

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Hoeven	Rosen
Butler	Kaine	Rounds
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Marshall	Tillis
Coons	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Moran	Warnock
Crapo	Mullin	Warren
Daines	Murkowski	Welch
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Britt	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Budd	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Vance

NOT VOTING—7

Hagerty	Menendez	Tester
Hassan	Schmitt	
Hawley	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 27.

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 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF KRISSA M. LANHAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Krissa Lanham to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona.

Born in Bangkok, Thailand, Ms. Lanham received her B.A., summa cum laude, from Yale University and her J.D. from Yale Law School. She then served as a law clerk, first for Judge Robert N. Chatigny on the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut and then for Judge Barry G. Silverman on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Phoenix.

In 2009, Ms. Lanham began working as an assistant U.S. attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Arizona. She has served as appellate division chief since 2020, after previously serving as deputy appellate chief, human trafficking coordinator, and medical marijuana coordinator. She also serves as the Ninth Circuit representative to the Department of Justice's Appellate Chiefs Working Group.

Ms. Lanham has represented the United States in more than 500 Federal

prosecutions, and she has represented the United States and its Agencies in more than 50 civil cases. She has tried nine Federal criminal cases to verdict, including six jury trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Lanham as "well qualified" to serve on the District of Arizona. She has deep ties to Arizona, and she enjoys the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Ms. SINEMA and Mr. KELLY.

At Ms. Lanham's confirmation hearing, Senator SINEMA highlighted Ms. Lanham's commitment to public service and noted how she looked forward to Ms. Lanham's continued service to the Nation as a district judge. I also look forward to Ms. Lanham's continued service, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

VOTE ON LANHAM NOMINATION

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

Mr. PETERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Risch
Brown	Hoeven	Romney
Butler	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Rounds
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Lummis	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tillis
Coons	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Daines	Mullin	Welch
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Cornyn	Hyde-Smith
Blackburn	Cotton	Johnson
Boozman	Cruz	Kennedy
Braun	Ernst	Lankford
Britt	Fischer	Lee
Budd	Grassley	Paul

Ricketts	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
Rubio	Sullivan	Vance
Scott (FL)	Thune	

NOT VOTING—8

Hagerty	Menendez	Shaheen
Hassan	Sanders	Tester
Hawley	Schmitt	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). 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 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 executive 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. 600, Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael G. Warnock, Laphonza R. Butler, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Coons	Hoeven
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Blumenthal	Cramer	Kelly
Brown	Crapo	King
Butler	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Durbin	Lankford
Capito	Fetterman	Luján
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Graham	Markey
Casey	Heinrich	Marshall
Cassidy	Hickenlooper	McConnell
Collins	Hirono	Merkley

Moran	Romney	Warner
Mullin	Rosen	Warnock
Murkowski	Sanders	Warren
Murphy	Schatz	Welch
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Ossoff	Sinema	Wicker
Padilla	Smith	Wyden
Peters	Stabenow	Young
Reed	Tillis	
Risch	Van Hollen	

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Ernst	Rounds
Blackburn	Fischer	Rubio
Boozman	Grassley	Schmitt
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Britt	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Budd	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Paul	Vance
Daines	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Hawley	Tester
Hagerty	Menendez	
Hassan	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 29.

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 Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation vote on the Martinez nomination occur at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, and that the cloture motions filed during yesterday's session ripen upon disposition of the Martinez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 58 is made, the motion to proceed be agreed to and that at 6 p.m., the joint resolution be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

RURAL PROSPERITY AND FOOD SECURITY ACT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for the Rural Prosperity and Food Security Act, which is the strong, bipartisan farm bill proposal that has been put

forward by our colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, chair of the Agriculture Committee.

Chair STABENOW's framework reflects more than 2 years of work and outreach and contains more than 100 bipartisan bills, and it puts the 2024 farm bill back on track for being signed into law this year. As Chair STABENOW says, this farm bill is designed to keep farmers farming, families fed, and rural communities strong.

The farm bill touches nearly every aspect of life, and it touches the life of nearly every American. It is a big, complicated piece of legislation, but at its core, it does three things.

The first is that it governs how nutrition assistance, like SNAP, works for 42 million Americans, including 2.5 million rural residents.

The second thing is that it sets the rules for how farm and forestry programs work, including conservation and risk management tools like crop insurance, animal health, research and education, and forestry and timber.

Third, it drives rural development by supporting rural broadband, housing, childcare, and rural energy so that rural America can be strong, prosperous, and competitive.

For many years, the farm bill has bucked the tide of partisanship in Congress by finding common ground, providing stability and predictability to farmers, ranchers, and rural communities, and by sustaining nearly 23 million jobs across the country.

And why does it pass with such broad bipartisan support? Because we have all agreed in Congress to support what I think of as the three pillars of the farm bill: nutrition assistance, farm and conservation programs, and rural development.

This has been the grand bargain of Congress—that we agree together to keep each of these pillars strong, and then you can pass the bill. If you weaken any of these pillars, then a bipartisan farm bill just doesn't stand.

Colleagues, this grand bargain will be the recipe for success for the 2024 farm bill as well. So I want to spend a few minutes talking about where we have agreement and what more we need to do to pass a strong bipartisan bill.

Chair STABENOW released her proposal in early May, and, just this week, the House Agriculture Committee will mark up Chair THOMPSON's farm bill proposal. While Chair THOMPSON should be commended for including many proposals with broad bipartisan support, his bill significantly weakens nutrition and conservation programs. This undermines the grand bargain that is necessary to pass a bipartisan bill.

Here is what I am talking about when it comes to nutrition programs: Almost 45 million Americans live in homes that don't have regular access to affordable food. Almost all of these households are working families or seniors or people who are living with disabilities. This is interestingly and especially a rural issue. Households in

rural areas are even more affected. Of the top 10 counties facing the greatest food insecurity in this country, 9 are primarily in rural areas.

So Chair STABENOW's proposal, which I support, strengthens nutrition assistance. It makes certain that nutrition assistance now and into the future is going to meet the needs of Americans by making sure that monthly stipends are enough so that families can afford the food that they need.

I want to just note that it is not as if people are getting lots and lots of money here. I think the average cost for a family—the average benefit of a family—is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$6 a day. So we are not talking about a lot of money per person.

In contrast, the House Republicans' proposal prevents nutrition assistance from keeping pace with food costs. What does that mean for a family that is relying on SNAP benefits, for example? The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the House Republicans' farm bill could result in a \$30 billion cut to SNAP over the next decade. This is going to hurt people. It is not going to help them. It won't work, and it won't pass with bipartisan support.

Simply put, any farm bill proposal that weakens nutrition assistance now or in the future can't pass Congress.

The foundational farm bill risk management, research, and conservation programs—those foundational programs—are also incredibly important. They should be strengthened and not weakened in the next farm bill.

To that end, Chair STABENOW's farm bill includes many bipartisan provisions that I have fought for, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It updates and improves crop insurance and other USDA programs so that they work better, especially for small and beginning farmers and farmers from more diverse backgrounds. I am thinking, in Minnesota, of Native farmers, of Black, Hmong, and Latino farmers, and of farmers who are recent African immigrants.

It is interesting that, across the country and in Minnesota, the average age of farmers and ranchers in America is 58 to 60 years old. So it is essential for the future of our food system and for agriculture and farming that crop insurance is going to work for the next generation of farmers taking over, and that is what Chair STABENOW's bill does.

I want to also note that Senator STABENOW's farm bill maintains the sugar program, which is so important to Minnesota's sugar beet farmers. The U.S. sugar policy runs at zero cost to taxpayers. What it does is to just simply make sure that American farmers can compete on a fair playing field against subsidized foreign sugar.

Senator STABENOW's farm bill also includes updates to the Dairy Margin Coverage Program that we established in the 2018 bill. I expect this is important to the Vermont dairy farmers, as it is important to Minnesota's dairy