

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, DEFENSE, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Motion to Proceed

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration on the motion to proceed on H.R. 2740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I would like to speak briefly about an issue important to me, about an issue important to many Americans, and I would like to speak briefly about Senator DURBIN's recent request for a hearing concerning the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act.

The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is a bill that many Senators have worked for, for nearly a decade, and it has long been a top priority of mine. I have introduced this bill in every single Congress, ever since I was first elected to the Senate back in 2010.

During that time, it has been a subject of widespread debate and discussion. There has been a period of time in which a lot of people have learned a lot about this area. The debate and the discussion has occurred both on the Hill and off the Hill throughout the United States.

Other Members, including Senator SCHUMER, have sought to pass the bill, as I am doing. Whether that passage occurs by unanimous consent or through some other form matters less to me than that we get it passed, but we do need to get it passed. This year, we have come closer to making this important and bipartisan reform a reality, closer than we have ever come before at any point over the nearly decade that this has gotten a lot of attention.

In early July, the House of Representatives passed the bill on the Suspension Calendar by a wide bipartisan supermajority vote of 365 to 65. Around that time, I negotiated an agreement with Senator GRASSLEY to help advance the bill by adding provisions drawn from the Durbin-Grassley H-1B reform bill.

Senator GRASSLEY has for many years, openly and publicly, made it known that he had concerns with the

bill. I was therefore very pleased that we were able to sit down and work out an agreement to address those concerns, while keeping the bill narrow and focused on the immediate problem that it is trying to solve. That is eliminating the country of origin discrimination in our employment green card system. I thank Senator GRASSLEY for working with me on that.

The process by which I have tried to advance this bill through Congress has been open, transparent, and straightforward. I have sought and continue to seek unanimous consent to pass the bill on the floor. If any Member has raised concern about the bill, I have been willing to work with them quickly and in good faith to address their concerns.

That is why, after reaching an agreement with Senator GRASSLEY, I also worked with other Members to resolve their concerns. For much of the past few months, I simply didn't know who, if anyone else on the Democratic side of the aisle, might have had concerns with the bill. We were told that there might be holds on the Democratic hotline, but we were not told who exactly might be holding the bill, and no one approached me with objections.

I certainly had no reason to think that Senator DURBIN would have concerns with the bill. As I have explained before, he was a leading cosponsor of the bill in a previous Congress. What is more, the only substantial difference between the bill he supported and the bill I put forward in this Congress is the addition of the amendment that I negotiated with Senator GRASSLEY, which is drawn almost entirely from provisions of the Durbin-Grassley H-1B reform bill.

In September, I learned that Senator DURBIN did in fact have concerns about the bill in this Congress. As I have with other Members and as I have expressed the willingness to do with other Members, I am ready and willing to work with Senator DURBIN in good faith to quickly and reasonably resolve any objection he may have, while preserving the bipartisan support that this bill has long enjoyed and that it deserves to enjoy.

As I have said before, I don't believe that any further factual development concerning this bill is necessary. Indeed at this point, I believe a hearing can serve no purpose other than to delay speedy action on this important reform and jeopardize our ability to act before the end of the year.

For that reason, I do not support Senator DURBIN's calls for a public hearing. Every day that we delay action on this bill is another day that suffering experienced by immigrants stuck in the green-card backlog continues and indeed intensifies. That is precisely why I will continue to work to pass this bill at the earliest possible date.

The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act arguably has wider and more bipartisan support than any

other immigration bill that has been considered in this body in recent years. The reason for that is that it is focused on a single, serious, solvable problem that I think we can all agree needs to be solved.

Whatever other reforms you think might need to be made to our immigration system, with good reason, we can all agree that America should not treat immigrants differently based on their country of origin. There is no reason for this bill to become yet another casualty to the polarized, partisan divisions that plague immigration policy.

I look forward to working with Senator DURBIN to resolve the concerns he may have about this bill. I reiterate that, once again, this is a narrowly focused bill, one that focuses on a simple but long-standing problem, a problem that subjects some immigrants to needlessly lengthy delays for no reason other than their country of origin. This is from a bygone era that we shouldn't be perpetuating in this country.

We need to fix the problem. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act would do that, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me. We are almost there, but we need to get it over the finish line.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Georgia.

H.R. 2740

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the vote we are going to have in just a few minutes to appropriate our first appropriations bill for this fiscal year, which, by the way, we are already in the first month of our new fiscal year.

We are under a continuing resolution, which we have talked about ad nauseam in this body and how damaging that is to our military and how expensive it is over the long run. I had breakfast with one of our Secretaries in the DOD today, and he told me that just in the Navy alone, a continuing resolution this year would cost the Navy almost \$5 billion. That is \$50 billion just in one service over the next decade. We can do better than this.

I want to praise Senator SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, the ranking member and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. They have done their job. The subcommittee chairman and ranking members have done their jobs. We are ready to vote on these bills, and it comes down to just an obstructionist issue about funding the wall versus funding our military.

Just last weekend, President Trump announced that Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of ISIS, had been taken off the battlefield by his own hand, I might say. This is a win not just for our country but for the world in this fight against terrorism.

As we now know, the world has gotten to be very dangerous—maybe the most dangerous in my lifetime—with five threats across five domains. We are worried now about places like China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran,

as well as the asymmetric threat of terrorism around the world in over five domains—air, land and sea, and now we have to worry about cyber and space as well.

Let's just take a moment and realize that without a strong military, this Special Operations op over the weekend would not have been possible. Our intelligence community, our special operators, our military personnel, all the supply people, all the people involved in supporting these people at the tip of the sphere came to bear and brought us a victory this week over the No. 1 terrorist in the world.

Everybody in America should be celebrating this incredible achievement by our military. Rather than celebrating, however, our friends across the aisle are trying to change the subject in many ways. One way is in the U.S. House with the hypocritical approach we are seeing right now of denying due process to our President and having a vote this week that is a real mockery of the process in itself. There is no guarantee of due process to the President in this resolution.

I believe the Democrats just don't understand how President Trump got elected, and they hate it so much, they will not even let him have this win relative to taking a major terrorist off the battlefield.

We must never forget how depraved this gentleman was and their ideology really is. These ISIS thugs have been a scourge on that part of the world, and they are not going away, by the way. Since 2014, ISIS has beheaded two American journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff. Let us never forget that these things occurred. They forced women into sex slavery, including 26-year-old Kayla Mueller, a humanitarian worker who went there to try to do good who was later killed.

These are the people, under al-Baghdadi's leadership, who set fire to a Jordanian pilot—a captured pilot—violating the rules of war. They put him in a cage, poured gasoline on him, and lit him on fire alive. These are the people who lined up 21 Coptic Christians on a beach in Libya and beheaded them in front of a video. They crucified Christians across the Middle East for years.

Al-Baghdadi inspired all of these atrocities. His death brings justice to these countless victims. The fight is not over yet. We have taken out the leadership. We denied them the territorial caliphate. We are now moving to protect the oil so these people will be denied resources so they cannot reconstitute again. These people will not go away. The ideology has not died. We have just taken their caliphate away. We have to continue to do that.

The current strategy has not changed in Syria. The President has said this publicly. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said it publicly. We are there to defeat ISIS. We are there to protect Iraq, deter Iran, and support our friends in Israel, but we need bipar-

tisan support and consistent funding to achieve this bigger mission. That is just one of them in one domain. We have others across the world. With an ever-growing military capacity in China alone, we have to get serious about how we fund, consistently, our U.S. military effort.

Yet, as I stand here today, we are under a continuing resolution, which we know handcuffs our own military and adds hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade to the cost of funding our military. We have a CR right now that has us actually spending \$4 billion that the Department of Defense has already identified that they don't want to spend. Yet because of continuing resolution rules, they have to keep spending against these obsolete programs and wasting that \$4 billion.

In addition, we are sitting here at the end of October, the first month of the fiscal year, and we have not even finalized the authorization for our defense because of not being able to work this out with the House.

We have to do that and get to funding right away to fund our military. Our men and women in uniform are the best that we have in America, and we owe it to them to not drop the ball in this eleventh hour to show them that we have their backs. They can do the job, but only if we fund them.

This is a travesty, and right now it is broken down into partisan politics, not over defending our country. It puts our national security at risk.

I will give us just one little piece of data here to close this out. Over the last 50 years, we disinvested in our military by at least 25 percent three different times under three Democratic Presidents. That is just historical fact; that is not a partisan observation. We did it in 1976 to 1980; we did it in the 1990s; we did it in the last administration over 8 years. We disinvested in the military by at least 25 percent.

We saw the travesty that the military had in terms of readiness in January 1, 2017. We saw how bad our readiness was when two-thirds of our elite Strike Fighters, FA-18s, in the Navy could not fly. Only 3 of our 58 Army brigades could go to war that night. It was a terrible position to be in. Under new leadership, we have gotten that readiness back, but now we have to rebuild the military that has been burned up over the last 20 years fighting terrorism.

The challenge we have before us right now is to do our No. 1 job, and that is to fund and appropriate the Federal Government. Of that, discretionary spending is what this is all about. It is only \$1.3 trillion of the \$4.6 trillion the Federal Government will totally spend this year, but of that, the military, the VA, and all domestic discretionary programs make up \$1.3 trillion.

I am advocating today that we take our responsibility seriously to fund our military because of the growing threats around the world and the dam-

age we see that it does to the efforts of freedom by our friends abroad. There is no bigger responsibility we can have than to support our men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line every day. The best testament of that is this example we just saw of a success in Syria, very close to the Turkish border, pulled off through places where Russians and Syrian Government and Syrian rebels and Turkish soldiers were all in the general vicinity. We pulled off a miraculous victory for freedom in the world. Now it is our job to fund defense and get on with that. I highly suggest that we take that very seriously.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Senate is going to vote on whether to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a package of appropriations bills that will include the Senate Defense appropriations bill, and the Senate Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education (Labor-HHS) appropriations bill.

There are many things in these bills that I support, but I am going to strongly urge all Senators to vote no. I am disappointed that the majority leadership has taken this step. They bowed to demands by President Trump, and that is continuing to delay funding for our troops.

They insist on including in this bill authority for President Trump to raid American tax dollars from our military and their families. President Trump wants to raid that money to pay for his wall, after he had given his solemn word that Mexico would pay for it, and that is not acceptable. Because he cannot keep his word, he has already raided \$6.2 billion from the Department of Defense this year alone for his border wall.

He did all of that without congressional approval of either Republicans or Democrats. He diverted \$2.6 billion from the fiscal year 2019 Defense Appropriations Act. Then he took another \$3.6 billion from military construction projects for his southern border wall.

That money came from projects that would have improved the lives of our troops and their families: military schools, childcare centers, and improved training facilities, many of which have been damaged by hurricanes and other natural disasters.

On this side, we oppose this bill because we are fighting to protect funds that are meant for the women and men of our military and their families. We oppose this bill because we stand with those patriotic Americans, and we refuse to place the President's failed campaign promises on their backs.

That alone should convince every Member of this Chamber to oppose this package. Yet the Labor-HHS appropriations bill that is tied to this Defense bill also shortchanges the domestic priorities of the American people by stealing even more money to pay for President Trump's vanity wall.

If all things were equal, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill—our largest domestic funding bill—would receive a 3-percent increase in fiscal year 2020, but the Republican bill provides less than a 1-percent increase for Labor-HHS, while the Department of Homeland Security's appropriations bill receives a 7-percent increase to cover the cost of the President's demand for his wall. It doesn't add up to me, and it doesn't add up to most Americans, who broadly oppose President Trump's wall.

If, in the House and Senate, we were to have an up-or-down vote on the wall, I suspect it would fail. So now, they are trying to do it through a backdoor way—a shortsighted cash grab directed by President Trump. This is a bill that fails to cover even the annual costs of inflation in public health, Head Start, childcare, special education, veterans' training grants, and dozens of other programs that are relied upon by the American people. He will cut the veterans programs and he will cut the childcare programs to pay for this wall.

I am also disappointed by the willful spread of misinformation by President Trump and the Republican leadership regarding our opposition to this bill. They have baselessly accused the Democrats of blocking a 3.1-percent pay raise for our troops by our opposing this package. That is ridiculous.

Regardless of the action we take in this Chamber, the men and women of our military will see a raise in January. No matter what we do, they are going to get that raise. This well-deserved raise is based on a statutory formula that does not need to be authorized by the legislation before us. In fact, neither the House nor the Senate Defense appropriations bills contain any provision that is related to a pay raise. Reaching a bipartisan-bicameral consensus on a \$693 billion Defense appropriations bill is hard enough without there being the willful and irresponsible spreading of misinformation.

This campaign of misinformation does not stop there. The Republican leadership has even accused the Senate Democrats of holding up aid to Ukraine. That would be laughable if it were not for the real-world consequences we are seeing play out in Ukraine today. It is the Republicans who are holding both military funding and Ukraine aid hostage to President Trump's vanity wall. It is the Republicans who refuse to bring a bill to the floor unless Congress enables President Trump to continue stealing funds from our troops and our military families to pay for the wall that he gave his solemn word that Mexico would pay for.

The Senate Democrats have long advocated for aid to Ukraine. We insisted it be included in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills, and we will continue to do so because it is the right thing to do. Since 2015, I have personally supported more than \$3.3 billion in aid for Ukraine. That is a level that far exceeds the President's request.

These baseless accusations are merely attempts to distract from why the

Senate Democrats are actually opposing this package. We will not stand idly by as President Trump continues to rob our military families—using them as his personal piggy bank—for a failed campaign promise that he cannot keep. We will not stand idly by as the domestic priorities of the American people are shortchanged to pay for some unnecessary monument to the President's ego along our southern border.

We have been down this road before. Just last month, the Republican leadership failed to get the votes that were necessary to move these bills, but I think it is prudent to remind everyone that this entire strategy has been tried before. It failed before, and it will fail again—that strategy being the wall over everything, that strategy being the wall at all costs no matter how much damage it does to our veterans, no matter how much damage it does to our military families, and no matter how much damage it does to American children. It is a strategy of a wall and a campaign promise over the American people.

That same strategy drove the country into the longest government shutdown in American history earlier this year that cost the taxpayers billions of dollars, and they got absolutely nothing in return. Incidentally, that was when the Republicans controlled both Chambers of Congress, and they still allowed this shutdown. So, if you think this failed Republican strategy will work on the second go-around, I have a fence for you to paint back at my home in Vermont.

Everyone here knows there is only one real path forward to our reaching agreement on bipartisan bills, and I believe it is time we reached that agreement. I have tremendous respect for my good friend Chairman SHELBY. Look at the bills we just passed overwhelmingly. That is because Senator SHELBY and I were able to sit down and work on these bills, put them together, and do them in a bipartisan way. I have told the Secretary of Defense and others that we still have time to do that on the Defense appropriations bill. We can do it.

When we come back next week, we should try again. Let the grownups in both parties in this body work on it. We will get it done, but the clock is ticking. It is really time to stop the political maneuverings and to stop the sloganeering. Let's do real work.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise in the U.S. Senate to fight for America's military.

This past week, our Special Forces eliminated the leader of ISIS and his likely successor. Their accomplishments should remind all of us that our brave troops always carry out their duties no matter what the circumstances. They shouldn't expect anything different from the U.S. Congress. Yet they

do. They have come to expect that their elected leaders will fail to execute the most fundamental of their duties—funding the government. They don't deserve failure, and they certainly shouldn't expect it. They deserve our gratitude, and they deserve our unwavering commitment.

The best way to demonstrate that gratitude and commitment, I believe, is by passing an appropriations bill that gives our military what it needs. Our men and women in uniform should never find themselves on the battlefield, wondering if they will be able to support their families back home. They should never wonder if their training needs, support requirements, or mission objectives will be held hostage by partisan bickering in the Congress. They should never wonder why America's adversaries are doubling down on their military investments while America is sitting idle.

I believe the United States must maintain its edge over our adversaries. China is escalating its defense spending, which we all know. Yet America's military is operating under a continuing resolution. That means that our military is having to face tomorrow's threats with yesterday's funding levels. That means that our military's planning and operations are weighed down with uncertainty.

That should be unacceptable to all of us, on both sides of the aisle, in the U.S. Senate. We have an opportunity to change that today by voting to proceed to the fiscal year 2020 Defense appropriations bill. What are we talking about here? We are talking about \$695 billion in total defense funding. That is national security for the United States of America. That is an increase of about \$20 billion over last year's level. This increased funding, among other things, would provide a 3.1-percent pay increase for our men and women in uniform—the largest in 10 years. Believe me, they need it. It would continue the development of the world's most advanced weapons systems, and we will need them. It would increase our investments in hypersonics, 5G technology, artificial intelligence, missile defense, and cyber security, and we need that. I believe all of this is absolutely essential to maintaining America's strategic advantage over our main adversaries and competitors—China and Russia. We had better not lose sight of that here in the Senate.

Unfortunately, at the moment, my Democratic colleagues seem more focused on scoring political points than ensuring that our military has the certainty and the funding it needs to counter our adversaries. They have said they will not allow us to fund our military here in the Senate until the funding levels for all 12 appropriations bills are agreed to with the House. If that defies most Americans' senses of how our government works and what is most important, it should.

My Democratic colleagues want to press the pause button here in the Senate. I don't agree with that. I believe

that we must complete our work, and I believe that most of the Democrats want to get this done.

Foremost, we should certainly complete our work on the Defense bill. Funding America's military should be our priority. It should come first here in the Senate. Our men and women in uniform don't get to hit the pause button, as we do. They don't get to shirk their duties, and neither does Congress. We cannot afford additional delay. Our service men and women—those troops whom we have entrusted to keep us safe and protect our democracy, our country, and our allies—cannot afford additional delay. We must not kick the can down the road when it comes to America's security and America's military.

Let's come together. We have done this. Senator LEAHY and I worked together last year, and for the first time in years, we met the deadline. We can do this again. We need the green light here. We need to provide the resources that are necessary to maintain the greatest fighting force the world has ever known. We should never be second to anybody else. Let's show our troops that we can actually get our work done here, that we actually care about them.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote start now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Lisa Murkowski, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Rick Scott, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, Mitch McConnell.

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 motion to

proceed to H.R. 2740, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

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

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) 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 Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), 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 51, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Ernst	Peters
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Jones	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Perdue	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Paul	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet	Isakson	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 41. Three-fifths of the Senators having not voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 355.

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 David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at 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 David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, John Boozman, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Michael B. Enzi, Chuck Grassley, Mitch McConnell.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 463.

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 Danielle J. Hunsaker, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.