

were embracing. The mainstream media savaged the lab origin story. Social media sites censored it. And all of this happened because of the political affiliation of the people advancing this reasonable hypothesis.

You can only have a marketplace of ideas if ideas actually get out there, which is why censorship, as I have said, is antithetical to a free society. It is also important to note—and this is a critical, critical point—that having a free marketplace of ideas means allowing some ideas that might be wrong, that might seem offensive, that might seem silly. We are not talking about content that, for example, promotes violence but ideas that are provocative, debatable, or out of the mainstream. The alternative is allowing the government or some other entity to decide what information we see and what we believe.

It is important to remember that sometimes ideas that seem silly or wrong initially turn out to be right. More than one widely accepted scientific theory started out as a fringe position. A prevailing opinion may turn out to be wrong, and political or social power doesn't necessarily equal truth.

I hope that their abrupt reversal on COVID's possible origins makes media organizations and social media platforms think twice the next time they consider censoring a story. I hope it reminds them of the dangers of restricting the free flow of ideas and of their obligation to separate their politics from their jobs.

In a speech he delivered in 1967, Ronald Reagan, marveling at our government by the people, said this:

Perhaps you and I have lived too long with this miracle to properly be appreciative. Freedom is a fragile thing, and it's never more than one generation away from extinction. It is not ours by way of inheritance; it must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people.

I fear that long acquaintance with the blessings of liberty—with the blessings of a free press and freedom of speech and freedom of religion—has sometimes made us careless about the preservation of these freedoms. We are used to them, and we assume that they will always be with us. But, as Ronald Reagan pointed out, freedom has to be actively safeguarded, or it will be lost.

I have seen too many instances lately where our cherished First Amendment freedoms are subordinated to a political and social agenda, and I hope, I hope that the Wuhan story reminds us of the responsibility that each one of us has to safeguard these freedoms, lest they slip away from us.

BROADBAND

Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Commerce subcommittee of which I am the ranking member, the Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband, will hold a hearing on building resilient broadband networks. My hope is that this hearing will help

inform discussions of broadband funding in any infrastructure legislation.

I am particularly looking forward to hearing from Denny Law, the CEO of Golden West Telecommunications in South Dakota, who will speak on the challenges of deploying reliable and resilient broadband in rural areas.

The pandemic provided the most significant test to date of the resiliency of our broadband networks. Overnight, quite literally, our networks faced huge new demands. As the Nation locked down, demand for broadband shot up. Our phones and tablets and laptops became our main way of communicating with friends and family and, for many of us, our main way of doing our jobs. Video conferencing exploded—staff meetings, strategy meetings, virtual happy hours, telemedicine.

How did our networks stand up to the demand? Well, they exceeded expectations and vindicated the light-touch regulatory approach of the United States to broadband policy. While networks in Europe and elsewhere slowed streaming speeds in order to keep their networks up and running, U.S. networks maintained both their speed and quality. It was a real American success story.

The success of American networks during the pandemic was the result of sustained investment by U.S. telecommunications companies, which have made network reliability a priority. Congress should continue to encourage this kind of private investment and maintain a regulatory regime that allows companies to make the kinds of choices and investments that have resulted in strong and resilient U.S. networks.

Going forward, one of our priorities here in Congress has to be supporting the continued development of 5G. U.S. companies are already building out 5G networks, but there is more work to be done. We need to remove regulatory and permitting hurdles to deployment and ensure that companies have access to the spectrum they need to build strong networks.

Increasing spectrum availability will spur 5G deployments, and we need to build on previous efforts to make spectrum available, like my MOBILE NOW Act, legislation that we passed a few years ago. I have also repeatedly introduced legislation called the STREAMLINE Small Cell Deployment Act to address another key part of the 5G equation, and that is infrastructure.

Mr. President, 5G technology requires not just traditional cell phone towers but small antennas called “small cells” that can often be attached to existing infrastructure, like utility poles or buildings. The Federal Communications Commission, under Chairman Pai, modernized its regulations for the approval of small cells, but more work can be done to expedite small cell deployment.

The STREAMLINE Act focuses on updating current law to better reflect

emerging technology and to speed up permitting while respecting the role of State and local governments in making deployment decisions.

Adequate spectrum and the ability to efficiently deploy infrastructure are essential for building out strong U.S. 5G networks. But there is another key part of the equation, and that is having a sufficient workforce to meet the demands of 5G deployment and, later, 5G maintenance. That is why I have introduced the Telecommunications Skilled Workforce Act. My bill would help increase the number of workers enrolled in 5G training programs and identify ways to grow the telecommunications workforce to meet the demands of 5G.

As the resident of a rural State, expanding broadband access in rural areas has long been a priority of mine here in the U.S. Senate. We have made a lot of progress in recent years, but there is more work to be done.

I recently introduced the Rural Connectivity Advancement Program Act, along with Senators HASSAN, MORAN, and CORTEZ MASTO. Our legislation would set aside proceeds from spectrum auctions conducted by the FCC to build out broadband in unserved areas. It is essential that we expedite the deployment of fixed broadband in rural areas because this technology is necessary groundwork for 5G deployment. Without reliable broadband, rural areas will be excluded from access to 5G.

Reliable, fast internet is an essential element of our Nation's infrastructure. Like roads and bridges and railways and airports, strong internet networks keep our economy strong, and any infrastructure package should make an investment in broadband and 5G, as well as including regulatory relief, like that in my STREAMLINE Act, to expedite 5G deployment. However, we need to make sure that any Federal money is allocated in the most efficient manner possible and distributed responsibly, with coordination by expert Agencies like the Federal Communications Commission, to prevent waste.

We don't want another situation like what happened in the wake of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which provided more than \$7 billion to multiple Agencies for rural broadband deployment, a majority of which was wasted, resulting in just a fraction of the access that was promised.

I am looking forward to Tuesday's hearing, and I will continue to work to advance nationwide 5G deployment and ensure that our rural communities receive the full benefits of the 5G revolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1652

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the city of Chicago, which I am proud to represent, there is an organization called Life Span. This is an incredible group of people who dedicate their

lives to providing comprehensive services for the survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Every day they respond to horrifying cases of abuse. They help thousands of women and children access the support they need to address trauma and to rebuild their lives.

For example, Life Span recently assisted a woman after her teenage daughter was sexually assaulted by the woman's husband. Life Span was able to help the mother and daughter navigate the overwhelming challenges of pursuing justice against the abuser and offer support to the daughter throughout this horrible process.

When the mother pursued a divorce from the abuser, Life Span filed a petition and is representing the mother as she navigates issues of child support and allocation of custody.

The three Life Span staffers that the mother and daughter have interacted with all provided critical bilingual and bicultural support. They have provided this crucial service for this family during an incredibly traumatic experience. And all three of these staffers are funded by assistance provided through the Victims of Crime Act, or VOCA. Life Span told me that without VOCA funding, "none of these personnel . . . would be able to have done this job."

Congress passed the Victims of Crime Act in 1984 to establish the Crime Victims Fund. This fund provides grants to State victim compensation and assistance programs, which assist victims with expenses like medical bills, funeral expenses, and the loss of wages during recovery.

How often I have heard Members of Congress come to the floor and in committee speak about the plight of the victims of crime. This is an effort—an overt effort by Congress—to make sure that we are there when they desperately need us.

The fund also provides funds to thousands of victims service providers, like Life Span, across the Nation. These providers offer programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk driving.

The Crime Victims Fund doesn't receive a dime of taxpayer dollars. How about that? It is funded through criminal fines, penalties, forfeited bail bonds, and special assessments collected by the Federal Government.

Historically, most of the money in the fund comes from those criminal fines. But in recent years, deposits into the fund have dropped significantly, as the Justice Department began relying more on deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements.

Monetary penalties from these deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements are currently deposited into the general Treasury instead of this fund, and, as a result, this shift has had a devastating impact on the fund and the services available to crime victims in America.

That is why a bipartisan, bicameral coalition of Members of Congress

worked with the advocacy organizations on a fix to the VOCA law to sustain the Crime Victims Fund.

Our bill would stabilize the depleted fund by redirecting monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements to the victims and service providers that desperately need help.

The reduced deposits into the fund have already had a devastating impact. Victim assistance grants have been reduced by more than \$600 million in 2021, and more cuts are looming if we don't do something.

The executive director of Life Span in Chicago told me that VOCA funds 44 percent of the agency's services—about \$1.6 million annually. A substantial loss in VOCA funds would mean that they would have to cut back staff who provide legal services, affecting an estimated 880 clients.

Life Span is not alone. Advocates across the State of Illinois and across the country have reached out and shared what these cuts would mean for their agencies and the victims they serve.

The Center for Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, IL, noted:

We never want to be in a position where we are made to turn away people who need [our] specialized services and whole-hearted, dedicated care. Our teams are already stretched thin as they live the promise of our mission day in and day out. Fewer VOCA dollars means less staff and a lessened ability to help those who need to find safety, food, shelter, empowerment, freedom, and peace.

There is no time to waste. Every day that goes by, we miss an opportunity to help replenish this fund. In 2021, the fund has already missed out on approximately \$400 million in deposits. We are not even halfway through the year. Imagine how much more money the fund may lose if we don't do something.

That is why it is imperative that the Senate immediately pass this bill. The House already did it in March, with broad bipartisan support, and here in the Senate we have a bipartisan coalition of 56 Senators—36 Democrats and 20 Republicans—cosponsoring the legislation. We could send this bill to the President's desk today. We should have sent it to him weeks ago. Unfortunately, there is an objection that has prevented us from moving forward.

In a recent letter to Leader SCHUMER, victims' rights and law enforcement organizations said that, "The objectors are, in effect, holding victim services hostage in an ideological quest to overhaul the Appropriations process by eliminating budgetary offsets."

What a target to choose if you want to change the procedure of the committee—crime victims?

I agree with the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence and so many other groups. More than 1,700 that are begging us to do something and stop holding this critical legislation.

The passage of this legislation today would ensure that victims are able to

maintain these critical services. Don't we owe it to them after the promise of help to come through?

At this point, I would like to turn to my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI.

And I ask unanimous consent that Senators MURKOWSKI, TOOMEY, and I be able to complete our remarks prior to the vote.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge and thank my colleague and friend from Illinois for his leadership on this issue. He has outlined well the situation in front of us with regard to the status of the Crime Victims Fund.

Again, this is a nontaxpayer source of funding, which is designed to help the millions of victims of crimes—those who have been violated, those who are extraordinarily vulnerable. And we are at a place where, as he has indicated, we have a proposal here that could help address how this fund is replenished to, again, ensure that those who have been made victims can receive some level of compensation.

We are kind of stuck here this morning, which is extraordinarily unfortunate. Folks back home in Alaska are just starting their day, and they are looking with anticipation and hope and, quite honestly, prayers that today might be the day that they get good news on this.

Right now, I have about 30 organizations in Alaska, including our domestic violence shelters, our child advocacy centers, our victim advocacy organizations—they have all been notified that they are going to expect a 35-percent cut to their funding, effective the 1st of July, so just in a couple of weeks here.

And because of this broken VOCA deposit issue, this cut is set to affect their funds for not only this year but for next year going forward.

So think about it. You are the shelter in Kodiak, where I was just 6, 8 weeks or so ago. When you are told you have a 35-percent cut to your budget coming and you have a small community, where are you going to find those resources? Because, believe you, me, the individuals who still require those services are not staying at home and saying: Well, I guess we didn't have the services here on this big island of Kodiak; so I am just going to stay put.

The need is still there. In fact, the need is more enhanced or exacerbated than ever before. We have seen this as a follow-on from COVID. We have seen those aftereffects, that aftershock, when you have been in an isolated situation where you have been forced to kind of shelter in place, if you will, but your home is not a safe shelter. It is not a shelter in that sense of the word. But you don't have services. And so where do you go? You stay with your abuser. You stay in the situation that is unsound, unsafe, because you don't have anyplace to turn. So the need out there is considerable.

We had a situation last summer of devastating loss, with five village residents in different villages who had died in domestic violence murders over a course of 10 days. These are small villages where everybody knows everybody, and the loss of one person—an elder, a child, or a victim—is extraordinary. And so we looked at that, and we said: Well, that is exacerbated by COVID and what has happened.

But, no, this has been a situation for us long prior to COVID, in terms of, unfortunately, the levels that we see of domestic violence, sexual assault, the victimization that we see—so being there to provide funding for services to help prevent these deaths, the trauma that children experience when they are in the room, the murders that affect families for generations. There is a story in the news just today—a domestic situation, the husband and the wife. The husband took the wife's life and then took his own, and it was a 6-year-old with an iPad who notified the authorities.

I think about the reality of what a 35-percent cut means, what it means when you say your service providers are faced with \$6 million less in funding for victims services. The shelters are calling out to us for help. One domestic violence shelter in the State is facing the reality of laying off six full-time jobs within their organization. This is unacceptable.

I understand that there are concerns. Senator TOOMEY is going to speak to them. But this legislation doesn't change how Federal tax money is spent. It provides a technical fix by directing additional nontaxpayer dollars from criminal monetary penalties into this fund. So we are sitting at a point where the longer that Congress delays this fix, the larger the cuts that victims services in my State and all around the country will face.

This has been a hard time for us, and I think we recognize it, but for those who are trying to serve victims, for those who are trying to serve the most vulnerable at an exceptionally vulnerable time in their lives, it makes it 10 times harder. Our providers are exhausted, they are burned out, and now they are faced with massive cuts. We simply cannot fail them.

I would urge us to look past the politics on this. This is what these victims' advocates are saying: Please don't use us as the political lever here. So I join not only with Senator DURBIN but with the many in this body who would urge that we pass this technical fix to VOCA.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for her heartfelt remarks.

There are innocent people who are victims of domestic violence whose fate depends on what we do right here and now. This is an important budgetary debate that the Senator from Pennsylvania is raising. I ask, please don't use these people in this desperate situation as a pressure point. Let's try

to reconcile this on a rational basis without jeopardizing them.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, let me say I think I agree with 98, 99 percent of what I just heard from my colleagues.

In the 11 years I have been in the Senate, I have lost track of how many rape crisis centers and how many child advocacy centers I have visited. They have expanded the number, fortunately, because they have gotten additional resources from Congress. They do some of the most important work I know of—incredibly painful work—in helping a child through an appalling, traumatic experience when there is a law enforcement need to get information that can further traumatize a child. I mean, the work these folks do is amazing, it is essential, and the Senator from Alaska is exactly right in that there is a real need here.

The good news is that there is a real, very clear, and easy path forward here. The legislation that the Senator from Illinois is proposing creates a new source of money for the Crime Victims Fund. It is a new category, it is substantial, and it is going to be new resources for the advocates for crime victims to better be able to continue to do their very, very important work, and I fully support that.

So where do we disagree? Here is where we disagree: The legislation does require a lot of money—new money—to go into the Crime Victims Fund. The Senator from Illinois is exactly correct in that it is not taxpayer money; it is money from the settlements for criminal and civil penalties. I fully support that. What their legislation doesn't do, however, is require a dime of that money to actually get to the advocates of crime. It is very nice to put a lot of money into an account that has a name on it that is the Crime Victims Fund. That is very nice, and I support that, but I would like to take one more step and make sure the money actually gets to the victims of crime and their advocates.

Now, there is a little bit of budgetary information that explains why, if we don't adopt my approach here, this money will not get to the victims of crime and their advocates. You see, the appropriations process, the spending process around here, always operates under some limit. It could be a statutory limit or a limit passed by a budget resolution, but there is a limit. There is no limit as to how much people want to spend around here, but there is a limit as to how much they actually can.

We have a very perverse budgetary rule, and that rule says that, in any given year, if there is money in this Crime Victims Fund—mind you, not tax dollars, but if there is money in it—and Congress doesn't give it to the crime victims as it is supposed to, you can pretend that it is a savings, and it allows you to spend more than you would otherwise be able to spend on any number of other things, on anything—tanks, buildings, roads, whatever. That is the dynamic. That is what happens here. It actually creates an incentive, however perverse this is, for Congress not to allocate this money to the victims of crime and to their advocates. By not doing so, they get to claim a savings which isn't real—but that is the way the budget rules work—and spend that money elsewhere.

Now, you might say: Well, who would do a thing like that? Oh. Ha. Well, it used to happen all the time. In 2014, there was \$9 billion available in the Crime Victims Fund, but in order to spend more money elsewhere, less than \$1 billion was actually allocated to victims of crime and their advocates, so they got \$8 billion of difference that they could spend on whatever else they wanted, and they did. In 2013, it was the same story.

This was going on routinely until 2015 when I and some of my colleagues said: Wait a minute. This isn't right. This money is supposed to be going to crime victims, and it is not.

That is the first and most objectionable problem. It is also dishonest because there is no savings of taxpayer money here; this is just not giving crime victims the money from criminals that they are supposed to get. It is outrageous.

For a while, we got some cooperation, and they did less of this. In other words, more of the money that was supposed to go to crime victims for a while did, in fact, go there. But I am very concerned—and I have been concerned since 2015—that, at any point in time, we will go back to this process. So I introduced legislation called the Fairness for Crime Victims Act. I introduced it in 2015. What it does is it just requires that the money going into the fund actually go to the victims of crime and their advocates, and there are various mechanisms for doing it. The bill was reported out of the Senate Budget Committee in 2015, and it was unanimously adopted by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

I have been working as closely as I can with the appropriators to address this so that we will actually send to crime victims the money that is supposed to go to them. Since 2000, over \$82 billion of money has not been allocated to crime victims, as it should have been, precisely because of this mechanism.

Some might say: Well, hasn't it gotten better? Yes. The answer is that it has. But how do I know it is going to get worse? How do I know we are going to go right back to this? I will tell you

how I know. All I have to do is read the President's budget.

President Biden's budget, if you look at table S-8, explicitly calls for withholding money from victims of crime and advocates for those victims from the Crime Victims Fund and also the Children's Health Insurance Program so as to spend more money in other areas. It is right here: "changes in mandatory program offsets: \$26 billion." It says the limitation enacted will come from the Crime Victims Fund program and cancellations in the Children's Health Insurance Program. This is not like wild speculation; this is President Biden's budget, saying: Oh, here is what I want to spend, and part of how I will spend it—part of how we will get there—is by withholding money that should be going to victims of crime.

So I am fully in support of this new allocation of money into the account, but money in the account doesn't solve the problem. We need one more step, that is all—the step that says we are actually going to send it to victims of crime instead of whatever spending people in this town decide they prefer. That is what this is about. That is what the difference is.

We have developed a process. We have worked with people on both sides of the aisle, and we have passed legislation in committee to do it. We want to simply require the money that is meant for victims of crime and their advocates to get to them, and we are being told it won't all get to them under the status quo.

There is a simple solution here. There is a simple path forward. I think there is a genuine, sincere agreement, among everybody who has spoken, about the need for this service. All I am asking is that we actually have a mechanism to get them the money rather than to do what we all know is coming: Pretend they are going to get all of this money when, in fact, it is going to be diverted to other purposes.

Therefore, I ask that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I am disappointed that the Senator from Pennsylvania is adamant in his position, even though we are dealing with victims of crime, victims of domestic violence, and victims of child abuse. Like Illinois, Pennsylvania has experienced a nearly 70-percent cut in VOCA funding since 2018, and more cuts are on the horizon because of his strategy.

Here is what it boils down to: If you listen carefully to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, he is not suggesting that the money is being

spent for other purposes but is suggesting that it could be. In fact, there is a conscious effort by the Appropriations subcommittee to make sure, if all of the money is not spent in 1 year, that enough will be maintained to stabilize the fund for future years. That is thoughtful, and that is what we like to hear, but we are in a desperate moment now wherein we need the money and need it at this moment.

I understand my colleague's concern about the scorekeeping in the budget. It is an important issue, even though it is esoteric. But to do it in relation to the Crime Victims Fund seems entirely misplaced. While this adjustment does not, in fact, transfer money from the fund to other priorities, it is just a budgeting gimmick that he is suggesting.

This is not the right place or time to do this when thousands of people across the United States are in desperate need of shelter to get out of an abusive home; of help for their children who have witnessed murders; and of dealing with court proceedings that may be unintelligible to the average person to try to protect their families and themselves. To think that we are engaged in this high-level budget debate at this moment at their expense is just not right.

I urge my colleague to withdraw his amendment and allow the legislation to proceed. We can debate the budget within the budget resolution and the appropriations process but not at the expense of crime victims across America. If he will not withdraw his amendment, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I will just say briefly that, clearly and certainly, this is not a scorekeeping debate, and this is not about budgets. This is about whether victims of crime and their advocates will actually get the money that we say they are going to get. It is not about what could be; it is about what has been. This money was routinely raided for other purposes until we brought a stop to it recently, and it is about what will be because the Biden administration is telling us it intends to do this.

In order to ensure that crime victims and their advocates actually get the money that we say they are going to get, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VOTE ON BEAUDREAU NOMINATION

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Beaudreau nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Lankford	Smith
Cassidy	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lujan	Tester
Coons	Lummis	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	Marshall	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Fischer	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Ossoff	
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—9

Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Hawley	Paul	Sullivan
Kennedy	Sanders	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Cramer	Peters
--------	--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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. 157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.