

Sanders	Sinema	Van Hollen
Sasse	Smith	Warner
Schatz	Stabenow	Warren
Schumer	Sullivan	Whitehouse
Scott (FL)	Tester	Wicker
Scott (SC)	Thune	Wyden
Shaheen	Tillis	Young
Shelby	Toomey	

NAYS—5

Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Hawley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Johnson	Rounds	Warnock
---------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 312, Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for a term expiring December 31, 2026. (Reappointment).

Charles E. Schumer, Chris Van Hollen, John Hickenlooper, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Christopher Murphy, Martin Heinrich, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet, Ron Wyden, Raphael Warnock.

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

Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for a term expiring December 31, 2026 (Reappointment), 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 36, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 464 Ex.)

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cornyn
Bennet	Capito	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Cardin	Duckworth
Blunt	Carper	Durbin
Booker	Casey	Feinstein
Brown	Collins	Gillibrand
Burr	Coons	Graham

Grassley	Menendez	Schumer
Hassan	Merkley	Shaheen
Heinrich	Murkowski	Sinema
Hickenlooper	Murphy	Smith
Hirono	Murray	Stabenow
Johnson	Ossoff	Tester
Kaine	Padilla	Toomey
Kelly	Peters	Van Hollen
King	Portman	Warner
Klobuchar	Reed	Warren
Leahy	Romney	Whitehouse
Lujan	Rosen	Wyden
Manchin	Sanders	
Markey	Schatz	

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Hawley	Risch
Blackburn	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Tuberville
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Cramer	Rounds	Warnock
--------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

BUILD BACK BETTER AGENDA

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, over the last year, America's economy has faltered and the American people are struggling. Families have been confronted with rising inflation, which is essentially a tax on their paycheck every time they go to the grocery store, every time they fill up the gas tank, and every time they go out and buy clothing or essentials for their family. America's small businesses, after suffering from the COVID shutdowns last year, are facing supply chain issues and labor shortages.

It is no surprise that the majority of Americans believe our economy is in poor health and they fear things are getting worse.

And the Democrats' answer to the growing economic anxiety?

Double down on Big Government policies.

President Biden and Democratic leaders are pursuing a \$2 trillion tax-and-spending spree that offers Americans more debt, more government, more taxes, and more inflation. They think that government is the answer to all our problems. This \$2 trillion bill is an attempt to fundamentally transform from an opportunity-driven society built on the American dream to a dependency-driven society powered by the Federal Government.

The Biden administration put a lot of work into trying to market their plan—their tax-and-spending spree. They claim it will bring down costs and help the middle class.

But what are their top priorities?

Tax cuts for their wealthy donors in New York and California and other blue States that have State and local taxes, giving them a deduction on those taxes imposed by State legislatures and Democratic Governors. They want to raise the SALT tax from

\$10,000 to \$72,000, a move that mainly benefits wealthy Americans.

Ninety-seven percent of the tax cuts would go to Americans making more than \$100,000 a year. Millionaires would get a \$23,000 tax cut. And, as Democrats' rich donors get richer, middle-class families get poorer.

Although Democrats are touting their childcare cost entitlement program, the devil really is in the details. While a single parent stands to receive thousands of dollars in childcare payments, married parents at the same income level would receive no assistance at all.

Once the regulations in the bill are factored in, the cost of unsubsidized childcare will skyrocket. Millions of middle-class families won't get subsidies because they make more than \$67,000 a year, and they will be on the hook for the rising costs of healthcare that their proposal will create. According to one analysis, parents making more than \$67,000 a year can see their childcare costs skyrocket by more than \$13,000 in the first year of the program.

How many middle-class families can afford that?

Democrats also want to meddle with our Nation's economy under the guise of promising that they just want to combat climate change.

The Democrats are proposing a new electric vehicle tax credit, which would subsidize high-cost electric vehicles for affluent Americans who can already afford them. To make matters worse, Democrats are offering a second tax credit only if you purchase an electric vehicle constructed by their Big Labor union allies. That's right, a car built in a non-union shop doesn't get the tax subsidy; a car built in a union shop does.

Look, I support clean energy, and I have got a record of supporting it here in the Senate and back in my time at the House of Representatives in North Carolina, but I don't support having the Federal Government unfairly pick winners and losers in the private markets.

Democrats also hope to create a Civilian Climate Corps to give young liberal activists paid jobs—jobs paid by the American taxpayer. That is an outrageous concept, considering that we already have a record number of jobs that private employers can't fill. The government is going to create jobs to compete with these businesses that are desperately looking for labor.

But this isn't about jobs. It is about the socialist wing of the Democratic Party having their own army of government-funded social justice warriors. It is no surprise that the Civilian Climate Corps is championed by the radical and anti-Semitic Sunrise Movement. Their activists have protested climate policy in the past by blocking traffic during rush hour and chaining themselves to boats. They also frequently go to homes of elected officials—including me, just back in August—to trespass on property and to

harass and intimidate us into supporting their extreme socialist demands. These activists would be at the top of the list to get taxpayer-funded jobs in the Civilian Climate Corps. And by their own admission, progressives see it expanding well beyond the scope of climate change to anything the left considers social justice.

These are just some of the provisions in the Democrats' Big Government spending spree.

The next logical question is, how do they intend to pay for it?

They will do it by raising taxes, shaking down the middle class, and adding more to our debt.

They have proposed doubling the size of the IRS. The IRS already has 83- to 85,000 people. They are proposing hiring another 80,000 people, doubling the size of the IRS. Democrats want to expand the size of the IRS in order to monitor bank accounts of hard-working Americans in the hopes of squeezing more money out of them.

While millionaires and billionaires have tax lawyers and accountants to handle an IRS inquiry, hard-working, middle-class Americans don't. And there is nothing more chilling than getting a call from the IRS or a letter saying that you are about to be audited or "We just have a few questions for you." They are going to have to take on the IRS themselves when they get accused of not paying enough.

My friend, the Senator from West Virginia, has spoken out against the plan to double the size and scope of the IRS, and I agree with him. He has also warned Democrats on the dangers of creating massive new spending programs at the same time that Social Security and Medicare are on the verge of bankruptcy.

Focus group-approved slogans and new promises the government can't keep might be good politics for Democrats, but it is horrible policy for Americans. Americans can't afford more inflation, more taxes, more childcare costs, and more government. The Democrats' tax-and-spending spree won't Build Back Better; it will only make life harder for Americans already struggling to get by.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my friend from North Carolina expressed his point of view. I would like to express mine.

Do you think that those who are making incomes in America in the highest levels should pay their fair share of taxes?

I do.

Do you think that those who get the tax break from the Trump tax plan of 4 years ago, which added \$2 trillion to our deficit, should pay more in taxes?

I do.

Do you think we should help families who are struggling with the cost of living to defray those costs, for example, for daycare?

Well, I do; and I can tell you from my family experience, so do my kids.

What do you think about the possibility of starting kids in school, a possibility at 3 years of age or 4 years of age, if that is a parent's choice? Is that a good idea?

I think it is. And so do educators.

If kids get a flying start at education, they have a much more likely chance to succeed and to graduate and to progress to a point in life where they are making a living and more. That is part of it.

So do you support, as I do, cutting the rate of childhood poverty in the United States in half?

I think we ought to at least do that, maybe even more.

If your answer was yes to these questions, what I describe is the mechanism which we have taken into the reconciliation process. It is a long Senate word for a bill that we are going to consider in about 10 days to 2 weeks. What we are trying to do is to alleviate and reduce the costs that families face.

It is a legitimate question raised by the Senator from North Carolina: Well, who is going to pay for this?

It is paid for by people in the highest income categories. If you are making less than \$400,000 a year, your taxes will not go up. That is what Biden said in the campaign, and that is the standard we have been governed by. For those who are not paying their fair share of taxes, they may have to.

And I am not nervous about putting more auditors in the IRS to look at how much taxes people pay because I know what the numbers are. Working families, particularly those who have withholding, are paying their fair share within a few percentage points; but at the highest income level, these folks are finding ways to avoid their taxes. So working families are paying their fair share and the wealthiest Americans—some of them—are not. So these new IRS auditors will make sure everybody pays their fair share.

How is that for a starting point?

You shouldn't be afraid of hiring more cops on the beat if you are not violating the law, and that, I think, is a reality that most of us realize in life.

In terms of other payments, corporations that have profited, declaring millions of dollars in booked gains and profits, don't you think they ought to pay something?

I sure do. There ought to be a minimum tax that these corporations pay if they are profitable beyond certain million-dollar ranges. That is reasonable to me. Average Americans are paying their fair share. Small businesses are paying their fair share, but some of these folks have found ways to avoid these taxes. I think we ought to look into that.

What is the goal here?

The goal here isn't socialism, however the Senator wishes to define it. The goal is to have the government give families—working families in particular—a helping hand by reducing the cost of daycare, by making more education available, by providing a

childcare tax credit to some of these families, by providing home health services for their parents and grandparents who need a helping hand.

Now there is a very popular idea, because a lot of folks who are raising small children also have to worry about grandma and grandpa and how they are doing. Are they in place where they feel safe and secure and taken care of? Or if they can stay home, that is even better. That is what this bill does.

The reconciliation bill provides additional assistance for those people who want to live in the independence of their home to have home healthcare services. I can't think of a better income than if that is part of what they do, and it involves government getting into the picture. For some of my colleagues, that is reprehensible—that is just pure socialism.

But I might remind those who are following my remarks, when Social Security was created to give fiscal solvency to families once retired, it was branded as communism or socialism. Then came the idea of Medicare, health insurance for seniors in America in the 1960s.

Do you know what the American Medical Association called it?

Socialized medicine or socialism. Every time the government steps in to solve a problem which the economy can't solve by itself, the critics will always say it is socialism; it is too much government.

Well, we have got to take care that the amount of government we give to this country is adequate to meet the needs of these families who are struggling with the cost of living today. I believe these are steps in the right direction.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. How does going zero to 60 in 3 seconds sound to you? How about traversing through terrains of unimaginable challenge? Or having an entire kitchen stowed away in your car wherever you go?

These are just a few of the innovations being pioneered by the minds of Rivian, the company that is leading the electric vehicle revolution in my home State of Illinois.

The company recently released the R1T, which "Motor Trend" has described as "the most remarkable pickup we've ever driven."

That truck won't be built in China and it won't be built in Europe. It will be built in the heart of Illinois, in a town aptly named Normal.

The story of Normal is a story of revival and opportunity. Six years ago, a local Mitsubishi plant shut down, leaving thousands of workers unemployed. Today, that once shuttered factory has sprung back to life, manufacturing the first mass-produced electric truck in America. And even better, lawmakers in Illinois are now positioning Normal to continue leading the industry.

Earlier this year, the State of Illinois provided more than \$7 million to a

community college in Normal, IL, to launch a program training electric vehicle technicians. Graduates of that program will be fully prepared to land good-paying jobs at Rivian or one of the other countries that are suppliers in the electric vehicle industry.

Why is this good news not just for Illinois?

Each additional Rivian truck on the road will help confront the threat of climate change.

Transportation accounts for more than a fourth—let me repeat that—more than a fourth of total greenhouse gas emissions. If every vehicle on the road were electric, we would probably be on our way to a green future. What is happening in Normal proves that investing in sustainable innovation drives sustainable economic growth for everyone, and it is a look into the future that Democrats envision under the Build Back Better agenda, a future in which every American can gain the skills they need to be competitive in the 21st century and American innovators have the incentives they need to pioneer new technology.

CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

Madam President, the story of Normal's revival will be in the front of my mind tomorrow as I depart for the United Nations' 26th Conference of Parties climate summit in Glasgow. This gathering is an opportunity for the United States and our allies to come together for the first time in years around a shared goal: taking bold steps to address the climate crisis.

One of those steps is the Build Back Better World Partnership, an initiative that will bring together the world's major democracies to support sustainable development in low- and middle-income countries. This partnership will help counter China's rising influence in the world by equipping developing nations with the resources they need to grow their economies without relying on fossil fuels.

On the note of China, Xi Jinping's absence from the COP conference in Scotland should be an alarm bell for the international community. China is the world's biggest producer of greenhouse gas emissions. They emit more than every other developed nation combined. And the country is headed in the wrong direction. Over the next decade, the Chinese Communist Party plans to build dozens of new coal plants throughout the country.

China's leaders insist they are committed to addressing climate change, but the commitments they have made are inadequate. Carbon neutrality by 2060 is too little, too late.

Fortunately, over the past 2 weeks, President Biden has shown the world that if you want a partner in saving the planet, follow America's lead; work together, across borders. Already, the strategy is working. Yesterday, a coalition of more than 40 countries, including the United Kingdom, Poland, and Vietnam, announced they will phase out coal power over the next two decades.

There is no doubt that the international commitments we agreed to in Glasgow are crucial to combating climate change, but the question I hope to ask our foreign allies is, What will you do the moment you return home?

Climate change isn't a faraway threat. The extreme weather events over the past year have shown it is already here. Over the summer, one storm alone, Hurricane Ida, caused \$100 billion in damages—one storm, \$100 billion—twice as much as Democrats have proposed to spend each year to reduce the harm of climate change. And these costs are only getting worse.

Last month, our Nation's intelligence community released a landmark national intelligence estimate on climate change. The report illustrated how a changing climate is one of the biggest threats to national security and economic stability. It warns that over the next two decades, climate change will increase global poverty and instability and could lead to conflicts and wars and dwindling supplies of food, water, and habitable land. Hundreds of millions of people are likely to be displaced by 2050.

Among the 11 nations at greatest risk of collapse from climate stress, by this estimate, 5 are in our own hemisphere, and 2 possess nuclear weapons in other places in the world.

These humanitarian crises could also give rise to anti-democratic populists. We have seen these same politicians rising in France and Germany, peddling fear and xenophobia after an influx of refugees.

The NIE warns us that "current policies and pledges are insufficient" to meet the goals of the Paris climate conference. That is why the question for anyone in a position of power is: What are you doing about climate change today?

Well, between the bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Build Back Better package, Democrats are proposing roughly \$900 billion toward the climate change threat. This would be the largest investment in climate action in history.

These proposals will accelerate our Nation's transition to a clean energy future, upgrade our power grid and the rest of our physical infrastructure, and establish America as a global leader. This could pave the way for every State to attract job creators like Rivian or Lion Electric in Joliet, IL, which announced an electric vehicle plant earlier this year.

I heard the previous speaker criticize the idea of a Climate Corps. It is modeled, really, after the Conservation Corps of the New Deal that goes back at least 80 years. I can't understand why we would criticize an effort to put young people to work so that they would have jobs that would improve the world we live in, the Nation we live in, and make a decent income in the process. For many of the kids, this will be their first chance to really understand what life should be like. Why

wouldn't we want that? I don't know about North Carolina, but in Illinois, we can certainly use their good, hard work.

I got a call yesterday from the president of the Cook County board, Toni Preckwinkle, who said we have forest preserves all over Cook County—and they are a beauty to behold—but they need basic work. If the Climate Corps members can do it, we want to hire them locally and engage them in that process and give them a good life experience.

What could be wrong with that? That these kids, who might otherwise not have a chance at a job, get a decent job and get rewarded for their good work, with a paycheck when it is all over. For many of us, that was a formative experience we are never going to forget. There are a lot of kids who deserve it, and there is a lot to be done by this effort.

I want to say at this point, as I close—I see other Members on the floor—that we cannot wait when it comes to climate change. There are people who want us to be at the back of the pack, for America to come in second, when we are talking about changing the climate for the better in this Nation and around the world. I think American leadership is needed. It has always been an inspiration to many other countries and can be again today.

I thank the President for his leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to oppose the Biden administration's agenda, which is anti-American energy. That is what we are facing in the country today.

President Biden just got back from a trip to Europe. He went there to attend the United Nations' Climate Change Conference. I noted the previous speaker said he was jetting off to there this weekend, heading to Scotland.

He also made reference to the Climate Corps, which is part of President Biden's agenda. He said: Who could criticize it? Well, I am happy to criticize it. That legislation is asking to hire 1 million Americans—1 million Americans—to protest, to wage war on oil, gas, and coal jobs, energy jobs in this country. This is at a time when we have 10 million open jobs in this country and "Help Wanted" signs all around my State and the States of all the Members on the floor today. Yet the Biden administration's answer to rising energy costs is to hire a million people to protest American energy and American jobs as the prices continue to go up and inflation continues to ravage the paychecks of the American people.

So, yes, they are flying off to Scotland, so many of the Members on that side of the aisle. The Democrats have joined John Kerry. NANCY PELOSI is heading there. Many in this body from the Democratic side of the aisle will be

joining them, heading there soon. Well, back at home, people are struggling with inflation that is at a 30-year high as a result of the policies of this administration.

One in five American families has cut their spending this year. Why? To pay for the energy bills that are being brought forth by the policies of this administration, which is anti-American energy.

The cost of a gallon of gasoline has gone up a dollar a gallon since President Biden has come into office. It means the cost of everything else is up as well because higher prices aren't just prices you pay at the pump; they are prices you pay at the grocery store.

At the same time, the cost of natural gas has doubled, and it is now at a point where it is at the highest price it has been in 7 years. Half of the homes in this country are heated with natural gas. Winter is coming, and it is going to get worse.

This leaves less money in people's paychecks. They pay so much to fill up, so much to heat their home, there is less money for their family. That is why the New York Times' front page story last week talked about Thanksgiving and the cost of walloping the wallet of American families. People are soon going to have to decide whether they will have the money to heat or to eat.

That is what we are facing as a result of the agenda of this administration. So what is the President doing about it? Well, he went to Europe, and, astonishingly, he apologized to the world for America. He made unrealistic pledges to cut emissions. He said he was going to cut 1 billion tons in the next 8 years and went so far as to say the United States would reach zero emissions in 28 years. That would be a most dramatic change in the history of the American economy. It is a reckless promise. Yet the President did get the applause from the global elite. Well, the American people aren't applauding. The American people are wringing their hands today.

The average European doesn't have reason to applaud either. Joe Biden left out a few important facts in his speech in Europe. He forgot to mention he had given Vladimir Putin the green light to build the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline to Germany. He failed to mention that Putin can now hold half of Europe hostage with natural gas. He failed to mention that today—today—in America, we are using more oil from Vladimir Putin's Russia than we are from the State of Alaska.

Listen to this, Senators from Alaska, who follow these figures every day. The President failed to mention that he is actually asking Vladimir Putin to sell more oil to the United States, pump more oil, because he doesn't want it produced in the United States, and he is willing to kill American jobs in the process.

Well, due to the policies of this President and his radical attacks on Amer-

ican energy, Vladimir Putin has hit the jackpot, and he is going to cash in for years to come.

Working families all across Europe know better. They have seen this movie before. That is why, this morning, I have released a report. I have it here. It is called "Europe's Energy Crisis: A Warning to America." The sub-headline: "Democrat plans to mimic Europe's energy and climate policies will lead to sky-high prices, less reliability, and shortages."

That is where President Biden is leading the United States. It is no wonder that the national poll released last Sunday by NBC News showed only 22 percent of the American people believe the country is heading in the right direction under the Democrats and under this President.

This report details how Europe has tried many of the environmental policies that the Democrats are proposing and want to pass today. The consequences have been devastating to families there and will be devastating to families here.

Because of the policies, Europeans are paying some of the highest energy prices in the world, and much of the energy they use is undependable and unreliable.

Prices are really high in America right now, but they are even higher in Europe. This spring, gasoline prices were at least 65 percent higher in Europe than they were in America. From 2005 to 2020, the cost of energy in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom increased between 28 and 71 percent, depending on the country.

European industries pay at least 90 percent more for natural gas than American industries do. This is a major competitive advantage for American companies. Yet President Biden is doing everything he can to throw our competitive advantage away.

This President is trying to pass legislation that will make it worse here at home. The largest piece of the President's spending bill is over \$500 billion for the heavily criticized Green New Deal. It includes high payoffs for electric vehicle owners and an army of full-time climate activists that I just talked about. It includes higher taxes on American energy and higher prices for consumers. It would ban exploration for oil and gas off our shores and in the Arctic. All of these ideas will raise costs additionally for working families.

My new report shows that Europe already tried the Democrats' environmental policies. The results were disastrous for Europe. They will be disastrous here.

I urge my Democratic colleagues: Don't make this same mistake. Don't subject the people of the United States to the same punishing pain of the high cost of energy that people are sustaining right now in Europe. Stop raising prices. Stop making life harder. The American people and American

producers and American families deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, when we looked at the news this morning and we saw the evening news last night, when we tune in to the cable channels and we hear the radio, we see the astounding news of the voices of the voters on Tuesday of this week not just in Virginia and not just in New Jersey, but in the State of New York and throughout the Midwest and on over to the west coast.

The American people sent a strong message of disapproval to the Biden administration this week, and I hope our Democratic friends and the Biden administration will heed the message of the voters.

I normally don't bring the New York Times to the floor and quote it with approval, but it says here in the New York Times this morning: "Bruised at Polls, Democrats Look at Their Missteps."

I hope that is true. I hope our Democratic colleagues and our friends in the Biden administration are looking at their missteps because they are many and they have been harmful.

The Washington Post this morning, November 4, said: "A sharp turn looms in Virginia."

Yes, Virginia went from the three constitutional statewide offices all being held by Democrats to a Republican sweep, not only there but in the State General Assembly.

But then I see this other headline at the top of the page: "Democrats race ahead on fiscal proposals."

Presumably, our Democrat friends are not hearing the message that the American people in State after State after State sent just Tuesday of this week.

Even vastly underfunded GOP candidates, like the candidate for Governor in New Jersey, came within a hair's breadth of being elected. Vastly underfunded GOP candidates for legislative positions actually prevailed over candidates with millions and millions of dollars on the Democratic side.

The American people have sent this administration and this Democratic majority in the House and this tiny Democratic majority in the Senate a very unmistakable message. They are rejecting the malaise that we are under. And the Biden administration must understand that this election was the direct result of the President's failed agenda.

By all measures, our economy should be roaring by now. We are coming out of the pandemic. We should be back to the good news of February 2020, the month before the pandemic hit. The Trump and Republican tax cuts were in place. The unemployment rate was an astoundingly low 3.6 percent, something that we were told in our economics classes was impossible in the United

States of America. When I was taking kiddy economics, they said it couldn't go below 4 percent.

The unemployment rate in February of 2020 was 3.6 percent. Employment was up among women. Employment was up among minorities. Employment was up among veterans. Our economy was roaring.

And then the pandemic came, and we acted in a bipartisan way. But we are coming out of the pandemic now, and the administration acts as if we need a huge dose—\$4 trillion, \$5 trillion worth—of socialism.

The pandemic is in full retreat, and from the beginning of the administration this year, the Biden administration blew it. On day one, the President canceled the Keystone XL Pipeline, killing thousands of jobs, and almost in the same breath, he told the Russians to go ahead with their pipeline.

I mean, can Americans even grasp that?

I think they sent a message Tuesday about that sort of thing.

With the stroke of a pen, the President declared war on American energy. The result has been that fuel has become scarce, and, of course, because of its scarcity, it has become more expensive. After 4 years of relief under the last administration, U.S. energy producers are once again looking down the barrel of a hostile EPA.

This is a self-inflicted energy crisis. Coal and nuclear plants are shutting down as reliable natural resources are taken off the table, replaced by its administration's fantasy dream of green-only energy.

Taxpayers are being told to stomach higher gas prices while, at the same time, being asked to pay billions of dollars to subsidize wind, solar, and electric vehicles. There is a place for that, but they are all three unreliable. And, predictably, gas prices have soared.

Instead of reevaluating his own policies, it seems that the President is attempting to double down on them, and he has even gone to questionable governments across the sea in the Middle East asking them to produce more oil because we won't do that in the United States. It makes no sense at all.

Perhaps this administration should listen to the election results and hear the voices of the people from Tuesday.

But the economic damage is hardly limited to energy. Inflation spurred on by the administration's reckless spending is burning a hole in the wallets of Americans, and we simply can't get around it. The Consumer Price Index shows one thing, that prices have gone up 5.4 percent over the last 12 months.

Well, I will tell you, Madam President, I was speaking to a manufacturer from my home State of Mississippi just yesterday, and he said that figure is understated quite a bit. He said his costs have gone up around 20 percent in being able to manufacture goods for American people and hire Americans and hire Mississippians.

Meanwhile, the gears of our economy are slowing down, causing fears of stagflation, something we have not seen since the 1970s.

And I do want to agree with my friend from Wyoming about the gentleman from Illinois' point about the Climate Corps. This manufacturer in Mississippi said he has got 2,000 positions that need to be filled. Perhaps some of these people that the Senator from Illinois would like to employ in the Climate Corps can come to manufacturers like ours in Mississippi and take a good-paying job manufacturing things for Americans that we can sell in our country and all around the world.

GDP growth just slowed to 2 percent. Employers still cannot find enough workers, just like the manufacturer from Mississippi told me yesterday. Our supply chain is jammed up with endless delays, causing concern.

But, to me, one of the most serious and dangerous policies of this administration is the Biden administration's unprecedented and unconstitutional vaccine mandate on two-thirds of the private-sector workforce. We are being told that every employer with over 100 employees must comply with a Washington-mandated and unconstitutional vaccine mandate.

This is exactly what the President said 11 months ago he didn't want to do. Joe Biden was asked in December of 2020: Should vaccines be mandated?

And he said: "No, I don't think they should be mandatory."

The President was right when he said that to the press, and he is 180 degrees wrong today and taking his cues from the most radical advisers that he has. As a result, the American people, on Tuesday, have said: Enough.

Now, I know a little about American workers. I know a little about American service men and women. I was one. We have been raised in a free country, in a free land, and we are not accustomed to being told by Washington, DC, by the Chief Executive of the United States of America, what we must put in our bodies.

And I can tell you, this is a looming economic crisis for this country. Millions and millions of hard-working American taxpayers are going to be forced to leave their jobs because they will refuse, as free Americans, to be told that they must take a vaccine that they do not feel good about.

Madam President, the Chief Executive of our land has grossly miscalculated the American people on this issue, and a looming economic crisis because of a lack of workers and mass layoffs and mass firings is about to occur.

The Biden administration should pause, do what the New York Times said this morning and, as they are examining their bruises, look at their missteps because they are many and they are hurting the American economy.

I would urge the Biden administration to let these tax cuts stay in place,

to let these soft-touch regulations stay in place, to pause and listen to the clear voices of the American people as they voted in strong numbers this past Tuesday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATION OF SAULE OMAROVA

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, on Tuesday, the President of the United States officially nominated Cornell Law Professor Saule Omarova to be America's top banking regulator. She would be the Comptroller of the Currency. The Comptroller of the Currency is the lead regulator of all of our national banks.

Now, twice before today, I addressed her nomination on the Senate floor—her then-prospective nomination. Now she has been nominated. And I noted that Professor Omarova describes her own views as radical. For example, Professor Omarova has written that she wants to "radically redefine the role of a central bank." She has also stated that her proposals represent a "radical departure from what we've been conditioned to view as the 'normal' state of play."

Madam President, probably the only thing I can think of in all of her writing that I agree with is her characterization of her views as radical. Specifically, let me be clear about what is radical about her whole approach. It is radical because she has a clear and obvious aversion to democratic capitalism itself, in other words, the central organizing principle of American society that we would be a free society and that that would include economic freedom and economic decisions can be made by free men and women pursuing their own understanding of their self-interest.

Instead of that, she has a clear preference for an administrative approach where decisions are not made by free men and women engaging voluntarily in exchanges but, rather, by technocrats who are deemed to know what is better for us than we could possibly know for ourselves.

The fact is, in my 11 years in Congress, I don't think I have seen a more radical nominee for any regulatory spot in our entire Federal Government. And I know that is a bold statement, but I stand by that.

Now, last month, I spoke about Professor Omarova's radical plan to have the Federal Government set prices throughout our economy. She wants the government to decide what people should pay for food and gas and wages and home prices and many other things. That is pretty radical.

Today, I want to focus on her radical proposal to nationalize the U.S. banking system. So let me first start by observing that Professor Omarova's plan to nationalize our financial system wasn't something that she wrote decades ago or even years ago. In fact, I believe she wrote it last year, and it was published in the Vanderbilt Law Review just last month.

Professor Omarova's radical plan to nationalize financial services was published just last month, and the paper was titled "The People's Ledger: How to Democratize Money and Finance the Economy."

"The People's Ledger." Not the people's Republic, mind you, but "The People's Ledger." That is her title for the paper.

In the paper, Professor Omarova outlined her plan to "effectively end banking as we know it."

Now, that is a very strong statement. So what exactly does she mean by this? Well, she lays this out for us.

In her proposal, the Federal Government would become the retail bank for every American. That is right. It has essentially two features. She would have the creation of retail deposit accounts at the Fed for every American citizen and the issuance of a central bank digital currency to manage this in various ways.

The objective of this plan—these are her words—the objective is to "re-imagine the role of a central bank as the ultimate public platform for generating, modulating, and allocating financial resources in a modern economy." Think about that. We want the central government to be allocating financial resources in a modern economy. Those are not my words; those are her words.

In its role as the "ultimate public platform," according to Professor Omarova, "central bank accounts [would] fully replace—rather than uneasily co-exist with—private bank deposits." These are her words. She wants to fully replace all of the private accounts that we have. So, in other words, if you have a bank account with a local community bank, no more; couldn't have that uneasily—what is her word?—uneasily coexisting. That would be replaced. Your money would be with the Federal Reserve instead.

So Professor Omarova's view is to put the Fed in charge of handling all of our bank deposits, all of our bank accounts. So when a hard-working American receives their paycheck every week, it doesn't go in direct deposit to the community bank with which you are accustomed to doing business; it would go to a government-controlled bank account with the Fed.

Professor Omarova's proposal would "envision the complete migration of demand deposit accounts to the Fed's balance sheet." So lest anyone suggest I am exaggerating about her plan to replace all banking, these are her words: "the complete migration of demand deposit accounts to the Fed's balance sheet."

Now, why does Professor Omarova propose that we destroy banking in America and shift all deposit accounts from the innumerable private institutions that we all use and do it all through the Fed? Well, one reason she cites is to empower the Fed to directly distribute fiscal stimulus and aid to worthy beneficiaries. I kind of wonder

who the radical left would consider to be sufficiently worthy to be a beneficiary, but that is another whole topic.

Another justification that she offers for the Fed to control all retail banking—really, for Fed to be America's sole retail bank—is so that the Fed can more easily control the money supply.

This is very interesting. She provides a little insight into how she envisions this because she says this would include "implementing a contractionary monetary policy by debiting" consumers' accounts. Now, she allows that this could "be perceived as the government 'taking away' people's money." Why would people perceive it as the government taking away people's money? Because that is exactly what she is saying should be an option available to the Fed.

So specifically what she is saying is that all Americans' deposits must be at the Fed. There can be no private banks. That would be an uneasy coexistence we shouldn't tolerate. And then, if the Fed causes inflation, which is the usual source of inflation, no problem—the Fed can solve the problem by confiscating a little bit of the money from everybody's accounts.

Imagine this. That is exactly what she is advocating. The Fed can create inflation, but that is all right—we will give it a new tool to solve the inflation problem: just confiscate the money from the American citizens who are forced to put their money with the Fed. You can't make this stuff up. This is what she is advocating.

That is not the only reason she wants the Fed to be everyone's bank. She says it is to "maximize [the Fed's] capacity to channel credit to productive uses in the nation's economy." This is the definition of "socialist hubris." This is the definition of "socialism"—the idea that we have the government allocate the resources. Let the government decide what is the productive way to use the resources of our society rather than individual men and women by virtue of the exchanges they voluntarily choose to engage in. She wants to substitute a centrally managed, planned socialist economy for the free society that we have today. There is no other way to characterize it.

Where has this ever worked? This is unbelievable. If it were possible, which it is not, how would the Fed decide which are the productive and the non-productive uses? What about loans to energy companies? Gee, I don't know. Is that productive or is that not productive? Let's leave to it the Fed to decide. What could possibly go wrong?

Here is another reason why it is very bad to force all Americans to do their retail banking with a central government. It is the end to privacy for Americans' financial transactions. That is over.

We remember just weeks ago the tremendous backlash against the idea that banks would be required to report aggregate transaction information to

the IRS. I know I got buried with phone calls and letters. I think we had 16,000 Pennsylvanians who reached out to my office alone, urging Congress to reject that proposal. Can you imagine what people will think of Professor Omarova's plan to force you to have your whole bank account with the Fed? Americans don't want the Federal Government monitoring their bank accounts. I should think that would be obvious. They certainly don't want the Federal Government having control over this.

Let me conclude with this: It is perfectly OK for academic institutions and think tanks to have people espousing these socialist ideas and spinning all different variations on these collectivists and centrally planned and socialist themes. It is perfectly fine. That should be debated. I am not in the camp that thinks you cancel someone who has a different point of view from being able to articulate what they believe in. But the idea that we would take someone who holds these socialist views, who is so strongly anti-capitalism, and put that person as the chief regulator of America's banks—that makes no sense at all.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nominee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3170

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have introduced 12 bills against President Biden's vaccine mandate. Most of these bills should have been supremely non-controversial. Some of the bills would have made sure that the exemptions President Biden announced were actually efficacious in the final mandate. Another bill would have made sure that the government didn't vaccinate children without the consent of their parents. Yet another would have provided transparency to the American people on exactly how their tax dollars are being used in this area.

Lamentably, each time I asked that one of these bills pass this body, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle objected. They determined that legislation protecting religious, medical, and moral exceptions to the mandate were not helpful. They decided that the American people do not deserve to understand how their tax dollars are funding research or COVID relief. They declared that laws protecting parents' rights to make the best decisions for their kids were somehow unnecessary.

On each of these issues, the American people, of course, begged significantly to differ. Americans don't appreciate it when their government takes decisions out of their hands. As elections this week showed, parents want a voice in their children's education, and they certainly want to be respected when it comes to medical decisions involving and affecting their children as directly as this one does.

Crippling inflation and polling data on Americans' economic outlook show

that people want government to be more responsible and more transparent in how it oversees their tax dollars and how it spends them. Those on the other side of the aisle who have objected perhaps aren't getting that particular message. And how tragic that is.

I have heard from hundreds of Utahns in recent days who are at risk of losing their livelihoods under the mandate. Many of these individuals are military servicemembers and first responders. Others are key workers. Many have legitimate medical or religious reasons not to be vaccinated. But each one of them is an everyday American. These are mothers and fathers. They live in our communities. They are people we call friends and neighbors. In today's economy, all too many of them are struggling just to get by. Forcing them out of work will put an unimaginable strain on their families and on our economy at a time when they can't afford to face additional strains, certainly not one imposed by the Federal Government.

Additionally, I have heard from countless businesses that are worried about keeping their doors open should the mandate require them to fire key members of their workforce, that this just isn't tolerable. These businesses are already under tremendous strain due to the supply chain crisis and inflation and the labor shortage. They fear that they will be unable to operate should the mandate take effect. Every American—every single American—would suffer if these key industries were to shut down.

Now, some might say these impacts are far away. Others still might claim that because the mandate has not yet taken effect, these impacts aren't real or worth worrying about today. I don't think that is true. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

Now, it is true that President Biden's vaccine mandate is yet to be officially published in the Federal Register. However, it will be tomorrow. The unpublished version of the mandate can now be found, as of a few hours ago, and here is some of what it entails:

If employers have 100 or more employees, they must ensure that their workers are either fully vaccinated against COVID-19 by December 5 or that workers test negative for COVID at least once a week by January 4. If an employer has an employee who has yet to be vaccinated, President Biden is requiring the employer to pay workers for the time it takes to get vaccinated and provide sick leave for workers to recover from any side effects.

What happens if businesses don't comply? Well, President Biden has threatened them with a nearly \$14,000 fine per violation, per person, per day. This is an administrative nightmare and nothing short of it.

If employees don't want to be vaccinated against COVID-19, then they must pay for the testing. American workers will be on the hook, and it is not something most Americans can afford.

Mr. President, seeing that we have a vote approaching, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PETERS and I be able to speak for a period of time not to exceed an additional 5 minutes to complete our remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. So today I am offering a bill that would help with this situation. My No Forced Vaccination for COVID-19 Act would prevent the President of the United States or any executive branch agency from issuing a general vaccine mandate, including a mandate that requires an individual to be vaccinated or undergo periodic testing. It would end this extraordinary nightmare for millions of Americans and key businesses. It would put this sorry, mean, cruel saga to an end.

The people of Utah and the United States will rest easy if this bill passes. We would be able to focus on encouraging vaccination in reasonable, acceptable, and constitutional ways. I think this is what we all want.

Ultimately, I believe in these vaccines. I am fully vaccinated. I have encouraged everyone around me to be vaccinated. I believe these vaccines are helping to protect millions of Americans from the harms of COVID. What is not helping Americans is President Biden's mandate. We can fix that today. That is why I am encouraging my colleagues to support this bill.

To that end, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3170, which is at the desk. I ask 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 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PETERS. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Objection is heard.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

This bill would be a step backwards in our country's fight against the COVID-19 pandemic.

Across this country, we have seen over 45 million cases of COVID-19 and almost 750,000 deaths. Communities—and particularly communities of color—have been hit hard by this virus.

But, luckily, we have a safe and effective way to help prevent the spread of the virus: vaccines.

So far, almost 60 percent of U.S. population has been fully vaccinated. However, the virus continues to spread. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention classified over 70 percent of our counties are having high transmission rates. Conversely, less than 2 percent are classified as low transmission. In order for us to beat this virus, we need to reach higher levels of vaccine rates and put a stop to community spread.

This bill would bar executive agencies from being able to mandate that individuals receive the COVID-19 vaccine or even mandate that an individual agree to undergo periodic testing for COVID-19 in lieu of a vaccine.

The science is clear: Vaccines are safe, they are effective, and they save lives.

Rather than wasting time on partisan bills that make our country less safe, we should be finding ways to ensure an equitable recovery for all of our communities and preparing for the next public health emergency.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this isn't about whether we are against the virus; we are. It is not about whether we are for the vaccine; we are. It is about the fact that only 14 percent of Americans believe that it is fair, just, and proper to fire someone because they refuse to get the vaccine.

It is not appropriate for the President of the United States or this government to be ordering everyone to be fired, removing someone from their ability to put bread on the table for their children. It is immoral. It is wrong. It is without foundation and law. It is contrary to the constitutional word. This is shameful. I will be back and I won't stop until we are finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT LUIS SANTOS

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Robert L. Santos to be the Director of the Census Bureau.

Mr. Santos is uniquely qualified to lead the Census Bureau as it carries out its important work serving as the leading source of quality data about the Nation's people and economy. He brings over 40 years of experience in both the public and private sectors as a manager and expert in the field of survey design and statistical research.

Throughout his career, Mr. Santos has interacted closely with the Census Bureau as a researcher, a stakeholder, and an expert adviser, serving on the Census Advisory Committee and National Academies panels on Federal statistics. He has a deep understanding of the Census Bureau, its data, and its stakeholders.

Throughout the nomination process, Mr. Santos has demonstrated a firm commitment to upholding the Bureau's mission of producing the essential high-quality data that our communities, our businesses, and people all across our Nation rely on.

As the Census Bureau completes the 2020 census, plans for the 2030 census, and administers the Bureau's crucial demographic surveys, it is absolutely critical for the Agency to have a qualified Senate-confirmed leader at the helm.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of

Robert Santos as Census Bureau Director.

VOTE ON SANTOS NOMINATION

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

Mr. PETERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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 Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 465 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Capito	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Toomey
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—35

Barrasso	Hoeven	Rubio
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Braun	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Tuberville
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Paul	Young
Hawley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—7

Burr	Johnson	Warnock
Cramer	Rounds	
Cruz	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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.

The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Graham Scott Steele, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 401, Graham Scott Steele, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Thomas R. Carper, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard Blumenthal, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Martin Heinrich, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Farrell Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Production and Conservation.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 345, Robert Farrell Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Production and Conservation.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Thomas R. Carper, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard Blumenthal, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Martin Heinrich, Brian Schatz.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian Eddie Nelson, of California, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 463, Brian Eddie Nelson, of California, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Charles E. Schumer, Chris Van Hollen, John Hickenlooper, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Christopher Murphy, Martin Heinrich, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet, Ron Wyden, Raphael Warnock.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory