

away far too soon fighting for his fellow workers. His widow, Rita, has become my friend. She has continued this fight. She has become a leader and an inspiration to so many of us.

I brought her to the State of the Union twice. She has made the trip here over and over, along with so many workers and retirees. They travel all day and night on buses. They have rallied in the bitter cold of the winter and in hot DC summers. Their government, their majority leader, their President refuse to listen and turn their backs.

Rita once told me that retirees and workers struggling with this crisis feel like they are invisible. They feel like they are invisible. To far too many people in Washington, they are invisible. They are not invisible to Speaker PELOSI or Leader SCHUMER or Senator SMITH or Senator PETERS or Chairman NEAL or Chairman SCOTT—all of whom have joined with me on fighting for this—and to so many colleagues who worked for years now trying to find a bipartisan solution. We won't give up until these retirees' benefits are protected.

It comes back to the dignity of work. When work has dignity, we honor the security—the retirement security—that people earned—again, sitting down at the bargaining table. Workers give up wages today to put money aside, matched by employers, generally, for the future, for this retirement.

They made the right decision back then, but we are not making the right decision right now as their pensions are in trouble. I urge my colleagues in this body—colleagues with healthcare and retirement plans paid for by taxpayers, all of us who are in this body—to think about these retired workers and the stress they are facing.

Join us. Let's pass a solution that honors their work. Let's honor their work. Let's honor the dignity of work. Let's keep our promise to them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, isn't it interesting? Here we are, Christmas week, the weekend before Christmas, and we are talking about needing targeted relief. Now, the Democrats have spent their year pushing off targeted relief. They have had their opportunities to tackle this issue. They have chosen not to tackle this issue. They have chosen to play politics with this issue. So, on the Saturday before Christmas, when we should be home and visiting with our families—I would love to be home with my children and grandchildren—here we are.

I honestly have decided that my friends across the aisle must not be paying very much attention to what is going on back home because the people back home in Tennessee are very frustrated with them. They seem out of touch. They seem to not care. They don't seem to be interested in taking care of people with needs who have been adversely impacted by COVID. They seem to be more interested in taking care of themselves.

This year really did not have to end this way. As I said, our friends across the aisle could have addressed this back in the summer. In July, the minority leader and his colleagues in the House immediately rejected our HEALS Act proposal in favor of Speaker PELOSI's mega-trillion-dollar—\$3 trillion—wish list that they had dubbed the "Heroes Act." You know, they always give such nice sounding names to things. Who could be against this? Yet they rejected the HEALS Act proposal that was targeted-specific relief and went with the Heroes Act.

It was a very partisan bill. It contained provisions that had nothing to do with COVID relief and that the House and Senate Democrats knew were going to be stumbling blocks. Their bill was filled with things—nothing to do with taking care of people, but, oh, they had it filled with poison pills. Why? They wanted to make certain that relief didn't come. They wanted to make certain that they could run this out and get it past the election. Then we found out from Speaker PELOSI herself and from some of the other Democrats who are in leadership why they did this. Oh, politics. It helped them with the election, they thought. They used people as pawns.

That Heroes Act that they continue to like to talk about would have undermined State voter ID requirements and given the green light to some ballot harvesting schemes. Isn't it interesting? What are we talking about? What are Tennesseans talking about so much? Yes, you got it—ballots, elections, some of the harvesting, some of the tricks. Those items they had in the Heroes Act didn't have anything to do with targeted relief, but do you know what? They were willing to play these games and to withhold that relief. Why? They thought it would help them in winning an election.

That was all back in July. Then comes September 10. The Democrats again block the forward motion on another targeted bill, throwing a procedural hurdle in between the American people and desperately needed relief. They got by with it in July, so September rolls along, and it is about time for people to start getting ballots and mailing in ballots. What do they do? They decide to mess with it again—to play politics, to use people as pawns.

They lower the bar even further on October 21, throwing away \$500 billion in targeted relief. They all vote no in an attempt to tear our focus away from

another round of funding for small businesses, support for schools, and more money for COVID-19 testing.

Think about this. Time and again, they say: Oh, we have to have more PPP. We have to have more unemployment insurance. We have to have more money for vaccines. We have to have more money for testing. We have to have more money for getting schools open. But they vote no. They have turned their backs on the American people repeatedly. They did it in July. They did it in September. They did it in October. They have turned their backs.

Think about what a plus-up of unemployment insurance would have done for a family had they decided to vote yes and worked with us in July. That would have been a lot of money if they had had that plus-up every single week through August, September, October, November, and December.

I mentioned the October 21 vote. One day earlier, on October 20, the Democrats had blocked Senate action to extend the PPP. That was for all of our small businesses—and yes, indeed, they are hurting. We are hearing from them on the phone and through email. They are begging for relief. The minority leader threw another possibility of compromise out the window by again insisting that the Democrats would accept the full Heroes Act or nothing. Isn't that amazing? That is what small businesses have gotten, is nothing, because my colleagues across the aisle have basically said: Give us everything we want, or we will just vote no. We will just leave people suffering.

It is not the Republicans who have voted no. The Republicans have consistently tried to help people, and my friends across the aisle are consistently trying to help themselves and use people as pawns.

At the beginning of this month, the minority leader took to the floor again. He rejected targeted relief again, and he demanded that the Republicans come to the table. Well, we have been at the table. They are the ones who reject proposal after proposal and don't want to move forward on things on which there is agreement. They want to hold out. They have not been paying attention to what is going on outside the four walls of this Chamber. They continue to say: We have to have money to bail out cities and States. They call it aid to cities and States, but they are bailouts for these big blue cities and States that were having problems long before lockdowns came along and that have really made an uncomfortable spot for themselves because of having irresponsible spending policies.

I know that Tennesseans do not want to see their tax dollars going to bail out people who have chosen to waste their taxpayers' dollars, and I can't help but wonder how much longer the Democrats are going to allow industries and small businesses and individuals to twist in the wind because they

feel like this is a great time to push their socialist agenda and get us on that fast track. Oh, that is what they would like to do.

We had a hearing this week in the Commerce Committee and had some of the venues and the live entertainment industry come before us—the people who tend to the stages when the curtains go up, the people who are working backstage. We heard from Michael Strickland, out of Knoxville, whose company, Bandit Lites, helps these shows look great. You have millions of people who are in these support industries. We heard from the motor coach industry. We heard from some of these smaller venues. They are totally shut down. They were totally shut down when the country went into lockdown. They were the first to be totally closed, and they are going to be the last to reopen. These are people, joined by small business retailers and restaurants, who can't open their doors, and they are small business manufacturers who have to wait for the supply chain to kick back up so that they can reopen their production lines.

And they are saying: We need the help. They are asking us: Who is blocking it? Who is holding out? And we tell them repeatedly they could have had relief in July or they could have had it back in September or a couple of times in October or November or earlier in December. And it is not Republicans who have blocked that relief.

Time and again, the Democrats have blocked Republican proposals to send funding where it is needed most. They have rejected every single lifeline that we have tried to throw.

I think it has become clear that the Democrats in Washington, DC, never really saw getting assistance to the unemployed, getting help to small businesses as a priority. Instead, they looked at this, they saw a crisis, they said: Well, this is an opportunity. Let's not let this crisis go to waste.

They have used it so that they can push their message, their agenda: Do what the Federal Government says or we will let you drown.

So they know that their bills weren't meant to act as help. Maybe they were meant to be a push for their leftist agenda. They know that the emergency financial provisions of the CARES Act were never meant to replace private markets or be used as a mechanism to bail out State and local governments. But you know what? They are going to push to try to make it so to further a leftist agenda. Crisis management is no substitute for fiscal policy.

So I would say to our friends on the left, these tactics have failed. It is time to stop using the American people as pawns. Read your mail; listen to the phones. People want targeted relief that will help them to get to recovery.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to address the ongoing debate over the

content of a relief bill that I think we have made a lot of progress on and I am hopeful that we can get finished.

Many of our colleagues have been down here and have reminded all of us, quite rightly, of the terrible difficulties that many Americans are facing.

We are not in a full-blown financial crisis anymore, but we are experiencing a lot of economic hardship that tends to be concentrated in certain sectors and industries, and we have a full-blown healthcare crisis. So it is a very, very serious moment, and it demands a response.

I am hoping we can get that done as soon as possible, and I want to discuss one of the terms that I have advocated for in this legislation. The terms I have advocated for have been mischaracterized, including by the Senate minority leader and others, and so I want to set the record straight on what this is all about and why I think this is so important.

And to that, I think it is worth remembering what brought us to this point. Back in March, when the coronavirus was first ripping across America and wreaking so much havoc, the response, in many, many places, was a complete economic shutdown—a complete prohibition against doing business, against going to work, against earning a livelihood.

And I understand why that was done—that we were in a healthcare crisis, and that was the response that was believed to be most likely to prevent an overwhelming of our healthcare capabilities. That would have been absolutely horrific, and so we had this economic disaster.

And what we discovered in March was this shutdown brought us to the brink of a financial crisis as well.

If you think about the financial markets where people are providing capital to businesses and municipalities and individuals, they only do that if there is some confidence that they know, at least generally speaking, what the future looks like. We had never seen anything like the government shutting down our economy before.

And so not really shockingly, the financial markets were on the verge of completely freezing up, shutting down, and preventing even the most basic functioning of our economy. I mean, we might well have gotten to the point where a business couldn't go to its bank and borrow the money it needs to make payroll on Friday or they couldn't issue the bond that they need to do to pay off another bond that is coming due, and so that would put them in default and force them into bankruptcy and require them to lay everyone off.

I mean, the knock-on effects would have been devastating had our financial system completely frozen up, and it was on the verge, some would say it was actually in the process, of freezing up.

And so that is why the Treasury Secretary and the Federal Reserve Board

Governor came to Congress and said: Look, we need some extraordinary, unprecedented new facilities that we can stand up very, very quickly, and we can use them to be a backstop, to restore confidence, and to enable private credit to start flowing again so that this economic recession that we are certainly going to go through—back in March it was clear that was going to happen, but it was not clear that we had to suffer through a financial crisis that would create a depression. That was something we thought maybe we can avoid.

So these facilities were set up, as I say, to restore the normal functioning of private lending and private capital markets—not to replace those markets, not to pick winners and losers and decide, well, who gets credit and who doesn't depending on whether we like their business, not to subsidize, not to say: Well, look, you know, let's just give cut-rate loans to the people we like to give them to. None of that was the intention. None of that was the purpose.

The purpose was to ensure that creditworthy borrowers could access credit through the normal channels. That was it. That was the purpose of what has been widely described as the 13(3) lending facilities. There were several of these facilities. That was the intention for these facilities.

And guess what. They worked. They worked amazingly well, remarkably well. Within days, certainly weeks, markets were again functioning, credit was flowing, and as a matter of fact, within a matter of months, credit was flowing at an alltime record pace; corporate bond issuance hit an alltime record high. Across the credit quality spectrum, municipal bond issues were at an alltime record high. Borrowers, businesses that wanted to keep their workers and continue to survive until we got past this COVID crisis—they were able to draw down lines of credit from their banks. It worked.

The creation of these facilities gave the confidence to our financial markets that restored the normal functioning of those markets. It was really quite extraordinary.

Now, that doesn't mean that the economy got perfect after that. Certainly not. The economy is not perfect today. But it meant that a recovery would be possible. We would be able to function. We would be able to begin to pick up the pieces of a closed economy and, sure enough, we have made tremendous progress. More than half of all the people who lost their jobs are back at work. So that is not anywhere near where we need to end up, but we are on the right track, in part, because these facilities did exactly what they were designed to do.

Now, what does my language in this bill do? What my language does is it puts an end to these three programs that did their job—they functioned; they restored the private credit markets; and so they don't need to continue.

What are these three programs? There is a corporate bond credit facility, there is a Main Street Lending Program, and there is a municipal lending program. Actually, they were hardly used at all. So quickly did the normal private credit markets resume their normal functioning that very few borrowers took advantage.

In fact, I am pretty sure in the corporate credit facility that was set up under these 13(3) facilities, I don't think anything was done at all. In the Main Street lending, there was very little. In the municipal lending, there were two borrowers. That is it.

These are the programs that were funded by the CARES Act, were set up at the time of the CARES Act for this narrow, specific purpose, and now they have achieved their purpose.

By the way, there are lots of other programs that have been set up over time—some were set up recently—that my legislation doesn't touch in any way, shape, form, or fashion. The Commercial Paper Funding Facility—unaffected. The money market fund liquidity provision—unaffected. The Paycheck Protection Program, primary dealer liquidity facility—untouched. All of them untouched, and, quite contrary to what some have suggested, this is no big rewrite of the Fed's 13(3) lending facilities. It couldn't be further from that.

What it is is an acknowledgment that the three programs we created in March—and which, by the way, we put an expiration on them in March. We said they end on December 31.

But now we have folks on the other side of the aisle who have a novel interpretation of the statute, saying: Well, they don't really have to end or, if they do end, we could bring them back to life.

We shouldn't even be having this conversation, but we are because we have got this interpretation that we have to deal with.

What my language simply does is it follows the statute and calls for the end of this.

How do we do this? There are three steps. One is we rescind the money that never got used because, as I said, the markets responded so quickly we never even needed to use this money. And I think our Democratic colleagues agree on this provision.

The language that I am trying to get in this package reiterates that these CARES facilities end on December 31, as Congress intended. You know, I was in the room when we were writing this bill, and nobody thought that any of these programs were going to last beyond the end of the year.

But, as I say, because of this novel legal interpretation, we need to reiterate, in an unambiguous way, that they end on December 31, as Congress intended.

And, finally, we ensure that they can't simply be restarted next year or sometime thereafter or duplicated without congressional consent.

Now, we have folks on the other side of the aisle who are raising all kinds of objections. They are very upset about this. And it is fair to ask: Why? Why would that be?

Well, it certainly isn't because the credit markets are back in turmoil, and they think we need to restore the flow of private credit. That would be ridiculous. The credit markets are functioning as well or better than they ever have. It is not even a close call. So it is not that.

No, what it is is something very different, and that is the problem that some of my colleagues want to morph these facilities into a use that was never intended for them. They want to convert them away from these temporary emergency liquidity facilities designed to stabilize markets and restore the flow of credit—to convert it away from that—and instead to use them to implement fiscal policy and maybe social policy and certainly to allocate credit based on their political preferences.

What is one of the ways that our Democratic colleagues would like to do that? No. 1, they want to bail out irresponsible States. Now look, I get that there are some States across the Union that have suffered financially because of COVID. There are other States that haven't been harmed at all; in fact, they have more revenue coming in this year than they had last year. It varies, and there is definitely a category of States and municipalities that have suffered a loss of revenue. We can and should have an ongoing debate in this body about what to do about that, if anything, but that is our responsibility.

If we are going to send money to States and municipalities, we should have a bill, appropriate the funds, and have a vote in Congress so that the American people can hold us accountable. That is what happens. We get held accountable.

When an action like that is done through legislation, it is out in the open. It is transparent. It happens in the light of day, and the American people know who to hold accountable.

That is not what our Democratic colleagues want to do. They want to force the Fed to do this for them.

How do we know that? Because they passed a bill called the Heroes Act, H.R. 6800, that instructs the Federal Reserve to use the municipal facility for exactly this purpose—superlong-term, ultralow-cost loans to municipalities, up to 10 years, at one-quarter of 1 percent interest rates. States wouldn't even have to attest that they couldn't secure ordinary credit; they could just show up and get it. So the Fed wouldn't be playing its traditional role as the lender of last resort in a national crisis; it would be the lender of first resort to their preferred constituency.

There is the Main Street lending facility. If they can replicate that, who knows what kinds of conditions they

would impose on low-interest loans there, whether it is climate or other policies that ought to be debated on this floor and ought to be determined through an accountable process.

So, as I say, none of this is speculative. Our Democratic colleagues have talked about this. They passed a bill that actually does this.

It is ironic that when we were developing the response to the crisis of March, earlier this year, some of our colleagues described this \$500 billion fund that was intended to capitalize these vehicles that would lend and restore liquidity. They called it a "slush fund." In one of many examples, Senator WARREN, on March 30, 2020, said the CARES Act created "a half trillion dollar slush fund that the Trump administration could use to help its political friends and punish its political enemies, and I think that's a bad thing."

Well, now there is a new administration, and now they want to keep the slush fund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. TOOMEY. So this is a very bad idea for many reasons, not the least of which is to put the Fed in this position of being pressured to make these give-away transactions based on political pressure that would completely politicize the Fed. It would be the end of independence of the Fed. That is why this has never been the role of our central bank, the Fed. We have never asked the Fed to engage in fiscal policy or promote social policy or to allocate credit based on political standing. That is guaranteed to politicize the Fed and undermine Fed independence.

Fiscal and social policy is the rightful realm of the people who are accountable to the American people, and that is us; that is Congress.

I want to address another accusation that is completely false and totally unjustified, and that is that somehow this is an effort to hamstring the Biden administration and prevent them from doing what they want to do.

Let me assure the Presiding Officer and my colleagues, my efforts to ensure that this would be a temporary facility began when we began discussing the facility. It was in March that I was arguing—actually, I argued that we should have this end as soon as the financial markets had restored their normal functioning and no later than September 30. I didn't win the argument. We ended up settling on December 31. But that is when I started pushing to have a finite period of time and a short period of time. There was nobody in the room who thought that this was supposed to go on indefinitely. Once we started working on another COVID-related bill, starting in the summertime, and I became aware of this alternative interpretation of the language, we put it in our bill, and we voted on that in September. So this

language or the substantively similar language has been public for many, many months now.

I also want to stress that we are not making permanent changes to laws and Congress can always act again. The CARES Act already made these facilities temporary. They were supposed to end at the end of the year, and, of course, no change in law is ever permanent. Any future Congress can change it.

Back in March, when this crisis hit, the Fed and Treasury knew that they needed to come to Congress for the tools to solve it. They came to Congress, and we turned around in an extraordinarily rapid fashion these massive new facilities that had never been imagined before. We responded quickly. And if there is some kind of future event that calls for a future set of facilities of this particular sort, they can come back to Congress.

There are three facilities—three facilities that were launched in conjunction with the CARES Act, funded by the CARES Act, and I am saying that they have achieved their purpose. They should come to an end. They should not be restarted, and a replica should not be created. That is all.

Some have suggested that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve has some opinion on this. I would challenge anyone to find a statement in the public record that he has made in criticism of this. He is very well aware of what is going on.

The last point I want to make: Some on the other side have suggested that our language may be too broad, and maybe it captures potential facilities that shouldn't be captured. If that is the sincere concern of my colleagues on the other side, I urge them to give me a call. It is very easy to track me down. If you have an objection to the way we have worded this and you want language that is narrower, I am all ears. We can work this out.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON THE DIETZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

PERDUE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Grassley	Roberts
Barrasso	Hassan	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kelly	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sinema
Collins	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Whitehouse
Gardner	Moran	Wicker
Graham	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—36

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blunt	Fischer	Portman
Burr	Harris	Risch
Crux	Loeffler	Rounds
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute on the next vote and the nomination to be FCC IG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN CHASE JOHNSON

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the FCC is one of the most important independent agencies that we are counting on for the future of the information age. When you think about the fact that they regulate interstate commerce, radio, television, wire, and satellite in all 50 States, it is imperative—imperative—that we have someone as the IG who understands these policies.

I believe the next era of telecom is going to usher in 5G. I do think we are going to solve our rural IT problems. I do think we are going to connect schools. But if we have an IG who does not understand communication policy, has no experience in communication policy, has never had a role in that, I say we won't accomplish the mission of oversight or the mission, ultimately, at the FCC.

It is clear we don't all agree. It is clear we don't all agree. You got a

nominee last week; I didn't spend all my time talking about why we opposed them. There was no debate.

But when it comes to an IG, we have to get on the same page. We need an IG we can believe in. So I ask my colleagues to turn down this nomination and get us someone who has a depth of experience we all can believe in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on this nomination for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, Chase Johnson is the nominee here. This is a cloture vote. He is a marine. He is a Marine Reserve veteran. He is an accomplished attorney. He was reported from the Commerce Committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote. The distinguished ranking member who just spoke made the motion that Chase Johnson be reported.

We are the victim this afternoon of some absences. We are also the victim this afternoon of some discussion and some differences that have arisen over extraneous issues, and I would just urge my colleagues, both on and off the committee, to remember that this was a unanimous vote out of the committee.

This is an outstanding candidate, and he deserves to be confirmed. With that, I ask for a yes vote.

And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 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 nomination of John Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission. (New Position)

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Rick Scott, Tom Cotton, Mike Crapo, Cory Gardner, Ron Johnson, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Marco Rubio, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Mike Braun, Pat Roberts.

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 Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission (New Position), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.