

fiscal year, and for other purposes, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Baldwin	Fischer	Peters
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Reed
Blumenthal	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Johnson	Shaheen
Casey	Jones	Shelby
Cassidy	Kaine	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Murray	Young

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden
Harris	Paul	
Markey	Warren	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Klobuchar	Rounds
Booker	Roberts	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the following as conferees on the part of the Senate:

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms.

ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. JONES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 417.

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 McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, James M. Inhofe, Lindsey Graham, Rick Scott, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, John Hoeven, Deb Fischer.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. 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 10 minutes each.

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

CONFIRMATION OF JOHN RAKOLTA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to express my reservations about the nomination of John Rakolta, Jr., to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates. Historically, the United States has sent career foreign service officers to serve as ambassadors to the United Arab Emirates, men and women well-versed in the complexities and challenges facing the region. Mr.

Rakolta would be the first political nominee to serve as Ambassador to this critical post. The U.S. mission in the United Arab Emirates has benefited from experienced, trained diplomats who can adroitly navigate our important security partnership while also addressing some of our major policy disagreements, particularly regarding involvement in conflicts throughout the Middle East.

In nominating Mr. Rakolta, this administration is putting a political nominee with no diplomatic experience at the helm of one of our most critical Middle East posts. While Mr. Rakolta possesses extensive business experience, he lacks knowledge of the arms sales process, security commitments, and complex diplomacy that we should demand of our emissaries to the United Arab Emirates. This is a risky venture that could jeopardize our effectiveness in the region. It also is part of a concerning trend that has reduced the number of career ambassadors serving abroad. The historically even split between political and career nominees is becoming further skewed toward political ambassadors.

Mr. Rakolta's nomination is also indicative of the lack of due diligence and forthrightness demonstrated by a number of this administration's nominees. It took months for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to obtain an accurate and complete picture of the extent of Mr. Rakolta's business holdings, litigation history, and the role he played at a questionable nonprofit, ostensibly related to economic development.

Mr. Rakolta initially failed to include key details in the paperwork he submitted to the committee. He did not disclose dozens of companies that he had owned or managed, including many with an international presence, and omitted dozens of foreign lawsuits, among other details. More concerning, however, he did not disclose that he had served on the board of a nonprofit that had been the subject of intense public scrutiny, including questions about payments the board approved for its executive director. These issues and omissions not only slowed down Mr. Rakolta's nomination, but raised concerns about Mr. Rakolta's candor and forthrightness with the committee.

The committee relies on nominees to be transparent and forthcoming about relevant information to ensure that there are not actual or potential conflicts of interest or issues that call into question a nominee's fitness for public service. When these details are obscured, omitted, or hard to obtain, it further erodes the confidence that a nominee is well-qualified and committed to serve in a given position. Mr. Rakolta's failure to provide accurate details to the committee did not inspire confidence about his diligence or transparency. Further, the details that the committee did obtain raise concerns about the type of leadership that