Judge Hopkins has the strong, bipartisan support of his home State Senators, Mr. BROWN and Mr. PORTMAN. Additionally, he received a unanimous rating of ''well qualified'' from the ABA. I support this highly qualified nominee, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

VOTE ON HOPKINS NOMINATION

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

Ms. SMITH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 384 Ex.]

YEAS—64

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

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Fischer	McConnell
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Hickenlooper
Duckworth	Moran

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 U.S. Senate's actions.

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. 1183, Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tim Kaine, Ben Ray Luján, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Angus S. King, Jr., Patty Murray, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, 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 Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 385 Ex.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—39

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Hickenlooper
Duckworth	Moran

(Mr. HEINRICH assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 39.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2527

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, in the last week, new details have come to light regarding Twitter's top executives' past collusion with political figures to censor speech that they did not want the American people to see. This problem is not limited to Twitter, but this news underscores the problem and the need for congressional action to protect the rights of the American people. Americans deserve to know when their government and Big Tech platforms are trying to manipulate what they can say or what they can read.

Recently published emails among Twitter executives reveal the extent to which the company worked to prevent Americans from seeing a New York Post story, and this was just weeks before the election. The extent of the suppression was breathtaking. Indeed, the Twitter executives locked the Twitter account of the White House Press Secretary who simply mentioned a story that was published in an established American newspaper with one of the largest circulations in the country. Facebook admits that it likewise limited the spread of this story based on a general warning from the FBI about ''propaganda.''

Evidence has also emerged that in 2020, Biden and Democrat campaign officials were going so far as to send lists of tweets for their corporate allies to remove—requests that Twitter granted.

This censorship activity has carried over into the Biden administration. In 2021, then-Press Secretary Jen Psaki stated that the government is ''in regular touch with social media platforms'' and ''flagging problematic posts for Facebook that spread [what she called] 'disinformation'.''

For example, a Facebook official emailed Surgeon General Vivek Murthy stating:

> I know our teams met today to better understand the scope of what the White House expects from us on ''misinformation'' going forward.

A Facebook employee later told the HHS Department that a number of posts had been deleted.

In addition to regularly flagging posts for Twitter and Facebook to take down, the CDC proposed setting up a monthly ''misinformation meeting'' with Facebook in order to censor American speech.

Additional Freedom of Information Act requests and lawsuits have also revealed improper coordination between

government Agencies and social media companies to restrict speech here in America.

Meta, the parent company of Facebook and Instagram, disclosed that it had communicated with more than 30 Federal officials about content moderation on its platform, including senior employees at the FDA, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and the White House. YouTube, which is owned by Google, disclosed that it had such communications with 11 Federal officials.

The disturbing truth is that when the Biden administration officials don't like what Americans are saying, they simply reach out to their allies at unaccountable big tech companies to silence it.

Government using its power to coerce censorship of disfavored information is what the Chinese Communist Party or what the North Korean regime might do. It is not only fundamentally un-American, but often, it is unconstitutional. Government cannot use Big Tech as a tool to end-run the First Amendment.

The American people deserve to know when their government, which is supposed to work for them, is using Big Tech to censor their speech or manipulate the information they see. I introduced legislation in July of 2021 to require this transparency. Yet the Senate has failed to act on it.

The Disclose Government Censorship Act would require that government officials publicly disclose communications with Big Tech regarding their actions to restrict speech—actions that would plainly violate the First Amendment if the government did it itself. The act contains appropriate exceptions to protect legitimate law enforcement or national security activity.

It would also require a cooling-off period to address the revolving door that occurs between government and Big Tech. This Washington revolving door fuels politically driven censorship, as evidenced by the fact that the former FBI general counsel who resigned because of the Steele dossier scandal was then hired by Twitter and, unbelievably, was at the center of the decision to suppress the New York Post story in 2020.

Our Nation was founded on the ideal that protecting citizens' speech from government censorship—under the First Amendment—would protect the people's right to govern themselves by preventing the government from controlling information and ideas. Americans deserve to know when their government is covertly trying to accomplish what the First Amendment prohibits.

Now, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2527 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask 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. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I certainly fully appreciate Senator HAGERTY's interest in protecting the First Amendment and ensuring that legitimate speech is not unduly or unfairly restricted. I am also committed to holding big tech companies accountable. I held a series of bipartisan oversight hearings on social media this Congress, including bringing top executives in to testify and to answer tough questions.

The legislation, though, we are discussing today has not been considered by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. I certainly look forward to working with my colleague to explore these issues more fully, but given this bill has not been marked up by the committee, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, my Democratic colleague is objecting to legislation that simply allows Americans to see when the government is trying to censor them.

My colleague states that his objection is largely on procedural grounds, and he has concerns that my bill hasn't been marked up in committee, but the committee to which this bill was referred has had over a year to review the legislation, and no progress has been made.

I would ask that my colleague commit to working with me on my legislation to address this important First Amendment issue in the next Congress. This problem is simply too significant to ignore. Our government works for the American people. To ensure this continues, the First Amendment prohibits the government from controlling what Americans say or read. But now government is using Big Tech to accomplish that censorship. Without disclosure of such communications, Americans' free speech rights become a dead letter because there is no way to address improper government efforts to ban speech.

My legislation would preserve these rights by allowing Americans to see when government is trying to silence them. This is a basic element of self-government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4431

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which is a bill I first introduced in 2012 with Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire.

Senator CASSIDY from Louisiana has worked hard for years with me and with others to get this bill passed. I want to thank Senator CASSIDY, as well as the chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Committee, Senator MURRAY; Ranking Member BURR of that same committee; and Majority Leader SCHUMER and others for all the work they have done to help us pass this bill.

This is a commonsense bill that has broad bipartisan, bicameral support. Everyone from the ACLU to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this legislation. These organizations didn't merely endorse the bill after reviewing it; they were actively involved in shaping the legislative text and finding agreement on the text that we are attempting to vote on, and they remain supportive today.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act simply closes a loophole in the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to allow pregnant workers to request reasonable accommodations—''reasonable accommodations''; you are going to hear that phrase a lot today—so that that worker can continue working safely during their pregnancy and upon returning to work after childbirth.

I am going to be coming back to that phrase in a moment, ''reasonable accommodations,'' but I want to cite just two examples among many. Just one from Pennsylvania—Janasia, a teaching assistant working at a childcare facility. She is from Bucks County, PA, in suburban Philadelphia. She suffered a miscarriage due to an infection during a previous pregnancy. When she got pregnant again, she asked for extra bathroom breaks, which were necessary to prevent contracting another infection. She was made to wait over an hour just to use the bathroom. Later that day, Janasia was fired.

This is just one example of a pregnant worker asking for a simple—simple—commonsense accommodation and being denied that accommodation.

What are other types of reasonable accommodations that pregnant workers might request? Light duty is a common example. Pregnant people are routinely advised by their doctors to limit how much they lift, whether it is 20 pounds or 25 pounds or 30 pounds.

Peggy Young was a UPS driver who requested light duty when she was pregnant. Other workers had received light duty, but she was denied because there was no requirement under the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to provide reasonable accommodations. That is the loophole we are trying to fix. Peggy Young was forced onto unpaid leave and eventually took her case all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Other common accommodations a pregnant worker might request are stools or water bottles. Cashiers and other retail workers are often denied these reasonable accommodations that can help them maintain a healthy pregnancy.

There have also been multiple cases where pregnant workers have been demoted or forced into lower paying jobs because their employer refused to provide uniforms that can accommodate