

Democratic friends right here in Congress.

Democrats in the House and the Senate have had no shortage of rhetoric on the subject. They are very focused on sounding concerned about this but thus far have stood in the way of any action.

It is not rocket science. The agencies on the border that are confronting this unprecedented crush of people need more resources. They have explained that to Congress as clearly as possible.

There is nothing remotely partisan about this. A few weeks ago, even the New York Times editorial board wrote:

As resources are strained and the system buckles, the misery grows. Something needs to be done. Soon.

That is the New York Times. Just yesterday, they followed up with another piece: “When Will Congress Get Serious About the Suffering at the Border?”

So for those scoring at home, President Trump and the New York Times editorial board are actually on the same side. It seems like everyone across the country understands that we should provide this funding—everyone except Democrats here in Washington who have become so addicted to picking political fights with the Trump administration that they are letting even their most basic responsibilities slip.

Well, I will have a lot more to say on this subject in the days ahead. I think everyone understands quite well that my friends across the aisle are not personal fans of the President. We got that.

I would suggest it is time to get over it. The security of the United States and the humanitarian conditions on our border cannot afford to go underfunded any longer just because Democrats cannot bring themselves to give this White House anything it asks for.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, examples continue to pour in about the big difference that well-qualified individuals the Senate has been confirming are making in government service.

Last autumn, the Senate got the Securities and Exchange Commission up and running at full steam when we confirmed the fifth member. Just last week, we saw the Commission take a major step forward thanks to those Commissioners and to the leadership of Jay Clayton, its Chairman.

In the area of investor protections, as with many other subjects, the legacy of the Obama administration was messy and ineffective.

President Obama’s Department of Labor decided to unilaterally go even further than Dodd-Frank in regulating the advisers and broker-dealers who sell to investors. The regulation they put in place was a confusing, garbled attempt at imposing a single, one-size-fits-all standard on all kinds of businesses where it was not necessarily the best approach. It was wrong on the merits and, even apart from that, it was implemented in a half-baked and ineffective way.

Now Chairman Clayton and his colleagues are getting back on track. The SEC has carefully crafted a tailored new rule to make sure brokers really act in the best interests of their clients. There are new standards for disclosing conflicts of interest, new standards for transparency in fees, and new prohibitions against shady sales tactics.

In short, the new rule seems to be a case study in regulation done the right way, a careful, prudent step that will actually protect the American people.

This will not necessarily make front-page news across the Nation but just another example of the way we are literally turning the page on the Obama administration’s failed policies and taking a smarter, better direction for the good of the country with outstanding nominees and sound decision making.

REMEMBERING DR. LLOYD JOHN OGILVIE

Madam President, on one final matter, last week, the Senate learned of the passing of our longtime friend and counselor, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, who was the 61st Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Dr. Ogilvie served as Chaplain for 8 years, beginning in 1995. His career in ministry, teaching, and writing had already spanned four decades when Lloyd agreed to come serve here.

He brought with him unceasing patience, an attentive ear, and genuine concern for the thousands of Members, staff, and families who made up his Senate flock.

The Senate and the Nation saw tragedy during Lloyd’s tenure. We mourned the death of three colleagues in office; we endured an attack on this building that left two Capitol Police officers dead; we faced September 11 and its aftermath; we weathered the anthrax scare; and, of course, those to whom he ministered also faced their own private, personal challenges during that time.

On all of these matters, so many people sought guidance, comfort, and counsel from Lloyd, and every single day, he provided it—a joyful, consistent, straightforward messenger and example of God’s love.

He delivered daily prayers with kindly wisdom. He offered common ground in Bible study. He checked in on spouses, children, and staff, and he did it all while immaculately dressed with that deep, ringing voice. He was the complete package—a Scot, a Midwesterner, and briefly a Washingtonian, all in one.

After Dr. Ogilvie moved on in 2003, he moved to Fuller Seminary and established a center for preaching which bears his name. I am glad his legacy will continue to ripple out into new generations of spiritual leaders who will learn from his singular example.

So today the prayers of the Senate are with Lloyd’s family. We are grateful for his lifelong ministry and especially for the fact that it brought him here.

One day early in his tenure, Dr. Ogilvie convened the Senate by asking God “to hope through us today.” He prayed: “Make us people who are a lift and not a load, a blessing and not a burden.” Today the many people whose lives he lifted up are remembering just how blessed we were by his friendship and how blessed we are by his example.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF DR. LLOYD JOHN OGILVIE, FORMER CHAPLAIN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 240, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 240) relative to the death of Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, Former Chaplain of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL STEVE BASHAM

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Lt. Gen. Steve Basham, who recently departed his position as Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison and assumes his new duties as Deputy Commander of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe and Air Forces in Africa.

As the Director of Legislative Affairs of the Air Force, Lieutenant General Basham worked directly with the Senate and the House of Representatives on all aspects of organizing, training, and equipping our airmen to project global combat power abroad. Throughout this time, then-Major General Basham prepared the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, as well as other senior Air Force leaders, for engagements on Capitol Hill, to include extensive testimony before congressional committees.

A product of some of these strategic engagements was the decision to select Ellsworth Air Force Base as the first unit to host the B-21 Raider bomber, a strategic decision that I personally thank the Secretary of the Air Force for making. I also thank Lieutenant General Basham for his steadfast efforts in the deliberate decision-making process.

In 1989, following his graduation from Western Kentucky University, Lieutenant General Basham was commissioned through Air Force Officer Training School and achieved his flying wings. Over the course of his distinguished career, he has attained a command pilot rating with more than 3,400 flying hours in the T-37, T-38, B-1, B-2, and B-52 aircraft. He holds the honor of being one of the first four pilots to fly the B-2 stealth bomber in combat.

Throughout his career, Lieutenant General Basham has held numerous other positions of strategic importance, including Deputy Director of Requirements for the Joint Staff at the Pentagon and as the Director of Strategy, Plans, and Programs for Headquarters Pacific Air Forces at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam in Hawaii.

Of course, none of this could be done without the support of his wife Angie and their two daughters, Lauren and Sarah.

On behalf of the U.S. Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation to Lt. Gen. Steven L. Basham and his family for their dedicated service to the Air Force and to our Nation. We wish them all the best as they move on to his next assignment and continue working to keep our Nation and our allies safe from potential Russian aggression in Europe, as well as violent extremists in Africa.

There is no question that the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and the United States will continue to benefit greatly from Lieutenant General Basham's outstanding leadership.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HELICOPTER CRASH

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Madam President, on my way coming down to Washington, I heard that a helicopter crashed onto the roof of a building on Seventh Avenue in my hometown of New York City. We are still learning the circumstances of the crash and the extent of the damage, the injuries and casualty it may have caused. But, as all of America saw after 9/11, the Fire Department of New York and the Police Department of New York are truly

some of the very, very best we have. They are strong, they are brave, they are smart, and I have every faith they will do their duty to protect New Yorkers and make sure everyone is safe.

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on another subject—the border—the President ultimately, of course, backed off his threat of tariffs against Mexico, but really, anyone who has observed the President's foreign policy efforts could have predicted how this would play out. It is a pretty simple pattern. The President stakes out a maximalist position but never clearly defines his objectives. That way, after he backs himself into a corner, he can use a deal of any kind, even if it is merely a fig leaf, to justify retreating from whatever misguided policy he has threatened. Then he declares victory, having done little or nothing to solve the underlying problem.

Well, that is exactly what happened right here. According to public reports, the agreement President Trump reached with Mexico contains policies negotiated months ago—nothing more than warmed-up leftovers—and then today, after the President tweeted that we have “a fully signed and documented . . . Immigration and Security deal with Mexico,” the Mexican Foreign Minister said that no secret deal exists. He clarified that the only agreement reached was to revisit the issue in the future. This is the headline of the New York Times: “No Secret Immigration Deal Exists With U.S., Mexico’s Foreign Minister Says.” It is amazing how this President will just make stuff up—there is an “L” word here—he just makes it up, and then it is refuted.

So, to recap, in February, the President declared a bogus emergency to build a wall he said would solve the problem. Then he made a bogus threat to shut down the border completely, which, of course, never materialized. Then he made a bogus threat to impose tariffs, which the business community and Republicans in Congress rejected. And now the President claims a bogus agreement with Mexico, which contains policies Mexico volunteered to do months ago. Bogus, bogus, bogus.

It is no wonder our problems don't go away in this country because of the way the President does things both on the domestic front and the foreign policy front. What he did here is typical of the President's game-show foreign policy: a big production without very much progress. He generates a lot of coverage and attention around big summits, photo-ops, scare tactics, and belligerent threats, but because the President doesn't set clear goals, because the President doesn't have a defined strategy about how to achieve them, and because he is impatient to always declare victory prematurely even when it doesn't occur, his negotiations with foreign countries are ineffective.

We saw this play out in North Korea last June. The President returned from

his meeting with Chairman KIM and tweeted: “There is no longer a nuclear threat from North Korea.” One year later, North Korea continues to conduct weapons tests. We are seeing it play out now with Mexico, which has not agreed to anything new. And I am deeply concerned the same pattern may play out with China—perhaps the most serious of them all.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform China's economic relations with the world. But despite the President's success in getting China to the table—and he has with the tariffs—the President has never clearly defined what an effective agreement with China looks like. So I am afraid that, in the end, just like he did with Mexico, the President could retreat from his position on China in exchange for a face-saving deal that doesn't accomplish much of anything. I hope and pray that is not the case. I hope and pray he stands strong because the state of the future of jobs in America, of businesses in America, and of wealth in America is at stake.

For the sake of all of those things, I hope that, unlike this charade with Mexico, President Trump is willing to stay the course on China and not come up with another bogus solution that doesn't solve any problem.

One final point on this matter, and a very important point, and I hope everyone will listen because we have talked about this in the last week or two, but so far, the media hasn't written much about it. I hope they will today.

President Trump tweeted this morning that Democrats have no plan to deal with the surge of migrants at the border. That is another bogus claim. Democrats do have a plan. We proposed it, actually, last year. I have talked about it here on the floor of the Senate two or three times in the last 2 weeks, and it would be far more effective at dealing with the actual problem than what President Trump announced on Friday. Let me outline the three things in our plan.

First, we would allow asylum seekers to apply for asylum within their own countries.

If you are a Guatemalan, a Honduran, or an El Salvadoran, your child is threatened with being beat up, brutalized, or killed by gangs, and your daughter is threatened with rape, you want to leave the country. But it is a long, dangerous trek to go across Mexico. You have to pay the coyotes a lot of money.

Let them apply for asylum in their home countries, not at the border with the United States.

Second, we would provide security assistance to Central American countries to crack down on the violent gangs and the drug cartels and the human trafficking. That is what most of these people are fleeing. If you look at their pictures, most all of them are not criminals. They are not gang members. They are average people seeking desperate relief.

What we could do to stem the tide—and it wouldn't cost that much—is crack down on violent gangs, drug cartels, and trafficking. President Obama began to do this, and President Trump has rescinded it. It is logical, and it could work. These countries don't have our knowledge, our ability, or our resources to go after these horrible gangs and these horrible drug dealers, but we can help them. We should.

Third, here at our border, we could increase the number of immigration judges to process the cases faster so people wouldn't have to wait so long. Their case could be adjudicated. If they meet the asylum requirements, fine, and if they don't, they don't get in.

Those are three commonsense solutions to the problem that President Trump has talked about. As the President's illusory deal with Mexico continues to unravel, as the situation doesn't get better, please—there are Republicans on the other side of the aisle who agree with this solution. Please, Mr. President, look at this solution. It can work. It can be bipartisan. No, you don't get to pound the table and make a lot of demands that won't ever affect anything, but it might get the job done. Let's give it a shot in a bipartisan way.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, finally, on election security and my friend the Republican leader's graveyard, which continues to grow, ever since the Democrats won the majority in the House of Representatives, Leader McCONNELL has hardly considered legislation on the floor of the Senate. Instead of bringing up bills passed by the House, Leader McCONNELL has turned the Senate, as now widely quoted and known, into a legislative graveyard where pretty much the only thing we debate around here is nominations. It is frustrating not just to Democrats but to Americans. They say: Can't we get something done for the country? And it is frustrating, I am sure, for my Republican friends who didn't come here just to rubberstamp nominees.

One of my biggest frustrations about Leader McCONNELL's legislative graveyard is that even on the nonpartisan issues, there is virtually no movement. Take election security. We all know—on a good day, even President Trump agrees—the Russians interfered in our elections in 2016. That is uncontested. Senior intelligence officials and Director Wray, the head of the FBI—well-regarded and appointed by the President—issued multiple warnings that foreign powers will try to interfere in our elections again in 2020.

We have to make sure our election systems are resilient and our cyber defenses are up to date. There is nothing partisan about that. When a foreign country can twist an American election one way or the other, that eats at the wellspring of our democracy. We shouldn't allow it. So why, when there is bipartisan legislation, is Leader

McCONNELL just sitting on his hands and refusing to bring it up? He is not moving any legislation having to do with election security—Democrat, Republican, or, best of all, bipartisan. We have multiple bipartisan bills that would harden our election infrastructure and punish any adversary that tries to interfere in our elections. Why will Leader McCONNELL not bring them to the floor?

Now, I am certainly glad that he has agreed to my request to at least hold a secure briefing on the risks we face in the next election. I am looking forward to a date soon. I hope the leader will update us all on when it might be scheduled. It should be ASAP. This is serious stuff. The Founding Fathers were worried about foreign interference in our elections, and in our modern digital world it has taken a new, new dangerous turn.

But a briefing alone isn't enough. We have to take legislative action. Democrats and Republicans, we all know, disagree on a whole lot of issues, but surely we can all agree that nothing matters more in our democracy than defending the integrity of our elections, and I hope that we as a body can take bipartisan action soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

247TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "GASPEE" RAID

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I come to the floor of the Senate today, as I do every year at this time, to remember what Rhode Island abolitionist Frances Whipple McDougall called "the first blood [drawn] in the Revolution." This past Sunday marked the 247th anniversary of the *Gaspee* raid.

This is an image of what happened to the *Gaspee*. We ought to remember. Most Americans do not know about the *Gaspee* Affair. They have learned about a far tamer incident in Boston Harbor a year later, when some tipsy Bostonians toppled bales of tea into the water.

I get why Bostonians are proud of their tea party. It is a decent story that tea was ruined, the British East India Company was out some money, the Crown got angry, and the American patriots gained notoriety and momentum for our cause.

But the *Gaspee* raid offers so much more—a true villain, a daring escape, a vigorous call to action, the storming of a ship, the vanquishing of an enemy, a blast in the night, and an earlier stirring of revolutionary spirit.

The story begins in the 1760s, with King George and the English Parliament trying to raise money. The Crown needed to recoup losses from ex-

pensive recent wars, and the Colonies seemed like a convenient place to turn. Their solution was to allow the powerful British Navy to enforce customs laws, transforming naval officers into well-armed tax collectors.

The Admiralty commissioned sloops and schooners to troll the Colonies' most profitable waters for tax revenue. In Narragansett Bay the Crown sent Lieutenant William Dudingston in an eight-gun schooner, the *Gaspee*. The boat and its captain quickly earned a nasty reputation. Dudingston stopped virtually every vessel in sight, from the biggest schooners to the smallest packet boats. He harassed sailors, seized cargo, and annexed Rhode Island vessels, merchants, and watermen, often on shaky or nonexistent charges.

Historian George Washington Greene, a Rhode Islander and grandson of Rhode Island's legendary Revolutionary War hero, Major General Nathaniel Greene, described Dudingston's conduct this way:

Not contented with performing the duties of his office, still vexatious even when considerately executed, he multiplied its annoyances by a thousand acts of petty tyranny. He stopped vessels of every kind without discrimination—ships just from sea and market boats on their way to Providence and Newport with their perishable freights, and to increase the indignity refused to show his commission or the authority by which he acted.

A further insult, Dudingston sent prisoners and cargo to Boston to face justice before a British tribunal, not the Rhode Island court established in Newport. This violated the Colony's agreement with the Crown to adjudicate such disputes on Rhode Island's soil, an offense to our Colony's sovereignty.

From winter to spring of 1772, tensions in Narragansett Bay rose. Among the incidents involving the loathed *Gaspee*, Dudingston commandeered *Fortune*, the ship belonging to the influential merchant and later Revolutionary War hero, Nathaniel Greene. Rhode Islander Daniel Harrington notes in a 2017 Providence Journal article that "the patriotic fervor" that had swept "the colonies [had] seemed to elude [Greene]—until Dudingston snagged his *Fortune* and ignited the righteous spirit of resentment."

When Greene later led the Continental Army's successful Southern Campaign, British General Cornwallis would lament: "That damned Greene is more dangerous than Washington." The ignited spirit was a forceful one.

On June 9, 1772, the coastal trader *Hannah* caught Lieutenant Dudingston's eye as she sailed up Narragansett Bay en route to Providence. The *Gaspee* pursued the *Hannah* and ordered her to stop for inspection. The *Hannah* refused. The *Gaspee* fired a warning shot. The *Hannah* sailed on.

Off Warwick's shore, near Pawtuxet Village, things came to a head. According to the account of Rhode Islander Ephraim Bowen, the *Hannah*'s skipper, Benjamin Lindsey, sailed his lighter boat over shallows around Namquid

Point. Dudingston followed in chase taking his *Gaspee*, a heavier boat, into waters too shallow for it. The *Gaspee* ran aground in a falling tide.

The *Hannah* sped on to Providence. Captain Lindsey alerted respected local merchant John Brown, later a founder of Brown University. Brown "immediately concluded that [the *Gaspee*] would remain immovable until after midnight," Ephraim Bowen recalls, and saw what he calls the "opportunity offered of putting an end to the trouble and vexation she daily caused."

A Providence man named Daniel Pearce "passed along the main street, beating a drum and informing the inhabitants of the fact that the *Gaspee* was aground on Namquid Point and would not float until 3 o'clock the next morning," Bowen recalled. Pearce invited "those persons who felt a disposition to go and destroy that troublesome vessel to repair in the evening to Mr. James Sabin's house," presumably for some strong spirits and discussion of an attack.

Once assembled and refreshed, the Rhode Islanders set off into a moonless night in eight longboats with muffled oars. The group's "powder was prepared and bullets run" as it "set forth on its mission of vengeance," George Washington Green recorded.

Aboard the *Gaspee*, the seaman standing watch, Bartholomew Cheever, first thought he saw light dancing off rocks in the near-blackness. Suddenly, however, Cheever realized the glints he saw were more than rocks. The Rhode Islanders and their long boats encircled the *Gaspee*. Cheever alerted Dudingston, and Dudingston ordered his men to fire on the assault party. The Rhode Islanders, however, outnumbered the British crew by more than 4 to 1 and quickly overwhelmed the *Gaspee*. A brief and decisive melee ensued. Soon, Dudingston lay on the quarterdeck with musket wounds to his arm and groin. The *Gaspee* would never again be under British command.

The Rhode Islanders ferried the British crew to shore, where they were awaited by the Pawtuxet Rangers, a group that exists still today. The raiders then returned once more to set fire to the *Gaspee*. The fire burned until it reached the powder magazines below the *Gaspee*'s decks, and when the fire reached the magazines, the *Gaspee* was blown to bits and was no more.

King George soon learned of the *Gaspee* raid and was not pleased. The raiders would face charges of treason, he said, and the gallows, were they to be found guilty and convicted. The Crown put up the colossal reward of 500 pounds sterling for the capture of the rebels—50 times what a colonial farmer would earn in a year.

No Rhode Islander would give up the raiders. Try as they might, British authorities never found and never convicted the brave raiders who burned the *Gaspee*. Word of the *Gaspee* raid spread swiftly through the Colonies and stirred revolutionary spirit.

George Washington was actually hosting a British officer when he heard the story. The officer exclaimed that the Rhode Islanders ought to be "phlebotomized" and that he would personally march 5,000 British regulars "from Boston to Charleston, South Carolina, and put down all opposition to the revenue acts." To that assertion, Washington shot back:

I question not, Sir, that you could march from Boston into Charleston, South Carolina, at the head of 5,000 British regulars; but do you mean to say, Sir, that you could do so, as a friend, or as an enemy? If as the latter, and you will allow me a few weeks' notice of your intention, I will engage to give you a handsome check with the Virginia riflemen alone.

Washington punctuated his retort, as an onlooker reported, by "[striking] the table so violently with his clenched hand that some wine glasses and a decanter near him with difficulty maintained their upright positions."

Every year, Rhode Islanders gather for a celebration and parade through Warwick, the neighborhood off of which this event took place. We gather to remember the daring assault on the *Gaspee*. We recall our forebears' resolve for independence, freedom of religion, and the rule of law. We are also glad to remember that Rhode Islanders are not to be trifled with. This is a story worth remembering.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1766 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. COTTON. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

(Ms. MCSALLY assumed the Chair.)

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

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Ex.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—35

Baldwin	Heinrich	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schumer
Booker	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Cardin	Menendez	Stabenow
Casey	Merkley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden
Hassan	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Harris	Warren
Capito	Klobuchar	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Rossie David Alston, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

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

Mr. PERDUE. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

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