

What am I talking about? This is the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska. The Congress of the United States—in a law said that we are going to develop this part of my State for oil and gas production. And Joe Biden came in with a regulation saying: Nope, we are going to shut that down, violating the rule of law.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really want to promote the rule of law, they should vote yes.

And, finally, as I mentioned yesterday, this is a vote for the interests of the Native people of my State. As I said yesterday—here is a letter I submitted for the RECORD. The Tribe in this area, the borough, which is all run by Alaska Natives, elected officials; the Alaska Native Corporation, all the leaders in this part of my State—which is what this resolution is all about—all of them, all the indigenous people, the leaders of this part of my State want this resolution.

They didn't want the Biden lockup. They came down to Washington, DC, eight different times to just request a meeting with the Secretary of the Interior, saying: Don't lock up our lands. This will hurt our future. This will hurt our life expectancy. This will hurt our jobs.

And the Secretary of the Interior never even met with them, neither did the President—eight times.

So this is a strong vote for the interests of the indigenous people of my State.

I will conclude with this: My Democratic friends often bristle when accused of selling out the interest of working Americans—the men and women who build stuff, the unions that build stuff, the building trades, the men and women who drill for oil and gas and mines and rare earths and critical minerals. Well, here is an opportunity for them to say: No, we are going to stand with the people who build this great Nation.

My friends on the other side of the aisle often talk about: Hey, we are going to support indigenous people, people of color. Well, here is an opportunity to do it.

But what I fear, what has happened way too much in this body, these interests—working Americans, building trades, the unions, the Native people of my State—they always get sold out to what? The far left, coastal elites, the radical neocolonialists. That is why HEINRICH and SCHUMER are down there saying: Vote no on the SULLIVAN resolution.

But I know some of my colleagues know that a “yes” vote is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for our energy dominance. It is the right thing to do for our foreign policy. It is the right thing to do for working Americans who have fled the Democratic Party over issues like this. And it is the right thing to do for the indigenous people of my State.

I hope I get a couple more Democrat Senators who cross the aisle. Don't lis-

ten to your leader. Don't listen to Senator HEINRICH, for God's sake, on this issue. Vote yes on this important resolution for America and for working families and the Native people of Alaska.

I yield the floor.

**PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO “NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA INTEGRATED ACTIVITY PLAN RECORD OF DECISION”**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 80, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to “National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read a third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 80

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. MURRAY. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) is necessarily absent:

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 599 Leg.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—3

Gallego	Schmitt	Wicker
---------	---------	--------

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 80

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to “National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision” (issued April 25, 2022, as a record of decision, and a letter of opinion from the Government Accountability Office dated July 24, 2025, printed in the Congressional Record on July 28, 2025, on pages S4768–S4770, concluding that such record of decision is a rule under the Congressional Review Act), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

**TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED TO IMPOSE GLOBAL TARIFFS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). Under the previous order, the Committee on Finance is discharged from and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 88, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) terminating the national emergency declared to impose global tariffs.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 88

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 600 Leg.]

## YEAS—51

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

## NAYS—47

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

## NOT VOTING—2

Schmitt Wicker

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) was passed, as follows:

## S.J. RES. 88

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared on April 2, 2025, by the President in Executive Order 14257 (90 Fed. Reg. 15041) is terminated effective on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3079

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have a brief question for this body before I proceed to my motion: What is it that keeps our Nation secure? It is millions of Armed Forces, Active-Duty Reserves, National Guard, civilians supporting them, the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the intelligence Agencies; they are keeping us safe now, like all Federal employees, not knowing when they will get another paycheck.

Our military is less than 1 percent of our Nation. That is how many people sign on the dotted line up to and including their lives to keep us safe. They put their lives on the line to secure liberty and security, and I am grateful to the thousands serving today at Dover Air Force Base, the Delaware National Guard, and throughout our Armed Forces.

They and their families deserve the same devotion to them that they are providing to us.

I come from a military family. My father, brother, sister-in-law, uncles all served in the Army, and my father long said he first really understood what it means to be an American when he was responsible for others and others' lives when deployed.

Taking care of them is our sacred obligation. So while we keep fighting for better healthcare, more affordable healthcare for all Americans, my bill will pay our Armed Forces now.

It will pay Active-Duty, Reserves, National Guard, Coast Guard, civilians at the Pentagon, and intelligence Agencies, and give those who keep us safe, often at great sacrifice, a small piece of security in return.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3079 introduced earlier today; that the bill be considered read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, government shutdowns have real consequences. I have said that countless times during my time here. Incredibly, it seems to have taken Democrats a month to remember that the proverbial stove is, in fact, already hot. And yet, they aren't ready to turn it off, just turn it down a notch; just low enough that they can take the political heat.

My friend from Delaware is right: Our military deserves a lot better than a government shutdown that jeopardizes their paychecks and the services military families count on. During Democrats' shutdown, the President has had to scrape together unobligated balances within the Defense budget in order to uphold the Nation's promise to servicemembers through another pay period.

I certainly hope he won't have to divert resources from urgent modernization again to make payroll in another 2 weeks, but that ball, of course, is in the Democrats' court. I hope they realize the surest way—the surest way—to help servicemembers and civilian DOD employees is to simply turn government funding back on and pass full-year appropriations.

I know my counterpart on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, of all people, understands this. He knows what would really help our Armed Forces because he and I worked closely together on a full-year bill for Defense that would pay servicemembers and invest more in the capabilities they need to keep America safe.

I am grateful for Senator COONS' collaboration on the bipartisan bill that earned overwhelming support in committee and would add \$22 billion above the President's defense request. This, by the way, is the bill that almost every Democrat voted against considering 2 weeks ago.

I know the ranking member cares about the promises we made to the all-volunteer force and the challenges we expect them to make. I know he is concerned about the erosion of Congress's authority to set and fund national security priorities. So am I. And if we cannot appropriate, we will render ourselves completely irrelevant.

The way to provide real certainty and to deliver serious full-year appropriations is to just open the government back up and pass our bill. It is really that simple.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I want to convey my thanks, my gratitude to the chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, my colleague and friend from Kentucky. We and our staffs have had a genuinely constructive and positive process in appropriations this year.

Frankly, overall, the Senate Appropriations Committee has worked well. We have passed out of committee a significant number of major bills by big bipartisan margins—26 to 3 in the case of our bill and the Labor, Health and Human Services bill. But there is a stark contrast between the real progress we are making on appropriations and the lack of progress on addressing the core issue of can Americans afford their healthcare.

Of course, I want to move ahead and appropriate, as my colleague from Kentucky has indicated. Of course, we need to do our job and appropriate, for this body to carry out and to continue its core article I responsibility. But part of what has got us to this moment is a vote earlier this year on the Big Beautiful Bill in July to destroy healthcare for millions of Americans.

We need to find a path forward toward ensuring that millions of Americans do not lose insurance through the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid, something that will raise insurance costs for everyone and that will increase ER wait times in my State and in every other.

This Saturday, 20 million Americans will see how much their premiums go up. And if the calls that come into my colleagues are anything like the calls I am getting, there will be then an accelerated motion toward resolving this issue and moving forward with appropriations.

I will close by just citing one conversation I had yesterday.

I spoke with a small business owner from Delaware. Her name is Jan. She is a stage IV cancer survivor. She is a small business owner.

She told me yesterday that, without the Affordable Care Act, she would have died 10 years ago because insurance would have dropped her. And if her rates double, she will need to close her business of 30 years.

This is one of many stories of entrepreneurs and families, of veterans, of servicemembers, of constituents that have reached out to me.

There is an urgency about reopening the government—yes, I agree—and an urgency about finding a path forward on healthcare. We should be negotiating both now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

## TARIFFS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, this week, the U.S. Senate voted to terminate national emergency declarations that enabled President Trump's tariffs on Brazil and Canada.

Next week, November 5, 2025, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear a majority of trade cases challenging President Trump's authority to impose global tariffs under the Emergency Powers Act.

The law is clear that the President does not have authority under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to impose sweeping tariffs on imports on more than 80 countries around the world. I am pleased that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce endorsed the Trade Review Act, legislation proposed by myself and Senator GRASSLEY. The Cantwell-Grassley legislation focuses on the fact that it is this body's job and responsibility to do trade acts.

The Chamber of Commerce clearly states in their letter that they are representing millions of businesses around the United States of all sizes to try to press upon us the importance of why Congress needs to reinstate its role.

The U.S. Chamber writes to the Members of the U.S. Senate:

"The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges Congress to pass legislation to reclaim its constitutional role in setting tariffs, including the Trade Review Act. Doing so would restore appropriate procedural deliberation in the enactment of taxes on trade, benefitting the millions of Americans whose livelihoods depend on international commerce and the certainty that supports investment in our economy.

Members of Congress continue to hear from farmers, workers, and business owners about the harm inflicted by broad-based tariffs and the associated economic uncertainty. American families are facing thousands of dollars in higher prices as a result of these increased taxes. Small businesses, manufacturers, and ranchers are struggling with higher costs, with additional economic pain likely coming in months.

The Chamber—

Meaning the U.S. Chamber.

has long supported legislative proposals to reassert congressional prerogatives on trade as a means to secure durable outcomes. The Constitution grants exclusive authority to Congress "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . . [and] to regulate commerce with foreign nations," and exercising leadership on this front should be a priority in the context of today's challenging economic outlook.

By establishing a more deliberate process for enacting tariffs, Congress can ensure that [the] appropriate stakeholder consultation and a methodical assessment of costs precede any decision to raise [costs] on traded goods. To date, several proposals have been introduced that address these concerns, including but not limited to the bipartisan . . . Trade Review Act as well as resolutions terminating the national emergency [declaration on] tariffs (S.J. Res. 88 [and] S.J. Res. 77). The Chamber urges members of Congress to work across the aisle to enact [this] legislation requiring an up-or-down vote for any new tariffs and those imposed in the year to date.

This is signed by Neil Bradley, Executive Vice President, Chief of Policy,

Head of Strategic Advocacy for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 27, 2025.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce ("the Chamber") urges Congress to pass legislation to reclaim its constitutional role setting tariffs, including the Trade Review Act. Doing so would restore appropriate procedural deliberation in the enactment of taxes on trade, benefitting the millions of Americans whose livelihoods depend on international commerce and the certainty that supports investments in our economy.

Members of Congress continue to hear from American farmers, workers, and business owners about the harm inflicted by broad-based tariffs and the associated economic uncertainty. American families are facing thousands of dollars in higher prices as a result of these increased taxes. Small businesses, manufacturers, and ranchers are struggling with higher costs, with additional economic pain likely in the coming months.

The Chamber has long supported legislative proposals to reassert congressional prerogatives on trade as a means to securing durable outcomes. The Constitution grants exclusive authority to the Congress "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . . [and] to regulate commerce with foreign nations," and exercising leadership on this front should be a priority in the context of today's challenging economic outlook.

By establishing a more deliberative process for enacting tariffs, Congress can ensure that appropriate stakeholder consultation and a methodical assessment of costs precede any decision to raise taxes on traded goods. To date, several proposals have been introduced that address these concerns, including but not limited to the bipartisan and bicameral Trade Review Act as well as resolutions terminating the national emergency declared to impose broad-based tariffs (S.J. Res. 88, S.J. Res. 77). The Chamber urges members of Congress to work across the aisle to enact legislation requiring an up-or-down vote for any new tariffs and for those imposed in the year to date.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY,

*Executive Vice President, Chief Policy Officer,  
and Head of Strategic Advocacy, U.S.  
Chamber of Commerce.*

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I hope that as we continue to talk about trade, that Congress will take the steps necessary to end tariffs on U.S. small businesses and American families.

## HEALTHCARE

Now, Mr. President, I also want to rise to talk about the serious healthcare crisis and the affordability crisis that is affecting our Nation. In just 2 days, on Saturday, November 1, millions of Americans are going to go online to sign up for their 2026 Affordable Care Act health insurance plan.

As we know, keeping healthcare affordable is a key priority, and I see that the premiums that are being talked about are going to increase by hundreds or thousands of dollars every month for the same coverage they just had this year. That is, next year is going to go up thousands of dollars.

Some people are going to say, "I can't go without health insurance. I have to find a way to cover this extra cost by cutting back on food and prescription drugs or working longer shifts." But for about 5 million Americans, including 80,000 in my State, they will probably be forced to say, "I just can't afford health insurance anymore." They are going to hope they don't get sick. They are going to hope that they don't have an emergency, but we know that that is uncomfortable.

Last week, my office released a case study detailing what this decision would look like for a married couple in Washington State making \$120,000 a year. Across all 39 counties in my State, couples in this situation would have to decide what to do in the face of an average premium increase of a whopping \$1,049 per month. That is, their costs will go up \$12,000 per year.

Here is just one example in King County, my State's largest county. This couple would go from paying \$425 a month to \$1,386 a month. This problem isn't unique to Washington. There are other parts of the United States that are seeing the same thing.

Hopefully, all of this data is being released to individuals, and hopefully, our colleagues are paying attention to this because it is showing what premium increases look like, but a couple in the State of Alabama—I am sorry, a single woman in Alabama making \$65,000 a year could see her premium increase 43 percent from the 2025 levels. It would mean she would pay an additional increase from going from \$314 a month to \$452 a month.

Another example, for a family of four in Texas, for parents making \$70,000 a year but don't just get insurance through their jobs, their insurance would cost \$505 in 2025, but without the extended premium tax credit, likely to face \$1,551 cost per month in 2026.

So these costs are adding up on American families. Together, these costs continue to hold individual households and their budgets in an undesirable position. We are already hearing stories about people squeezing in medical procedures before the end of 2025.

To make matters worse, for families with massive increases in premiums and with the rise in inflation we have seen since January of this year, households are trying to decide whether they take care of healthcare or groceries or electricity.

And the sad truth is that we could have worked this out. We could have done this in the bill passed earlier this year. Congress could be working right now, even, on working down the cost of insurance premiums for 24 million Americans. But instead, people are refusing to come to the table to discuss this issue.

The Senate needs to be the place we used to be: that is, getting legislation done. We need to work together collectively to have votes and to discuss how to solve these problems in good faith

across the aisle. We should be extending the ACA premiums now and making sure these prices don't rise and continue to work on long-term solutions to make health insurance more affordable for Americans.

So I urge my colleagues to continue to work with us. The ACA tax credits expiring at the end of this year and this enrollment that we are going to see on November 1, that everybody is going to see how much these costs are going up—I am asking my colleagues, let's roll up our sleeves. Let's work to lower these costs.

I know that in the Affordable Care Act, there are States like New York, Oregon, and Minnesota who have the basic health plan. The basic health plan provision, modeled on something our State had first done, lowered the costs for a lot of working families across the United States. Programs like this should be considered, as well as solutions that would help us lower costs for the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### NOMINATION OF JOSHUA D. DUNLAP

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Joshua Dunlap to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Josh is an attorney of extraordinary intelligence, extensive experience, and demonstrated integrity. He is highly respected in the legal community throughout the State of Maine, and I urge my colleagues to support his nomination to the First Circuit.

Josh grew up in Vassalboro, ME, and now lives in Scarborough with his wife Sydney and their three children.

He graduated first in his class from Notre Dame Law School, where he received the law school's highest honor, awarded to the student with the most distinguished academic record.

He then clerked for Judge Paul Kelly of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

In 2009, Josh joined the very well respected law firm Pierce Atwood in Portland, ME. During his 16 years at the firm, he has specialized in complex civil litigation matters and currently serves as cochair of the firm's appellate team.

Josh is admitted to practice in multiple U.S. courts of appeal and the U.S. Supreme Court. He has also assisted special masters in three original jurisdiction proceedings before the Supreme Court.

Finally, Josh also chairs the Maine Appellate Rules Committee, to which he was appointed by the Maine Supreme Judicial Court.

This impressive experience, coupled with his intelligence and integrity, makes Josh exceptionally well qualified to serve on the First Circuit. His substantial appellate litigation experience will also bring a practitioner's perspective to the court.

The nonpartisan American Bar Association unanimously rated Josh as

"well qualified" to serve on the First Circuit. I would note that that is the highest possible rating for a judicial nominee. It reflects the ABA's assessment of his integrity, experience, and temperament.

There were several compelling letters of support submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee in favor of Josh's nomination, and I would like to highlight a couple of them.

A diverse group of faculty and alumni from his law school who taught Josh or studied alongside him praised him for his "respect for differing views" and "deep appreciation for the rule of law."

A letter signed by a group of leading Maine attorneys who describe themselves as representing a broad spectrum of political views and legal philosophies wrote that Josh has all the qualities the very finest judges exhibit: He is hard-working, courteous, and judicial in temperament, very smart, and of sterling character, with a commitment to fairness and the rule of law.

At his confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Josh testified that Mainers are famously independent and that he suspects that characterizes him as well. That is exactly what we want in a judge.

Maine is proud of our history of supplying superb, well-qualified, independent-minded jurists to the Federal bench. I know that Josh will continue in that fine tradition. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of his nomination, for he truly deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. President, seeing that there are no other speakers, I would ask unanimous consent that the already scheduled vote begin immediately.

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. 370, Joshua D. Dunlap, of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Katie Boyd Britt, Chuck Grassley, James Lankford, Pete Ricketts, Markwayne Mullin, Tim Sheehy, Jon Husted, Eric Schmitt, Jim Justice, James E. Risch, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, Ted Budd, John R. Curtis, John Boozman.

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 Joshua D. Dunlap, of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 601 Leg.]

#### YEAS—51

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

#### NAYS—47

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

#### NOT VOTING—2

Schmitt  
Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joshua D. Dunlap, of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, today marks nearly a full month since the Schumer shutdown started. That was really the time when the Democrats decided to just go on strike and filibuster a clean CR.

What has happened is our Federal law enforcement is being forced to work without pay; air traffic control towers are understaffed; flights are delayed; and it has jeopardized nutritional programs for millions of low-income families. This crisis is something that was entirely, completely, unavoidable. Yet the Democrats have voted over and over to keep the government closed.