the sometimes not-so-exciting budget materials into content that is easier to digest and understand.

And finally, our intern Eleanor Clark was a great help to all our staff during this time as well.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021—MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, even at this late hour, and before the conclusion of the session, this Chamber is going to take one more step in the fight to protect voting rights in this country.

In a moment, I will move to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the For the People Act, a vehicle for the Senate to have a debate on voting rights.

It is my intention that the first amendment to the bill would be the text of a compromise bill that a group of Senators are working on.

Let me be very clear. This is a debate the Senate must have. In America today, we are witnessing the most sweeping and coordinated attacks on voting rights since the era of Jim Crow.

Reactionary Republican legislatures are making it harder for poorer, younger, and non-White Americans to vote, while at the same time making it easier for partisan actors to steal an election.

Senate Democrats are not going to stand by while this happens. We are going to fight to protect the sacred right to vote.

Now, before I make my motion, I yield to my colleague and friend from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I have made it crystal clear that I do not support the For the People Act.

Over the past few months, I have worked to eliminate the far-reaching aspects of that bill and amend the legislation to make sure our elections are fair, accessible, and secure.

In June, I voted to begin debate in the Senate on my amended voting rights legislation, not For the People Act. Tonight, I am again voting to move that process forward because I believe that we need to come together to restore people's faith in the integrity of our elections.

But I do make it very clear that I will not support the For the People Act. For example, I firmly believe that we need commonsense voter ID requirements, just like we have in West Virginia, that strengthen the security of our elections without making it harder for Americans to vote.

I also firmly believe that we shouldn't politicize the Federal Election Commission, prohibit any guardrails on vote by mail, or prevent local election officials from doing basic maintenance of voter rolls.

The compromise bill we voted on in June included all of these important provisions, and I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to allow us to debate this critical issue and come up with a bipartisan solution that protects every American's right to vote.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my friend for his dedication to finding a way forward on this critical issue.

And now, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Rules Committee being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of S. 1, For the People Act of 2021.

And for the information of the Senate, it is my intention the first amendment to the bill would be the text of a compromise bill that a group of Senators are working on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion equally divided between the two leaders or their designees with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, well, here we go again, colleagues. We have seen this once before, and I think it is fitting that after passing this budget resolution full of reckless taxing and spending, we end the evening with an effort to Federalize—take over all elections all across America by the Federal Government.

Now, we are hearing it is going to be a substitute, but what is technically before us is as follows: After ramming through this reckless taxing-and-spending spree here in the dead of night, they also want to start tearing up the ground rules of our democracy and writing new ones, of course, on a purely partisan basis.

I suppose the timing actually makes sense, given the terrible votes that every Democratic Senator has just cast here tonight. I can understand why their thoughts have turned so quickly to their next elections and why they might be feeling especially anxious to tilt the playing field in their direction.

This ridiculous, go-nowhere bill that is stuck in the Rules Committee would let Washington Democrats take over 50 State election laws, completely Federalize how we handle elections in this country.

It would attack popular safeguards, like voter ID. It would turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan body. It would even spend public funds on our political companies. Four-plus trillion dollars in new spending actually wasn't enough tonight. It wasn't enough.

The preference of at least 49 out of 50 of them is to spend public money on our own elections; have public money finance the attack ads of people you disagree with.

So, look, my view is that maybe this is just concluding the night with a little comic relief. S. 1 is an absurd and clumsy effort by one political party to literally rewrite the ground rules of our democracy to try to advantage them and disadvantage the other side.

It is always a temptation when the majority wants to write the rules to make it more likely you can get the outcome you want.

This isn't going to work. It isn't going to work tonight, and it isn't going to work when we get back.

VOTE ON MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield all remaining time on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 358 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49. The motion to discharge is agreed to, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2093

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2093, the For the People Act of 2021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill would constitute a Federal Government takeover of elections. It would constitute a massive power grab by Democrats. It would disenfranchise millions of Americans. It would do precisely the opposite of its nominal title, ''For the People.'' It is, instead, for the politicians because it entrenches politicians and ensures that the people cannot vote them out of office.

It would strike down virtually every reasonable voter integrity law in the country, including voter ID laws supported by the overwhelming majority of this country; including prohibitions on ballot harvesting—again, widely supported by people in this country. It would mandate that felons be allowed to vote, and it would automatically register millions of illegal aliens to vote. It would profoundly undermine democracy in this country, and for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2670

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. The Republican minority has just prevented the Senate from even having a debate—a debate; just that—on voting rights in this country.

I understand my Republican colleagues don't approve of every aspect of the Democratic bill to protect voting rights, but surely there are areas where our two parties can find some agreement. Partisan gerrymandering, for instance, has plagued our country for too long. It skews our democracy towards the extremes. It strips the American people of their right to have a truly representative government.

Voters ought to pick their politicians, not the other way around. But in so many States, partisan legislators draw maps that artificially maximize the number of seats that the majority party will win. Some districts are so safe that the most extreme candidates can run and win with hardly any competition.

Surely my Republican colleagues would agree that partisan gerrymandering deserves a debate on the Senate floor. It is a small part of S. 1 but one that has broad universal support—and the support, by the way, of all 49 of my Democratic colleagues.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2670, Calendar No. 119, the Redistricting Reform Act of 2021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the text of the Constitution explicitly assigns power to engage in redistricting to elected State legislatures in the States. There is a reason for that. That ensures that redistricting is controlled by the people.

We have an unfortunate pattern in today's Congress, which is today's Democrats no longer believe in democracy. Their bill, S. 1—what many call the Corrupt Politicians Act—is designed to prevent the voters from voting Democrats out of office.

This bill, the bill to remove the State legislatures from their constitutionally appointed responsibility of being in charge of redistricting, would instead assign that to commissions and ultimately to the Federal courts, to unelected Federal judges.

Now, redistricting and gerrymandering can lead to ugly consequences. This is not new. The Founders were well aware of the ugly consequences of gerrymandering. Indeed, the very word ''gerrymander'' comes from Elbridge Gerry, one of the Founders whose district was so contorted, it looked like a salamander. That is where the district came from.

The Founders knew that if you give redistricting to elected politicians, they will act based on political concerns. The reason the Founders did so is, even with those down sides, it keeps the process accountable to the people. If you instead hand it over to unelected commissions or to unelected Federal judges, the people are disenfranchised. That is a serious mistake.

I would note, over a decade ago, I defended the constitutionality and the constitutional assignment of that responsibility to the State legislatures before the U.S. Supreme Court in the Texas redistricting case, and we won a landmark 5-to-4 victory where the Supreme Court upheld the clear constitutional authorization of legislatures to engage in redistricting even if they engaged in political concerns because the check on that is not unelected judges second-guessing the people; rather, the check on that is democracy and the people engaging in their own check and balance.

Accordingly, I object.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. So the American people should understand, Republicans just blocked the Senate from even debating legislation to end partisan gerrymandering and make our Congress more representative of the people.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2671

Mr. President, surely our Republican colleagues, however, would agree that billions of dollars in anonymous campaign donations every year is not a function of a healthy democracy. Surely they must agree that America's representatives should have only one boss—the people, not the special interests.

So I am going to ask the Senate now to debate a simple measure to bring a much needed transparency to campaign donations—just transparency, not even limits, although I would certainly support those. At the very least, the American people deserve to know who is trying to influence their representatives and how strenuously.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2671, Calendar No. 120, the DISCLOSE Act of 2021, which has the support of our entire caucus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, you know, I would note there is a long history of government trying to force the disclosure of the identity of political contributions, and much of that history is sordid.

Indeed, in a landmark case before the U.S. Supreme Court, racist southern Democratic politicians tried to force the NAACP to hand over their donor list, and they wanted to do so for reasons that were not difficult to discern, because they intended to persecute those who dare contribute to the NAACP.

And the Supreme Court, in a landmark decision, concluded that the Constitution protects against that forced disclosure. But I will say, the majority leader said just a few minutes ago that surely there must be some area of common ground, and indeed there is on this issue.

I think all of us, if we were speaking in a moment of candor, if we were not engaged in our typical partisan battle on the floor, would acknowledge the current system is stupid. The current system makes no sense. Super-PACs make no sense. Why is that? Because in all of our elections—every one of us has run for election—there are super-PACs, which are independent groups. It is illegal for us, as candidates, to speak with those independent groups. And in every one of our races—I see the Senator from Arizona. He is going have a hotly contested race. It wouldn't surprise me to see $100 million or more spent in his race, perhaps on both sides. Much of that will be spent in super-PACs.

It is illegal for us, as candidates, to communicate with those super-PACs. So we are left with the bizarre situation where there is millions or sometimes tens of millions of dollars being spent on behalf of us; millions, sometimes tens of millions of dollars, spent attacking us; and we can't communicate with them. We hope it has some bearing or relevance to what we believe.

Every Congress, since I have been here, I have introduced legislation to end this. This is legislation called the SuperPAC Elimination Act. This act does two very simple things. No. 1, it allows unlimited individual contributions to Federal campaigns, not from unions, not from corporations but from real human beings, from people—unlimited contributions.

I would note this is the way the State of Texas handles State elections.

No. 2, my legislation, the SuperPAC Elimination Act, requires immediate 24-hour disclosure. So if an individual

writes a check to a campaign, that gets disclosed immediately, and you can debate about whether that contribution was corrosive or not.

This legislation would not prohibit super-PACs, but, as a practical matter, super-PACs would fade from relevance because every candidate would much prefer money given to their campaign, where you can spend on your own message. It would make far more sense to have an open, transparent system.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill at the desk that would protect freedom of speech in America's electoral process and ensure transparency in campaign finance. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that a motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the able.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I object to the Senator from Texas's legislation. It is obvious to just about every American that it would make a bad situation even worse. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request from the Senator of New York?

Mr. CRUZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in conclusion, before I turn it over to some of my colleagues, Democrats have tried to do something very simple. We asked the Senate to start debate—just debate—on legislation to protect voting rights and strengthen our democracy. Republicans said no. Democrats have asked to debate a measure just to prevent partisan gerrymandering, and, then, frankly, in my colleague's response, he was all over the lot: It is good to have politicians do it; it is not good to have politicians do it. It is good to have judges do it; it is not good to have judges do it.

We would set standards to make sure that in a State like Wisconsin, where 53 percent of the people voted for a Democratic member of the State assembly, only a third of the districts were Democratic, drawn by a Republican legislature.

So Republicans have said no. They don't even want to debate these issues.

Democrats have asked to debate the measure to bring much needed transparency to campaign donations and get special interest dark money out of politics. Republicans still said no.

So let there be no mistake about what is going on here. We have reached a point in this Chamber where Republicans appear to oppose any measure—any measure—no matter how common sense, to protect voting rights and strengthen our democracy.

Let there be no mistake. Both inside this Chamber and outside of it, Republicans have formed a wall—a total wall—of opposition against progress on voting rights in the U.S. Senate. Even on an issue as sacred as the right to vote, Senate Republicans refuse to allow even a debate. They are afraid to debate.

Yesterday morning, we saw what it looks like when the Senate comes together. This is what it looks like when it doesn't. Apparently, there are very serious and important limits to bipartisanship. There are some issues where Republicans refuse to join us, in good faith, to make progress for our country.

I never thought I would see the day when voting rights, which used to be supported in a bipartisan way as recently as 2006, would be one of those issues. But that is what we have come to—total Republican intransigence when it comes to simple measures to make our democracy more perfect and strengthen the hand of the individual voter.

Now, let me be clear. Republicans refusing to support anything on voting rights is not an excuse for Democrats to do nothing. In recent weeks, I met with a number of Democratic Senators: Senators KLOBUCHAR and MERKLEY, MANCHIN and WARNOCK and PADILLA, KAINE, KING, and TESTER to discuss a compromise voting rights bill. We have made a great deal of progress on that legislation. We had a very good meeting as late recently as yesterday afternoon, and we intend to rally around it.

So, tonight, I am filing cloture on a vehicle to allow the Senate to take up the compromise voting rights bill. Voting rights—voting rights—will be the first matter of legislative business when the Senate returns to session in September. Our democracy demands no less.

I yield the floor. I yield to my colleague from Oregon and then my colleague from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we have the privilege to come to this floor and examine issues important to every American. And what could be more important than the fundamental right to participate in the guidance of our country and to be able to cast a ballot. And that ballot box, it is the pulsating heart of our Republic.

In fact, it is 56 years ago, just a couple of days ago, that President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And what did he say? He said it is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any American the opportunity to vote. Well, what was deadly wrong in 1965 is deadly wrong in 2021.

It is hard to believe that over 50 years—over half a century—has passed, and we are reverting to that period before 1965, where there was a systematic effort to target specific groups of voters and prevent them from going to the poll.

And we all know how this worked. On election day, there would be fewer precinct voting locations in those areas that you didn't want to vote, and they would be understaffed so there would be long lines, or their voting machines would be out of order, or they would change the location every 2 years so people would be confused about where to go, or they would locate them where there was no parking—all of these things deliberately aimed at preventing Black Americans from voting and preventing other communities of color from voting.

Well, today, we are seeing in State after State after State an expanded version of this, not just targeting Black Americans and other communities of color but also targeting poor communities and college students. And we see these laws unfolding in just the recent months.

I would expect 100 of our colleagues here to stand up and defend the ballot box. Aren't we long removed from those days of that racist past? But apparently not.

So some of us have to stand up and say: We are going to stand up to the vision of our Constitution where all men and women are created equal and every man and woman has the right to participate in the guidance of this country.

You know, we know that in the founding of our country, we had a beautiful vision, imperfectly formed, that Black Americans, Native Americans, and women were not allowed to vote. We fixed those things over time. We progressed in an arc to full opportunity, and that is what we are fighting for now—full opportunity of every citizen to have a full measure of what it means to be a participant in a Republic.

Well, there is much more in this bill to mend the assault on equal representation through the diabolical gerrymandering denied to bias the outcome from one party over the other, and certainly to keep billionaires from buying elections.

And when we ask people around the country—Independents, Democrats, Republicans—they all say: We do not want billionaires to buy elections. We do not want equal representation destroyed by diabolical gerrymandering, and we want every citizen to have access to the ballot box.

But in this Chamber, suddenly, the views of the Republicans across this country are forgotten by my Republican colleagues across the aisle. In that thirsty quest for power, they are willing to violate the fundamental principles that inspire our Nation, and it is wrong—deadly wrong—today as it was in 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, a short word on dark money. When the Republican justices on the Supreme Court opened the floodgates of unlimited money in the disgraceful Citizens United decision, that suddenly made something new very important, and that was to hide who you are when you are spending the money.

If the biggest check you can write is $5,000, there is no great premium in hiding who you are. When you can write a $5 million check to back a candidate, suddenly hiding who you are becomes extremely valuable and salient.

So, suddenly, this became very real. But those Justices who had opened the door to unlimited money, when they made that decision, in order to justify that decision, they had to say that the spending had to be transparent. Otherwise, the Citizens United decision would not have worked in the constitutional scheme. They had to say that.

But for the next decade, what did they do about it? Case after case came before them where the dark money problem was raised. We rode through a billion dollars in dark money being spent in our elections. This was on the front page of the newspaper. This was being done in plain view. And what did the Republican Justices on the Supreme Court do to enforce their own stated requirement of transparency? Not one thing.

And so we have had a decade of corruption of government by billionaire interests who can hide who they are and operate through an enormous phalanx of phony front groups whom they have stood up. And if you want to know how real this is, look at what we have had to do in the reconciliation measure to address climate change—because when I got here, there were Republicans willing to address climate change.

We had bill after bill in the Senate that were bipartisan and serious and sincere. That stopped dead in January of 2010. When Citizens United was decided, the dark money spigots opened, and the fossil fuel industry behind them enforced compliance across the entire Republican Party. If you crossed the fossil fuel industry on climate change, if you are Bob Inglis, you were out, you were done. If you lined up with them and did what they said, in came tens of millions of dollars in dark money to support you.

It was a devil's bargain, and it cost us a lost decade on climate change. And now we have to go forward, sadly, in a partisan way to solve this problem. That is the pressure of dark money in our politics. It is behind the capture of the Supreme Court. It is behind voter suppression. This is demonstrable stuff, and we have got to put an end to it. And it is a tragedy and a disgrace that we can't go to cleaning up the dark money mess.

My Republican colleagues and their dark money groups are actually at the point now where they are accusing us of taking dark money. They are accusing Democrats of being the dark money party. Well, we just settled that question tonight. Democrats want to clean it up. They want to protect it. It is as simple as that. That is all you need to know.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I must do a couple of procedural things.

But do my colleagues from Georgia and California want to speak on voting rights?

No. Thank you. I am sure the Senators from New Jersey and Connecticut are very grateful as well.

I will be brief.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 64.

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 James Richard Kvaal, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Education.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Executive Calendar No. 64, James Richard Kvaal, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Education.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Catherine Cortez Masto, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Baldwin, Chris Van Hollen, Tim Kaine, Thomas R. Carper, Amy Klobuchar, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 252.

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 G. Estudillo, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Executive Calendar No. 252, David G. Estudillo, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Sherrod Brown, Tammy Duckworth, Robert Menendez, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Ben Ray Luján, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Edward J. Markey, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 260.

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 Angel Kelley, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Executive Calendar No. 260, Angel Kelley, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Elizabeth Warren, Edward J. Markey, Christopher A. Coons, Cory A. Booker, Alex Padilla, Richard Blumenthal, Mazie K. Hirono, Chris Van Hollen, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.