

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

#### YEAS—92

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Cornyn	Lee	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McSally	Tillis
Cruz	Menendez	Toomey
Daines	Merkley	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

#### NAYS—4

Blumenthal	Markey
Gillibrand	Warren

#### NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill 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 nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]

#### YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Jones	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lee	Stabenow
Cotton	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Menendez	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

#### NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Booker	Markey	Warren
Cantwell	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schumer	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill 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 nomi-

nation of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

#### YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

#### NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schatz	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California,

to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1508

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

"We hope they die." "We hope they die." "We hope they die."

These are the vile words that anti-police protesters yelled on Saturday night, outside St. Francis Medical Center, in Los Angeles County, CA. They were yelling that about two deputy sheriffs, who, at the time, were clinging to life inside the hospital. They were clinging to life, just barely, because, earlier that night, those two deputy sheriffs were brutally ambushed by a gunman, who shot them multiple times as they sat in their patrol car while they were simply doing their jobs of patrolling the local train station.

One of the deputies is a 31-year-old mother of a 6-year-old boy. The other deputy is a 24-year-old man. Both joined the force about 14 months ago. The female deputy was shot through the jaw, but, heroically, she still managed to radio for help and apply a tourniquet to her partner's wounds.

What happened to these deputies in Los Angeles was horrific and dangerous. It is a reminder that, every single day, law enforcement officers put on a badge and then risk their lives to protect all of us—and I mean every single day.

Just this past Sunday, a police officer in Lancaster, PA, responded to a domestic violence call. It came from a home in the city. His body cam video captured what happened next. When the officer arrived, a full-grown man, wielding a huge carving knife and waving it over his head, came charging out of the house and charged straight at the officer. The man who did this, as it happens, is scheduled to go on trial in October on charges of stabbing four people last year.

What happened to the deputies in Los Angeles is not only horrific but is part of a disturbing trend of violence against police. According to the FBI, 37 law enforcement officials have been intentionally killed in the line of duty so far this year. That is a 23-percent increase from the same period last year. Rioters have attacked law enforcement. We have seen them hurling bricks and rocks and other dangerous objects. We have seen them ram them with their vehicles and set police cars on fire.

This violence against police is not happening in a vacuum. It is not. In recent months, the Nation has been engaged in an important, substantive debate about the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect. I happen to think the debate is important. It is one of the reasons I supported Senator TIM SCOTT's bill—to provide more accountability and transparency with respect to law enforcement.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues blocked us from even being

able to hold a debate on that bill. Senator SCOTT and the Republicans were willing to allow votes on any Democratic amendments. They could have changed the bill in any way they had seen fit if they could have made the case with their amendments, but they refused to even have a process—they refused to even allow anyone, including themselves, to offer amendments. They refused to let us even consider the bill.

The police reform debate has exposed some radical voices. Unfortunately, that sometimes includes government officials who spew anti-police rhetoric. They call for defunding—sometimes even for abolishing—the police, and they want to bail out rioters in Minneapolis.

For example, after the two Los Angeles deputy sheriffs were shot on Saturday, not only did anti-police protesters yell "We hope they die" and other vile things outside the hospital, but the city manager of Lynwood, CA—the very city where the deputies were clinging to their lives in the hospital—the city manager responded to the shooting by posting on social media a message saying "Chickens come home to roost." Can you imagine?

Well, protesters feed off the failure of elected officials to support and defend the police. In Lancaster, after that knife-wielding man was shot by an officer who was just protecting his own life, which was obviously under serious risk, protesters came out and started rioting—throwing bricks, rocks, and bottles at police, smashing windows at a police station and a post office, setting a dumpster on fire—despite the fact that the video clearly shows that the officer was being attacked. He was simply defending his life. I have no idea why anyone would protest a police officer defending his own life.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, a local Democratic elected official in Delaware County recently posted an image—unbelievable—on social media of two Black men holding guns to the head of a White police officer with a caption that said "Does it have to come to this to make them stop murdering and terrorizing us?" What kind of message is that?

As the Los Angeles County sheriff noted on Saturday—after his officers were shot, he said: "Words have consequences." They do.

You know, instead of defunding the police, we should be defending the police—defending them against this kind of violence both in word and especially in deed. That is why I am here today, calling on the Senate to pass my Thin Blue Line Act today.

My bill sends a very simple and clear message: Anyone who murders a law enforcement official should be prepared to pay the ultimate price. Under Federal law, killing a Federal law enforcement official is an aggravating factor for the Federal jury to weigh when considering whether to impose the death penalty on a cop killer, but that consideration does not apply when a State

or local law enforcement officer is killed. So the Thin Blue Line Act provides that same level of justice to State and local law enforcement officers that we already apply to Federal law enforcement officers by also making the killing of a local law enforcement officer an aggravating factor in determining whether to impose the death penalty in a Federal case.

In 2017, the House passed this bill with bipartisan support, including support of liberals like ADAM SCHIFF and Beto O'Rourke. The bill has very broad support from law enforcement groups, as you might imagine, including from the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, and others.

The Thin Blue Line Act is common-sense, bipartisan legislation that the Senate should pass now. Our law enforcement officers put themselves in harm's way every day, and we are reminded of that every day. They are out there protecting us, and I am not sure that has ever been more dangerous for law enforcement than it is today. We need to do our part to support them, to send a message to them that we support them but to send a message to criminals and potential assassins that they will pay the ultimate price.

In the tragic event that a police officer is killed in the line of duty, we owe that officer justice, and I am going to keep fighting for them to receive it.

So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1508 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition.

As a former New Mexico attorney general and assistant U.S. attorney, I have worked hard to prosecute violent crimes. I have been privileged to work with law enforcement, and we are all thankful for the tremendous work the Capitol Police do here in our Nation's Capital.

The recent shootings of two sheriff's deputies in California was heinous. Our prayers go out to the officers and their families. The perpetrator must be brought to justice. But I do not support rushing through this bill in response to the California shootings.

Under California law, murder of a law enforcement officer already makes someone eligible for the death penalty. This bill needlessly expands the Federal death penalty.

As I understand this bill, for someone to be eligible for the death penalty, he