

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

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Isakson	Warren
Booker	Johnson	
Harris	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 0. The motion is agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

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

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 Charles R. Eskridge III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Rick Scott, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Lamar Alexander, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James E. Risch.

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 Charles R. Eskridge III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

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

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Gardner	Roberts
Blunt	Graham	Romney
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Braun	Hawley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Warner
Cruz	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Daines	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Perdue	
Feinstein	Portman	

NAYS—29

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Isakson	Warren
Booker	Johnson	
Harris	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 29. The motion is agreed to.

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 bill 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 David John Novak, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

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 David John Novak, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, 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.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Ex.]

YEAS—86

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

NAYS—4

Gillibrand	Markey
Heinrich	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Isakson	Warren
Booker	Johnson	
Harris	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 4. The motion is agreed to.

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 Rachel P. Kovner, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

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 Rachel P. Kovner, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, 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 Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Baldwin	Collins	Gardner
Barrasso	Coons	Graham
Blackburn	Cornyn	Grassley
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Blunt	Cotton	Hawley
Boozman	Cramer	Hoeven
Braun	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Brown	Cruz	Jones
Burr	Daines	Kaine
Cantwell	Duckworth	Kennedy
Capito	Durbin	King
Cardin	Enzi	Lankford
Carper	Ernst	Leahy
Casey	Feinstein	Lee
Cassidy	Fischer	Manchin

Markey	Risch	Smith
McConnell	Roberts	Sullivan
McSally	Romney	Tester
Menendez	Rosen	Thune
Merkley	Rounds	Tillis
Moran	Rubio	Toomey
Murkowski	Sasse	Udall
Murphy	Schatz	Van Hollen
Murray	Schumer	Warner
Paul	Scott (FL)	Whitehouse
Perdue	Scott (SC)	Wicker
Peters	Shaheen	Young
Portman	Shelby	
Reed	Sinema	

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Heinrich	Wyden
------------	----------	-------

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander	Hirono	Klobuchar
Bennet	Inhofe	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Stabenow
Harris	Johnson	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 85, the nays are 3.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

PENSIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I just came from a rally—a meeting—with more or less 100 middle-class workers from Wisconsin, West Virginia, my State of Ohio, and all over the country. There were teamsters and mineworkers dressed in camo shirts. There were also bakery and confectionery workers, carpenters, and electricians. They were here because many of them—maybe all of them—are about to lose 50 percent of their pensions. They are about to lose their pensions because 10 years ago, in the end days of the Bush administration, which was when our economy plummeted and people were losing jobs—800,000 jobs a month in the last months of the Bush administration—and when companies were going out of business, a lot of the employers of these workers went out of business. When you put on top of that the Wall Street greed, you can see why these pensions are in jeopardy.

Too often in this town, the White House, frankly, and my Senate colleagues don't understand what collective bargaining is about. Collective bargaining is negotiating at the bargaining table the giving up of wages today so as to put money aside and have pensions and healthcare in the future. That is what these workers did, these teamsters and these confection workers and these ironworkers. That is what they did, but they are paying a price. There is nothing they did to cause this, but they are paying a price.

Now, parenthetically, this body fell all over itself to bail out Wall Street and to help the big auto companies, and look how they are paying back their workers. This body, the President—all of them are fine with bailing out the big guys. Yet the President has been absent, and the Senate Republican leadership has been absent. The exception is that Senator PORTMAN has been working with me, as has Senator

HOEVEN and others, but the leadership has been absent with regard to trying to fix this pension issue.

You love your country, and you fight for the people who make it work. You fight for the dignity of work, which means honoring and respecting work. We have to do better.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2254

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 2254, the Butch Lewis Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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 an objection?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I have some sympathy for the motion that Senator BROWN made because he just came from a meeting with people who are very interested in getting this multiemployer pension issue straightened out.

It was 3 or 4 years ago that I spoke to a big delegation of people who were mostly from the Central States Teamsters, and they were very much lobbying for a solution to this problem. They treated me like a hero because at that time we were probably in the middle of a Government Accountability Office investigation of the mismanagement of these funds. We thought we were going to get a GAO report that would show the mismanagement, reap the benefits of that mismanagement, and recoup a lot of funds. Quite frankly, that Government Accountability Office study of about 2 years didn't prove what I thought and what the Central States Teamsters people thought was wrong. We still think the mismanagement was there, but if you don't have an authority like the Government Accountability Office to justify that, it doesn't give you much of a leg to follow up on.

Now we have the Butch Lewis Act for which Senator BROWN is asking unanimous consent. We also have other proposals that the Senate Committee on Finance, which I chair, has been working on—and not only under my chairmanship. The biggest part of this work was probably done when Senator Hatch was still the chairman of the committee.

I also want to give people the reasons I have asked to reserve the right to object.

The Butch Lewis Act doesn't provide long-term solvency to the Central States' plan or to other critical and declining multiemployer pension plans. It is a costly and incomplete attempt to fix the multiemployer system.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, many plans that would be eligible for loans under this legislation couldn't pay these loans back, and most of the plans taking the loans