

Manchin	Peters	Tester
Markey	Reed	Van Hollen
Menendez	Rosen	Warner
Merkley	Sanders	Warnock
Murkowski	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murray	Shaheen	Wyden
Ossoff	Sinema	
Padilla	Smith	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Stabenow

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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 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. 1032, Sarah A.L. Merriam, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, Chris Van Hollen, Elizabeth Warren, Catherine Cortez Masto, Raphael G. Warnock, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher Murphy, Maria Cantwell, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Duckworth.

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 Sarah A.L. Merriam, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, 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 Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 336 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Stabenow

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Sarah A. L. Merriam, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CONFIRMATION OF E. MARTIN ESTRADA

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the confirmation of Martin Estrada to be U.S. attorney for the Central District of California.

The Central District of California is the largest Federal judicial district in the country. It serves over 19 million Californians, almost twice as many people as the next largest district, and it serves about half the population of the State of California.

It spans from San Luis Obispo County, home of Los Padres National Forest, all the way to Riverside County and the Mojave Desert. It spans from the Pacific Ocean to the eastern border with Arizona and Nevada. And it is home to some of the most diverse communities in the country.

So having painted that picture of the district that it serves, you can imagine that to effectively serve as the chief Federal law enforcement officer for such a large and diverse district, you need someone with a proven track record of experience, of credibility with the community, and the character to fight for truth and fairness in our judicial system.

Martin Estrada is exactly the right person for the job. He is a proud son of immigrants from Guatemala. Martin has spent most of his life in and around the Central District community that he will now serve as U.S. attorney.

He was raised near Costa Mesa in Orange County and earned his undergraduate degree at the University of California, Irvine. After earning his law degree at Stanford Law School, Martin returned home to the Central District, where he clerked for Federal District Judge Robert Timlin and then later for Judge Arthur Alarcon for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

After spending time as an associate at the highly regarded Los Angeles law firm of Munger, Tolles & Olson, Martin served for 7 years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Central District, working to protect communities from major crimes. Now, since 2014, he has been a partner at Munger, Tolles & Olson, and he has represented clients from before both Federal and State courts in a diverse array of legal practice areas. Meanwhile, he has maintained a significant pro bono practice, fighting for equal justice and equal access to justice for Dreamers, Latinos, Native American students, students with disabilities, and more. He has excelled at every stage of his career, and he is more than qualified to serve as U.S. attorney for California's Central District.

I have no doubt that he will bring a temperament, intelligence, and work ethic worthy of the community he will now once again serve.

I want to thank all of you, colleagues. I want to thank you for supporting his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4845

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, in the last few weeks, students in Uvalde and the rest of Texas started a new school year. Three and a half months ago, on May 24, 19 innocent children and 2 teachers were murdered by a deranged, evil gunman.

There are no words to describe a monster who enters a school and murders little children—19 children, 19 families in Uvalde who lost their little boys and their little girls, 2 teachers who are no longer here with us.

I was in Uvalde the day after the shooting. I sat down with local officials and law enforcement. I went to the prayer vigil that night where the entire Uvalde community came together, praying, weeping, and mourning the unbelievable loss of those 19 precious children and 2 teachers.

The Uvalde shooting was the deadliest school shooting in Texas history. Before that, I was in Santa Fe, where yet another evil madman killed eight students and two teachers. I was also at Sutherland Springs, the worst church shooting in U.S. history. I was in El Paso. I was in Midland-Odessa. I was in Dallas.

There have been too damn many mass shootings. With kids going back to school all across the country, we need to again revisit what we can do to keep them safe from mass shooters.

Many students, especially in Uvalde, are scared. Their parents are scared, and they have expressed concerns that the security measures at schools in Uvalde haven't improved enough to make them feel safe.

Today, I want to put forth two bills that would address this problem.

Inevitably, when a mass murder occurs, Democrats in this Chamber and the media implore Congress: Do something.

Well, in just a moment, the Senate can do something. The first bill I am going to ask this body to pass is the Secure Our Schools Act, which would spend unused COVID education funds on hiring police officers in schools and hiring school-based mental health professionals. This bill would be the most serious, the most significant, the most major investment in school security Congress has ever enacted. This bill would double the number of police officers on campus. So if, God forbid, the next deranged madman shows up trying to commit murder, before that madman gets into the school, into the classroom, he would encounter an armed police officer who could stop him outside the school before he commits murder.

This bill also funds \$10 billion for 15,000 new mental health counselors in schools. So many of these deranged killers have a long and horrifying descent into mental illness before they commit their crimes. We see the pattern of the lone, alienated, angry, deranged, young man who seeks to commit the most unspeakable evil. If we had additional mental health resources on campuses, they would be in a position to spot the warning signs, to see the young man heading down that dangerous path, and to intervene and stop them.

Recently, the National Center for Education Statistics, which is part of the U.S. Department of Education, found that 88 percent of public schools did not "strongly agree" when asked whether they had the funding and the mental health professionals they needed in the schools. Eighty-eight percent said: We need more mental health professionals in schools and more funding to hire them.

My bill would address both of these problems by ensuring that we are doubling the number of police officers so there are armed police officers to protect our kids and keep them safe and so there are mental health counselors to spot a dangerous young man before he goes down the road of committing a horrific mass murder.

This bill is common sense, and in a sane political environment, it would be passed 100 to nothing.

My colleague Senator BARRASSO wants to make some additional remarks on our bill. So I yield the floor to Senator BARRASSO.

(Ms. ROSEN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, Madam President, I come to the floor today to join my colleague and friend from Texas in support of this very important piece of legislation.

What happened in Uvalde was a tragedy. It was horrendous. I commend the citizens of that community for their strength in a time of heartache.

Every Member of this body agrees that we need to find the best way to protect children who go to school. Whether in Washington, DC, or Wheatland, WY, we need to find a way to protect those students.

That is why Senator CRUZ and I have introduced the Safe Kids, Safe Schools, Safe Communities Act of 2022. Our bill provides the kind of safety and the kind of security that our children, our schools, and our communities desperately need. And we do this while always protecting the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.

Now, as a doctor who served in our State legislature in Wyoming and now in this body, I have seen the devastating impact of mental health challenges, and Senator CRUZ talked specifically about those, and that is why we addressed them in this bill. I have seen how much those challenges contribute and what we have seen in these terrible acts. Our bill would make a difference—make a difference by providing mental health professionals with the resources they need to identify and to address these behavioral health needs of our students.

Our bill would hire 15,000 more mental health professionals at middle schools and high schools.

It also significantly increases the physical safety of our schools. Our bill would double the number of police officers in our schools. It would help schools buy more security equipment and metal detectors, door locks, and alarms.

Our bill also would do all of these things at no cost to the taxpayer. It wouldn't add to inflation. People might ask, how? Well, it is because our bill would redirect money that has already been allocated in the Democrats' spending bills. Our bill would work, and it wouldn't cost taxpayers a dime.

School is back in session now all across the country, and now is the time to take the real action that we need to keep our kids and our schools safe. No child should live in fear of going to school. No parent should live in fear of sending their child to school. And no law-abiding gun owner should be denied his or her constitutional rights.

So I want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for introducing this vital piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4845, which is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and

passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, what we just saw on this floor was stunning. I am genuinely at a loss for words.

This bill is common sense. There is not a constituent in Texas or Nevada or Connecticut who, if you asked: Would it be a good thing to have more police officers keeping our kids safe, wouldn't say: Of course it would. There is not a constituent of ours who, if you asked: Would it be a good thing to have more mental health counselors on campus to stop people from committing crimes, wouldn't say: Of course it would.

I was informed a few days ago that when I was going to seek unanimous consent, the Senator from Connecticut was going to object. Now, the Senator from Connecticut styles himself the leading advocate of gun control in the U.S. Senate.

I was asked by reporters: Why are the Democrats objecting to this?

I will tell you what I told reporters: I have no idea. They haven't said. They haven't told me why they object to it.

So I was genuinely looking forward to seeing the Senator from Connecticut's remarks. I was sitting here waiting to see, why do you oppose more police officers to keep our kids safe? Why do you oppose mental health counselors in schools?

I have been in the Senate 10 years. The Senator from Connecticut and I were elected at the same time. I have engaged in many debates on this floor, including with the Senator from Connecticut. The fact that he chose not to say a word about why he objects is stunning. I find myself genuinely flabbergasted.

I will say that one of reasons I think the Senator from Connecticut feels content not only not to argue but now to walk off the floor and not even listen to the debate he is ostensibly participating in, one of reasons he feels free to do so is, if you look up in the Senate Gallery—I can count them—there are precisely zero reporters in this Gallery. Not a single one of the corporate media will report on this, and I think the Senator from Connecticut feels absolutely certain, when he walks out, he will have reporters that will say: Tell me how terrible Donald Trump is.

He will lean in and say: Oh, Donald Trump is really terrible.

But not one of the reporters will ask: Hey, wait a second, why don't you want police officers keeping our kids safe?

None of them will. The Democrats are protected by a dishonest army of propagandists in the corporate media.

CNN will not have a panel sitting around discussing why is it that the

Democrats simply do not care to defend their positions.

Let me tell you, when there is a mass murdering and the Democrats stand up and give speeches and they point at Republicans and say: Blood is on your hands, it is great political rhetoric. It is dishonest, but, boy, it gins up their donors. It gets people to go and write checks to Democrats and fund their campaigns.

What we just saw reveals that Democrats have one objective when a mass murder happens, and that is to take away the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. That is always, always, always their solution. Never mind that it doesn't work. Never mind that it doesn't stop violent crime. Never mind that if you look at the jurisdictions across the country with the strictest gun control laws, almost every single one of them consistently has among the highest crime rates and murder rates.

Earlier this year, the Senator from Connecticut authored his big gun control package, rammed it through this body—a package which will do nothing, zero, to stop mass murders. We will see another mass murder. I pray that we don't, but evil exists in the world, and if another lunatic attacks a school, and there is not a police officer at the front door to stop him, remember right now. Remember this moment when the Democrats said: No, we will not protect our kids.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4586

Madam President, there are lots of arguments the Senator from Connecticut could have made. He chose to make none of them.

If he does not like how the money in this bill is specifically spent, I am now going to propound a second unanimous consent bill.

There is right now \$135 billion in unspent COVID relief funds to schools. Under the rules the Democrats have put in place, those funds cannot be spent on school security.

The second bill that I am going to ask this body to pass is a bill that is very simple. It is one page. It says schools can spend some of that \$135 billion on school security. They can decide what to spend it on, but if they decide they want to hire an additional police officer, they can spend the money on that. If they decide they want to enhance the physical security of their campus to make their students safer, they can spend it on that. They can invest in school security. Right now, the Democrats have blocked them from doing this.

These are funds Congress has already appropriated that haven't been spent. And this bill is unbelievably simple. It says the schools can choose to invest in school security.

Therefore, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 4586 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate

consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, the Senator is right—I am not going to engage in a colloquy on the merits of this request or the previous request. This isn't real. This is a TV show. This is click bait. This is theater. This isn't an actual attempt to pass legislation.

Senator LANKFORD approached me about this particular bill on the floor a week ago and asked to engage in a dialogue with me about it. I thought it was a legitimate request, and I set my team to the task of trying to work something out with Senator LANKFORD. And now there is a unanimous consent request to pass a bill that is under negotiation and discussions between serious legislators who actually want to find a result.

So, no, I am not going to debate the merits of these UCs. This isn't real.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, the Senator from Connecticut just gave us the sum total of his wisdom as he walks off the floor again, which is, he says this isn't real.

The Presiding Officer is well aware of how the Senate operates. When a Senator arises for a unanimous consent request, one of two things happens: A Senator objects, or the bill passes.

I have stood on this floor and passed unanimous consent requests because our colleagues chose not to object.

One of the more notable instances was following multiple instances in the House of House Democrats making anti-Semitic comments. The House tried to pass a resolution condemning anti-Semitism. Sadly, the radical left in the Democratic caucus objected, and the House Democrats couldn't pass a resolution condemning anti-Semitism.

I joined with our colleague Senator KAINE from Virginia, a Democrat. We authored a resolution, the Cruz-Kaine resolution—a bipartisan resolution that was a clear and unequivocal condemnation of anti-Semitism. It condemned BDS as anti-Semitism. It condemned explicitly the anti-Semitic comments made by those House Democrats at the outset of the dispute.

When Senator KAINE and I came to the Senate floor, we did not know if a Senator would object. There were numerous Senators in this body who did not join the resolution and could easily have walked out on the floor and objected. We stood up and asked unanimous consent, and much to our very pleasant surprise, the opposing party chose not to object, and the resolution passed. It passed 100 to nothing.

When the Senator from Connecticut says this isn't real, the only reason this bill has not passed the U.S. Senate is because the Senator from Connecticut stood up and uttered two magic words: I object. Had he done something really simple—just shut up, just shut his mouth, just sat there—we would be standing in a position where both of these bills would have passed into law.

What does it say about the Democrats' view of the American people that they don't engage in debate, they don't engage in discussion, they don't defend their positions? They, instead, arrogantly say no and have full confidence that their compliant cheerleaders in the media will never even tell anyone about it.

I don't know how you defend the position he just took. I was genuinely looking forward to hearing some form of an argument.

I can tell you, when I forced a vote on the Cruz-Barrasso bill on this floor and the Democrats voted, party line, no, we don't want more police officers in school; no, we don't want more mental health counselors in school; no, we don't want additional funding for school safety, to the best of my knowledge, no reporter asked a single Democrat: Why are you leaving our kids vulnerable? Why aren't you acting to protect children in school? Because, you know what, there is no money on the left for actually stopping these crimes. The money is for disarming law-abiding citizens. It is a narrow-minded, political focus.

We could have just passed the most significant school safety legislation ever passed by the Federal Government. Why didn't we? Because the Democrats objected. That objection is wrong, it is irresponsible, and it shows a willingness to play political games while demonstrating contempt for our constituents.

Today, the U.S. Senate failed the American people. Today, the U.S. Senate failed the schoolchildren of America. And I pray that the consequences are not truly horrific. I pray that this body will show up and do its damn job: Debate real issues and pass real legislation that will actually stop crime rather than the empty political gestures of the left.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, "Help Wanted." I see the signs in nearly every county I visit in Iowa on my 99-county tour. Small businesses and public services are struggling to maintain the workforce that is vital to our communities. The Des Moines Public School District, for example, has over 100 vacancies and is providing \$50,000 incentives for retiring teachers, nurses, and administrators to stay in school.

Faced with a declining number of soldiers, the Iowa National Guard is offering signing bonuses to new recruits,