

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. 725, Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Angus S. King, Jr., Jon Ossoff, Tim Kaine, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Raphael G. Warnock, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Ron Wyden, Gary C. Peters, Mazie Hirono, Christopher Murphy.

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 Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

## YEAS—56

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

## NAYS—43

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

## NOT VOTING—1

Hagerty

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:17 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

## 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. 791, C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation).

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Martin Heinrich, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Dianne Feinstein, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., Bernard Sanders, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher A. Coons.

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 C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation), 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 Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

## YEAS—52

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

## NAYS—47

Barrasso	Cramer	Hoeben
Blackburn	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Boozman	Daines	Johnson
Braun	Ernst	Kennedy
Burr	Fischer	Lankford
Capito	Graham	Lee
Cassidy	Grassley	Lummis
Cornyn	Hagerty	Marshall
Cotton	Hawley	McConnell

Moran  
Paul  
Portman  
Risch  
Rounds  
Rubio

Sasse  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune

Tillis  
Toomey  
Tuberville  
Wicker  
Young

## NOT VOTING—1

Whitehouse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to talk about one of the Senate's foremost constitutional duties, the advice and consent of executive nominations.

The most senior nominees, like Cabinet Secretaries, go through a floor process that normally takes about 4 days, if you run through all the procedural steps by the book. Other nominees, typically people with highly specialized expertise, go through a rigorous committee process and are often confirmed by unanimous consent.

Any Senator can object; that is the right of the Senator. If they feel that even one of hundreds of lower-level nominees should take up nearly a full week of the U.S. Senate's time, they can insist upon that.

I think Presidents are due an appropriate level of discretion in picking their teams, and I believe this is true whether or not the President is one I support or oppose. I believe in having the executive branch staffed with qualified professionals. I do draw the line at three areas: if a nominee is totally unqualified for the job, if there is a well-justified reason to question a nominee's ethics or honesty or impartiality, and, finally, if a nominee is so outside the mainstream in ways that go beyond normal good-faith disagreement on matters of policy.

I opposed a number of President Trump's nominees who met one or multiple of these criteria, but I also supported a larger percentage of President Trump's nominees. Even though these were not people I expected to agree with on policy, they did not fall afoul of the three criteria that I look at in a primary way.

I am here today because of several nominees within the jurisdiction of multiple committees I sit on; they are being blockaded, and I would like to focus on one just now.

Amy Loyd is nominated to be the Assistant Secretary of Education for Career, Technical, and Adult Education.

Ms. Loyd designed and led programs across the United States in her prior role at the education think tank Jobs for the Future and the Native American educational advocacy group the Cook Inlet Tribal Council.

She had a distinguished academic career, attending community college first in Santa Fe, prior to a doctorate in education leadership from Harvard Graduate School of Education. She is a lifelong professional in the field of career and technical education, and she brings personal life experience in the field, having begun her career at community college. I believe she is an outstanding point person for President Biden when it comes to matters of career and technical education.

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions advanced her nomination by a voice vote, with no recorded opposition. I sit on the HELP Committee. I am the chairman of the bipartisan Senate Career and Technical Education Caucus. I was proud to support her.

Although I do not know Ms. Loyd personally, I do have a personal connection to her nomination. My dad ran a welding and ironworking shop. I grew up working in that shop with my two brothers and my mother. I saw the power of career and technical education and the artistry of the ironworkers who worked in my dad's business.

When I was in the middle of law school, I took a year off to go be a missionary in Honduras, and I ran a school that taught kids to be carpenters and welders, again seeing the power of career and technical education. And I think that there is a bipartisan understanding in this body and the House—really, in society at large—that we may have undervalued career and technical education in recent generations; and as we are contemplating things like an infrastructure bill or other important priorities to grow the economy, we need to put more stress, not less, on the value of career and technical education.

So, as a Senator, I am proud to have made this one of my central policy fields: working on CTE bills with many, many colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

There is a hold on Amy Loyd's nomination, and that is the right of those who would hold her. But I am here specifically because I would like to know why.

I would ask my colleagues under which of the three buckets does Ms. Loyd's nomination fall short? Is there a perception that she is not qualified? Is there a perception that she is not ethical? Is there a perception that her views on career and technical education are outside the mainstream?

You don't have to support President Biden's nominees. If she is confirmed, part of her job will be answering tough questions from colleagues.

But I would ask my colleagues, if you are voting against nominees of any

President from the other party not because of flaws of the kinds that I have described, what does that get us?

The American people put Democrats for a period of time in charge of both the executive and the legislative branches. The American public often vote for divided government. Does that mean that any time the White House and the Senate are controlled by different parties, the parties just won't have anybody in their administration? What does that get our country? I think we know the answer: dysfunction.

Clearly, Madam President, as I conclude, there are nominees who engender significant controversy, either because of the peculiar nature of the post to which they have been nominated or because of aspects of their background or character. I know of no such controversy with this nominee, either about the position or about the individual herself. And I think if we are to succeed in the necessary project of elevating the importance of career and technical education, we need to have Ms. Loyd confirmed in her position.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination; Calendar No. 669, Amy Loyd, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

I do think it is significant that the party that is now in the majority that was previously in the minority took a different position when it was not in the minority—when it was not in the majority and when a President of their political party was not in power. There was elaborate and, I believe, an excessive delay in the confirmation of a lot of nominees, even more so than what we are seeing now.

I do have concerns that are particular as to this particular nominee and not generalized. They are not concerns that could be dismissed simply as a result of basic partisan disagreements, but based on views that are considerably outside the mainstream and that are radical and harmful.

Let me explain. As vice president of the think tank Jobs for the Future, Ms. Loyd was responsible for overseeing that organization's workforce development efforts through the lens of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

It is of great concern to me that this body of work produced reports that promulgated ideas aimed at furthering the divisive agenda of critical race theory and ESG scores. One of the most alarming of these reports is one that

was published on September 8, 2020, which asserted that due to "unconscious or implicit bias toward minorities," managers are limiting the advancement or promotion of minorities in the workforce.

These divisive, inflammatory assumptions are dangerous to the civil fabric of our society. Elevating individuals who espouse this dangerous and divisive ideology to key leadership positions within the Federal Government will only further divide Americans, pitting them one against another.

We should instead seek to elevate into positions of leadership those who aim to unify the American people and emphasize the importance of making sure that people are evaluated on the basis of the character of their heart, not the color of their skin. Her work has done the opposite of that.

In good conscience, I cannot and will not support the nomination of Ms. Loyd; and on that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

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

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

#### ENERGY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about unleashing American energy. Earlier this month, we saw the highest price ever for a gallon of gasoline in the United States. Inflation is over a high of 40 years. Energy costs are driving the cost of everything else, and there appears to be no end in sight. Joe Biden cannot hide from the fact that he is the President of high prices.

Meanwhile, in Europe, Vladimir Putin continues his onslaught. The Russian killing machine continues its assault on innocent people. Thousands of civilians have been killed. This includes hundreds of children.

Vladimir Putin's war crimes are all paid for with Russian energy. Energy accounts for nearly half of Putin's budget. Energy is the only successful industry in the Russian economy. If you want to defund Vladimir Putin, you have to drain his tank. You have to defund him on energy.

So what have we seen from the President of the United States? Well, Joe Biden spent all last year acting like Vladimir Putin was his "Secretary of Energy." Joe Biden played right along. Putin wanted it; Biden did it, followed the "Secretary of Energy."

Biden decided against sanctions on Putin's Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. People in this body, on both sides of the aisle, said: Mr. President, sanction the pipeline; don't allow it.

Putin said: I want it.

Biden gave it.