

solutions to protect and restore iconic salmon runs. And I know that Bill, as a fisherman himself, was always very interested in how we could use this science to better improve our outcomes.

When I first met Bill—everybody would remember him because he wore his unique bow tie. It was part of his personality. But when you met him, he was also a person of unbelievable kindness, and that always, always stayed with him.

I remember many times, in my role in the Commerce Committee, calling him up and asking him for advice about critical issues, and he was always there to tell me that these are the three people I should call and consult. I always found that so interesting, given his great intellect and his great ideas—he always wanted me to reach out to more people.

He was an avid golfer, a fly fisherman, and I often saw him at airports on his way to one of those great, beautiful places in the Pacific Northwest.

But many Americans might know him for his other passion, and that is baseball. I personally prefer the Seattle Mariners, but Bill, growing up in the Bay Area, had a childhood love that brought him into ownership and participation as a leader of the San Francisco Giants. Under this leadership, the team improved on the field, going from 72 wins in 2008 to 92 wins and a Major League championship just 2 years later. I happened to go to a game with him in the Bay Area, and, again, his love and passion for the success of that team was undeniable.

We are going to miss Bill Neukom. We are going to miss his warmth, his laughter, his kindness, his contributions, his intellect, and just an unbelievable chapter of Northwest history that he participated in. And I know all of his friends and colleagues at Microsoft will also miss him.

I want to say a special outreach to his family, particularly his wife Sally—I know this is a very hard time—and his 4 children, 14 grandchildren, and 2 brothers Davidson and Daniel.

We all were so privileged to know Bill. We are all so grateful for his contributions to all of us in the Nation and certainly for what he did in the Pacific Northwest.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The senior assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, 2½ years ago, I was sworn in as America's 2,000th Senator, a pretty unique honor for a kid that grew up in a working-class neighborhood in Bridgeton, MO. And as someone who appreciates history, the U.S. Senate has always been held out as the greatest deliberate body in the history of the world.

It is a very uniquely American institution. As our Founders envisioned what our system of government looked like, they wanted something that was very different than the House and something that you had equal representation as opposed to proportional representation, this system of checks and balances in a bicameral legislature, every State, no matter the size, having two Senators was thought of very differently and has proven over the course of our nearly 250 years to be a very important place to protect individual rights and a whole host of other issues that matter to the American people.

There has also been some people whose names are famous. You had Henry Clay, the great compromiser. You had, of course, Webster, Calhoun, and Clay as the great triumvirate. Missouri's first Senator Thomas Hart Benton was known as Old Bullion.

And I want to propose a new name, someone who serves currently in the U.S. Senate: the great arsonist, CHUCK SCHUMER. CHUCK SCHUMER has single-handedly, more than any Senator in the history of our Republic, done more to diminish the importance and significance of this Chamber.

And I am going to walk through a few ways in which he has done that. To take a step back for the folks watching on C-SPAN, for the folks in the Gallery, for over 200 years—for over 200 years—the Executive Calendar, which is what we are dealing with today and what this whole debate is about—this Executive Calendar, there was no filibuster ever. It didn't happen. It didn't exist.

Presidents were able to come in; they were able to nominate folks. They were done by unanimous consent. Maybe there was some debate. But to put this in perspective, the folks nominated as judges for the Cabinet and other related posts—judges, for example, weren't even really subject to the filibuster.

Think about this, Clarence Thomas, perhaps one of the most controversial Supreme Court Justices—or that nomination was—got 52 votes. A filibuster wasn't instituted on Clarence Thomas—52 votes and he was confirmed. Any Senator could have moved forward with an effort to filibuster, requiring cloture, and then a vote requiring 60 votes.

So then, of course, you move into sort of the 20th century, Harry Reid and CHUCK SCHUMER grew tired of that old institution of having to have 60

votes once that started to be employed. So they decided to change things around here, that you only needed 51 votes for anything other than a Supreme Court nominee. Lit the fuse. Lit the fuse.

Then, of course, now even for Supreme Court nominees, it is only 51. That happened in the 21st century. For the entirety of the 20th century, we didn't have this nonsense that we are doing here today.

I mean, even as we go back into the 1990s and into the 2000s, this Executive Calendar that we are dealing with was done by unanimous consent in voice votes. There are people literally being voted on today, I don't think the Ambassador of Uruguay has been voted on in 50 years; we just did that.

So CHUCK SCHUMER rode shotgun with Harry Reid to upend the Executive Calendar as it relates to judicial nominees. Now, CHUCK SCHUMER is doing that to all these other positions. We have never seen this in the history of our Republic. With over a thousand people that need to be Senate confirmed, the Democrats are requiring—they are filibustering and requiring cloture for every single one of them.

Because of those stall tactics, the 30-hour rule was changed to 2 hours, but this is all about delay. And why? Well, there is a couple reasons. One is the Democrats, at this point, are catering to a very, very radical and growing element of their party. And they are competing to be the greatest resister against President Trump. They can't believe he got back in. They can't believe it.

They tried to throw him in jail for the rest of his life. They invented this Russiagate nonsense in the first term. But the American people sat in that jury box, they weighed all the evidence, they saw all the shenanigans. And they said: Do you know what? We want our country back. We can't believe that you would weaponize the Justice Department against parents who showed up to school board meetings or Catholics or your chief political rival.

They rejected it. They rejected it because they want reform. So now President Trump is offering candidates who are reformed candidates for different positions, but they don't want to do it. And do you know what? Vote no or whatever, but this level of obstruction has never been seen before. It has never been seen before.

And don't even get me started on what CHUCK SCHUMER would do to the legislative filibuster. He is already on record, his colleagues are on record, many of which I have talked to privately and can't believe they would actually do it, but if they are ever in the position that the Republicans are in right now, with a President in the White House, Democratic Senate, and a Democrat House, they will blow up the legislative filibuster.

They have all voted to do it—save Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema, who are no longer here.

Mr. MERKLEY. Would my colleague yield to a question?

Mr. SCHMITT. No.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you.

Mr. SCHMITT. They won't do it. They won't yield at all. And by the way, I have had very—I won't mention who—conversations with my Democrat colleagues who pretend to care about this institution and who are on record for that, on record for voting to end the legislative filibuster.

Oh, it is just for one issue. It was just for the voting rights issue. Give me a break—because you know exactly what comes next, DC and Puerto Rico come into the Union, federalizing our elections, packing the Supreme Court, put a shot clock on the Republic on that day.

So here we are now, that is the legislative calendar. We are in the Executive Calendar. They already lit the fuse on judicial nominees. And now CHUCK SCHUMER is lighting the fuse on this. And I have got news for you: A reckoning is coming, because we are going to get back—the Republicans in this Chamber are going to get back to where the Senate always was, where the Executive Calendar isn't being utilized like this.

And so whether it is, you know, because a rule change is coming, if I have anything to say about it—and by the way, in a few hours, we may be recessing, and President Trump is going to get his recess picks.

You have lit the fuse. And let me give you another example of what CHUCK SCHUMER has done. Last year, for the first time in the history of the Republic, articles of impeachment were delivered over to this Chamber, all Senators were seated, all of us.

In every single instance that articles of impeachment have come over to this Chamber if the person was alive or still in office, there was a trial. It happens to be in the Constitution. That is part of our job. There are only three calendars, the legislative calendar, the Executive Calendar, and the impeachment calendar.

The fuse was lit yet again. For the first time in our country's history, CHUCK SCHUMER made a motion to dismiss the articles without a trial, and the Democrats, with a simple majority vote, went along with it.

I don't ever want to be lectured by any Senator on that side of the aisle about how much they care about the institution of the Senate. All three calendars would be lit ablaze, set on fire by the great arsonist and his merry men.

So what are we going to do about it? This is the charge to my Republican colleagues today. The charge is: We are not going to let you do this to the Senate. We are not going to let you destroy this place. We are going to get back to a place it has always been.

And one more example. I heard CHUCK SCHUMER on the floor earlier today lauding the passage of appropriations bills. In my first 2 years in this

place, we spent exactly 0.0 minutes on appropriations bills, a Blutarsky, nothing.

Leader THUNE has made it a priority to open this place up, to have amendments. In fact, when I carried the rescissions package, I wasn't seeking to box anybody out. Offer your amendments. Let's have free and open debate.

We didn't see that when CHUCK SCHUMER was in charge—not once.

So lit the fuse on judicial nominees. Lit the fuse on the Executive Calendar. Lit the fuse on the legislative filibuster. Lit the fuse on regular order. He will go down in the annals of history as someone with total disregard for this Chamber, the work we are charged to do when we are elected.

But I think Republicans have a chance to course correct today, and I hope we do it to get back to a place that can actually function.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just as a reminder to my colleagues, you should refer to each other as a person or Senator from, for example, Ohio. And I also just want to remind my colleagues that "no Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator."

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I was hoping my colleague would stay on the floor to have a little bit of discussion about the topic he just raised because there seemed to be some missing elements in his discussion.

And isn't that kind of what happens here, where we hear from our leadership about all of these terrible things the other side is doing, and we just kind of swallow that hook, line, and sinker, rather than actually looking at the record.

Now, one of the pieces left out of his story was 1974, 100 Senators on this floor said: We are going to create a special fast track, filibuster-free, for one single purpose: reducing the deficit. And think of Robert Byrd of West Virginia. And Robert Byrd was an adamant—adamant—advocate for the filibuster. Unfortunately, he had been very supportive of using the filibuster to block civil rights bills. But, in general, he was dedicated to making sure that it stayed in place. And even he joined 99 other Senators to say: Hey, we should have a special fast track solely for reducing the deficit. That was 1974.

At that same time, that same bill created the Congressional Budget Office so we would use honest numbers in putting forward spending bills because if we are going to actually reduce the deficit, we have to quit using smoke and mirrors to pretend that what we are spending is less than it really is.

So let's go forward 22 years to 1996. And in 1996, we were in the middle of the first term of the Gingrich revolution. The election of 1994 had been of dramatic success for Republicans in

the House, picking up dozens of seats with an agenda for America. And in that agenda was something called the line-item veto. And the line-item veto was the idea that we would delegate our constitutional responsibility of the power of the purse to the President of the United States of America and say the President can decide what is spent on what programs.

And the Supreme Court said: Oh, no. You can't do that. You have a constitutional responsibility under the separation of powers. Under the checks and balances, Congress, by law, establishes what must be spent on each program, not the President of the United States.

Certainly, the President gets a role. The President provides the budget. The President has to sign the spending bills. But Congress could not take the power assigned to it and simply hand it over to the Executive. That is the way you end up in a strongman state.

And so the Supreme Court wiped out, in 1996—well, they canceled, if you will, the line-item veto power that Congress tried to give the President.

And so the Republican team controlling the House and Senate said: Well, we have another idea, and that other idea is a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Now, that happens to require two-thirds of both bodies here to vote for it and then three-quarters of the States to do a constitutional amendment.

It easily flew through the House of Representatives. All very good. It came over to the Senate, and we needed 67 votes for that, and there were 66 votes. The 67th vote was potentially the chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Hatfield from Oregon, and Senator Hatfield said: This is a bad idea. Here is why it is a bad idea. Sometimes we are at war, and we need to spend more money. Sometimes we are in recession, and we need to spend more money. And we do decide every single year, and we are in the majority, Republican majority, we decide every single year how much is going to be spent through the spending bills, the appropriations bills. And we decide through the revenue bills how much is going to be raised. So we already have the power to do a balanced budget in the years that it should be balanced, but we need to retain the power to address these emergencies.

It is kind of an interesting story in that Senator Hatfield, for standing on this principle as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, was vilified—vilified—for defending the responsibility of the power of the purse held here. And, in fact, he was so vilified that he even received a message from his son-in-law with a picture of his granddaughter, saying: For her sake, you should do this.

He then went to the majority leader, Senator Dole, and said: If you feel so strongly this is right, and clearly I feel it is a mistake, I will resign. And Senator Dole decided, no, we are not going to ask you to resign. We are not going

to suggest that is the right answer. And so it fell one vote short.

There is kind of an interesting twist to this story because Oregon did not have a law that allowed a Governor to appoint a replacement. So had Senator Hatfield resigned, there would have been 99 Senators, and then you would have only needed 66 votes for the balanced budget amendment. But that did not transpire because Senator Dole turned Senator Hatfield's offer down.

So then what happened? Well, a little bit of frustration among the Republican majority. Their line-item veto had been knocked down by the Supreme Court. Their constitutional amendment had not cleared the Senate. And they said: We really want to do a massive tax bill, particularly giving huge breaks for the richest Americans. And they said: Ah, but we can't do it. We can't get it done. Why not? Because the Democrats won't agree to massive tax breaks for the richest Americans. So we won't be able to get the 60 votes we need to be able to pursue this path.

And then what happened? Well, Majority Leader Dole and others conferred and said: Let's do a nuclear option. And let's take this strategy, this tool, that we created in 1974 to reduce deficits, and let's repurpose it and allow it to be used to increase deficits—of course, not at all what the 100 Senators had voted on in 1974.

Well, that was pretty dramatic to proceed to take a tool, reconciliation, invented in 1974 to reduce deficits and to say it can be used to increase deficits. Well, so dramatic, in fact, that it couldn't be done unless they overturned the opinion of their Parliamentarian. So they fired the Parliamentarian. That is what the Republicans did. They fired the Parliamentarian and they brought in a new Parliamentarian and his name was Robert Dove.

Now, Robert Dove had been here in 1974. He knew about why they passed this bill with 100 Senators to have a fast track with no filibuster was only for decreasing the deficits. But where had Mr. Dove been working? He had been working for the majority leader, Robert Dole. And so he took and he came in and he ruled—or provided the recommendation to the chair—that it was just fine to completely repurpose this 1974 tool called reconciliation for decreasing the deficits so it could be used to increase deficits. That was the nuclear option. Wow.

Now, my colleague didn't mention any of that. He talked about lighting the fuse. Lighting the fuse, as if Democrats had been degrading the structure of this institution. But I would suggest maybe there is responsibility on both sides of the aisle. What was done in 1996 was a dramatic—dramatic—well, contravention of the very core of the understanding that every Democrat and every Republican had agreed to. It was a deal broken—deal broken—in the exercise of power politics.

Or let's go forward to 2008, and this man named Barack Obama ran for

President. He was a Member of the Senate, and he was elected. At that point, something dramatic happened, and that is the minority leader decided to undertake a dramatic blockade of President Obama's nominees. I mean, couldn't fill the National Labor Relations Board, couldn't get the Labor Secretary into place. The list went on and on and on.

Well, Democrats didn't respond with a nuclear option. They responded with: Let's work this out. Let's preserve the supermajority on nominations. But to preserve it, we can't abuse it in this fashion.

Just the number of blockades of nominations soared dramatically. This instrument that had really almost never been used on nominations, it started being used routinely on the Republican side of the aisle. That was left out of the speech you heard a few minute ago.

So we negotiated. We pleaded. It was like a 9-month process. And, finally, we all met in the Old Senate Chamber—no staff present. I don't know if there was anyone to even record the comments for history, and we basically talked to each other in very real terms about let's preserve this supermajority on nominations. But it can't be that the minority uses that as a blockade against a President to keep qualified people from being put into office. An agreement was reached that that blockade would be dialed back enormously.

I recall that a month or so into that, there was us on the verge of the minority blocking a very qualified individual that there was no justification for. I remember Senator McCain grabbing the arm of a fellow colleague coming down the aisle over here and saying: We mustn't do this. We agreed to not be irresponsible in blocking qualified people. And that person just got the 60 votes and went through.

All good and well, like we had resolved this conflict and preserved the supermajority, until the minority leader changed his mind and said: I don't care how qualified a nominee is from President Obama for the DC Circuit Court. We are going to block anyone—anyone—from being assigned to fill those seats.

Well, that was the final straw.

As much as Harry Reid tried to, as majority leader, say: Back off, don't do that; that is a violation of the agreement we reached in the Old Senate Chamber, the minority leader said: No, we are not going to allow Obama to put a single justice on the DC court.

A few arguments—policy arguments—were made by the minority leader to support the position. He said: I think they have enough justices already. We don't need to fill those additional positions. But that is not an argument that had ever been used here, that even though courts had a huge backlog, they didn't need the additional justices.

No, it was just a plain outpower move to block the President of the

United States from putting people on the DC Circuit Court.

Why was that the target? Well, for one reason, the DC Circuit Court considers—a lot of the national issues go through the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. And for another, a lot of folks who eventually get nominated to the Supreme Court serve on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. That makes it kind of a pretty important place.

But this pretty important place where justices consider pretty important issues and sometimes have a chance to be recognized as someone who might be a good candidate for the Supreme Court was blocked by the minority. And he has made all the efforts to undo that. The minority said: No, regardless of qualifications, we are going to back up the minority leader and not allow any justices to be appointed, no matter how qualified they are.

So I am just adding to the conversation that my colleague began—who proceeded to throw in kind of a dialogue of, say, all the obstruction here stems from one side of the aisle, the blue side of the aisle—I am suggesting that there have been moments where both sides have stretched their power. There have been moments when both sides have sought—and sometimes successfully—to resolve that conflict.

But in the end, there have been some big moments in which the Republicans have torn down the system. That may be true for the Democrats, as well. But it might be helpful to have a more balanced conversation.

And while we are at this dialogue, recognizing factors that have occurred on both sides of the aisle, let's talk about something else that never happened in U.S. history until it happened by the Republicans refusing to hold a debate and a vote on a Supreme Court nomination. It had never happened until the last year of the Obama administration when a vacancy became open due to an untimely death and the President nominated a candidate to fill that seat. And Republicans said: We are not even going to allow a debate or a vote—the first time in the history of the United States of America.

I was just reading a column the other day that referred to this as the “stolen seat.” I noticed it because that is what I called it at the time. I said this is wrong. Once one side steals a seat from a President, it will be horrifically difficult to fix that problem because if the Democrats have the same chance to do the same and balance things out, now you just have a tradition of stealing seats.

You have a Republican President and a Democratic majority that blocks debate on a nominee until the next election, hoping that you will keep that seat empty until there is a Democrat in the Oval Office. That just means we have locked in obstruction.

I came to this floor at 6 p.m. and started speaking and addressed my comments to the majority leader

across the aisle and the minority leader and said: Please get together. There have been several recommendations for fixing this, because if this seat is stolen in this fashion—kept empty until the next President comes in—we will never be able to fix it. There is no path for fixing it.

I proceeded to make that plea through the night up until cloture ripened—that is a motion to close debate—ripened the following morning, 15½ hours later.

Why would I stand on this floor 15½ hours later? Because I was asking my Republican colleagues: Do not tear down this institution.

That is three examples of what the Republican side has done. It didn't come up in my colleague's speech.

Let's talk about a fourth. I see my colleague from Illinois is here and I am going to defer to him. The fourth was just recently in which, for the first time ever since the 1974 act, we passed a bill—I say we passed a bill—Republicans passed on a partisan line bill, a spending reconciliation bill that will create deficits beyond a 10-year window. They had already blown up the agreement from 1974 that there could be no deficits created in a 10-year window. They blew that up in 1996, as I referred to. Then they proceeded to blow up, just weeks ago, the second half, second pillar of that deal, that there would be no deficits after that 10-year period.

Then they blew up the third pillar of that 1974 act, which was: We would use honest numbers from the Congressional Budget Office in laying out what a bill costs.

I say to my colleague across the aisle who was speaking before me: You pointed out things that you feel Democrats stretched the boundaries and damaged this institution, but you left out enumerable cases that I have just pointed to. Isn't it time to not do one more damage to this institution and, instead, get together a group from each side to wrestle with the issue at hand?

It is my understanding that as of this moment, this day, there is almost exactly the same number of nominees that have been approved to date under the Trump administration as there were under the Biden administration, a similar number of days under his administration—almost exactly the same number. I think the hyperbole across the aisle is profoundly exaggerated.

Let me yield to my colleague from Illinois, who stands ready to share a few thoughts.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oregon for his statement. I would like to join in the chorus for just a moment and note two or three things that have not been mentioned on the floor by the other side. In fairness, I think they should.

I have listened to several Republican Senators today, with the pie charts, come to the floor and express concern—

even outrage—at what is happening in this Chamber. There is some legitimacy to their complaint. There are a lot of things that need to be changed.

I join in with my colleague from Oregon to say we ought to put a group together to try to calmly come up with changes and Senate procedure to bring us back to the stature this Chamber once had. Today, we don't have it, and we should. There are several things I would like to mention briefly.

If you are talking about denying a voice vote or a rollcall to an individual seeking a nomination, I call to mind what happened with our colleague at that time, JD VANCE, the U.S. Senator from Ohio, who announced when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee that he would no longer allow U.S. attorneys to go through the voice vote. At that point, he said they should go through the procedure we are now using for all nominees. He literally stopped the process of choosing U.S. attorneys for President Biden at 63. There are over 90 U.S. attorney positions in the United States.

So he did exactly what is being complained about by Republican Senators, saying that we can no longer use the voice vote or unanimous consent to pick U.S. attorneys.

Let the record reflect, when President Trump was in his first term, every one of his U.S. attorneys was chosen by voice vote, no record votes. Democrats were in control and gave that option to President Trump. And then Vice President VANCE had an opportunity to stop it and did. He said at the time he wanted to “grind the Department of Justice to a halt.” I quoted that while he was standing on the floor right there. He didn't deny it. He had been quoted in the press.

When you talk about balance and fairness in reforming the Senate, it goes both ways.

Secondly, do you remember when Anton Scalia died on vacation and there was a vacancy at the U.S. Supreme Court? Do you recall what happened? That vacancy was protected by the Republican Senate leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for 10 months so that Obama would not have an opportunity to fill that vacancy. He wanted to make certain that was done by President Trump in his next term. There is another illustration of departure from common practice and precedent for political advantage.

But the last point that I want to make is one that came by as I listened to the Senator from Arkansas come to the floor and talk about the treatment of Republicans under his experience in the Senate.

We have something in the Senate called a hold. What that means, basically, when your name makes it to the Calendar, the Executive Calendar here, which means you have gone through the background investigation at the White House, you have gone through the committee process, you have been chosen by the committee, and you

come to the Calendar to be considered for a position in our Federal Government. There is still one last hurdle—not just a vote on the Senate floor, but the possibility of a hold. Individual Senators can put a hold on a nominee indefinitely.

One of the most egregious examples that has happened in modern times relates to the Senator from Arkansas. Let me read from an article by Frank Bruni in the New York Times, June 6, 2016:

In early 2014, after decades of government and nonprofit work that reflected a passion for public service, Cassandra Butts got a reward—or so she thought. She was nominated by President Obama to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the Bahamas.

It wasn't an especially high-profile gig at the crossroads of the day's most urgent issues, but it was a longstanding diplomatic post that needed to be filled, and she had concrete ideas about how best to do the job. “She was very excited,” her sister [Deidra Abbott, told me] said.

The Senate held a hearing on her nomination on May 2014, and then . . . nothing. Summer came and went. So did fall. A new year arrived, then another new year after that.

When I met her last month—

Mr. Bruni wrote—

she'd been waiting more than 820 days on the Senate Calendar to be confirmed. She died suddenly two weeks later, still waiting. She was 50 years old.

The delay had nothing to do with her qualifications, which were impeccable. It had everything to do with Washington.

The woman says:

At another point Senator TOM COTTON, an Arkansas Republican, put a hold specifically on Butts and on nominees for ambassadorships to Sweden and Norway. He had a legitimate gripe with the Obama administration over a Secret Service leak of private information about a fellow member of Congress, and he was trying to pressure Obama to take punitive action. But that issue was unrelated to Butts and the Bahamas.

COTTON eventually released the two other holds, but not the one on Butts. She told me that she once went to see him [personally] about it, and he explained that he knew that she was a close friend of Obama's—the two first [met] . . . at Harvard Law School . . . and that blocking her was a way to inflict special pain on the president.

COTTON's spokeswoman did not dispute Butts' characterization of that meeting, and stressed, in separate emails, that COTTON had enormous respect for her and her career.

That's Washington for you.

A hold of 820 days. A woman who waited on the calendar patiently for this ambassadorship to the Bahamas passed away from leukemia.

So, when we sit down and talk about bringing civility and common sense back to the Senate, let's bring in more than just the topic of the votes as to whether there will be record votes or whether there will be voice votes. That is an important issue, but it is not the only issue. Let us show civility, one to the other—Democrats to Republicans and Republicans to Democrats.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon, we will vote on the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida.

Until recent years, it has been unheard of to use floor time to confirm U.S. attorneys. Typically, they are confirmed by voice vote. I regret that we have become a body where every nominee has been obstructed. U.S. attorneys keep our communities safe and ensure law and order is enforced. There are 93 U.S. attorneys in the United States. It would take more than 230 hours to confirm all of them. That is totally unrealistic, and that is not hypobole.

The Democrats' obstruction of nominees is hindering law and order across our Nation. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I will continue to work across the aisle to restore a common-sense confirmation process for U.S. attorneys.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Quinones nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BURCH NOMINATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burch nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 488 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Banks	Daines	Marshall
Barrasso	Ernst	McCormick
Blackburn	Fischer	Moody
Boozman	Graham	Moran
Britt	Grassley	Moreno
Budd	Hagerty	Mullin
Capito	Hawley	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hoeven	Paul
Collins	Husted	Ricketts
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cotton	Johnson	Rounds
Cramer	Justice	Schmitt
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lee	
Curtis	Lummis	

Scott (SC)
Sheehy

Sullivan
Thune

Tuberville
Young

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt Rochester
Booker
Cantwell
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gillibrand
Hassan
Heinrich

Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed

Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff
Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Gallego
Kelly
Kennedy

McConnell
Tillis
Welch

Wicker

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 151, Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Markwayne Mullin, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Bill Cassidy, Kevin Cramer, Todd Young, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Marsha Blackburn, Shelley Moore Capito, Pete Ricketts, Ashley B. Moody, Roger Marshall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years, 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 489 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	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	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Gallego
Kennedy

McConnell
Tillis
Welch
Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, Americans want Congress to deliver. Americans want Congress to work. They want Congress to not just work as in being here but work as in collaborate and cooperate in order to get things done. But the reason there are such low expectations is because of days like today.

My colleagues—are they proud of this? Is this what they think their constituents want?

If you go back to any State and talk to, like, normal people—Democrat, Republican—they probably all agree that