

acknowledged that Afghanistan-based ISIS-K and al-Qaida terrorists have the intent and are acquiring the capability to strike the United States. ISIS-K could threaten our homeland in as little as 6 months. The Biden administration still doesn't have basing or access agreements in neighboring countries for its supposed plan to hit terrorists from "over the horizon." No wonder our adversaries are testing this President's resolve to protect American personnel and American interests.

A complex attack against U.S. forces in Syria last week may well have been carried out at the behest of Iran. The administration isn't saying. They need to come clean about who is responsible and how they intend to respond.

We know Tehran badly wants the United States and its partners out of Syria and Iraq and to continue to threaten Israel and other U.S. partners. What we don't know is what the Biden administration plans to do about it.

Even where progress should be easy, this administration finds ways to actually mess things up. For example, there is strong, bipartisan agreement about the threat the People's Republic of China poses to international security and specifically to American interests—case in point: Beijing's recent publicly reported efforts to test hypersonic weapons and advance their nuclear capabilities. China is also dramatically expanding the naval capabilities that they openly use to harass other nations.

Both Republicans and Democrats would welcome a clear and coherent China strategy from this administration, but all we are getting is a muddled mess. A few days ago, no sooner did President Biden offer comments on his own Taiwan policy than the White House staff rapidly walked it back. So it makes you want to ask, who is in charge over there—the President or the Press Secretary? American administrations have a tradition of handling Taiwan with something called strategic ambiguity. I am afraid the Biden team is taking that a little too literally. Even they themselves seem to have no idea what they are doing.

President Biden likes to say something like: Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value. But President Biden's own request for the defense budget didn't even keep up with President Biden's inflation. The White House proposed to cut defense funding after inflation. And here in the Senate, Democrats' partisan appropriations process seems to shortchange defense in favor of runaway domestic spending. Even their ostensibly China-focused bill from earlier this year would not have included any funding for the kinds of advanced defense capabilities that we need to keep pace if it weren't for an amendment offered by Senator SASSE.

Even the NDAA is stuck in limbo. The defense authorization bill is our most basic opportunity to shape secu-

rity policy. It is a core duty for the Senate majority, the bare minimum, but Democrats have completely neglected the NDAA and the traditional robust and real floor process that it will need. They are too busy debating how much socialism to unleash on the country to look out for our troops, our veterans, and our national security.

This unseriousness will leave Americans less safe. It is just that simple.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVES SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to seek unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of two very qualified nominees to USAID. They are the kind of nominees who, in previous Congresses, would have been approved, without debate, through voice vote. I will make the motion, expecting, unfortunately, an objection. Then I will proceed to comments on why I think this is incredibly damaging to the United States to not proceed forward with these nominees.

Thus, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 323 and Calendar No. 337; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order on the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, EcoHealth Alliance received hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer grants and contracts, including \$65 million from USAID. This company and their research may well hold in their hands the smoking gun to getting to the bottom of COVID's origins, and millions of families who lost loved ones deserve closure.

Any Federal Agency that has given them money must be transparent and

provide Congress all information on what EcoHealth used that money for. We asked for this information months ago. USAID has failed to do so, and that is why I am here to object to these two unanimous consent requests.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would just ask unanimous consent for two incredibly qualified, noncontroversial Administrators at USAID.

Isobel Coleman is the nominee to be the USAID Deputy Administrator. She is a seasoned foreign policy professional who has been nominated by the President to oversee and provide strategic leadership over the Agency's programs. She has been previously confirmed by this body by unanimous consent. There are, as far as I can tell, no objections to her candidacy based upon the merits of it; and there were no objections to her candidacy to serve as our Ambassador to the U.N. for Management and Reform in December of 2014. She is a former Ambassador, and she has spent 20 years in the study and practice of global development. She has worked in the public and the private sectors.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the nomination of Marcela Escobari, the nominee for USAID Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean. Ms. Escobari is a regional expert on Latin America and the Caribbean. She has previously served in the exact same role at the Agency, and she has done really incredible work reinforcing U.S. support work for Peace Colombia. She has been heavily engaged in the long-term development plan for Haiti, as well as in Congress's plans to double funding for Central America to try to stem the root causes of migration.

I think it is incredibly concerning that this blockade of capable diplomats, professional diplomats, continues on the Senate floor. By this time in the Trump administration, President Trump had had 22 Ambassadors who had been confirmed by the U.S. Senate, 17 of them by voice vote. Thus far, President Biden has had 4 Ambassadors confirmed.

Today, I was asking for consideration not of Ambassadors but of professionals who oversee the expenditure of U.S. taxpayer dollars abroad. There is nothing that Senate Republicans can do to stop the expenditure of taxpayer dollars in the Caribbean or Latin America. What they are preventing is the appointment and seating of individuals who oversee that funding, who represent us abroad.

This blockade—this unprecedented blockade—has never happened before in the history of the Senate. This kind of obstruction of standing in the way of the President's diplomatic team being seated compromises our national security. It makes us weaker as a nation.

As the President heads to the G20, he doesn't have Ambassadors seated to

most of the countries with which he is going to be conducting diplomatic negotiations and relations. USAID, today, only has two Senate-confirmed positions, leaving most of its top leadership positions vacant.

So forgive my sense of outrage when I listen to the minority leader come down to the Senate floor and chide the Biden administration for not having a strong enough policy in the Middle East when his minority is using its power to block Ambassadors to the Middle East and is using its power to stop an Assistant Secretary to the Middle East from being seated.

You can't have it both ways. You can't come down to the Senate floor and eviscerate the President's foreign policy and then deliberately stop him from having the personnel to conduct that foreign policy. It is like tying your buddy's hands behind his back and then criticizing him for not fighting back against a bully.

USAID is at the center of our COVID response. There is no way to protect this Nation from this pandemic or future pandemics if we don't have individuals who are confirmed at the top echelons of USAID.

I understand Senator MARSHALL's objection to be over questions he has about gain-of-function research that may or may not have been conducted in Wuhan.

What does Marcela Escobari—the nominee to be the USAID Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean—have to do with gain-of-function research in China?

First of all, I can show you fact check after fact check that suggests these allegations about gain-of-function research being funded in China are false, but even if the Senator thinks there is a legitimate question, what does that have to do with our ability to efficiently spend taxpayer dollars in Latin America and the Caribbean?

We just had two massive national disasters happen in Haiti. USAID is managing that response. It is spending taxpayer dollars right now.

Why wouldn't we want to have somebody overseeing that spending? Why is that a responsible exercise of U.S. taxpayer dollars to deny our taxpayers the ability to know that there is someone, confirmed by the Senate, overseeing the expenditure of their money in places like Haiti?

How do you complain about the border and then deny the President the personnel necessary to oversee migration from the Northern Triangle northward to the U.S. border?

One of the nominees we snuck through was the Assistant Secretary for the Western Hemisphere, but USAID, right now, is engaged in programming designed to stabilize the economic and security environment in the Northern Triangle. I think both parties agree that this is a key component of our strategy to prevent migration that ends in crises at the border.

Once again, the Republicans are denying the President the ability to have

personnel in place that will address the border crisis. Once again, the minority is denying the President the ability to have people in place who could oversee our COVID response. Once again, the minority is denying the President the ability to have people in place who will oversee our strategy in the Middle East.

This is an attempt to decapitate American diplomacy. This is an attempt to stop the President from being able to conduct the business of the executive branch. Never before has this happened. Never before has the minority used this amount of its power to slow down the confirmation of Ambassadors.

Yes, we can spend floor time on every single one of these Assistant Administrators, but we have never done that before. When it comes to somebody like Marcela Escobari or Isobel Coleman—people who are nonpolitical, who are unquestionably qualified to do these jobs—we have approved those kinds of nominations through unanimous consent. They have proceeded by voice vote because to require hours of debate on every single one of these nominees would be to gum up the works of the U.S. Senate.

That is why we have had this informal agreement over the years. It is in order to move these kinds of noncontroversial, nonpolitical nominees expeditiously. That agreement, obviously, has fallen apart, and the cost not only comes to the reputation and the comity of the U.S. Senate but to the security of the Nation.

You cannot complain about this President's foreign policy, as Republicans, if you are, at the same time, using extraordinary powers to deny the President the ability to have diplomats abroad to represent us. It is making us weaker as a nation, and it should stop immediately.

I am very sorry that the Senator from Kansas has come to the floor to object to two incredibly qualified, noncontroversial nominees to USAID. I hope this blockade comes to an end 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks before the start of the vote.

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

RECONCILIATION AND THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is another day and another really bad idea that is coming from the Democrats to fund their reckless tax-and-spending spree. It seems like, to fund this mas-

sive amount of spending, they are trying desperately to come up with new revenue sources, so much so that, as of yesterday, still under consideration was a tax on unrealized gains—in other words, on income that people haven't received yet.

Let's just put that into perspective.

If carried to its full conclusion and it became a precedent as part of the tax policy in this country—and it never has been before—to put it in terms for people to understand, a lot of people participate in the 401(k) or they have some sort of retirement plan from their employers. If there were a gain in a particular year—say that the total value of the portfolios of assets in their retirement plans, those 401(k)s, went up by 20 percent—they could be taxed on that 20 percent even though they haven't received the income yet.

That is what is being talked about here in terms of precedent. Never before has that been attempted or tried or implemented in American history, where you would actually have a tax on income before people actually ever received the income.

Of course, if you carry that to its natural conclusion, as we all know, markets go up and markets go down. If you had a year wherein your total value went down by 20 percent, then what? Do you get a refund from the Federal Government? My understanding is that they would offer some sort of a tax credit, in a case like that, if you had a year when you had losses.

Just think about the precedent that would establish, what that could mean for the American people, if at some point the government literally could tax you—tax you—on income that you hadn't received yet.

That is the latest really horrible idea which I think is being shot down by Democrats because they recognize what a horrible idea that is. But it is a good example of the desperate lengths to which Democrats are trying to come up with new ways to fund this reckless tax-and-spending spree that they seem to be insistent on trying to force through Congress. With an evenly divided Senate and evenly divided House of Representatives, it is hard to imagine that you could do something that radical, but this entire proposal is that radical, which is why they are having such a hard time getting even people in their own caucuses to agree with it.

Two years ago, Democrats introduced their original Green New Deal resolution. While the guiding principles of the Green New Deal was climate change and energy, Democrats didn't limit themselves to these issues. They outlined a radical, comprehensive socialist revamping of our society with the Federal Government inserting itself into nearly every aspect of American life. And while Democrats haven't advanced one all-inclusive bill to implement the Green New Deal—probably because of the absolutely staggering pricetag for a comprehensive piece of legislation like that—the Green New

Deal socialist vision has rapidly become an organizing principle of the Democratic Party. For proof, look no further than the tax-and-spending spree Democrats are contemplating with its massive expansion of government and radical climate agenda.

One major problem with the Democrats is they never fully consider the cost of their legislation, whether it is the actual dollar amount or other costs their proposals might impose. And nowhere—nowhere—is that more true than with the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree.

I have spent a lot of time on the floor talking about things like the way this bill will further drive up inflation and the dangers it imposes for economic growth. Today, I want to address some of the costs of the bill's Green New Deal-esque energy provisions, starting with the cost to American families.

We know some energy prices are increasing due to the rising demand from the lows of the pandemic. Yesterday's average price for a gallon of gas was \$3.38. That is compared to an average price of \$2.16 1 year earlier. Meanwhile, natural gas prices recently hit a 7-year high, and there are mounting concerns about supply.

Americans are paying a lot more to drive their cars, to heat their homes, and to cook their food. The high cost of gasoline and natural gas are two more reasons why Americans are finding that their paychecks don't stretch as far these days.

Given the situation, you would think that finding ways to lower energy costs would be among Democrats' top priorities right now, but you would be wrong. Democrats' tax-and-spending spree isn't going to lower energy prices; it is going to drive them even higher.

The new energy policies that Democrats are considering would drive up the price of electricity, natural gas, and gasoline and subsidize Democrats' preferred technologies with Americans' tax dollars. And the icing on the cake is that Americans are likely to be paying higher electric costs for possibly worse electric service.

A lot of Americans are familiar with the problems with California's electric grid—namely, blackouts. Well, if Democrats have their way, Americans around the country will be able to enjoy California-style electricity; in other words, expensive and inconsistent electricity delivery along with higher gas prices.

This is what I mean when I talk about Democrats not fully considering the costs. Nobody—nobody—questions that clean energy is a good thing. I have been a strong supporter—a strong supporter—of clean energy innovation. My State of South Dakota leads the way, whether it is wind energy, biofuel, or hydropower. Most of the energy generated in the State of South Dakota comes from renewable sources. In 2020, 83 percent of the electricity generated in my State of South Dakota came from renewable sources.

But clean energy policies need to be realistic and practical for each region of the country. We have to, for example, understand that we are not yet at the point, innovationwise, where we can rely mostly on intermittent renewable sources to power electric grids. We need reliable baseload power from sources like clean natural gas and nuclear. Additionally, forcing older electric plants to close before the end of their remaining useful life, especially the most modern and efficient ones, will strand those assets. Our utilities make long-term investments, and when they can't recoup those facility investments, they pass the costs on to consumers.

Overreaching clean energy policies that place heavy burdens on working families are unacceptable. Wealthy Democratic politicians and the wealthy donor class that supports them may not have to worry much if they have to spend more on their electric bill or an extra \$20 to \$25 filling up their gas tank. But that is a big deal to a family on a budget, especially when that family is also dealing with the increased price of food and other basics.

Thanks to inflation and other pressures on gas prices, Americans are already having to spend a lot more money to fill their gas tanks, and with the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, many working families would end up unable to fill their gas tank when they need to in a diminished oil and gas sector. Maybe that is the goal of some of the more extreme members of the Democratic Party, but it is an unacceptable one.

Working families are likely to have a tough time thanks to the energy provisions in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, but wealthy families should do a little better. Not only are they more likely to be able to afford increases in the price of electricity and gas, but they will also be able to claim a tax credit from the Federal Government if they want to purchase an expensive electric vehicle.

Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will offer tax credits of up to \$12,500 for the purchase of an electric car or truck with the biggest credit naturally going to those who purchase union-made vehicles.

That is right. Only electric vehicles produced at facilities under a union-negotiated collective bargaining agreement would be eligible for the \$4,500 plus-up, which would take the credit up to \$12,500. And anyone making up to \$400,000 a year will be able to claim this credit.

That is right.

Under Democrats' legislation, you could be making nearly half a million dollars a year and still receive a substantial tax break for the purchase of an electric car.

Meanwhile, more accessible and readily available clean energy technologies—notably, biofuels—take a backseat in this bill.

Electric vehicles are Democrats' chosen winner in the transportation sec-

tor, no matter how impractical they may still be for a lot of working Americans.

Speaking of impractical, if you want an electric bike to go along with your electric car, Democrats will also give you a tax credit for that as well. Yes, the Democrats' bill contains a tax credit for electric bicycles—a credit that would go to bicycles that can cost up to \$8,000.

Now, maybe it is just me, but if you can afford an \$8,000 electric bike, I am not sure you need a tax credit for it from the Federal Government. Also, while electric bicycles may have their appeal in urban and maybe some suburban communities, they are a completely impractical option for most individuals in States like South Dakota. When you live 20 miles away from the nearest grocery store, an electric bicycle is not going to be your vehicle of choice for getting around. And I am pretty sure that South Dakota agricultural producers will back me up when I say that electric bicycles are not going to be much use for getting out to check the fences in the far corners of their ranch.

However, I have got to say that tax credits for electric bicycles are far from the most wasteful use of government money in this bill. That honor may have to go for the new tax credit to higher education institutions for teaching environmental justice programs. That is right. I am sure Americans will be relieved to know that Democrats are planning to create a new tax credit for higher education institutions—including Ivy league schools and other well-funded universities—so that they can teach courses on environmental justice, whatever that is. You would think colleges that charge students tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of dollars in tuition could perhaps afford to fund their own environmental justice programs. But, again, I guess you would be wrong.

Then there is the \$3 billion the bill provides for tree equity—tree equity.

Now, I support and encourage the planting of trees, and I have introduced a straightforward bill to rapidly expand tree planting across the country without any Federal spending. But I am fairly sure the Federal Government cannot afford to spend \$3 billion on tree equity, especially when Democrats need to save money for their civilian climate corps—a new government program to provide government jobs and subsidized housing to climate activists.

There is so much more.

The word is that Democrats will soon be releasing a new version of their tax-and-spending spree, and I can only hope that it will be less extreme than the current version because if the bill's current Green New Deal-esque energy provisions go into effect, Americans are going to be looking at a future of higher energy costs, diminished energy resources, and a weakened energy independence, not to mention a lot of wasted taxpayer dollars.

Once again, it is abundantly clear that the Green New Deal is a bad deal for American families.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Nachmanoff nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael S. Nachmanoff, 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 Nachmanoff nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 435 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	
Cardin	Leahy	
Carper	Lujan	
Casey	Manchin	
Collins	Markey	
Coons	Menendez	
Cortez Masto	Merkley	
Duckworth	Murkowski	
Durbin	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	
Graham	Ossoff	
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeben	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds
-----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Nagala nomination.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sarala Vidya Nagala, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

VOTE ON NAGALA NOMINATION

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

Mr. KAINE. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 436 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeben	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds
-----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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 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 Executive Calendar No. 367, Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael Warnock, Alex Padilla.

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 Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 437 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeben	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds
-----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss again the scheme by rightwing donor interests to capture