ICBMs has been reconsidered and reviewed many times, and their value has been repeatedly reaffirmed in a bipartisan manner. For

example, last November the report by the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission stated that the triad presents insurmountable targeting challenges for adversaries, imposes disproportionate costs on adversary defenses, and hedges against unforeseen geopolitical or technological changes.

Mr. President, I will close by saying that our ICBM forces make key contributions to our overall nuclear forces and, as Members on both sides of the aisle agree, they are an essential ingredient to the bedrock of our national security—our nuclear deterrent.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Good afternoon. The crisis in Venezuela is a crisis in America. Senator RUBIO, Congressman DIAZ-BALART, and I have been talking about this for years and worked with the White House on a comprehensive strategy. More than 200,000 Venezuelans live in Florida, and their concerns are our concerns.

Make no mistake—this is a crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis that threatens the lives of the people of Venezuela and has created a flood of refugees numbering in the millions. It is also a crisis that threatens the safety and security of our allies in Latin America and in the United States of America.

The dictatorship of Nicolas Maduro and the creeping influence and military presence of our global adversaries represent a clear and present danger to the entire Western Hemisphere. There are some who will say that this is not our fight, that the millions of Venezuelans suffering 2,000 miles away are not our concern. Some have criticized the mere mention of the crisis in Venezuela by those like myself as American imperialism or a U.S.-backed coup. I reject that. This is our fight. Freedom and democracy in Latin America is our fight. I remind these critics that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good people to do nothing. We cannot let evil triumph in Venezuela. It would be a failure of leadership with disastrous consequences.

There is only one option left to get aid to the people of Venezuela. It is something that no one is willing to talk about. It is becoming clear that we will have to consider the use of American military assets to deliver aid. Maduro and his thugs have left us no choice.

I applaud President Trump and his administration for taking bold action by recognizing Juan Guaido as the legitimate President of Venezuela and organizing the international community to do the same. The sanctions implemented by this administration against the Maduro regime and its puppet masters in Havana reflect their commitment to freedom and democracy in Latin America. Yet Maduro remains in power, the people of Ven-

euela continue to suffer, and the influence of Cuba, Russia, China, and international terrorist organizations grows.

We must do more, but in order to understand where we go from here, we need to look at history. Hugo Chavez might have been elected democratically, but he never intended to govern democratically. He built a socialist dictatorship by hollowing out all the democratic institutions: the constitution, the electoral system, and the courts. He made civil society and the business sector bend to his will or face elimination. He nationalized entire sectors of the economy and used them to pay off his cronies. He took over the oil sector and made the national energy company his piggy bank. He made common cause with our enemies—most notably, the Castro regime. Cuba received and continues to receive free oil from Venezuela and in return provides political and internal security operatives. In other words, Cuba provided and is still providing military thugs to help stop freedom.

Chavez allowed his regime to engage in illicit trafficking of drugs and people. He cooperated with Middle Eastern terrorist organizations like Hezbollah and the terrorist state of Iran. This cooperation has only intensified under Chavez’s successor, Maduro.

The path of socialism chosen by the Chavistas inevitably led to a failed state that relies on bad actors for survival. The result is one of the worst humanitarian crises in our hemisphere’s history.

We cannot ignore the impact the socialist policies of Chavez and Maduro has had on the people of Venezuela. Nine out of ten households say they don’t have enough money to buy food. That is socialism. Eighty percent of children under 5 are in some state of malnutrition. That is socialism. Inflation is over 10 million percent this year, and their currency is worthless. What does that mean to the average person? A bundle of carrots costs 3 million bolivars. A dozen eggs costs \$150 USD. That is socialism. Venezuela has the highest murder rate in the world. That is socialism.

More than 3.5 million refugees—about 12 percent of the population—have fled to nearby countries because they can’t get food, water, medicine, or safety from their government. Two million more Venezuelans are expected to flee before the year is out, with Colombia taking the brunt of this refugee crisis. Colombian resources are strained, as they do all they can to help the refugees fleeing persecution, starvation, and sickness, while the Maduro regime blocks aid caravans, sets them on fire, and continues to cooperate with the narco-trafficking rebels that plague Colombia.

I want to thank my good friend President Duque for all he is doing. Other nations in the region, such as Brazil and Peru, have also chipped in, accepting hundreds of thousands of refugees.

For weeks, millions of Venezuelans have been left without running water and amid a series of massive blackouts. Journalists report scenes that are now a part of the daily life for Venezuelans: dozens sleeping in line for their turn at a well in one of the city's biggest slums; three men tossing an old paint bucket tied with ropes down a well hoping to hit water; people parked by the highway, waiting their turn to place bottles under small streams that run down the Avila Mountain.

Many Venezuelans call these conditions a genocide because the violence and starvation are being imposed on the civilian population as a conscious policy of Maduro and his Cuban puppet masters. Dictators like Maduro recognize weakness as an opportunity. The hungrier and sicker his people are, the easier they are to repress. This is the kind of evil we are facing in our hemisphere. But one thing is clear: Maduro underestimates his people. They may be oppressed, but they are not weak. They may be hungry, but their hunger is for freedom, and they are making their voices heard. We need to listen.

Nicholas Maduro is an illegitimate President. His election was a sham, just like the elections in Cuba and Russia—a complete sham and a joke. Dozens of countries across Latin America and Europe have recognized Juan Guaido's right to the interim Presidency. As President of the National Assembly—the only democratic body left in Venezuela—Juan Guaido has the right and the duty to preside over new elections and the return of democracy.

The people still in power in Venezuela are corrupt bureaucrats and military officers engaged in embezzlement, narcotrafficking, and human rights abuses. Since being tested by uprisings in 2014 and 2017, the regime has reinforced a repressive apparatus that uses armed mobile civilian gangs known as *colectivos*, specialized police units, and anti-riot forces of the National Guard to terrorize and control the civilian population through arbitrary arrests, beatings, detentions, and killings.

The Maduro regime has gone so far as to arrest the Chief of Staff for Interim President Guaido, Roberto Marrero. I met his wife Romy on Monday in Miami. She fled the country 3 weeks ago with their 7-year-old son, right before Maduro's thugs destroyed their home. The majority of the armed forces want change in their country, but they live under the repressive forces of control, threats, intimidation, and violence.

Russian mercenaries protect Maduro because he can't trust his own troops, and the Russian Government has provided military advisers and specialists to maintain the Maduro regime's defenses, including surface-to-air missile systems. Russia has also sent nuclear-capable bombers to Venezuela, in violation of the Venezuelan Constitution, to intimidate the United States and other countries in the region.

In short, Russia is expanding its military presence in Venezuela to prop up a regime hostile to the United States and create a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Not since the Cuban Missile Crisis has Russia taken such an aggressive step to expand their influence in the region.

Meanwhile, China evades sanctions we have placed on the regime by investing in the country and extending generous loans to prop up the dictatorship in Caracas.

The United States faces a serious national security threat and a humanitarian crisis at our doorstep. This is becoming as dangerous for us as the Syrian civil war has been for Europe, Israel, and Jordan. Left unchecked, it will destabilize our regional allies and provide a base of operations for our enemies.

Today, I am urging the administration, Congress, and the American people to see the crisis for what it is—a rising tide of social and political collapse encouraged and funded by our enemies. The socialist dictatorship of Nicholas Maduro and his Cuban, Russian, Chinese, and narcotrafficking allies do not care how many millions of Venezuelans suffer and die. He is determined to remain in power, sucking the life out of a once-vibrant nation and creating an outpost for adversaries and a safe harbor for terrorists intent on harming Americans.

We cannot let this stand. We will be judged for our response to this crisis—not just the humanitarian crisis but the threat to our hemisphere. The credibility and security of the United States is on the line. The question is not whether we can tolerate this crisis that is worsening daily—we surely cannot. The question is, When will we act to end it? Hostile regimes like Russia, China, and Cuba are digging in. They are training killers, distributing weapons, and placing military assets in Venezuela. Their message is clear: They don't intend to give up without a fight.

History has proven that permitting the former Soviet Union to establish a presence in Cuba perpetrated a six-decade, totalitarian dictatorship that has exported instability to the region and worked against U.S. national security interests. Our safety, national security, and the peace of our hemisphere demand that we take action. We cannot allow this murderous regime to continue spreading misery within its borders and into neighboring countries.

There is a democratic government-in-waiting in the form of National Assembly and Interim President Juan Guaido. U.S. policy relies on rallying his internal support and forcing those around Maduro to see their future as brighter if they defect and support the movement toward freedom and democracy. There are steps we can take to accelerate this process.

First, we must follow through on American policy and indict regime leaders for human rights violations and

for narcotrafficking and money laundering crimes.

The region's strongest supporters do not care if the people suffer, but they do care if their stolen fortunes and their freedom are at risk. We must make clear to them that their future is in jeopardy if they continue to support Maduro and interference from Cuba, Russia, and China. There will be nowhere to run, nowhere to hide. The United States will give no quarter to those who support the brutal Maduro dictatorship instead of freedom and democracy for the people of Venezuela.

Second, we must break the hold the Cuban Government has on Venezuela.

It is imperative that the United States fully implement the sanctions contained in the LIBERTAD Act to allow U.S. nationals to sue over property confiscated by the Cuban Government and to deny entry to those who traffic in stolen property. Cuba cannot continue to freely incite violence in Venezuela while profiting from the use of stolen property and human trafficking. Chavez and Maduro kept the Cuban regime afloat for decades, and now Cuban operators are keeping the Maduro regime in power. It is time we recognize that these problems are one and the same.

Third, we must encourage our allies in the region to join us in this effort.

President Trump has repeatedly called on regional counterparts to exert more leadership, and he has a right to do so. The United States has implemented strong sanctions on Venezuelan leaders, on oil, and on trade. Our allies must join us in this effort.

The Lima Group, made up of our friends in the region, has given broad support to the strategy of isolating the Maduro regime in favor of Interim President Guaido, urging additional sanctions. That is welcome, but they should not rule out the possibility that they need to pursue more aggressive means to secure this threat. Their security and economic well-being are also at risk. They should remember that the Maduro regime and its supporters want Venezuela's neighbors to live in fear. Even before this crisis began in earnest, Colombia and Guyana faced regular interventions and threats from the Venezuelan regime. Maduro and his supporters do not want peaceful relations with other countries except on their own terms. I am quite sure that Cuba, China, and Russia do not have the best interests of the region in mind.

I was glad to see the Organization of American States accept the appointment of the designated permanent representative of the National Assembly, Gustavo Tarre Briceno. Consistent with the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the Organization of American States must expel Maduro's representative. The Maduro regime is not a legitimate government and has no right to send a representative to the very body in the Western Hemisphere charged with protecting and promoting democracy in the region.

Fourth, we must not appear weak in the face of Chinese, Russian, and Cuban determination to prop up Maduro.

Our adversaries question our will and determination. Put simply, they don't think we are serious. We should disabuse them of that notion. All options, including the use of American military assets, must remain on the table. If sanctions can cripple the Maduro regime, we must continue on that path, but so far, sanctions alone are not stopping the Maduro regime, and the United States needs to start considering the use of military assets to bring aid to the millions of starving and sick Venezuelans. I call on all of our allies and those supporting Guaido to help us in this effort.

Let me repeat that. The United States must consider the use of military assets to bring aid to the people of Venezuela, but that doesn't end the conversation. If embargoes and blockades can help, we should consider them. If military force on the part of the United States and our allies in the region is necessary to rid us of the scourge of Maduro and his thugs, then we cannot rule it out. If the Venezuelan people, through their elected National Assembly and their own laws and Constitution, request assistance to restore constitutional government and democracy, we should be ready to answer that call. The Maduro regime has not been broken yet and can count on billions of dollars looted from the Venezuelan people and generated from 20 years of narcotrafficking.

The Cubans, Russians, and Chinese see Venezuela as an economic opportunity, but, more importantly, they see a chance to intimidate the United States—to be a thorn in our side. This is a “great power” confrontation and one that our national defense strategy might not explicitly contemplate. Yet it is a confrontation we must be willing to meet with decisive action.

The Venezuelan people want change, and even now they think of survival as much as they think of a democratic future. They are looking to the future. They are looking to the United States and democratic countries to help them. We must answer that call.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of David Bernhardt to be Secretary of the Interior.

I opposed his nomination as Deputy Secretary of the Interior because of his numerous conflicts of interest as a former lobbyist.

Bernhardt's tenure, both as Deputy Secretary and now the Acting Secretary at Interior, has since confirmed my initial concerns and given rise to new ones.

As a former partner at a powerful DC lobbying and law firm, Bernhardt represented numerous oil, gas, mining, and water companies with ongoing business before the Department that he now oversees.

The Washington Post recently reported that he has at least 22 known conflicts of interest, the most of any President Trump's nominees.

This is particularly concerning given that Mr. Bernhardt's recusals mandated by President Trump will expire in August, and he has refused to commit to continuing recusing himself beyond then on any issues that could benefit former clients.

In fact, during his recent confirmation hearing, Bernhardt stated that recusal isn't “really is the best strategy”—an unacceptable stance.

By refusing to recuse himself, Bernhardt has shown a potential willingness to put his former clients' needs before the public good.

One troubling example is his relationship with Cadiz, a company that wants to profit by draining a critical aquifer in the Mojave Desert.

Before coming to the Department of the Interior, Mr. Bernhardt was a partner at and led the natural resources division of Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, Cadiz's lobbying firm that retains a financial stake in the project.

This project would destroy the treasured California desert that I have fought my entire Senate career to protect.

In order to sell the water, Cadiz needs to build a more than 40-mile pipeline through the desert to connect to an aqueduct.

Several months after Bernhardt was nominated as Deputy Secretary, the Department of Interior temporarily suspended its own solicitor's opinion requiring Cadiz to get Federal permits to build its pipeline along a railroad right-of-way.

That solicitor's opinion was ultimately reversed 2 months after he was confirmed, completely removing the Federal permitting authority for this project.

The timing of this decision is extremely troubling, particularly in light of the Interior Department's own independent science that has repeatedly questioned the sustainability of this project.

The U.S. Geological Survey, which is part of the Interior Department, stated in 2002 and confirmed in 2017 that the natural recharge rate of the aquifer is only 2,000 to 10,000 acre-feet per year. Cadiz proposes to withdraw water at more than 50,000 acre-feet, or 16 billion gallons, per year for 50 years.

Taking that much water would rob the desert of its most precious natural resource and harm the surrounding flora and fauna.

Now the Federal Government, despite its own science saying Cadiz would take too much water and legal opinions requiring Federal review, has removed itself from the permitting process.

Even the mere appearance of favoritism or special favors for Cadiz is extremely inappropriate and a concern with this nomination.

I am also concerned that throughout his tenure at Interior, Bernhardt has

shown a willingness to ignore the public's interest for political purposes.

During President Trump's government shutdown—the longest in U.S. history—Acting Secretary Bernhardt kept most of the national parks open to avoid public backlash for the shutdown.

Left open but severely understaffed, major damage occurred to parks across the country. Few places felt the impact of his poor decision more than Joshua Tree National Park.

Iconic Joshua trees were cut down, cultural artifacts stolen or destroyed, and pristine desert habitat marred by vehicle traffic.

I have twice requested from Mr. Bernhardt a full accounting of the damage and costs of his decision and have not received a response.

I am also deeply concerned by steps Interior has recently taken to expand offshore oil drilling, despite bipartisan opposition from coastal States.

Californians don't want new offshore drilling along our coast. We still remember the horror of the 1969 Santa Barbara spill, when an offshore oil rig leaked more than 100,000 barrels, the third largest oil spill behind the *Exxon-Valdez* and Deepwater Horizon disasters.

There has been no new drilling in State waters since that spill and no new drilling in Federal waters off the coast of California since 1984.

Now, the Department of the Interior is openly discussing the option of restarting such drilling.

Bernhardt's ties to the fossil fuel industry give me zero confidence that the Interior Department will reach the right conclusion if he is confirmed.

For the reasons I have stated, I cannot vote to confirm Mr. Bernhardt.

Should he be confirmed, I again ask that he fully recuse himself from all matters related to former clients during his tenure as a lobbyist.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this nomination before voting.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 6 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the President's nominee for Secretary of the Interior, David Bernhardt. Once again, instead of draining the swamp, President Trump is flooding the swamp with a whole new breed of corporate-sponsored creatures. Already, we have a former coal lobbyist running the Environmental Protection Agency. We have chemical lobbyists running the EPA's chemical safety programs. And unless we put the brakes on Mr. Bernhardt's nomination, soon we will have a fossil fuel lobbyist running the Department of Interior.

For a State like New Jersey, which depends on a healthy, vibrant coastal

economy, Mr. Bernhardt's extensive ties to the fossil fuel industry are troubling, to say the least.

The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the stewardship of public lands and waters and safeguarding our natural resources for generations to come. Yet the Washington Post has reported that Mr. Bernhardt has so many conflicts of interest that he must carry a card around just to keep track of them. Think about that. Mr. Bernhardt has such deep ties to fossil fuel companies with business pending before the Interior Department that he cannot keep track of them.

How Mr. Bernhardt would approach his position if confirmed as Secretary of Interior is no mystery. During his time as Acting Secretary, he has gained a reputation as a general in the Trump administration's war on science. Reports suggest that he has suppressed scientific evidence in order to benefit corporate interests at the expense of environmental protection.

Rather than be responsive to Congress about our concerns, Mr. Bernhardt has displayed a stunning lack of transparency. Like many Trump nominees, he has failed to respond to basic inquiries from Congress. For example, on March 20, I sent a letter—along with Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator MERKLEY, and 15 of our colleagues—requesting that the Acting Secretary respond to a series of questions about his views on offshore drilling. With his hearing in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee quickly approaching, we asked Mr. Bernhardt to respond prior to coming before Congress. This way, committee members could have at least a baseline understanding of his views while crafting their questions. We received no response.

Mr. Bernhardt then came and testified before the committee. He could have used the opportunity to enlighten us about his views on offshore drilling. He chose not to. Now, 3 weeks later, we still lack answers, even as the majority seeks to confirm him as Secretary of the Interior.

When an individual seeking confirmation by the Senate refuses to answer basic questions posed by 18 Senators, that should be a red flag for all of us. The questions that were asked weren't technical. They weren't "gotcha" questions. They were straightforward questions about one of the most fundamental jobs the Secretary of the Interior has—the stewardship of our Nation's coastal waters.

We asked Acting Secretary Bernhardt: Do you support opening up any or all of the Atlantic Ocean to offshore oil and gas exploration, development, or production? No response.

We posed the same question about the Pacific, the Arctic, and the eastern Gulf of Mexico. Again, no response.

We asked the Acting Secretary if he would commit to meeting with the Governors of States in which he proposes to drill for oil. No response.

We asked if he would commit to meaningful public hearings in States

impacted by offshore oil drilling. No response.

We asked how he could reconcile the opposition to offshore drilling of every Atlantic and Pacific Governor—Democrat and Republican—with President Trump's goal of opening all of those waters to drilling. Again, we got no response.

We asked whether the Acting Secretary could confirm to us that the Trump administration's revisions to the well control rule—the one major safety reform put in place after the Deepwater Horizon disaster—wouldn't denigrate safety. No response.

I will not risk it. I will not risk New Jersey's \$44 billion tourism industry. I will not risk over \$800 billion in coastal property values. I will not risk a recreation and commercial fishing industry that supports 50,000 jobs in my State. I will not risk the economies of shore towns up and down the coast of New Jersey and the entire Atlantic. I will not risk the lives and livelihoods that depend on clean coastal waters because that is what we are risking if we vote for Mr. Bernhardt.

I cannot fathom going home to my constituents and telling them that I gave the nominee for Secretary of the Interior a free pass on basic questions about the job he is applying for.

With the radio silence from this nominee on offshore drilling, I have no reason to believe Mr. Bernhardt will deviate from the path chartered by this administration. Every Member of this Chamber knows what that path looks like.

We have seen the weakening of protections put in place after the BP oil-spill, endangering the safety of workers and the livelihood of our vibrant coastlines. We will see the start of seismic blasting in search of oil up and down our coasts without any concern for the devastating impact on wildlife and our fisheries. We will see the finalization of President Trump's offshore drilling plan—one that would open the entire Atlantic Ocean, the entire Pacific Ocean, the entire Gulf of Mexico, and the entire Arctic Ocean to offshore drilling. If this plan comes to fruition, sooner or later we will see another crisis of the magnitude of the Deepwater Horizon.

My friends, my colleagues, this is not a matter of if; it is a matter of when. When that day comes, every Member of this Chamber who supported David Bernhardt is going to have to answer to their constituents, to the shore businesses who see their livelihoods washed away in a slick of oil, to the fishermen who are suddenly out of a job through no fault of their own, to coastal towns that see their communities and the tourism and recreation industries their economies depend on wiped out.

I refuse to take that risk. A vote for David Bernhardt is a vote for offshore drilling. I ask my colleagues to oppose his nomination.

I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	King	Sinema
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	McSally	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Harris	Perdue
--------	--------	--------

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.