

in favor of her nomination as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We need someone at the helm of our civilian and diplomatic efforts on counterterrorism who has the experience of working in some of the most dangerous and challenging environments. We need someone who is qualified to direct and successfully implement the Department's counterterrorism programs and who can work hand in hand with the Department of Defense on counterterrorism issues. We also need someone who has proven they will stand up for American values.

The threat from terrorism has not gone away but has changed dramatically. Not only has terrorism spread across more countries, but today it takes on a different form.

Protecting our Nation from the evolving counterterrorism threat is absolutely critical to the security of the United States. That is why we must have an experienced leader at the helm of the Bureau of Counterterrorism and why we must confirm Ambassador Richard without delay.

Ambassador Richard has over three decades of experience in the Foreign Service. She has served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs at the Department of State; as Deputy Chief of Mission in Yemen; as Border Coordinator in Pakistan; and as Ambassador to Lebanon—a career diplomat who has served our Nation. Throughout her tenure, she has led efforts with our partners and allies to confront the challenges from terrorist groups.

Ambassador Richard's nomination was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a voice vote. She has overwhelming endorsements from military and civilian leaders alike, including the support of some of our most experienced and senior national security officials, from General Votel, retired four-star general and former commander of Special Operations Command and Central Command; to General Nagata, former commander of Special Operations Command Central and Director of Strategy for the National Counterterrorism Center; to retired Major General Fontes of U.S. Army Cyber Command.

All endorse her candidacy, as does Jeffrey Feltman, the former Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs of the United Nations, Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs, and U.S. Special Envoy for the Horn of Africa; as has Anne Patterson, former U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan, Egypt, and Colombia, and Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs.

I could go on.

Ambassador Richard has earned the support because of her long career. They all speak highly of her ability and qualifications to lead the Department's counterterrorism policy. As one of them said, she is "among the very finest diplomats our nation has produced."

I have every confidence she will lead the CT Bureau with distinction. This is a serious position, and it demands someone with the experience and caliber that Ms. Richard possesses. She has the skill, knowledge, and capacity to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 30 minutes so that my colleagues and I can participate in a live unanimous consent prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1669

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today in support of free speech and in support of AM radio. AM radio is something that is widely enjoyed by Americans across this country. Over 80 million Americans listen to AM radio every month. They rely on it. Yet, earlier this year, we saw eight major automakers announce that they are stripping AM radio from new cars and new trucks, taking away the option of AM radio for consumers.

That decision, I believe, was a serious mistake—a mistake that would hurt Texans and that would hurt Americans in all 50 States. As a result, I join with my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, ED MARKEY, in introducing legislation—the AM Radio for Every Car Act.

I would note that Senator MARKEY is one of if not the most liberal Senator in this Chamber, and I am one of if not the most conservative Senator in this Chamber. I do not recall another bill on which Senator MARKEY and I have joined forces, and it speaks to the power of this issue that you see such deep agreement across ideological lines.

When Senator MARKEY and I introduced that legislation, within days, one of the eight major carmakers—Ford Motor Company—reversed course and announced they would now include AM radio on new cars and trucks. I think they viewed this coalition as a sign of the apocalypse. I would note that this bill has overwhelming bipartisan support. It has 44 cosponsors, 22 Democrats and 22 Republicans.

When we took it up in the Commerce Committee, it passed out of the Commerce Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, and why is that? Because on the merits, this bill is the right thing to do for the American people.

No. 1, in times of disaster, AM radio is the single most reliable medium for communicating about a natural disaster. I remember when Hurricane Harvey hit my home city of Houston and the entire Texas gulf coast, the enormous challenges, people relied on AM radio.

When other forms of communication go down, AM radio is consistently the

most resilient to help people get out of harm's way, whether it is getting out of the way of a hurricane or getting out of the way of a tornado or getting out of the way of a forest fire or any other disaster, AM radio is there to help people know where to go and how to keep their families alive.

But, secondly, AM radio is particularly important for rural America. Texas has enormous quantities of our State that is rural. And in rural America, there are many parts of Texas, many parts of other States, where farmers and ranchers—the only thing they can get is AM radio. And when they are out on their farms and ranches, they rely on AM radio for weather reports, for crop reports, for news, for sports, for entertainment. Taking away the option for rural America of AM radio is bad—bad—for farmers and ranchers in America.

But, No. 3, diversity. AM radio promotes a diversity of views. Why? Because the barriers of entry to getting into AM radio are relatively low. To start an FM station is quite expensive. An AM station is much cheaper to start and to operate, and, as a consequence, we see a beautiful array of diversity of views reflected on AM radio nationally. There are 296 AM stations that are owned by Hispanics.

Nationally, there are 138 AM stations that are owned by African Americans. Nationally, there are 104 AM stations that are owned by Asian Americans. Nationally, there are 14 AM stations that are owned by American Indians or Alaskan Natives. Nationally, there are four AM radio stations owned by Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders. And nationally, there are 385 AM radio stations that are owned by women.

If we wanted diversity of views, AM radio is critically important, and I would note, the support for this bill is broad and far-ranging. Seven former FEMA Directors have called for the Senate and the House to pass this bill as soon as possible, saying that "the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act is critical to ensuring Federal, State, and local officials can keep the public safe."

That sentiment was echoed by multiple emergency response organizations, such as the International Association of Fire Chiefs, Big City Emergency Managers, and the National Association of Counties.

All 50 State broadcaster associations have called on Congress to pass this bill. In addition to media groups, including the National Association of Black-Owned Broadcasters, the National Urban League, and OCA-Asian Pacific American Advocates.

The bill has received the support of many agricultural and livestock groups. And the AARP has likewise shared their support for this bill, noting that "adults age 50 and above represent the largest share of AM radio listeners, but they also represent those most at risk from disaster events."

This is a bipartisan bill that makes sense, that preserves consumer choice.

This bill should pass easily, and yet it is not going to pass this afternoon.

My friend the Senator from Kentucky, it is my understanding, intends to object. And I would note that one aspect of AM radio is particularly important to Texans and to the citizens of Kentucky and to people all across this country, which is that AM radio is a haven for free speech. AM radio is a haven for people to speak, even if their views are disfavored by the political ruling class.

Talk radio is an oasis for conservative speech. Rush Limbaugh would not exist without AM radio. The views of my friend the Senator from Kentucky would be heard by many fewer people without AM radio, whether Mark Levin or Sean Hannity or Glenn Beck. Allowing free speech is important. I believe these automakers stood up to remove AM radio as part of a broader pattern we see of censoring views that are disfavored by Big Business. I think this is consistent with what Big Tech has done—silencing views they disagree with.

And so this bill is all about preserving consumer choice, letting consumers decide. If you don't want to listen to AM radio, turn it off. But you know what, if the automakers all come together and say: You can't turn it on because we are not going to put it in your car; we are not going to put it in your truck; you don't have the right to choose what you will listen to, I think that is profoundly harmful for our country, profoundly harmful for free speech. And so I hope this body can actually act in support of Americans in harm's way in a disaster, in support of farmers and ranchers who rely on AM radio, in support of a diversity of views speaking online, and in support of free speech for whatever your views, whether they are rightwing, leftwing, or no wings at all. AM radio lets people speak and make the case in John Stuart Mill's marketplace of ideas.

Accordingly—actually, before I do this, I would like to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts—oh, OK.

Accordingly, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 208, S. 1669; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, 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 Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, there is a certain amount of irony in seeing Republicans come to the floor proposing mandates on business to Republicans picking winners and losers. Mandating that all cars have AM radio is antithetical to any notion of limited government and has nothing to do with the debate over free speech.

The debate over free speech is whether or not government can place limita-

tions on speech. It has nothing to do with whether or not you have a right to have your opinion in the New York Times or whether you get to listen to radio. It really has nothing to do with the debate over free speech.

The debate over free speech, as listed in the First Amendment, is that government shall pass no law. It has nothing to do with forcing your manufacturers to have AM radio. This legislation attempts to insert Congress's judgment into a question best decided by American consumers. This isn't about consumers turning on or off the radio; this is about consumers deciding which car they want to buy, what they want to pay for it, and what they want as the extras in the car.

American families are already struggling, and this bill is yet another private sector mandate that would cost car buyers even more money. This bill mandates that AM radio be included in vehicles manufactured in the United States, imported into the United States, or simply shipped in interstate commerce.

What happens when government places mandates on the private marketplace? Consumers pay more. To provide AM radio in electric cars, manufacturers must include equipment to counteract the electromagnetic interference between the battery and the AM radio waves. The equipment necessary to fix this problem, at a minimum, costs several hundred dollars per vehicle.

According to the Consumer Technology Association, even a small automotive production line would incur costs above \$15 million to comply with this mandate. The sponsors of this legislation know this bill will increase costs for car buyers. That is why they included a provision that also prohibits carmakers from charging a fee or an additional payment for access to AM broadcast stations.

So it is not just a mandate that you have to have AM; it is a mandate that you can't charge for AM radio. It is more than one mandate on car manufacturers, and it will add to the cost of the car.

Well, that sure is an interesting thought. They think they are going to prevent this by saying that the car manufacturer can't charge for AM radio, but people will still pay more for their cars. If the mandate is imposed, one way or another, people will pay for this cost. It just doesn't disappear.

When angry consumers then complain about the ever-increasing cost of cars, the proponents of this bill will inevitably shrug their shoulders and say: Don't blame us. We passed a bill to force car companies to incur an additional cost, and then we told them they weren't allowed to charge you, but they did anyway.

When the government imposes costs on manufacturers, the government inevitably imposes costs on the consumers. No bill can shield consumers from the higher costs imposed by gov-

ernment. And Congress already imposes significant costs on all taxpayers by forcing the many to subsidize the few who own electric cars.

Electric car vehicles make up a small but growing percentage of vehicles on the road. They comprise about 2 percent of all vehicles, and nearly 6 percent of the vehicles sold last year were electric. Most of these electric cars are subsidized by the taxpayer.

If you want to get to the root of this problem, if you don't want government subsidizing something that bans your favorite form of entertainment, quit subsidizing them. So I have a great deal of sympathy for AM radio. I love AM radio, but I don't want to give up on our philosophy and just say: Well, because it is something we like, we are going to mandate it.

If you want to get to the root of the problem, quit subsidizing the car manufacturers, quit subsidizing electric cars if they are going to disfavor our speech. That is a way of empowering speech and promoting speech that doesn't involve giving up on our principles that mandates on business are not a good idea.

The electrical vehicle tax credit forces all of us to subsidize the small number of electrical car owners. This subsidy, by incentivizing the purchase of electrical cars, does threaten AM radio.

If you want to really get rid of this, quit subsidizing electric cars. So instead of attacking the crux of the problem here though, this legislation adds a government mandate to force car manufacturers to install AM radios and increase the price of cars.

Do we seriously not see the folly of this exercise, particularly from a conservative point of view? Let me be perfectly clear. Government intervention in the economy cannot be the solution to problems caused by government intervention in the economy. We have this problem because government subsidizes these electric cars. We are going to fix it by then mandating some other government rule. One mandate does not cancel out another and will not make the situation better.

At some point, we have to remember that we are Members of Congress, not the central planners of the automobile industry.

With that in mind, I offer a solution to get the government's foot off the neck of taxpayers. Let's let the free market decide where consumers can operate. Let's let people without subsidies, without coercions, without the government getting involved, let's let them pick. Do you want a car with AM radio or do you want an electric car without an AM radio, but let's don't subsidize one or the other.

Rather than mandate the installation of AM radio, let's stop subsidizing the purchase of electrical cars and the removal of AM radio. Let's let the consumers tell the manufacturers, through hundreds of transactions a day, what their preferences are.

So I ask unanimous consent to strike the mandate imposed by this legislation and empower car buyers by modifying the request forward to replace the text with my language that would repeal the electric vehicle car tax.

So I would ask that the Senator modify his request and that the Paul substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, 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 (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, my friend from Kentucky is attacking a bipartisan bill with overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle. When I started in the U.S. Congress, one of the main operating principles under which we were able to make progress upon big issues—and it went back to President Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn—was the Austin-Boston connection working together, Texas and Massachusetts, to make progress where we could. That is what this legislation is today. Senator CRUZ and I agree that we have to ensure that, for public safety reasons, AM radio stays in the vehicles that Americans drive. And, as Senator CRUZ said, 80 million Americans a month use AM radio.

And not only is the Senator from Kentucky proposing to strike our bill but also to actively harm American drivers and American workers. We are going from win-win to lose-lose for American drivers.

The electric vehicle tax credit helps Americans drive cheaper cars while driving manufacturing. Electric vehicle sales are soaring. Investments in new manufacturing capacity related to the electric vehicle supply chain also increased by more than 100 percent. It reached \$35 billion in a single year since the passage of the tax credit. In total, since the passage of the Inflation Reduction Act, more than 84,000 new jobs have been announced in the EV sector.

In fact, most of the largest single Federal investment in the auto industry is going to Senator PAUL's State of Kentucky. New Federal loans for three battery manufacturing plants are expected to create 5,000 construction jobs and 7,500 operations jobs—all to build batteries for Ford and Lincoln electric vehicles. My friend, I would hope, would want Kentucky to be the home of those new jobs, new opportunities, and new economic energy driven by the electric vehicle tax credit, and I am sure other States would be interested in stepping in.

We have union workers who have secured a historic victory over the Big Three with their recent strike. They have been clear that the electric vehi-

cle revolution, which is kick-started by the tax credit, can be an engine for good-paying union jobs. So let's not pump the brakes on giving drivers the freedom to buy cheaper, cleaner vehicles. Let's not pump the brakes on new jobs in States across the country, including Kentucky. And let's not pump the brakes on ensuring that drivers and passengers can receive alerts during emergencies.

AM radio is the backbone of FEMA's emergency response system. It allows emergency responders and, if necessary, the President of the United States to communicate with the public during the most dire of circumstances.

In just the past 5 years, FEMA has invested more than \$150 million to harden 77 radio stations across the country to withstand natural disasters, emergencies, and even a nuclear electromagnetic pulse. These stations are equipped with backup generators and other tools to stay online in the worst conditions, and FEMA has specifically chosen stations that would allow the President to communicate with more than 90 percent of the public. Those stations include WBZ-AM in Boston, MA, which beams all across New England. From Superstorm Sandy to the recent wildfires in Maui, when self-service and other communications channels went down, broadcast AM radio stations, especially those 77 hardened stations, remained on the air.

Despite its immense importance to our emergency response system, broadcast AM radio is under attack from automakers. Over the past few years, car manufacturers have increasingly removed broadcast AM radio from their vehicles, arguing that AM radio is outdated and unnecessary during emergencies.

Well, Senator CRUZ and I know that is not accurate. That is why, a year ago, I sent letters to 20 automakers requesting additional information about their plans for broadcast AM radio. When I learned that eight companies had removed broadcast AM radio from their vehicles, Senator CRUZ and I teamed up to introduce the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act, which would direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to require automakers to maintain broadcast AM radio in their vehicles. We now have 44 cosponsors from across the political spectrum, split evenly between Democrats and Republicans. We have built this broad coalition because this issue of access to AM radio is about public safety.

And don't take our word for it. All year the emergency response community has been sounding the alarm about the removal of broadcast AM radio from vehicles and urging lawmakers to pass our bill. In fact, every former FEMA Administrator since the Clinton administration has endorsed the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act and so have groups representing the local emergency response communities, including the National Emer-

gency Management Association, the International Association of Emergency Managers, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and Big City Emergency Managers.

Earlier this year, FEMA warned that "millions of people could be prevented from receiving critical, lifesaving information if AM radios are not included in automobiles" and called the removal of AM radio stations a "public safety crisis" for the United States. The current FEMA Administrator has warned that the removal of AM radio would have a significant impact on the emergency alert system.

So while automakers may argue that cell phones or streaming services can replace broadcast AM radio during emergencies, the emergency response community—the experts actually responsible for responding to emergencies—are universally saying just the opposite. They are saying that AM radio is important; that cell service often goes down, as we saw in Hawaii; that the key to an effective emergency alert system is redundancy.

Whom do you want to listen to—the automakers with a financial interest in removing AM from their vehicles or the experts warning that this is a crisis?

Every single day that passes is another day in which automakers put cars on the road without broadcast AM capabilities, putting their drivers and their passengers and their families in jeopardy. In matters of safety, we can't compromise. We have to listen to the experts when it comes to our national security. I urge my colleagues to stand with the tens of millions of AM radio listeners and the emergency response experts and support the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act, which Senator CRUZ and I have introduced.

With that, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I want to briefly respond to the arguments raised by the Senator from Kentucky and then yield the floor to Senator LUJÁN from New Mexico.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky suggested that free speech has nothing to do with the actions of private companies censoring citizens, and I am going to suggest that is a very cribbed version of free speech.

The Senator from Kentucky argued: All we should care about is government restrictions of speech.

But, apparently, that means there is no role to do anything to protect free speech rights from Big Tech companies that censor and silence and deplatform voices they disagree with, that abuse their monopoly power to silence voices.

I will tell you, I have been proud to earn support from libertarians across Texas and across the country, and it is a strange libertarian view that supports Big Tech censorship of free

speech. Being a libertarian does not mean being an anarchist, and I would suggest there is a role for government rules and regulations that are liberty enhancing and choice enhancing, and that is what this choice is.

The Senator from Kentucky said: Well, consumers could just choose to turn on the AM radio.

Well, no, they can't, if you have eight automakers working in concert to take that choice away from them. This is all about giving them that choice.

Secondly, I would say, the Senator from Kentucky suggested consumers would pay more.

Mr. President, the status quo is AM radio is in the cars and trucks right now, and it is not just electric vehicles the carmakers are pulling it from. It is every vehicle including internal combustion vehicles. This is about stripping consumer choice and killing AM radio.

I hope the majority leader will schedule this bill for a vote because, if he did, it would pass with an overwhelming vote on the floor of the Senate. And I hope the Senator from Kentucky will reconsider because this bill would have passed today, were it not for two words from the Senator of Kentucky: "I object." That is the only reason this bill has not passed today.

I yield to Senator LUJAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. President, I want to express thanks for the leadership of my colleagues from Texas and Massachusetts and for the work they have done in this space, bringing more and more attention to something that doesn't impact our daily lives until we need it most, when there is often an emergency, as there was in New Mexico about 2 years ago, when the world's attention was on our beautiful State and we suffered the worst fires in our State's history.

Now, these were forest fires that received so much attention in our State because they were started by the Federal Government. How, you might ask. These were prescribed burns that went out of control.

Now, when cell phones were not working, when other methods of media were not able to connect because powerlines were going down, it was one local radio station, KNMX, an AM station in Las Vegas, NM, that was streaming more and more news to volunteers coming in on their time off, radio personalities ensuring that people would know what was happening because they were being told to evacuate from their homes, folks driving home from work in rural areas. As Senator CRUZ points out, when there is no news connectivity, no other information coming in, we depend on AM radio.

I just don't understand why there is opposition to this. I was hoping Senator CRUZ and Senator MARKEY and I could come to the floor today to celebrate the passing of this important legislation, not to sit and listen to that objection.

Just to point this out, in local news reporting, predominantly through AM radio, and in New Mexico because of the fires, we heard from the FEMA Administrator—from Administrator Criswell—who said "AM radio is one of the most dependable ways that we can reach individuals across this country to get warnings out there."

We saw this play out firsthand in New Mexico, and, as we have been reminded, this is not just a challenge in my State or in Texas or in Massachusetts but in every one of the 50 States across the country. The Federal Government should be doing more to make it easier for Americans to access potentially lifesaving emergency broadcasts—plain and simple.

With natural disasters happening every day in every State, I wanted to clarify a few points, some of which I heard today.

One, I heard a claim that the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act will force manufacturers of electric vehicles to completely redesign the drivetrain. I heard a little bit about that today.

Here are the facts. The fact is that car companies have already solved this engineering challenge. We have already heard of the number of companies that have come forward. With the 20 letters that Senator MARKEY sent out, 10 companies responded—Honda, Hyundai, Land Rover, Kia, Lucid, Mitsubishi, Nissan, Stellantis, Subaru, and Toyota—that they already figured this out. Brilliant engineers at those companies figured this out.

Some of the folks who are objecting to this are flying rocket ships and, I would argue, have some of the most talented engineers in the world working for them. Challenge them to solve this challenge, as the other 10 companies have. Sometimes, it just means insulating some cable a little bit more, not because it impacts the vehicle but because there might be a little bit of static coming in.

I would rather have a little static and receive the lifesaving information than not even have access to it.

I have heard that the AM Radio for Every Vehicle Act would increase costs for new vehicles by thousands and thousands of dollars by these vehicles. Well, again, 10 companies have already figured this out, and they are making it happen.

But here is the concern that I have. I see access to AM radio as a lifesaving feature—important information that we all depend on. I had heard that seatbelts would be too costly when that was being put forth as a requirement in vehicles to help save people's lives. When there was a conversation about airbags saving people's lives, I heard and I read that it was too expensive, that that shouldn't happen. We don't need airbags in vehicles.

When we were all debating about the inclusion of backup cameras to prevent the deaths of little kids in cars, there were many who were saying: Oh, it is too expensive. It cannot be done.

I am very concerned that when it comes to moving this technology forward that the same tired excuses are brought forward. This body has a chance to be able to get this done, and I hope that we can see something put on the floor here soon because more and more vehicles getting on the road without AM radio are jeopardizing the lives and safety of our constituents.

The last thing I will say is this—and this is about a conversation with a small radio owner in New Mexico, out of Sante Fe, at KSWV. I was speaking to him before I came down, and he was reminding me about the core physics of electromagnetic spectrum around AM, and the Presiding Officer touched on this. It is everywhere. As a matter of fact, KOB—a station in Albuquerque, NM—touches a little more than half the State with their broadcasts.

It is pretty incredible what this spectrum can deliver in our communities. We should maximize the reach of emergency alerts over AM radio and wireless networks. The physics and the electromagnetics of this are plain and simple, and that is why I certainly hope that we can get this done.

To the Senator from Texas, I have so much more to offer, and I was going to offer it in the RECORD because the argument is strong; it is compelling. We have got to get this done. I certainly hope that we will see some floor time and get this done because it could mean someone's life in our communities after not getting the information they need to get out of their community or out of their home because a tornado or a hurricane or a fire is on them.

No more excuses. Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). 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 Executive Calendar No. 144, Elizabeth H. Richard, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher Murphy, Richard Blumenthal, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Debbie Stabenow, Raphael G. Warnock, 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 Elizabeth H. Richard, of Virginia, a