

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs.

John Thune, John Kennedy, Pete Ricketts, Marsha Blackburn, Thom Tillis, Bill Hagerty, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, David McCormick, Steve Daines, Ashley Moody, Jon Husted, Roger Marshall, John Hoeven.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska Mr. RICKETTS.

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Nebraska Mr. RICKETTS would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alsobrooks	Graham	Murray
Armstrong	Grassley	Ossoff
Baldwin	Hagerty	Padilla
Banks	Hassan	Paul
Barrasso	Hawley	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt Rochester	Hoeven	Rounds
Booker	Husted	Sanders
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Britt	Johnson	Schiff
Budd	Justice	Schmitt
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kim	Shaheen
Coons	King	Sheehy
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Smith
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Luján	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Tuberville
Curtis	Marshall	Van Hollen
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	McCormick	Warnock
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moody	Welch
Fetterman	Moran	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moreno	Wicker
Galleo	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Ricketts

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). On this vote, the yeas are 99, the nays are 0.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING THE PAY OF SENATORS IF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN OCCURS—Motion To Proceed The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, here in DC this week is Police Week, and we are reflecting on the brave men and women who serve us in Tennessee and also across this country, where they are serving our communities every day with courage, with integrity, and with honor. We so appreciate their service. Every day, they put their lives on the line to protect their families, their friends, their neighbors. They enforce the law, and they keep the peace; and for that, they deserve every American's enduring gratitude.

Few places better capture the magnitude of their sacrifices than the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial that is here in our Nation's Capital. Engraved on that memorial are the names of every fallen officer in our country going back to the year 1850. This memorial contains 24,775 names. This week, 363 heroes are being added, including 3 from Tennessee: Hugh Carlen of Putnam County, whose watch ended February 24, 1912; James Hood of Jonesborough, who fell in the line of duty August 26, 1928; and Deputy Sheriff Justin Bradford Mowery, of Blount County, whom we tragically lost on December 28.

This week's candlelight vigil will provide a powerful moment to reflect on their sacrifices and their stories and those made by the thousands of other officers on the Roll Call of Heroes.

There is a reason our officers are called the thin blue line: They are the only force separating us from chaos, disorder, and anarchy. They take pride in their responsibility, but to do their jobs, they need the support of their communities, their States, their country. They need the support of this Chamber, and for too long, they have lacked that support from Democrat leadership. Instead of funding the police, the Democrats have worked to defund the police and, indeed, all law enforcement. But, under President Trump, the Federal Government is backing the blue from one side of this country to another.

In Tennessee, we have seen this much needed support in Memphis. For years, Memphis, which is an iconic American city, has struggled with rampant crime. In 2024, it had the highest crime rate per capita of any city in the country. Memphians truly suffered. Indeed, all West Tennesseans suffered. Many could not walk outside of their homes without fear of being robbed, assaulted, or murdered in Memphis.

Under the President's leadership, those days are coming to an end. Since

launching the Memphis Safe Task Force last year, crime in Memphis has plummeted. In the first quarter of this year, overall crime was down more than 40 percent compared to 2025. Indeed, since the task force began 7 months ago, the crime rate has been cut 50 percent.

The way this happened was in coordination with local, State, and Federal resources. The task force has done a great job in getting criminals off the street and behind bars. In total, authorities have made more than 9,000 arrests, including 996 for narcotics, 838 for firearms offenses, 105 for sex offenses, and 67 for homicide. They have also seized 1,500 illegal firearms, and they have located 150 missing children. Every single American—indeed, every Member of this Chamber—should applaud this success.

In the Senate, Republicans are working to support the administration's effort. My Restoring Law and Order Act would increase funding for law enforcement and help keep violent criminals behind bars.

The Protecting Law Enforcement Officers from Doxing Act would make it illegal to dox Federal law enforcement officials and put them in harm's way.

The Safer Prisons Act would double the maximum term of imprisonment for assaulting a Federal Bureau of Prisons correctional officer.

While Republicans work to support our brave officers, unfortunately, many of our Democratic colleagues are trying to do everything in their power to undermine law enforcement.

For 76 days, they shut down the Department of Homeland Security, left the Secret Service, Coast Guard, TSA, FEMA, and other critical Agencies without funding, and they jeopardized our Nation's security at a time of heightened threats from the world's largest sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

And the reason? Well, they had a petty reason. They used our Federal law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security as a trading chip. What they were trying to do was to abolish ICE, end the enforcement of our immigration laws, and defund Federal law enforcement.

Thank goodness they were not successful. They got nothing for their little fit. President Trump brought this charade to an end late last month by signing into law legislation that reopened DHS and restored its vital operations.

Now Republicans are moving forward with a public security bill that will fund ICE and Customs and Border Protection for years to come. We are accomplishing this through the reconciliation process, and that is the same process we used to pass the Working Families Tax Cut last year. We are going to make certain we can fund these vital Agencies.

Our colleagues across the aisle can continue to oppose the rule of law, and they can side with criminals over law enforcement. They can continue to side

with illegal aliens rather than citizens, and they can continue to champion the same radical policies that unleashed chaos at the border and across the country during the Biden administration, but that will not stop Republicans from saluting our men and women in uniform, from backing the blue, from standing with the thin blue line, and making certain that law enforcement has what they need to provide safety for American citizens in communities coast to coast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote no on Donald Trump's attempt to take over America's central bank.

Trump's economy is in big trouble, and everybody knows it, including Donald Trump. Consumer sentiment is at an alltime low. Families are paying more for groceries, more for housing, more for healthcare—all thanks to Trump's chaotic tariffs and his One Big Beautiful Bill, and now his foolish and illegal war with Iran is further driving up the cost of gas and the cost of nearly everything else here at home.

So it is no wonder that Donald Trump is desperate to salvage the economy before November's midterm elections. Now, he can do that. Instead of taking action to lower prices, which he could do, he has cooked up a ridiculous scheme: Install sock puppets at the Federal Reserve Board who are willing to artificially juice the economy. Of course, it will be American families who pay the price when this scheme backfires and raises prices and the cost of borrowing even more.

Donald Trump has not been subtle about this takeover attempt. First, he opened a bogus criminal investigation into Fed Governor Lisa Cook, and he illegally tried to fire her. Then he opened another bogus criminal investigation into Fed Chair Jay Powell—all in a ploy to push him out.

Trump then disclaimed:

Anybody that disagrees with me will never be the Fed Chairman.

And, about a month later, he nominated Kevin Warsh to be his sock puppet on the Fed.

Consideration of Mr. Warsh's nomination was rightfully delayed by some of my Republican colleagues when they joined Democrats in refusing to move forward amid the Department of Justice's phony inquiry into Chair Powell, but the second that the administration pretended to close the investigation, Republicans folded and advanced Mr. Warsh's nomination. No one here is fooled. The investigation is still open.

But don't take it from me. Take it from President Trump, who said the investigation is "not dropped."

Take it from the President's spokeswoman, who said "The investigation still continues."

Take it from U.S. attorney Pirro, who said that she "will not hesitate to restart a criminal investigation." She

went on to promise that her office would "continue to litigate the issue."

And no one should forget that President Trump is still trying to fire Fed Governor Cook, taking it all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Justice Department's reported criminal probe against her is ongoing.

So it is clear that Donald Trump is still using bogus criminal investigations as a way to take over the Fed—to push out the people who have been confirmed so that he can install his own people who will do exactly what he wants.

So let me turn to Mr. Warsh, the nominee. At this unprecedented moment in the Fed's history, he is uniquely unqualified to lead the Agency, and that is why every single Democrat on the Banking Committee voted against his nomination—the first party-line vote ever for a Fed Chair, ever in history.

First, Mr. Warsh has proven to be a sock puppet for President Trump. During his confirmation hearing, Warsh couldn't even say that Trump lost the 2020 election. We need a Fed Chair who evaluates economic data and sets monetary policy in the real world, not in Trump's delusional alternative reality.

Second, Mr. Warsh has refused to disclose the sources of more than \$100 million worthwhile of assets. If confirmed, he will be the wealthiest Fed Chair in history, but he refuses to provide transparency to the American people about who he is entangled with. During his hearing, Mr. Warsh refused to say if he is invested in companies affiliated with President Trump or his family, companies that have facilitated money laundering, Chinese-controlled companies, or financing vehicles established by Jeffrey Epstein.

We have no idea if Mr. Warsh owns stock in any banks, which will be in direct violation of the Federal Reserve Act upon his swearing in later this week.

We also have no idea how and to whom Mr. Warsh will divest those secret assets. Based on the information we pieced together, it is possible that Stanley Druckenmiller, who makes a living betting on what the Fed will do next, may cut Mr. Warsh a huge check to cash him out. The American people would be right to question who Mr. Warsh will serve if a billionaire gives him a sweetheart deal just as Mr. Warsh takes office.

Third, Warsh says that he has "no regrets" from his catastrophic tenure as a Fed Governor before, during, and after the 2008 financial crash. The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, which Congress set up to investigate the causes of the financial crisis, found that Governor Warsh attended multiple meetings in 2006 in which participants rung the alarm about subprime mortgages and rising mortgages and rising foreclosures and implored the Fed to use its authority to address these risks. Not only did Mr. Warsh ignore these warnings, he pushed back against them. In fact, in 2007, he said:

Subprime mortgages have gotten a bad name in this environment, and in some cases, that's not just.

He also said later that he doesn't "see any immediate systemic risk issues" among the big banks. Remember, this is shortly before the crash of 2008.

Then, for good measure, Mr. Warsh also praised risky financial instruments like credit default swaps that helped trigger the 2008 crash, and he said: No, these are innovations that make the financial system safer.

So that is what he did before the crisis. During the crisis, Warsh served as Wall Street's personal liaison on the Fed Board as 8 million workers lost their jobs, 10 million people were being thrown out of their homes, and many more saw their life savings vanish. Mr. Warsh's No. 1 priority? Not those families. Not those workers. Mr. Warsh's No. 1 priority was the big banks that crashed our economy. He worked tirelessly to orchestrate multibillion-dollar Wall Street bailouts. But Mr. Warsh says today he has "no regrets."

After the crash, most people on the Fed saw the economic devastation and said: Now might be a good time to lower interest rates to revive the economy and help get people back to work.

Not Mr. Warsh. Nope. He wanted to keep interest rates high—"no regrets"—and he kept pushing for higher interest rates for more than a decade even as our economy struggled.

When the job of Fed Chair became available during Trump's first term as President, Donald Trump passed him by. Now, Mr. Warsh chalked this up to his refusal to "put [his] ambitions ahead of [his] principles." Well, Mr. Warsh decided not to make that mistake the second time around. As soon as Donald Trump became President a second time, Mr. Warsh began shouting from the rooftops that the Fed should cut interest rates. In exchange for abandoning his principles, the President offered Mr. Warsh his dream job.

Look, red lights are flashing all across our economy. American families are struggling. Republicans will come to regret their decision to aid and abet President Trump's Fed takeover by installing Mr. Warsh as Chair.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose Kevin Warsh's nomination to serve as Chairman of the Federal Reserve. I am not persuaded, based on his record and his testimony at his hearing before the Senate Banking Committee, that he has demonstrated the independence or the judgment this position requires.

The Federal Reserve has a statutory dual mandate: maximum employment to support jobs and price stability to avoid excessive inflation. To carry out that mandate effectively, markets need confidence that monetary policy decisions are being made on the basis of

economic evidence, not on the basis of political pressure or convenience.

That is especially important now as prices are rising too fast and President Trump is still demanding a big cut in interest rates. In fact, just yesterday, a Washington Post headline read "Iran war pushed inflation to highest rate in nearly three years."

We know our constituents are feeling these rapid price increases around the country—at the gas pump, at the kitchen table, farmers across the country with higher input costs. So there is no doubt that the illegal Iran war is driving prices up, and that comes on top of the continued upward inflationary pressure from the President's failed tariff tax policies, which continue to work their way through the system and put upward pressure on prices.

So illegal tariff taxes and the illegal war in Iran and other policies the President is pursuing are making life simply unaffordable for our fellow Americans. Yet, when he was faced with the prospect of carrying out that dual mandate free of political interference from the White House, Mr. Warsh's record and his responses to questions raised very serious concerns.

When he served as a Federal Reserve Governor during the financial crisis and its aftermath, he was a consistent inflation hawk, supporting higher interest rates. He did that even as unemployment then approached 10 percent and the country was in the middle of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. Despite that loss of jobs and high unemployment, Mr. Warsh repeatedly focused instead on inflation risks.

At a 2009 meeting of the Federal Open Market Committee—that is the committee that sets interest rates—Mr. Warsh said he was "more concerned about upside risks to inflation than downside risks"—again, at a time of very high unemployment.

He also argued publicly against quantitative easing—the policy that Chairman Bernanke put in place to lower long-term borrowing costs and support economic recovery.

So just to step back here, at a time when unemployment was near 10 percent, as Americans faced the great recession, Mr. Warsh was a hawk, pushing for higher interest rates over more near-term relief for American families. That was his position when the economy was weakest, weaker than it had been in generations, when millions of Americans were out of work.

But these days—these days—Mr. Warsh has had a complete conversion, a 180-degree flip. He is now a super dove on interest rates even as unemployment has recovered from the depths of the great recession, and, in fact, today, prices are too high. That is a situation where textbook economics would say that the big rate cuts demanded by President Trump will make inflation worse; they will make life even more unaffordable for the American people. Prices will keep going up.

Now Mr. Warsh says that rapid productivity gains, particularly from artificial intelligence, could justify easier monetary policy without reigniting inflation. Economists across the spectrum are overwhelmingly skeptical of this theory, especially when you look at the near- and midterms—certainly not something that would happen by the end of this year, and it is the end of this year where President Trump is demanding big interest rates. In fact, President Trump has repeatedly and publicly demanded sharply lower rates. We have seen him harangue the Federal Reserve over and over and over. And Mr. Warsh's views have conveniently moved in exactly that direction.

That doesn't automatically disqualify him, but it does create a very legitimate question: Is this a genuine change in economic judgment or is it a shift that reflects the preferences of the President who nominated him—specifically, a President who has been abusing his power to influence monetary policy and to strip the Fed of its independence; a President who has launched an unprecedented assault on the Fed, trying to fire Governor Lisa Cook, trying to concoct charges against Chairman Powell to push him out of the Federal Reserve. President Trump is doing all of this to try to get lower interest rates and much lower interest rates now.

It wasn't a secret that Donald Trump was looking for a Chair who would implement his preferences, who would lower interest rates significantly in the short term. And all of a sudden—all of a sudden—on his nomination-day conversion or just preceding that as he was auditioning, Mr. Warsh now seems to think that is appropriate despite his clear prior views.

That question became even more concerning during the Banking and Housing Committee hearing. I asked Mr. Warsh a straightforward question about monetary policy.

President Trump has called for a massive rate cut—below 1 percent—by the end of this year, so I asked Mr. Warsh whether a rate cut of that scale in an economy with steady growth and inflation already above target—whether that would likely put upward pressure on prices. Right? This is a simple, basic economics question, and he would not answer the question directly.

As I said, the basic framework is clear: Lower rates stimulate demand. If demand rises faster than supply, inflationary pressures increase, costs for families go up. That is Economics 101. If a nominee for Fed Chair will not directly acknowledge that basic relationship in a public hearing before this body, it is reasonable to ask whether he is avoiding an answer because it conflicts with the policy direction favored by the White House, favored by President Trump.

Now, colleagues, our economy works best when the Chairman of the Federal Reserve implements monetary policy based on their reading of the data, not

on the reading of politics. And I am concerned about whether Mr. Warsh meets that standard because we have seen these questions of independence raised even more dramatically under this administration than any before.

And against that backdrop, members of the committee asked Mr. Warsh direct questions. We asked: Would he step down if pressured by the President over monetary policy?

We asked: Would he resist efforts to manipulate the composition or decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee?

We asked: Would he clearly reject political pressure on reserve bank leadership?

And over and over, Mr. Warsh refused to give direct answers.

I believe Americans deserve clarity about whether Mr. Warsh is committed to standing up for the Fed at a time of unprecedented attacks and political pressure from the White House.

And based on his record and his flip-flops and his answers to the Senate Banking Committee, I remain unconvinced. I hope, if confirmed, he proves my concerns wrong. I hope he does act independently, and I hope he makes decisions based on facts and evidence, even when those decisions conflict with the President's preferences.

But on the record before us today, I cannot support this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

WHISTLEBLOWERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I am here in the Senate about the Democrat Judiciary Committee minority in the House of Representatives.

They wrote a letter on May 12 of this year that I found to be more than troubling. That letter made disgraceful and wrongful accusations regarding this Senator's helping many FBI whistleblowers.

For the entirety of this Congress, I have been open and very public about my efforts to help whistleblowers. Accordingly, the timing of this letter, so late after settlements occurred in August of 2025, is suspect. If concerns existed, why were they not raised last year?

I have seen a lot, in my time serving the people of Iowa, but this attack on this Senator and my office and whistleblowers is beyond the pale.

Now, you have often heard me say on the Senate floor, over many years, that I feel like honest whistleblowers are treated like a skunk at a picnic. Oftentimes, their only crime is telling the truth. And for telling the truth, they often lose their job. They are hurt professionally, and it discourages other people who want to tell the truth about wrongdoing in government from coming forth. That is why whistleblowers deserve the protection that I and other Senators give them.

So getting back to that letter, this letter from the minority calls my office's efforts to obtain a fix for whistleblowers who faced years of retaliation

and financial ruin—that letter called it a “shakedown scheme.”

The Democrats are dead wrong about what they said, and if they had a sliver of integrity, they would retract that letter. This isn't the way to handle disagreements.

But what is there to disagree with? Patriotic whistleblowers had wrongs against them righted, and I helped make their case right.

This should be a bipartisan celebration, especially since some of these whistleblowers weren't pro-President Trump.

The letter also notes that some of the whistleblowers were properly disciplined, as if suffering retaliation is OK.

The letter further notes:

The record definitively shows that the agents weren't disciplined for making protected disclosures to Congress or for the imaginary offense of being a Republican.

Now, even publications in this town—and I am going to quote POLITICO.

POLITICO noted in their article:

Judiciary Democrats did not provide supporting documentation for the sources of some of their claims.

As an example of how far off base the letter is, one FBI official who was wrongly accused of being a part of a January siege was cleared by the inspector general. His clearance was restored. He got his job back. The FBI Security Division had ignored photo and video evidence supporting that whistleblower's claim.

Indeed, the whistleblower's lawyers have publicly defended their client, noting:

No classified leaks. No criminal conduct.

But the records happen to exist, just not the ones that the Democrats want to talk about.

The lawyers for the whistleblowers rightly said the following, publicly:

It's common practice for Federal Agencies to settle legal or administrative complaints against them, which virtually all the whistleblowers had against the FBI at the time of settlements.

Those lawyers also noted that they published hundreds of pages “documenting the flaws in FBI actions against employees”:

In fact, two of our clients who received settlements were FBI Security Division employees retaliated against for exposing the FBI's use of the security clearance process for reprisal also against other Empower Oversight clients—a wrong even the Biden-era FBI recognized when it reinstated Marcus Allen's security clearance.

President Trump's Justice Department and the FBI should get credit for righting the wrongs against these additional whistleblowers.

And what the Democrats did with this letter may cause tremendous damage to whistleblower reputations for getting the facts wrong.

At my direction, my staff did what many in this town don't understand. When whistleblowers step up to the plate, you have to fight for them. So that is exactly what my office did, and

I am not going to back down one bit and let brave individuals suffer more years of ruin. And I am certainly not going to apologize for fighting and winning for whistleblowers.

That doesn't always mean that every whistleblower is going to get the satisfaction and settlement that he or she deserves. But that effort to get them justice must be made, and I make it clear to all of my staff that they must do what they can to get the job done of protecting whistleblowers—in other words, give the effort of protecting whistleblowers the “old college try.” That is what the taxpayers expect, and that is my reputation as a whistleblower defender.

I have made a career out of protecting and defending whistleblowers; and never in my time have I, my staff, or my whistleblowers received more attacks for doing that job than in this Congress.

I encourage all whistleblower groups in this town to stand up to what is happening here, just as I stood up for whistleblowers throughout the decades—no matter who they blow the whistle on, Republican or Democrat administrations—whether that is disagreeing with this administration about Mr. Reuveni being a real whistleblower or defending the Ukraine whistleblower, years ago.

In conclusion, I will note that the Democrat letter said:

The treasury isn't a personal checkbook for ideological payouts, and the misuse of millions of dollars in taxpayer resources for personal or political benefit is a felony.

Did the Democrats forget about FBI Agent Peter Strzok reportedly receiving \$1.2 million or Lisa Page receiving \$800,000 from the Biden Department of Justice after the damage that they did to this country? Or were they covering up again for a disastrous Biden-Harris administration?

For God and country, this Senator will never stop fighting for whistleblowers.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the President of the United States, there are few decisions more important than nominating leaders of integrity and good judgment to hold trusted positions in office. And few of those trusted positions are more important than the Chair of the Federal Reserve. Those words were uttered by President Trump during his first term when he announced Jerome Powell as his nominee to Chair the Fed. How times have changed.

During his tenure, Chair Powell served with competency and dignity as he navigated the economic problems of our time, from the COVID-19 pandemic to rapidly rising inflation. Yet he also faced a challenge unlike any other Chair in history: a sham legal battle waged by the very President who nominated him. To President Trump, it seems that exercising good judgment does not mean reliance on the economic facts and data, but instead obedience to his every demand.

Because of Chair Powell's refusal to kowtow, Donald Trump has weaponized the Department of Justice to pressure, belittle, and threaten him. I want to commend Chair Powell for standing firm in the face of the President's tirades. It is not easy to face Trump's vengeful wrath, and it is indefensible that DOJ has kept open the possibility of pursuing these baseless, politicized charges in the future.

But Mr. Powell's term as Chair expires on Friday, and President Trump seems determined to nominate a Chair who will do his bidding, instead of one who is independently minded. Earlier this year, President Trump nominated Kevin Warsh to lead the Fed after Powell's departure. Mr. Warsh previously served as member of the Board of Governors from 2006 through 2011 as a Bush appointee.

Warsh's actions during that time raise cause for concern: Mr. Warsh played a central role in arranging numerous multibillion-dollar bank bailouts, while warning against interest rate cuts even as unemployment soared. He has expressed no regrets about these bailouts and continues to support Trump's Wall Street deregulatory agenda. We already have seen the damage across our government, from the Department of Justice to Health and Human Services, that Trump loyalists can wreck. We cannot allow that chaos in our central bank.

America's economy is trusted by the world because of the belief that our economic policies are determined by facts not politics. Warsh threatens to undermine that.

When President Trump asks him to juice the economy by lowering interest rates, even if it raises inflation, will Warsh have the courage to say no? When one of the President or his allies' many shady business ventures fail, will Warsh stand strong amid pressure to provide a taxpayer funded bailout? When the chips are down, will Warsh make the decisions that best benefit his country or the President who picked him? Warsh's record and his answers at his confirmation hearing indicate the answers are no. Americans are struggling more than ever to afford basic goods, from housing, to gas, to groceries. Yesterday, data showed that Trump's war of choice in Iran has caused inflation to reach 3.8 percent, the highest in 3 years. Working families deserve a central bank that will fight for them, not the President and his billionaire buddies.

I am not convinced that Mr. Warsh has the willingness to do what is best for the American people. For that reason, I will be voting no on his nomination and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 2 o'clock be called immediately.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination.

The legislative clerk reported the nomination of Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

VOTE ON WARSH NOMINATION

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Armstrong	Fetterman	Moody
Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
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	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Lummis	Tillis
Curtis	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young

NAYS—45

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
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Gallego	Ossoff	Warren
Hassan	Padilla	Welch
Heinrich	Peters	Whitehouse
Hickenlooper	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, this week marks National Police Week—a time for our Nation to honor the bravery, sacrifice, and service of the men and women in law enforcement, who work every single day to keep our communities safe. These heroes put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

I want to give a special thanks to law enforcement officers across Nevada, who serve every day with honor and integrity. Every day, they put on the uniform. They kiss their loved ones goodbye and head into situations that most of us hope we never ever have to face. Whether it is a major emergency or a domestic dispute or a routine traffic stop, they face danger every single day. They do it because they believe in service and because they believe in protecting others.

National Police Week is also about honoring the fallen, those heroes who left behind family, friends, colleagues, and the communities they served and helped to protect—heroes like Officer Jason Roscow, who served for 17 years, proudly, with the North Las Vegas Police Department and was tragically killed in the line of duty last year. Officer Roscow devoted his life to serving his fellow Americans—first in uniform for the U.S. Air Force and then for nearly two decades in law enforcement in Southern Nevada.

Today, I am thinking about his family—the two sons he left behind—his fellow officers, and the entire North Las Vegas community that continues to mourn this tremendous loss.

Unfortunately, Officer Roscow is not alone. In Nevada and across the country, far too many officers have made the ultimate sacrifice to their communities. This week, every week, and every day, we honor their memory. We also honor the work that our officers do.

I want to let Nevada's law enforcement know one thing: I have your back. That means making sure law enforcement agencies have the funding, staffing, training, equipment, and mental health resources that you need to do your jobs safely and effectively. I have worked across party lines to deliver exactly that for Nevada.

Earlier this year, I helped to secure millions of dollars in funding to strengthen public safety and support local law enforcement. That funding included \$1 million for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to procure equipment supporting search and rescue operations, to support patrols, and to support large-scale event security.

It included \$3 million for Washoe County to acquire a mobile command intelligence vehicle to improve emergency response capabilities.

The bill also included more than \$1 million for the city of Henderson to implement a domestic violence and sexual assault response program to better support victims and to improve public safety.

These funds are absolutely critical, and it is one of the best uses of our taxpayer dollars. Any time that we invest in fighting crime and keeping people safe, well, we are investing in ourselves, and we are investing in our communities.

These are so much more meaningful, well, than, let's say, a ballroom because, right now, Donald Trump has proposed spending \$1 billion of your taxpayer dollars—taxpayer money—on a new White House ballroom. Imagine that—\$1 billion for one room that no one will go to except the President and his friends. Mr. President, \$1 billion at a time when police departments across America are struggling with staffing shortages, recruitment challenges, retention issues, and the growing demands every day on officers.

Let me tell you, this \$1 billion could do a whole lot to support our local law enforcement. Mr. President, \$1 billion?

Well, it could fund nearly 2 years of full funding for the COPS Hiring Program to help communities hire and train and retain more officers. Not only that, it could fund 2 years of the COPS Hiring Program and fully fund 2 years of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program. Do you know what the Benefits Program is? It is to help support the families of the fallen officers and the officers who have been permanently disabled in the line of duty. It could fund 2 full years for the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program and, like I said, 2 years for the COPS Hiring Program.

There are a few other things that that \$1 billion could do that is a lot better use than a ballroom for our public safety; \$1 billion could also fund an entire year of the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants, which help our local law enforcement agencies combat violent crime, invest in crime prevention, support drug treatment programs, and strengthen public safety initiatives. These are actually investments that are keeping all of our communities safe everywhere—that are keeping all of you safe; that are keeping our officers safe.

That is why I am going to be doing a few things. I am going to be filing two amendments to the Republicans' reconciliation package that would redirect the \$1 billion boondoggle of a ballroom. It would take that funding away from the White House ballroom and put it toward the programs that support law enforcement and public safety in our communities.

Remember that. With 2 years here, 2 years here, and another year here for funding for law enforcement safety, for survivors, and benefits, it matters.

If my Republican colleagues truly support law enforcement the way they claim to, then they, too, should support my amendments.

I am doing this because I believe we must do everything we can to give our police the resources that they need to stay safe. They are the ones who put their lives on the line to protect us,