

As Elon Musk is pushing Agencies to purchase services that his own companies provide and shutting down Agencies that are investigating his companies, Eric Ueland told me that he was unable to see any conflicts of interest raised by Elon Musk's influence on government decisions.

Government should make decisions in the interests of the people and not in the interests of conflicted billionaire donors to the President like Elon Musk.

If Eric Ueland is confirmed, I am concerned that he will defy our duly passed laws and our Constitution to continue President Trump and Elon Musk's assault on the Federal Government. Because of this, I oppose Eric Ueland's nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote start immediately.

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

VOTE ON MICHAEL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Michael 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Banks	Gallego	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	King	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shueh
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—43

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Padilla
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Sanders
Booker	Kim	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schiff
Coons	Lujan	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Markey	Shaheen
Duckworth	Merkley	Slotkin
Durbin	Murphy	Smith
Fetterman	Murray	
Hassan	Ossoff	

Van Hollen	Warren	Whitehouse
Warnock	Welch	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Gillibrand	Graham	Tuberville
------------	--------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Ueland nomination be waived.

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

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 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. 82, Eric Matthew Ueland, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Eric Schmitt, Roger Marshall, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Joni Ernst, Pete Ricketts, Tom Cotton, James E. Risch, Jon A. Husted, James Lankford, Katie Boyd Britt, John Hoeven, Kevin Cramer, Bernie Moreno, Bill Hagerty, Chuck Grassley.

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 Eric Matthew Ueland, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Management, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 255 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Boozman	Capito
Barrasso	Britt	Cassidy
Blackburn	Budd	Collins

Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Murkowski
Cotton	Johnson	Paul
Cramer	Justice	Ricketts
Crapo	Kennedy	Risch
Cruz	Lankford	Rounds
Curtis	Lee	Schmitt
Daines	Lummis	Scott (FL)
Ernst	Marshall	Scott (SC)
Fischer	McConnell	Shueh
Grassley	McCormick	Sullivan
Hagerty	Moody	Thune
Hawley	Moran	Tillis
Hoeven	Moreno	Wicker
Husted	Mullin	Young

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Slotkin
Duckworth	Markey	Smith
Durbin	Merkley	Van Hollen
Fetterman	Murphy	Warner
Gallego	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Welch
Heinrich	Peters	Whitehouse
Hickenlooper	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Alsobrooks	Graham
Coons	Tuberville

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric Matthew Ueland, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1771

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1771, which is at the desk; further, I ask 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. I am going to object, but I think the Senator has some remarks.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURPHY. I will let the Senator explain the reasons for the motion he is making, and afterward, I will comment on the reasons for my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. It is now indisputable that the last 4 years saw more injuries and more deaths of law enforcement officers than at any time in American history. Let me just read to you some of the data.

From 2021 to 2023, more officers were feloniously killed than in any other consecutive 3-year period of time over

the last 20 years. Let me repeat that. There were more deaths over the last 3 years than in any 3-year period in the last 20 years.

Let me give you the numbers. One hundred ninety-four officers were killed from 2021 to 2023. Last year, in 2024, 234 police officers were killed in the line of duty.

Tomorrow, we will see their families on the Capitol. We will see the moms that no longer have their kids, the kids that no longer have their moms and dads, the sisters that don't have their brothers, the brothers that don't have their sisters—234 officers just last year, including a Cleveland police officer that, Mr. President, I think you know well.

His name is Jamieson Ritter. I wear his badge today with honor. He was killed on the Fourth of July, responding to a police call in Cleveland. He was a good person. He went in there, gave all the notice he could. As the arrests were being made, the assailant shot and killed him.

Imagine that phone call. Mr. President, you have now almost adult kids and daughters. You have an adult son, I believe. Imagine getting that phone call that your child has been killed in the line of duty, a person who put their entire life under risk for us, for our communities.

My colleague from Connecticut, in his State, just a year ago—and I hope he remembers it, and I am sure he does because I assume he is a good man. There is a gentleman named Aaron Pelletier. He got killed a year ago. He was a Connecticut State trooper killed in the line of duty. He was one of those 234 people.

Just, sadly, a week and a half ago, Larry Henderson, my age, retired from the Hamilton County Sheriff's Office. You know how you go to some places and you go to a funeral, and they always say, "He was a good man," and you are not sure if people meant it or not because it is a terrible time of tragedy? As I walked into the Cintas Center, a place where you have large gatherings of people, there was a line out the door, cars around the corner to pay tribute to him and his family.

You know what everybody said? Of all the people, how could it have happened to Larry, a good man.

I talked to his wife. I talked to her about this bill and how important this was to the community to get this done. As I was telling her that, she gave me a big hug and said: Please fight for Larry and for the others that wear the uniform so that this does not happen again.

In 2025, the list keeps growing. We continue to see more and more fallen officers. So what is the solution?

I understand my colleague is objecting, but I assume he is listening carefully and not just ignoring what I am saying, but rather willing to change your mind, because here is the reality. There are a lot of things that happen here on the Senate floor. There are a

lot of things we may not agree with. There are lots of policies where we maybe have one viewpoint on the Republican side and one on the Democrat side, and that is fine and that is healthy. I think that is what this institution was intended to be. In my humble opinion, having been here 4½ months, I wish there was more debate—that there was more robust conversation about the issues—but here we are.

This is a very simple bill. This bill just says: Look, let's just make certain that there is Federal jurisdiction whenever a Federal law enforcement officer is killed or injured in the line of duty. Let's make certain that we have the police officers' backs like they have ours and put a mandatory 20-year prison sentence for anybody that harms a member of law enforcement. That is it.

It is not a 2,000-page bill, not a 4,000-page bill. It is a 3-page bill. It is just a simple way that this institution, this body, can come together. And in your case—to my colleague from Connecticut—you have had Aaron Pelletier. I am sure you and your community suffered greatly when you lost him in the line of duty, just as my community in Southwest Ohio and Cincinnati suffered when this great man, after retiring from the line of duty—after retiring—he is out directing traffic for a graduation at the University of Cincinnati and was absolutely murdered for the crime of wearing the uniform.

We can stop this. We can today. Today can be a day that people—Americans—watching, who have less and less faith in our government's ability to come together to get things done, when they see bickering and arguing, and they don't quite understand what it is that we are doing here—today is the day we can come together and say: We, on both sides, not as Democrats or as Republicans but as Americans—that we support law enforcement.

That is what I am asking my Democratic colleague to consider—just a simple statement. We, the entire U.S. Senate, can come together for once, unanimously, and say we have the backs of law enforcement and pass the Larry Henderson Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, thank you. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I look forward to getting to know him as a new colleague.

But let me explain to the Senator why I am objecting. I abhor attacks on police officers—all police officers—and no matter the motive. But that is not the position of Republicans in the Senate.

On the day that President Trump was sworn into office, he pardoned scores of violent felons who beat police officers, and my Republican colleagues—almost to a Member—cheered him on and supported him. Donald Trump pardoned David Dempsey who, on January 6, beat Capitol and DC Police officers

with his hands, feet, flagpole, crutches, broken pieces of furniture—anything else that he could find that could be used as a weapon. He teamed up with another rioter who pulled back one police officer's gas mask while Dempsey sprayed pepper spray in his eyes. He hit another police officer over the head with a metal crutch, with so much force that it cracked the protective shield of the officer's gas mask, causing him to collapse as his ears started ringing.

Donald Trump also pardoned D.J. Rodriguez.

On January 6, Rodriguez pushed through the crowds, found a police officer and put a Taser to his head. When the police officer screamed out in pain and recoiled from the shock, Rodriguez attacked him again, Tasing him this time in the neck. The officer was done. He collapsed unconscious. Another officer pulled his lifeless body to safety. That attack ended that officer's career.

Thomas Webster was pardoned by Donald Trump too. Webster attacked police officers with a flagpole. He tackled one officer to the ground, dragged him by the helmet, ripped off his gas mask to allow tear gas to seep inside, and held the officer down so other rioters could brutally kick him.

I oppose all violence against all police officers. So I don't understand why there seems to be an exemption for the violence that was perpetrated against the officers who protect us.

Your bill proposes a new mandatory minimum for assaults against police officers that you are not applying to the officers who beat the people who protect us. They were let out of jail free—D.J. Rodriguez, David Dempsey, Thomas Webster. Republicans cheered as they were let out of jail before their sentence was completed.

So if we are serious about protecting the police officers, we need to protect all police officers. If police officers are protecting Democrats—because that is who those rioters were here to kill or here to hurt—then those assaults should matter. If Donald Trump says the assault is OK, that shouldn't matter.

Yes, I have stood by the side of the families of slain or injured police officers. But think about the families of those officers who were brutally beaten here at the Capitol. Think about the officer who was dragged unconscious from the site. His attacker was let out of jail—no mandatory minimum.

Politics shouldn't have anything to do with our collective decision to stand up against attacks on police officers. So I offer this objection because I just don't feel like this bill is on the level until we have agreement in this Chamber that President Trump doesn't get to decide which attacks on police officers we care about and which ones we don't.

We shouldn't pass this bill until Republicans make it clear that they oppose all attacks on police, no exceptions—no exceptions, no exemptions.

Republicans need to loudly oppose President Trump's pardons because if you don't, you are sending a message that if you are carrying out attacks on police officers in the name of President Trump's political agenda or you are carrying out attacks on police officers who are defending Democrats, those attacks might end up being pardoned or excused. And our Nation just fades away. What makes our Nation great fades away if violence is OK if it is in service of a particular political agenda or if the attacks are in service of the President.

So I do take attacks against our police officers seriously, but I don't think we should move forward legislation that implicitly has exemptions in it. So let's get on the same page. Let's come to a collective decision as a body that we care about all violence against police officers. Let's hear every Member of this body condemn President Trump's pardons. Let's come to the conclusion that politics should never play a role in enforcing our laws against police violence.

I look forward to working with the Senator on that endeavor, and if we can come to that conclusion jointly as a body, then I look forward to working with him on this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. First, let me say I appreciate my colleague's willingness to acknowledge that we have to support law enforcement.

The reason I went into elected office is to prevent these types of debates. I am proposing legislation that is clear you support. You want to make certain that we punish anybody who harms a member of law enforcement. It is very simple. The objection isn't about looking forward. The objection is saying: Well, I can't support something going forward because I am upset about something that happened in the past. That is a political comment. That isn't a matter of what is good for public policy. Tell Lori Henderson why her husband had to die because you are upset about something politically that happened in this Chamber.

I wasn't here last year. I wasn't here the year before that. I wasn't here the year before that, and I certainly wasn't here in 2001. If we are going to move forward as a nation, we have to come together on a forward-looking basis. We have to draw the line now and say: No more law enforcement officers should ever be harmed.

What this bill will do is it will send a massive, chilling effect to anybody looking to harm a member of law enforcement.

You should look at that and say: That is fantastic.

And if you want to have a conversation about what happened 4½ years ago—where you know better than I do; you have been here a lot longer—the Constitution gives the President full pardon power. Joe Biden pardoned al-

most 10,000 people, including 32 people who were on death row, and commuted their sentences to life instead of death, which is what they had been convicted of. I don't want to have that debate because it has nothing to do with Larry Henderson. This bill is about saying we will protect law enforcement.

The people watching this are so hungry for a government that works. We don't have to wear a Republican jersey and a Democrat jersey at every turn. We can come together as a country and say—look, you said you agree. You said you agree that it should be a standard for all Federal police officers. That is what I am proposing: every single member of the Capitol Police, every single member of the FBI, of ICE, of the U.S. Marshals—anybody who protects all of us. By the way, the people who look to do us harm don't know if we are Democrats or Republicans. I had a gentleman drive to my home in Toledo when I wasn't there. He knocked on our door. My wife is not used to not answering the door when somebody knocks. He was there to kill me. Thank God the Westlake Police Department is 90 seconds away. If we don't put a stop to this—if we don't just put down our little lapel pins that call us Democrat or Republican—we are never going to be able to do anything in this country.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORENO. Let me finish real quick. The point is very simple. I get it. I get it. Politics has become a sport. It is about one team winning and one team losing, but that is why I ran for office, and I hope you can remember back when you first ran for office. What is it that you wanted to really accomplish? Did you want to make this country better for your kids and grandkids? Be able to look them in the eye someday and say, "I made this country better"? We do that by coming together on things that we can easily agree on, and we agree—we agree—that we should defend law enforcement. Let's do it now, not next week, not next month because between now and then, we are going to lose more Larry Hendersons. I find that unacceptable.

Imagine, my colleague, if the families, tomorrow, of the 234 slain officers—what it would feel like for them to come to the U.S. Capitol and say: Look, in this time of Democrats versus Republicans, where they can't agree on anything, seemingly, they came together to say: Today, we will never allow another Federal police officer to be harmed in the line of duty.

I know you objected, but I will ask you one last time. I think it is—and we don't need to go on all evening. I don't have CORY BOOKER's stamina, but I will say this. Please consider the message you are sending to every single mom or dad who puts on the uniform that says there is a process question: I don't like the process in which this is happening. I am mad at my political enemy. I may have or others may have political aspirations, and this may hurt us.

Think about that family who does wake up every day to protect you just in the same way they protect me.

God bless them.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, you are right. The Senator from Ohio was not here on January 6, and your political affiliation mattered that day. It mattered that day. Those rioters were here to harm not allies of President Trump but opponents of President Trump. They had the gallows outside with Mike Pence's name on it. They were searching the halls of the Capitol for people who opposed Donald Trump's agenda.

So I agree with you that it would be wonderful and lovely to remove this debate from politics, but on that day—on that day—there were bad people here, seeking to do violence based upon the political affiliations of people in this building; and the reason that they were pardoned was that President Trump supported the violence so long as it was in his name. So, yes, it does matter what happened not just on that day but when Trump issued the pardons because it provides this message of endorsement to violence so long as it is violence that Donald Trump supports. That puts officers in jeopardy all over the country if the potential perpetrators of violence against police officers have an idea in their heads that, if they are doing it in support of Donald Trump, they have a pretty good chance to get away with it. I don't think anyone who assaults a police officer should get out of jail early.

So let me put the question to you. Maybe we can find common ground right now. I recited to you the violence that was perpetrated on police officers here by three specific rioters. Do you support Donald Trump's decision to let those three individuals out of jail early? I think it would be important for you as a Republican Member to say that you oppose Donald Trump's decision to let those perpetrators out of jail early, and we could have common cause today in that we both oppose all early releases of individuals who attack police officers. So do you agree with me that it was wrong to release those three individuals early from prison?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. As my colleague knows—again, better than I do—the President of the United States is given the constitutional authority on pardons—

Mr. MURPHY. I understand he has that power. Regardless of whether he has that power, do you agree with his decision?

Mr. MORENO.—and there is no mechanism with which this body can change that, but what we can change—what we can change—is what happens from here forward. We can say that anybody who harms a police officer is going to do 20

years in prison. Now, Biden pardoned 9,500 people—9,500 people. This is not the debate that we are having.

Do you know what I have found in business that is maybe a little bit different than politics? The way to be successful is to look forward. If in business all you do is look in a mirror and blame and try to score points, you lose. We have to look forward.

You just said we have common cause. You don't want police officers—by the way, you and I—

Mr. MURPHY. Let's have common cause right now.

Mr. MORENO. Hold on.

Mr. MURPHY. Let's decide—

Mr. MORENO. Hold on.

Mr. MURPHY. Let's decide it was not OK for Donald Trump to let the people who brutally beat police officers out of jail early. Let's find common cause right now. That would be in service of preventing violence against police officers in the future because we could make it clear—you and I could make it clear right now—that it doesn't matter whether you are committing violence in the name of Donald Trump or not. It is wrong if you commit violence against police officers. Why can't you just agree with that?

Mr. MORENO. As my colleague knows—let me just restate—

Mr. MURPHY. Just say yes.

Mr. MORENO. Let me just state this again very simply. I haven't interrupted you, and I would ask you to give me the same courtesy.

Mr. MURPHY. I apologize.

Mr. MORENO. That is OK. Look, we don't know each other. We acknowledge that.

I actually believe that, in everybody, there is the innate desire to do good and that Democrats and Republicans love this country. This country is a gift to me. I came here from another country, as you know, and got the ability to live in this country. The issue at hand—in front of us—and what we can do right now is to pass the Larry Henderson Act, something that you have acknowledged that you agree with the elements in that bill: a mandatory 20 years for anybody who harms a Federal law enforcement officer. You said you agree on that.

We can have 100 distractions that go right back into another conversation. If you want to have a conversation, which, by the way, because I have gotten to preside—you have had that conversation multiple times. You and your colleagues have had it and you should and you deserve to have it. That is not the issue before us today. The issue before us today is, Do we want more Larry Hendersons?

So you asked me a question. I would ask you a question: If in the next week you knew that there was another Aaron Pelletier and we could have avoided that because we could have had a deterrent of a 20-year jail sentence for that person, what would you feel you would tell their family, "I was fighting a 4½-year-old grudge"?

Do you know that you can make a difference right now? We can do this right now. That is what the American public may not know and that I didn't know until I got here. We can actually pass this bill in the U.S. Senate right now—right now. We would make news. We would make history. We passed a bill—somebody from Ohio whom you would consider to be, maybe as a pejorative, a MAGA extremist and somebody who would say, maybe, disparaging things about your political beliefs. Both you and I—we have never met. We have never had a conversation. We have never shared a cup of coffee. We could save the lives of law enforcement officers all over this country. We could do that tonight.

I will ask you a question: Is it worth risking the life of a law enforcement officer to score political points?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator is new. I will remind him you are not allowed to impugn the motives of Members of the Senate.

Listen, I think it is unfortunate that you cannot and other Republicans cannot say that the individuals who beat the living hell out of the police officers who protect us should not have gotten out of jail free. I don't think that is a separate issue from the broader concern about protecting police officers from violence because I think what you have done in endorsing violence, as long as it is perpetrated in the name of a political agenda, is to make every police officer in this country less safe and to make all of us less safe as well.

So I think, if we want to come together around an agenda to protect members of law enforcement, then, yes, it is very important—it is very important—for the future protection of the law enforcement officers, the police officers who protect us, to hear loudly from Republicans that there is no exception—no exception—to the premise that you will serve a long prison sentence if you commit an assault on a police officer.

So I look forward to continuing this dialogue with my colleague. I admit that we do not know each other. Maybe we can find common ground here, but this is not a small issue. The normalization of political violence in this country could be the defining issue of the next decade, and I think that my Republican colleagues will rue the day that they looked the other way when Donald Trump said that it was OK to beat police officers over the head with flag poles, to Taser them to the point that they were unconscious just because you were serving President Trump's political agenda. That is not a side issue. That is not a fringe issue. That issue of endorsement of political violence may be central to the question of whether this democracy survives.

I know we have a pending vote and our colleagues are eager to get home, and I look forward to continuing the conversation with my colleague.

VOTE ON UELAND NOMINATION

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

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, 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. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 256 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormick	Wicker
Daines	Moody	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Moreno	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Lujan	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Welch
Heinrich	Peters	Whitehouse
Hickenlooper	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Alsobrooks	Gallego	Graham
------------	---------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). 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.

The majority leader.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Donahue nomination be waived.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the