

impugn someone's character, you need to have actual evidence to back it up, not a story that even the accuser herself has called into question.

Is this what Democrats want subsequent Supreme Court confirmations to look like, a hyperpartisan process in which character attacks don't have to be backed up with actual evidence, in which innuendo can substitute for information, and where a presumption of guilt is the order of the day, no matter how shaky or unsubstantiated the allegations?

I will say it again. I am deeply disappointed in my Democratic colleagues.

I look forward to hearing from Judge Kavanaugh later this week.

#### NOMINATION OF PETER FELDMAN

Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the nomination of Peter Feldman to be a Commissioner at the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Peter has been an exceptional member of my staff throughout my time as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee. Serving as senior counsel for consumer protection on the committee for over 7 years, Peter has been instrumental in drafting and negotiating bipartisan legislation and conducting meaningful oversight of Federal agencies related to consumer product safety, unfair and deceptive trade practices, and sports policy. Those who have had the privilege of working with Peter would attest to his well-earned reputation for building consensus and forming coalitions to improve consumer safety.

Peter's work on significant consumer safety legislation began even before his tenure on my staff. As a staffer for former Senator Mike DeWine, for example, he worked directly on the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act. More recently, on the Senate Commerce Committee, Peter led our work on numerous bipartisan legislative initiatives, including the Consumer Review Freedom Act, the Better Online Ticket Sales Act, and the Child Nicotine Poisoning Prevention Act.

Peter is very well qualified to serve as a Commissioner on the CPSC and enjoys the support of a wide range of stakeholder groups, including safety advocates who describe him as "a professional, thoughtful, and committed public servant." Nevertheless, it is my understanding that some on the other side of the aisle are requiring us to hold multiple votes on his confirmation for reasons that have nothing to do with his qualifications. In a nutshell, Democrats have expressed no objection—no objection—to Peter's qualifications to be a CPSC Commissioner. Instead, Democrats object to the fact that, in addition to being nominated to complete the remainder of a term expiring next year, President Trump has also nominated him to a full 7-year term on the CPSC.

While Peter's situation is somewhat unique, it is not unprecedented. In fact,

in 2005, the Senate confirmed former CPSC Commissioner Nancy Ann Nord to similar successive terms—a remainder term and a second full term—and the Senate did it by voice vote.

What is unprecedented is the level of partisanship that CPSC nominees are facing in the current environment. In fact, since Congress established the CPSC in 1972, there have been only three rollcall votes to confirm CPSC Commissioners. One of those rollcall votes occurred this past May for Commissioner Dana Baiocco after Democrats delayed her confirmation for over 6 months. The other two were in 2014 and in 1976.

Put another way, when we finish voting on Peter's confirmation, we will have doubled in a single year the amount of votes on CPSC Commissioners since Congress established the agency in 1972. That is how easy, in the past, it has been to confirm Commissioners to this agency.

My hope is that we are not yet done confirming CPSC nominees. I am hoping that soon the Senate will turn to the nomination of Acting CPSC Chairman Ann Marie Buerkle. The Commerce Committee held a hearing on Acting Chairman Buerkle's confirmation almost a year ago; nevertheless, Democrats still haven't allowed a vote on her confirmation. While she continues to lead the agency in an acting capacity, the CPSC deserves a Senate-confirmed leader, and we are committed to confirming her nomination as soon as possible.

Let me be clear. I expect and appreciate that more Democrats will likely vote for Peter Feldman's initial term at the CPSC. I expect that we are going to have Democrats here—many Democrats, I hope—who will vote for that initial term. Peter's history of bipartisanship, depth of experience, and mastery of the critical consumer safety issues before the agency will undoubtedly benefit the agency greatly and more than merit such support from both sides of the aisle. Peter's confirmation will also ensure that the CPSC has its full complement of Commissioners to execute its important safety mission. Nevertheless, I find it deeply regrettable that a well-qualified nominee like Peter will face objections from some who have expressed no substantive concerns about his qualifications to be a CPSC Commissioner.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon return to its tradition of bipartisanship in the confirmation of nominees to critical independent safety agencies such as the CPSC.

I urge my colleagues to support Peter Feldman's confirmation for both the remainder of the existing term and for the full term to which he has been nominated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time has expired.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Feldman nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Ex.]

#### YEAS—80

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Baldwin	Gardner	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hassan	Perdue
Boozman	Hatch	Peters
Burr	Heitkamp	Portman
Cantwell	Heller	Risch
Capito	Hoeben	Roberts
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Jones	Shaheen
Coons	Kaine	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Tester
Cotton	Kyl	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Leahy	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Udall
Donnelly	Manchin	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Feinstein	Murkowski	

#### NAYS—19

Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Markey	Stabenow
Brown	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden
Harris	Sanders	
Heinrich	Schatz	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Flake

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.