The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Hirono	Rounds
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Booker	Kennedy	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Luján	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	McConnell	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Graham	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	Young
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Ernst	Ricketts
Blackburn	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hagerty	Rubio
Britt	Hawley	Schmitt
Budd	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Cramer	Lummis	Vance
Crapo	Marshall	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	
Daines	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Menendez
Feinstein	Mullin

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. 177, Darrel James Papillion, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Charles E. Schumer, Raphael G. Warnock, Mazie K. Hirono, Jeanne Shaheen, Elizabeth Warren, Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Mark Kelly, Tammy Duckworth, Chris Van Hollen, Amy Klobuchar, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, John Fetterman, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown.

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 Darrel James Papillion, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Shaheen
Capito	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Cassidy	Markey	Tillis
Collins	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Merkley	Vance
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wicker
Hassan	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Romney	Young

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Ernst	Moran
Blackburn	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hawley	Rubio
Budd	Hoeven	Schmitt
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Menendez
Feinstein	Mullin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Darrel James Papillion, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DISAPPROVING OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY RELATING TO ''PUBLIC CHARGE GROUND OF INADMISSIBILITY''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 18, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) disapproving of the rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to ''Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

SOCIAL MEDIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 10 days ago, America lost a visionary public official, and I lost a friend. He was 97 years old. His name was Newt Minow.

He was 35 years old in the year 1961 when President JOHN KENNEDY tapped him to chair the Federal Communications Commission. At the time, Americans were involved in big change—moving from their radios to this new thing called television.

In his maiden speech as FCC Commissioner, Newt Minow famously described much of commercial television as a ''vast wasteland.'' He was especially concerned about the effects of endless commercials and violent cartoons and other programs on the minds of our children. He said the public airwaves should serve the public interest and that the FCC should use its power to ensure that this emerging new technology of television met that standard.

Fast-forward six decades. Social media now fills the role that broadcast TV once did in the lives of our kids. Yet Federal laws currently allow social media companies to endanger our children with near total immunity. Social media companies can and regularly do sell children's personal information for profit, allow bullies to hound children mercilessly, and allow drug dealers and sexual predators to hunt for child victims on their platforms.

Our laws, as they are currently written—as we have currently written them—make it nearly impossible for victims to hold these companies accountable. This has to change, and the Senate Judiciary Committee is taking bipartisan action to see that it does.

Virtually every parent I know is concerned about how much time their kids spend online, looking at screens, how it is affecting them, and the dangers that kids can stumble into. Parents have a right to be concerned. Look around the next time you are in a grocery store or in a mall or at a family restaurant. You will see kids who are transfixed by smartphones and tablets. I have seen this happen. I will bet the Presiding Officer has seen it. Many kids learn how to scroll before they learn how to walk.

I know two children in New York who are quite adept at navigating the online world. They are 11 years old. Their

parents have talked to them about the dangers lurking online. Both parents monitor their kids' screen time as much as they can, but they still worry that they are missing dangers. I know these children because they are my grandchildren. My wife and I visited them recently.

I sat down with my grandkids, and I asked them: What do you know about staying safe online?

Well, they both assured me they ''knew all about it, Papa.'' They knew all the danger signs to steer clear of.

But we cannot continue to place the responsibility for protecting children online entirely on these children, even their parents, and even child advocacy groups alone. No matter how concerned and vigilant they are, parents stand virtually no chance against social media companies that use powerful algorithms to hook kids and make a profit off of them but cannot be held accountable in a court of law for the harm that their products cause.

Well, Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee want to change that. Over the last 2 weeks, we have voted out of committee a package of four bipartisan bills that would require Facebook, Snapchat, and other social media companies to adhere to new online safety standards for children or pay a price. The price would be anything from significant fines to civil judgments to criminal prosecutions. I say enough is enough.

STOP CSAM ACT

Mr. President, last Thursday, the Judiciary Committee voted unanimously to advance a bill I am sponsoring, called the STOP CSAM Act. CSAM stands for ''Child Sexual Abuse Material.''

Before I go any further, I want to say a word about this 23-member committee.

We have some pretty strongly held political opinions among the membership of that committee, both on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. It is rare, if ever, that we agree on everything, but these four bills about social media passed with unanimous rollcalls in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Every Democrat and every Republican voted for it.

Sadly, the online spread of violent material is exploding, and it is a call to action for us. It is far beyond the ability of victims, of child safety organizations, or even of law enforcement to stop it under current law. The STOP CSAM Act, which I introduced, would protect victims and promote transparency and accountability for social media companies.

Here is how it works: Companies that fail to remove child sexual abuse material and related imagery after being notified about them would face significant fines, and companies that promote or facilitate the online sexual exploitation of children or host or store child sexual abuse material could face new civil and even criminal penalties.

According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—the recognized national experts—there are an estimated 84 million images of child sexual abuse material on the internet—84 million. That figure is increasing exponentially each year. These images are traded, sold, and shared online around the world.

I have spoken before about a young woman called Charlotte. Like many naive young people, when Charlotte was 16 years old, she shared intimate images of herself with a man she met online whom she thought was a friend. That man then posted those images of Charlotte online. They have haunted Charlotte ever since—for more than 10 years. She has attempted suicide three times. She has lost jobs when those images would appear in communities where she was trying to work. The images of Charlotte have been shared around the world. She has endured years of online harassment and abuse because of it.

She and her mom and child advocacy groups have asked social media companies in dozens of nations to take down the images, with almost no luck. Charlotte lost a teaching job she loved because of the images. She attempted suicide, as I mentioned. She says she doubts that she will ever feel safe.

Other children and teens have been bullied mercilessly online. Sadly, some have taken their own lives to escape the torment. We had a hearing at which some of the mothers came in, holding the color photographs of their kids, some who were induced to try choking exercises in their closets, ultimately taking their own lives by hanging themselves.

EARN IT ACT

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, our committee passed another child online safety bill—again, unanimously. It is called the EARN IT Act. It would modify section 230 of the 1996 Communications Decency Act.

Here is why we need it: Section 230 currently shields media companies, such as Facebook and Snapchat, with very rare exceptions, from being held accountable when material that is posted on their platforms results in harm to kids and others. It gives social media companies a pass and denies their victims their day in court.

Section 230 was written when Mark Zuckerberg was in the sixth grade, long before social media existed. It was passed when internet companies were small and struggling. Today, social media companies are some of the richest, most powerful companies in the history of the world. Yet they still benefit from the shield of section 230 to deny victims their day in court.

The EARN IT Act eliminates immunity and creates accountability. Its cosponsors are our colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL, from Connecticut, and Senator GRAHAM.

Big Tech can no longer disregard its role in online child exploitation. Many of the rest of our committee members, Democrats and Republicans, are cosponsors. I am happy to be one of them.

We also passed two additional child online safety bills in our committee, the SHIELD Act and the Project Safe Childhood Act. Senators KLOBUCHAR and CORNYN are the lead sponsors of both bills, and both of them have bipartisan sponsorship.

We can, and we will, balance the need to protect free speech with and the need to protect our kids from harm. What we will not do is accept the status quo where some social media companies continue to destroy lives and make vast fortunes by exploiting a legal loophole that can no longer be justified.

We hope our colleagues will join us in protecting America's children and teenagers from online horror.

S.J. RES. 18

Mr. President, we are going to vote on a resolution in a few minutes that I would like to speak to. It is called the ''Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility.'' I oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

This resolution aims to overturn a Biden administration regulation on the public charge ground of inadmissibility. This regulation provides immigrant families—especially those with U.S. citizen children—with stability and certainty.

It does not make a single immigrant eligible for public benefits. Instead, it restores and qualifies the longstanding practice that an individual is ineligible for a green card if the individual relies on public benefits for income.

Four years ago, the Trump administration upended that definition, creating a new, vague test. For the first time, receiving supplemental public health benefits like nutritional assistance and Medicaid could be considered part of a public charge determination. Most immigrants, even those with lawful status, have been ineligible for means-tested programs since 1996. Immigrants who apply for these benefits are usually doing so to obtain central healthcare or food assistance for a U.S. American citizen child.

In 2016, 5.8 million U.S. citizen children with an immigrant parent had Medicaid or CHIP coverage, for example. The Trump administration rule forced these parents to make a choice: Deny their kids essential services or risk losing their status and being deported.

When that rule was announced, school districts reported massive drops in school lunch enrollment. Healthcare providers also reported pregnant women were afraid to receive assistance for fear of losing their status or putting at risk the immigration status of a loved one.

For example, one healthcare center reported that immigrant parents here on a student visa were afraid to obtain Medicaid for their disabled child. Although the child was a U.S. citizen and it was perfectly legal for the child to receive Medicaid, the parents worried that they could lose their status and be

separated from their child if they applied for this assistance.

A 2021 report found that even after the Trump rule was rescinded, nearly 50 percent of Americans with an immigrant family member believed that applying for assistance for any family member could cause immigration problems.

The Biden administration tried to resolve this. Their regulation makes it clear that an immigrant cannot be eligible for a green card simply for receiving healthcare or food assistance for their U.S. citizen child. That is why the American Hospital Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Illinois Department of Human Services, and countless other healthcare organizations support the Biden rule. These experts believe that the rule provides clarity and certainty to immigrants, as well as medical professionals, ensuring that kids get the basic access to food and healthcare they need.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this harmful resolution and protecting families and children.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

S.J. RES. 18

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise in support of our CRA disapproval of the Department of Homeland Security's public charge inadmissibility rule.

Last week, I had the honor of leading a trip with several of my fellow Senators to Brownsville, TX, to see the border crisis up front and firsthand for myself—the border crisis created by Joe Biden—as title 42 was coming to an end. We met a lot of people on the trip, and I want to share some of their thoughts, some of their concerns.

We met a young former marine officer who said he felt safer in Afghanistan than he did in southern Texas right now.

Local residents were bracing for the impact, with 170,000 people just across the border waiting to come across with the end of title 42. Families are gearing up to protect their families against the cartels, very specifically.

We met a fifth-generation rancher who was leaving his family ranch and moving his family into town, and even that night, he was teaching his wife how to load a 410-gauge shotgun to protect their family.

We met officers. Many of these officers were multigenerational—their fathers, their grandparents had served on the border—and they said it was worse than they have ever seen in their lifetime.

Something new on this trip: We were told that 90 Chinese military-age nationalists are entering illegally every day in South Texas.

As we all know, over 6 million people have entered the country illegally since President Biden took office—6 million people. That is twice the size of my home State of Kansas. Another 1.5 million people have evaded apprehension and entered the country—''got-aways,'' as they call them on the border.

Thousands upon thousands more continue to overwhelm the borders. I think we all realize our immigration system is broken, but rather than fix the problem, this administration continues to point fingers and find ways to ignore or abuse our laws to provide pathways for illegal immigrants to come here.

Many of the people crossing our border will get to roam freely throughout our country. They leave our intake facilities with a cell phone and a court date, a court date that is 4 to 5 years from the date they entered. I think we are all kidding ourselves if we think these folks will ever show up for those dates in 5 years. Despite breaking our laws, they will be long gone, settled into communities across the country. In fact, on our trip, law enforcement officers told me 90 percent of the migrants are not showing up for these court dates so far.

Sure, they are going to seek citizenship down the road. There is no doubt about that. And open border colleagues across the aisle will no doubt call for amnesty for all of them. We expect President Biden will support that. He has said that as much himself, broadcasting across the globe that you can take advantage of the benefits we provide, despite breaking our laws.

I think it is fair to say Americans have the most generous legal immigration standards in the world, but we have to draw the line somewhere.

Since the 1800s, our Nation has required foreign nationals seeking admission to the United States to show that they can care for themselves without becoming a public charge or burdening the taxpayers.

Most nations require you to have a job before you come into their country. We just don't want you to become a public charge if you want to become a permanent citizen. Being a public charge is a ground of inadmissibility under our immigration laws.

Let me say that again. Being a public charge is a ground of inadmissibility under our immigration laws.

Congress specifically directed the executive branch to consider various factors when allowing people into this great Nation. These factors include: age, health, family status, assets, resources, and financial status, along with education and skills.

Indeed, as recently as 1996, Congress clearly declared in a policy statement included in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 that self-sufficiency is a basic principle of U.S. immigration law and should continue to be a governing principle in the United States.

Specifically, the Immigration and Nationality Act makes an alien who is an applicant for a visa, admission, or adjustment of status inadmissible if he or she is likely at any time to become a public charge. The public charge ground of inadmissibility, therefore, applies to aliens applying for a visa to come to the United States temporarily or permanently for admission or adjust their status to that of a lawful permanent resident, with some limited exceptions.

We need an immigration system that welcomes the best and the brightest, but we need to limit the cycle of chain migration. Again, we need some type of guardrails. While we open our hearts to asylum seekers, we must also build a merit-based immigration system that considers that immigrants' potential contributions to our economy, to our communities, and our future. We don't want a system that rewards idleness and reliance on taxpayer-funded benefits.

Under the previous administration, the Department of Homeland Security issued a rule that would have required immigrants seeking to remain in the country to be self-sufficient. But under President Biden, the regulations have changed.

Now, my hope is to override the Biden public charge rule today with a vote here in the Senate. The Biden administration's public charge rule makes a mockery of the law and the intent of Congress to ensure that immigrants are self-sufficient.

According to an estimate by the Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform, at the start of 2023, the net cost of illegal immigration for the United States at the Federal, State, and local levels was at least $150 billion.

Again, since the start of 2023, the cost to taxpayers, $150 billion.

Now, this number is going to increase drastically if this rule stands. Our resolution of disapproval would rescind the Biden public charge rule and, hopefully, spur this administration to come to the table and craft a solution that will ensure the self-sufficiency of immigrants and protect American taxpayers.

I encourage my colleagues to vote to support this CRA of disapproval, to introduce some sanity into our immigration system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote start immediately.

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

The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Under the previous order, the joint resolution is considered read a third time.

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

VOTE ON S.J. RES 18

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Ricketts
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Coons	Menendez	Mullin

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 18

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the final rule submitted by the Department of Homeland Security relating to ''Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility'' (87 Fed. Reg. 55472 (September 9, 2022)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

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. 20, Nancy G. Abudu, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tina Smith, Christopher Murphy, Mazie K. Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Margaret Wood Hassan, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Gary C. Peters, Alex Padilla, Michael F. Bennet.

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 Nancy G. Abudu, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted ''nay''.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blackburn	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hawley	Romney
Budd	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Mullin	Rubio

(Mr. PETERS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Nancy G. Abudu, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WYOMING SHRINE BOWL

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Wyoming Shrine Bowl. This postseason high school football game showcases the top Wyoming high school athletes and coaches. The annual event supports and enriches patient care at Shriners Children's Hospital in Salt Lake City, UT.

In 1973, football Coaches Jerry Overton, from Kelly Walsh High School, and Denny Brown, from Byron High School, started organizing an all-star football game. The challenging search for a sponsor ended with an agreement from Shrine Temples in Sheridan and Rawlins to sponsor the annual game. This partnership created the Shrine Bowl of Wyoming, Inc., a nonprofit organization. The first Wyoming Shrine Bowl was played in 1974. It was an all-star football game for Wyoming high school seniors led by Wyoming all-star coaches.

Since the Shrine Bowl's beginning, the organization has raised over $1,000,000 for the Shriners Children's Hospital. Thousands of Wyoming residents are now familiar with the Shrine Bowl's purpose and motto:: ''STRONG LEGS RUN SO WEAK LEGS MAY WALK.'' In 2022, the Shriners Children's Hospital in Salt Lake City treated 400 Wyoming children.

A cornerstone of the Shrine Bowl is a visit by the coaches and players to this great hospital. The week prior to the event, participants and learn about the lives of these children who are benefiting from their charitable football game. On June 10th, 2023, at the Kelly Walsh High School in Casper, the all-star north and south teams will face off in the 50th Annual Wyoming Shrine