

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed, after a very brief remark, to engage in a colloquy with Senator SCHIFF from California.

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Just one quick point of fact into this maelstrom of faux outrage about Democratic obstruction, and that is that the proposal that has been made to the Republicans to resolve the customary August jam-up where we clear nominees would actually put President Trump ahead of the number of appointees that Republicans had allowed President Biden at this same time in his Presidency. So you can take what is being said here with a bit of a grain of salt.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Mr. President, what I wanted to discuss here with Senator SCHIFF was—Senator SCHIFF was an assistant U.S. attorney, which is one of the prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office. I was a U.S. attorney. U.S. attorneys have a higher but slightly more ceremonial role, I think assistant U.S. attorneys would be swift to confess, and AUSAs do a lot of the direct work.

One thing that Senator SCHIFF and I both noticed with respect to this Epstein saga has been that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States went out and did a direct witness interview with Epstein's coconspirator and Trump's friend Ghislaine Maxwell.

If you don't know the backdrop to this and how things ordinarily work in the Department of Justice, it is hard to fathom how very weird that was, so we would like to take a minute and describe, from our perspective, how it is that, in regular Department business, the engagement with witnesses takes place.

I will turn it over to the former assistant U.S. attorney to give his description of how and when a prosecutor would go into a room with a witness. But as I do that, let me just say that the Deputy Attorney General of the United States virtually never ever, ever, ever, ever, does. For somebody at that level to be involved is truly bizarre.

With that, let me give Senator SCHIFF a chance to engage in his part of the colloquy here.

Mr. SCHIFF. Senator, thank you.

There are lots of extraordinary and suspicious happenings around the Epstein case in the last few months. But just by way of background to those who may not be following each development, you have Epstein at one point describing himself as one of Donald Trump's closest friends. You have Donald Trump saying at one point that he shares a bond with Epstein over their mutual like of attractive women and pointing out that, in the case of Epstein, they tend to be on the younger side. You have the President recently acknowledging he is upset with Jeffrey

Epstein for stealing young women from Mar-a-Lago—by Epstein—for purposes that he did not disclose—the President did not disclose.

Tragically, in April, one of those women—one of those children, underage women—working at Mar-a-Lago committed suicide. She was a victim of the Ghislaine Maxwell-Jeffrey Epstein sex trafficking. Just this past April, she took her own life. But she was one of those women, apparently, that Trump was upset that Epstein was taking away from him at Mar-a-Lago. It certainly begs the question of, what did Trump think Jeffrey Epstein was doing with these young women he was taking from Mar-a-Lago?

So these are just some of the questions we hope will be answered, but, of course, after promising the MAGA base that he would disclose these files, after Bondi promised and Kash Patel promised and Trump promised, they have reneged on this.

So this is the backdrop in which Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche goes to visit the No. 1 coconspirator, Maxwell.

The other background piece of this is that Todd Blanche isn't just some Deputy Attorney General; Todd Blanche is Trump's former criminal defense lawyer. Todd Blanche is the guy who sat in the courtroom in Manhattan helping to defend Donald Trump against the Stormy Daniels allegations against him, for which Donald Trump was convicted of multiple felonies.

As you will remember from the Judiciary Committee when Blanche came for his confirmation hearing, you and I were both concerned about whether Blanche would be able to shed his role as Trump's criminal defense lawyer when he adopted the new role of being the No. 2 person in the Justice Department.

All of this begs the question of, when this very unusual thing happened where the No. 2 person at the Justice Department goes to talk to the coconspirator, this child sex predator, is he acting as Trump's defense lawyer or is he acting as a Deputy AG?

As you were alluding to, if this wasn't bizarre enough, for a top person like that to go interview a witness is unprecedented. For them to do it secretly—and we don't know if this was recorded; we don't know if an FBI agent was present. It would be unthinkable to do this in the absence of an FBI agent taking down the statement, but there is no evidence that took place.

The only thing we do know is that this interview lasted 9 hours, and after the interview, Ghislaine Maxwell got the special treatment of being moved from her prison in Florida to a minimum security prison in Texas that is like a camp, to which sex predators are not supposed to be sent. So why did she get that special treatment?

Finally, one other point I would make before I yield back to you about how unusual all this is, is the defense

attorney representing Maxwell is friends, apparently, with Todd Blanche, the Deputy Attorney General, and when Maxwell was asked "Are you hoping for a pardon out of this?" he basically said "We didn't ask for one, but of course the President has said he has the power to do it." They obviously want some special treatment. They are already getting it. But we have no record of any of this.

So, yes, this is so unusual, extraordinary, and unprecedented. And if they think this is going to somehow answer the questions that have been raised by their refusal to turn over these documents, it is the furthest thing from that, wouldn't you say?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I see that the Senator from Maryland has come to the floor to make his unanimous consent request, so let me yield to him since we are kind of into his time here.

But what Senator SCHIFF and I can both tell all of you is that it is extremely rare for even a U.S. attorney to go and do a witness statement and unusual in most circumstances even for an assistant U.S. attorney to go and do a witness statement. The reason for that is you then become a witness to what took place in that room, and you don't want to be both the prosecutor and the witness in the same case.

So the fact that he went in either alone or with no FBI agent or with no stenographer and became a witness to what took place sends off flares of concern to everybody who has served in that line of work.

With that, I yield.

Mr. SCHIFF. Can I make one last point, with your indulgence?

One other extraordinary fact about this is that none of the prosecutors who actually worked on prosecuting Maxwell were present. The reason you would want them there is, they know the facts. Blanche doesn't know the facts. So when you are interrogating this person, when you are taking their statement, you want somebody who knows the facts, who can attest to whether they are being forthcoming, telling the truth or not.

Also, a defense lawyer representing 20 of the Epstein victims asked to be present, and they were turned down.

This just stinks to high heaven.

I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Rhode Island. They have well described, I think, all the inappropriate actions that have been taken by the Justice Department, including recently with respect to the Deputy Attorney General, who had been Donald Trump's personal lawyer, conducting the secret interview with the Epstein associate Maxwell.

This is an important conversation to continue here on the Senate floor. We were here earlier this morning, where

we discussed the very, very troubling and disturbing case of Jeffrey Epstein and the horrifying abuse of young women and girls.

Those who were so terribly abused and mistreated deserve to have the full truth. They deserve to have all the facts come out, as do their loved ones, as do the American people so the American people can have some kind of confidence that the Department of Justice is presenting the American people with the truth because we need transparency in order to ensure full accountability.

It used to be the case that Donald Trump and his Attorney General Pam Bondi and others in this administration said they wanted to get to the bottom of this. In fact, they said they wanted to release the Epstein files. But as we got closer to actually doing that, they suddenly decided that they did not want the public to know and that they didn't want Epstein's victims to know. So now they have decided not to be forthcoming.

The obvious question is, What are they hiding? And that is why we took to the floor earlier today to say: Release the damn Epstein files.

We have learned just in the last 48 hours that at some point along the way, the FBI redacted Trump's name from the Epstein files. We have learned that his name was very likely in those files. We also know that the Trump administration asked the FBI to do a search of his name in the files. We now know that his name was redacted from those files at some point along the way by the FBI.

As my colleagues from Rhode Island and California were just discussing, we have also witnessed in just the last week or two the highly inappropriate action of Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche to conduct a secret interview with Ghislaine Maxwell, who was Jeffrey Epstein's partner in these crimes.

When he was asked at his confirmation hearing before the Senate about whether he had a continuing duty of loyalty and confidentiality to Donald Trump, his response was yes, as the former personal attorney of Donald Trump, he had an ongoing duty of loyalty and confidentiality.

Clearly, that duty of loyalty and confidentiality to Donald Trump puts him in direct conflict with the interests of the truth and the people of the United States when it comes to President Trump. So it was highly inappropriate that he held that interview.

As the Senator from California just pointed out, he excluded from that interview lawyers who had been working on this case for a long time. It is also a fact by at least many reports that he, Todd Blanche, has a very close, personal relationship with the lawyer for Ms. Maxwell.

So this thing stinks to high heaven, and one thing they should do is immediately release the transcripts of this secret interview that was just conducted. Release the transcripts.

According to all reports, they gave Ghislaine Maxwell immunity—proffered immunity for the purpose of her testimony; nothing she said in that interview could be used against her. So release the interview transcript to the American people, because Donald Trump's personal attorney should not be the one in the room conducting an interview with somebody who might have testimony that directly incriminates Donald Trump.

We have also seen just in recent days the question floated about whether the President of the United States would pardon Ghislaine Maxwell. When President Trump was asked about that possibility, he acknowledged he had that power.

As I said on this floor this morning, President Trump should immediately, today, announce that he will not use his pardon power to pardon Ghislaine Maxwell, who is serving a 20-year sentence for being a coconspirator in the abuse of young women and girls.

What is clearly happening in plain view is very dangerous to our system of justice.

What is clearly happening is the possibility that Ghislaine Maxwell and her lawyers are seeking a pardon in exchange for her giving the kind of testimony that would please President Trump.

One of the families of one of the victims, a family from Virginia who lost their loved one to suicide in April, has said: President Trump, do not pardon Ghislaine Maxwell.

And my understanding is that is clearly the sentiment of the other victims and their families. So the President should, today, announce that he will never do that.

Now, earlier this morning, Senator MERKLEY offered a resolution and asked unanimous consent on it to release the Epstein files. And we should do that immediately. That should be done immediately.

Senator DURBIN and I wrote to the Attorney General last week urging her to do what she said she was going to do, which is release the files. But that was objected to on the Republican side.

And I see Senator BARRASSO on the floor. And when he objected to Senator MERKLEY this morning, this is what he said. He said:

Senate Republicans included a provision to address this very issue in an appropriation bill that Democrats blocked earlier this week. This issue would have been addressed here on the U.S. Senate Floor, yet Senate Democrats came to the floor and objected to what was in this bill.

Well, first of all, I should clarify the fact that it was not Senate Republicans who included that provision in the appropriations bill to require that the Justice Department retain all the records with regard to the Epstein files and that they answer certain questions regarding those files and provide those responses to Congress. It wasn't Senate Republicans. In fact, it was my amendment in the Senate Appropriations Committee on that very issue.

I am glad it did pass unanimously, and momentarily I am going to ask for unanimous consent on the exact same provision that was adopted unanimously by the Senate Appropriations Committee, word for word.

Now, it is true that that bill did not move forward here in the Senate. And I am not going to go on for the hours that would be required to talk about the provisions in the Commerce-Science-Justice bill. Suffice it to say that there was another issue that we discussed for about an hour the other night regarding the fact that the Trump administration decided to seize, rescind, steal—whatever you want to call it—\$1.4 billion that had been set aside for a secure FBI Headquarters, and they decided to snatch that money away from the selected site and put it to another site. And my view is that, wherever the FBI builds that new headquarters, it should be a secure site.

So that was a disagreement that led to the fact that that bill did not proceed at this time. We also know—and Senator BARRASSO knows as well—that the appropriations bills take a very long time to wind their way through the Senate and the House, go through conference. And so, really, there is no reason to delay the provision in that bill that was unanimously adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee and which Senator BARRASSO said this morning Republicans included.

Well, if it was included in that bill, we should do it right now. We should get it done right now. And I am just going to, in closing, read this resolution because it is pretty straightforward. It says:

IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall retain, preserve, and compile any records or evidence related to—(1) any investigation, prosecution, or incarceration of Jeffrey Epstein; and (2) any service provided to victims identified in such an investigation.

Pretty straightforward. Retain the records. Don't destroy any evidence.

It also called for a report.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that includes information on the history of the Jeffrey Epstein case, which shall include—(1) information regarding the 2008 non-prosecution agreement between Jeffrey Epstein and the Department of Justice; (2) information on victims and testimony by victims, including notification of victims under section 3771 of title 18, United States Code . . . the "Crime Victims Rights Act"; (3) information on any investigation of a coconspirator; (4) information on any internal review or misconduct findings by the Department of Justice related to any investigation related to Jeffrey Epstein; (5) the current status of any investigation into the financial and trafficking networks of Jeffrey Epstein; (6) an intelligence assessment of the financial ties and clients of Jeffrey Epstein and any connections between Jeffrey Epstein and the United States Government or foreign governments; and (7) information on oversight failures at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York, New York.

Finally—

(c) **PRIVACY PROTECTION.**—The Attorney General may redact the names and personally identifiable information of any victim from the report submitted to Congress under subsection (b), as necessary to protect privacy.

That is it. I wanted to read it to all the Members of the Senate so everyone knows exactly what they are voting for. It is straightforward: President Trump, Attorney General Bondi, do not destroy the evidence of the Epstein files, and within 60 days present this Senate with answers to questions regarding the case.

That is what this amendment does. It is exactly the same as the amendment that passed unanimously, with Republican and Democratic support, out of the Appropriations Committee, the same provision that Senator BARRASSO this morning said was a Republican proposal. So I hope all the Republicans will join us in supporting this measure.

And with that, Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, just briefly because, as I made clear, this was the very provision that Senator BARRASSO this morning said that Republicans have supported, and he indicated that this was something that they wanted to see move forward.

Well, that was this morning, and now it is 6 this evening, and I don't know what changed. But the language is the same as what Senator BARRASSO talked about this morning. It is the same as what the Senate Appropriations Committee passed on a bipartisan basis.

All of a sudden, when it comes time to actually get it done on the Senate floor—not just as part of an appropriations bill that is going to wind its way through this place for weeks or months—when it is time to actually get it done, Republicans are opposing the idea of transparency. I find that quite shameful.

I understand my colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY is interested in making some points and maybe asking some questions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, would my colleague from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I will.

Mr. MERKLEY. If I understood your presentation right, this is, word for word, exactly the same—this bill—

the amendment you proposed in the appropriations meeting.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, that is exactly right.

Mr. MERKLEY. Well, I can tell you I have read through it, and it looks like, to me, exactly the same. And we heard from our colleague from Wyoming that this was a Republican proposal, which you clarified that, actually, you introduced it but also observed that it was passed unanimously.

So I am confused. If my colleague from Wyoming liked it so much that he wanted to claim authorship and he proceeded to say, We liked it so much, we passed it unanimously, why is he objecting now to actually getting it passed?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, Senator MERKLEY, I didn't hear an explanation. I heard the objection. I have not heard the explanation for the objection, and I think it may be difficult to provide an explanation given the fact that the Senator from Wyoming was here on the floor of the Senate earlier, as you and I have both pointed out, extolling the virtues of this amendment and, in fact, partially taking credit for it, saying Republicans supported this and wanted it.

But, apparently, that was this morning, and now is now. And I suspect it is because when it was included in the appropriations bill, it was included in a vehicle that, as we have said, will wind its way through a long road to this process. Who knows how many people will try to take it out behind closed doors in conference.

That is why we have an opportunity right now, in the light of day, here in the U.S. Senate, to actually pass this and send it off to the House immediately. And if they passed it, it could go to the President's desk.

Mr. MERKLEY. If the Senator would yield to another question.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. MERKLEY. This seems extremely—well—minimal. We are preserving the records. Earlier, we asked for a vote on a bill that would be a complete disclosure because we believe that disclosure is merited given a set of extraordinary circumstances—extraordinary circumstances like President Trump dangling a potential pardon in front of Ms. Maxwell, extraordinary circumstances like the FBI itself redacting Trump's name from documents, extraordinary circumstances like Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanch going and personally interviewing Ms. Maxwell and not taking along the lawyers who were experts in this case, and then, just shortly after, she was transferred to a minimum security prison in Texas—in other words, rewarded in a powerful way. There is a big difference between a regular prison and a minimum security prison.

So we wanted disclosure, and I think America wants disclosure because they want to see people held accountable who have perpetrated crimes—rape—against young girls. And yet all you

are asking for is to preserve the information, that it not be deleted or put into a shredder or put into a wood chipper. Is that right? Is that what the Senator is asking for?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, that is the heart of the amendment.

Again, I will read just the first sentence:

The Attorney General shall retain, preserve, and compile any records or evidence related to any investigation, prosecution, or incarceration of Jeffrey Epstein; and any service provided to victims identified in such an investigation.

It could not be clearer. The amendment does ask for a report on other very relevant information regarding the Epstein case.

But to your fundamental point here, this is simply a directive not to destroy evidence that could be in the Epstein files.

As I said, we just learned, at least within the last 48 hours, that somewhere along the road, the FBI had redacted Donald Trump's name from the Epstein files. So we know it is in there, and we know that at some point in time, it was redacted. We want to make sure these records are not destroyed.

Mr. MERKLEY. Another question, if I might.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes.

Mr. MERKLEY. If I turn the clock back to that Appropriations Committee hearing where you presented your amendment and I was present, was that not voted out of committee on a voice vote?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, it was. It was adopted by a voice vote.

Mr. MERKLEY. So the Republicans in committee said we support the idea, but let's do it by voice vote because we don't want to have our names recorded, yea or nay; is that correct?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Again, I cannot, Senator, read the mind of any of our colleagues. It was a voice vote, but of course the objection we are seeing here on the floor of the Senate today indicates that our Republican colleagues do not want to go on record and vote, when it comes right down to it, on this proposal, making sure the records are not destroyed.

Mr. MERKLEY. Had the Senator not objected, we could have passed this bill today by voice vote, not necessarily having a recorded vote.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It would have passed immediately if he had not objected to it.

Mr. MERKLEY. Because it doesn't even get to a—

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That is right. It would have gone directly to the House of Representatives.

Mr. MERKLEY. It would have been unanimous.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Correct.

Mr. MERKLEY. So even though it was passed out of committee by voice vote, and you offer a proposal simply to keep the records intact—which I must say, should never have to be

asked anyway—but why would any Member of the Senate object to the principle of protecting the records?

I mean, I am confused. Don't all of us believe that when there is evidence related to a crime, it should not be put into a shredder or a wood chipper?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It is a very fair question. And as I indicated, we didn't get an explanation for the objection. We had the objection made and no further comment from our colleagues on the Republican side.

I do think it is important that we underscore the fact for our colleagues and anybody listening that this amendment is very straightforward: Don't destroy evidence. It does also require, within 60 days, that a report be provided that provides certain relevant information regarding the Epstein case, and I am not sure why anybody would not want that information to be presented either.

I mean, this is like—oppose an effort to save the records and don't void the evidence and also voting against the idea of the Attorney General providing the U.S. Senate with answers to some fundamental questions.

Again, as we discussed this morning, the fastest and most complete way of doing it would have been to support the Senator from Oregon's motion this morning—UC request this morning. Just release all the files, right? That is what should be done. We should release the files, and we should do it now.

You don't even have to have a vote in the House to do that. The Attorney General could do what she said she was going to do and just release them on her own. That is what many of us have called for. That is what the Senator's motion this morning was all about.

But my goodness, you should be releasing them. But for goodness' sake, why not at least send a directive saying, "Don't destroy the evidence"?

Mr. MERKLEY. Well, I appreciate my colleague from Maryland bringing this forward. It seems like the absolute minimum we should do now is protect the evidence for the future. Certainly, it should be released, as both of us have spoken to.

I really appreciate my colleague from California who brought his legal expertise, along with our colleague from Rhode Island who put out how extraordinary it is that a Deputy Attorney General would go and sit in a prison interviewing a key witness to criminal activity and that magically, within hours thereafter, she is transferred to minimum security, and the President starts talking about the possibility of a pardon.

Americans, this is just stinking to high heaven. I will repeat the point I made earlier today. No one should be above the law. No powerful man should be able to rape young girls and be protected by friends in high places or by legions of lawyers or any other circumstances. Let the rule of law come forward in full force to hold those who have committed egregious crimes be held accountable.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I could not agree more. Our message is simple: Release the damn Epstein files, and for God's sake, don't try to destroy the evidence while we wait for those files to be released.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF JEANINE PIRRO

Mr. GRASSLEY. One of the next two votes will be for Ms. Pirro, nomination for U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Ms. Pirro is a trailblazer. It is shameful for Democrats to oppose this trailblazing woman. Her qualifications speak for themselves. She graduated from law school in 1975, and began prosecuting domestic abuse cases at a time when very few other women did so. She was the first woman to serve as a judge in Westchester County Court. She was the first woman to serve as district attorney for that county. And she was the first woman to serve as president of the New York State District Attorneys' Association.

Her record is remarkable. She spent 27 years prosecuting criminals and another 3 as a judge. In those three decades, Ms. Pirro gained a reputation for fierce advocacy against domestic abuse and crimes against children.

In 1977, she helped create the Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Bureau in Westchester County, serving as its first-ever chief. She also created the Elder Abuse Bureau to prosecute crimes against elderly citizens.

In the 1990s, she stood up one of the first law enforcement sting operations against sexual predators on the internet. Her reputation was so widely known that online predators referred to suspected police officers in the internet chat rooms as "Pirro's Boys."

Today, many Americans know her as Judge Jeanine, and she is beloved for her straight talk and witty commentary.

You may hear my Democratic colleagues criticize Ms. Pirro for some of her colorful remarks during her time as a TV personality. Yes, she has a larger-than-life personality, but she has decades of distinguished record as a prosecutor and judge.

DC is fortunate that the President nominated her to serve as its U.S. attorney. Her job in the interim role where she is stationed now has been heralded. She boosted morale. She has the support of the DC Police Union and the National Fraternal Order of Police.

I look forward to supporting her nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I know of no further debate.

VOTE ON QUINONES NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Quinones nomination?

Mr. MERKLEY. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 490 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Gallego	Welch	Wicker
McConnell		

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.