

progress. However, just because the arc of history always bends toward justice does not mean it will not meet resistance. As King said, “Change never rode in on the wheels of inevitability.”

We are the architects of our Nation. We are the truth tellers, life workers, and lovers that must exult our principles. We cannot fail now. Love is on the line. Citizenship is on the line. We are interdependent. We need each other. We cannot deny the worth of one American without denying the worth, dignity, and strength of our Nation as a whole.

The story of Jim Obergefell and John Arthur is a story not just of unconditional love and unconditional hope, it is not just about the two of them, but it is about our country. This is the story of all of us—of America. It is a story of what our truth will be. One member of this incredible partnership has passed away, but I know their love marches on.

I believe in this country our truth will march on, and equality and justice will have its way.

Madam President, I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, Senator SESSIONS wants to speak in a moment, and I will be brief.

I would like to thank Senator BOOKER for his always stirring words and for his sense of justice and fair play and leadership in so many ways.

I met Jim about 1 year ago and had a brief meeting, not too long after the court decision by Judge Black in the Cincinnati Southern District Court in Ohio. I just spent a half an hour with him in my office. He never wanted and never expected to be famous. He never expected to come to Washington to meet with Senators. He never expected to travel the country giving speeches. He was once a high school teacher. He joked that more people have been with him as he traveled across the country, joked that when he spoke to crowds of hundreds or even 1,000 about his experience with his beloved John and what has happened, he wished that his students had listened to him so closely. You could hear a pin drop when he spoke to hundreds, which is not always the case when speaking as a high school teacher. But he wanted to live his life in a normal way as most Americans do. He never expected to have his story or his marriage litigated before the U.S. Supreme Court.

But that is really the mark of character, that Jim has taken his grief and his pain and hoped to change the world, and that is what he is doing. His marriage is still not equal in my State of Ohio. I am embarrassed by that. I was, frankly, embarrassed when Ohio, 10 years ago, passed a constitutional amendment outlawing same-sex marriage. I thought it was a terrible public policy mistake. I think it left too many people behind and too many people heartbroken.

Jim and his late husband John Arthur's story is one of love and sacrifice. It could happen to anyone. It could happen to any of us. Frankly, it happens to too many families. So as Senator BOOKER pointed out, they flew to Maryland where John's aunt, Paulette Roberts, officiated their marriage on the tarmac in a medical plane.

Paulette remarked, “If marriage vows mean anything, then those two were more married than anyone I have ever known.” That speaks to their commitment, it speaks to their love, to the seriousness with which they took their wedding vows, and the seriousness of the relationship for 20 years prior to that.

Just 3 months and 11 days later John passed away. Jim has been fighting for his marriage ever since. The question is, why should he have to do that? No one ever voted to allow my wife Connie and me to stand before our families and acknowledge our love and commitment. When we were married, we were benefitting from a right not—get this—a right not extended to the minister who officiated our wedding.

The woman who officiated our wedding, Kate Huey, had had a marriage—she had had a commitment ceremony 18 years earlier. It was not until late last year that she traveled to New York with the woman she loved and was officially married, legally married in New York. You still cannot do that in Ohio. It is outrageous that she cannot do that in Ohio. I am hopeful after Jim's case is argued a couple of weeks from now and the Court hands down that decision, it will stop that bigotry and inequality that has hidden under the banner of tradition for far too long.

Keep in mind—and Senator BOOKER, I thought, laid out a lot of this history very well—Ohio once passed laws to keep Black people and White people from marrying. Ohioans came together, as we always do, we rallied, we repealed that unjust and hateful antimiscegenation law. We have a long history of fighting for justice and equality. We will not rest until we achieve that justice for Jim and for John.

I look at the pages who sit before us who are mostly 16 and 17-years-old. This is something that makes no sense to most of them. When I was talking to Jim earlier in my office, he had made a speech in Athens, OH, to Ohio University students. He told me most of them could not understand why State laws would prohibit somebody from marrying the person whom they love. They could not understand why the State government, the Ohio State government, would spend my tax dollars and Jim's tax dollars, the tax dollars of Hazel's parents—mother of the page from Ohio—the tax dollars of all of us to fight this court battle so that Jim's marriage would be denied.

If the Supreme Court rules in Jim's favor, and I think it will, Jim's name will go down in the history books, along with Roe, from *Roe v. Wade*; and

Brown, in *Brown v. Board of Education*. It is not what Jim was after. It would be fitting for a love that spanned decades and was strong enough to carry Jim here to Washington. The moment has come for our Supreme Court to stand on the right side of history and join Americans who support marriage equality.

As Senator BOOKER said, 37 States and the District of Columbia now allow marriage equality. I do not like it that we have to rely on the Supreme Court to get my State to change its laws. We have politicians who look backward rather than forward. That is too bad. We have politicians who are willing to deny human beings basic rights, basic civil rights, basic rights of decency and fairness.

I am hopeful that Jim's courage and Jim's outspokenness and Jim's willingness to join on behalf of John in his fight and make this fight will help change my State and help change our Nation. I know I cannot look to the gallery and thank somebody so I will not look to the gallery, but I will still thank Jim from here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

SGR LEGISLATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to share a few thoughts as we head into this week, because we will be confronting the question of how to fix the payment to our physicians who treat Medicare and Medicaid patients. If we do not take action, there will be a 21-percent reduction in the amount of money they are paid to do the work for the Federal Government.

This is an unacceptable alternative, but it is what current law says. Congress needs to fix it. In fact, we have been dealing with this for 17 years. For 17 years, Congress has, in some way or another, fixed the doctor payment plan and raised their pay so that they do not take a cut. As years have gone by, the size of the cut that needs to be fixed has increased too, as I said, 21 percent today if we do not act. I think there is a uniform, universal belief that we should do that, and do it on a permanent basis so we do not have to have doctors calling Congress every year, saying: Are you going to change the law so I can continue to do Medicare work? If you do not change it and my services are cut 21 percent, I am out of here. I can hardly make a living now on what you pay me, and taking a big cut will not allow me to continue to offer Medicare services for people in need.

It is a big issue and a real issue. I have favored a permanent fix for a number of years. I would offer, though, to my colleagues that many of us who have been concerned about the financial condition of our country have successfully insisted each one of those 17 times that the new money that is needed to pay the additional funding be

paid for, that is, by finding wasteful spending or other spending somewhere else in the government of this country and use that money to make up the difference.

We have refused to pass it by just borrowing the money. Remember, this is an entitlement. By that, it means once the government says what the rate will be, the doctors will go out and do the work, they will demand payment whether the government has any money or not, whether we are running deficits or not. If the government does not pay them the rate agreed upon, they can file a complaint and the government will have to come up with the money.

What we really needed to offset this was a real finding of wasteful spending, or spending in other areas to divert that money to pay for this increase in pay for doctors on a permanent basis. It appears that Speaker BOEHNER and Democratic Leader PELOSI in the House got together and agreed on a bill. They passed it in the House with a big vote. Even most Democrats voted for the bill.

It was sent to the Senate as we were voting, at that very time, that very day, on the budget resolution for the Senate. We were proud of our budget. It was not a perfect budget. I supported it. But it balanced. If we follow the plans put forth in the budget resolution that passed the Senate—if we follow those—we would be on a path to a balanced budget. We would be spending about \$4,000-plus billion 10 years from today. We would be increasing spending all right, but not as much as has been projected, but we also see a \$3 billion surplus in the final year of the budget window. So instead of having a deficit in the 10th year, we were going to have a \$3 billion surplus. That is something to celebrate after decades of deficits, trillion dollar deficits, \$1,000 billion deficits. I think we have averaged \$1,000 billion deficits for the last 6 years. Unbelievable.

We are committed to the American people to do something about it. The Budget Control Act and other efforts have reduced our spending from what it might otherwise have been. The House decided to send H.R. 2 to the Senate. They passed it with a big vote. This bill, over 250 pages in length, was sent to the Senate the same evening as our budget vote-rama. We had over 750 amendments under consideration that evening. We finished the budget process at 3 a.m. What many wanted us to do was just pass this bill at 3 a.m. with hardly any knowledge of what was in it and without a real understanding of how much it was going to cost. We were told by a number of people that it was “paid for.” “Don’t worry about it.” “It has been taken care of.”

So there was concern about that. Senator MCCONNELL did not bring it up at 3:30 in the morning right before we did our recess. It was unseemly to have done that for a whole host of reasons. But we are coming right up to the

deadline. The deadline was March 31, but I understand that there was a 14-day window whereby Congress could consider a fix before doctors were impacted. We need to get this taken care of. But we need to do it responsibly, in a grownup fashion.

The House Members really did not have the bill to study. They just followed mainly talking points, which if you read their talking points, I may have voted for it, based on what they were telling their Members. The talking points said this: First, it told House members that the bill pays for all new future spending.

To not have a 21-percent cut, but to pay them at a more appropriate rate, this bill is going to cost more money. But, they were told that all the new future spending would be paid for.

Second, it said it allows “Congress to go through regular order and legislate thoughtfully.” So we were going to pass it at 3:30 in the morning without it having gone through a committee and without having a real, firm, long-term cost estimate from CBO as to what it would actually cost?

Third, they also said in their talking points, “It offsets all new spending.” What that means, to Members of Congress, is that it would not add to the debt because somehow the increase in spending would be offset by a reduction in spending somewhere else.

Fourth, they used the phrase we use around here, they claim it “bends the cost curve,” it would bring down costs. But this is not accurate either.

So here are the problems: This bill is not paid for. Our own Congressional Budget Office said it would add \$141 billion to the deficit. Over 10 years, you add those up, \$141 billion. They said the net increase to the debt would be \$174 billion. How does it get to be more than 141? Well, when you spend \$141 billion more than you have, you have to borrow the money. When you borrow the money, you pay interest on the money.

The Congressional Budget Office said it would add an additional \$33 billion in interest payments just over that 10 years. Many promoting this legislation said: Well, there may be a shortfall in the first 10 years, but over 20 years, the reductions in spending we found somewhere are going to bring in enough money to pay for it fully then.

So what did the Congressional Budget Office say? The Congressional Budget Office said this. “It will increase budget deficits” in the “second decade.” So instead of reducing the deficits or paying for the cost of this by changes now that benefit us 15, 20 years from now, it adds more.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—a fine, responsible nonpartisan group headed by Maya MacGuineas—did a study of this. They said over 20 years it would add \$500 billion to the deficit. Those numbers, to my knowledge, have not been disputed. I think that is a pretty accurate figure. It is not going to reduce the deficit. In

10 years, it is going to add \$174 billion—not going to reduce the deficit over 20 years, it is going to add \$500 billion.

So this violates the Budget Control Act that we passed in 2011 that is in law today. That is something we should not be doing. We need to adhere to that agreement which the President signed and we in both Houses of Congress agreed upon in a bipartisan way to hold spending down. It is not going to balance the budget, the Budget Control Act doesn’t, but it helps a lot. We ought to at least adhere to it.

So this violates the Budget Control Act and is subject to at least eight different violations—points of order, we call it, where you can object because it violates the budget. There are at least eight different ways in which this legislation violates the Budget Control Act and, of course, it violates the House and Senate budgets that we are just now in the process of adopting.

The Senate has passed its budget. They had a \$3 billion surplus in the 10th year. Listen, not paying down any of that debt except that \$3 billion in the 10th year—but just not having annual deficits—it would take us 10 years to finally balance the budget, which we need to do. Experts have told us we need to do so because we are on an unsustainable financial path.

So our budgets go further than that. The House and the Senate budgets do so. If we pass a bill that adds \$174 billion to the deficit, it will be at least \$17 billion in the 10th year. So instead of having a \$3 billion surplus, we will have at least a \$14 billion deficit. And the day we are celebrating the fact that we altered the spending course of our country and produced a balanced budget, that very day we were asked to pass a bill that would wipe out all of that. It is just not responsible, in my view.

I am just not able to tout the fact that we passed a balanced budget. Maybe that is why they would like to pass this bill before the final agreement between the House and the Senate occurs in conference and we have a firm budget. We just now have a House budget and a Senate budget. Maybe they wanted to do that so the first thing we do isn’t to bust the budget to which we just agreed.

I wish I didn’t have to say these things. I wish I didn’t have to say this, but the truth is that this is not responsible. This is not maintaining faith with the American people who sent us to Congress.

I think on both sides of the aisle—certainly on the Republican side—there were real commitments made to our constituents that if we were in Congress, we would do something about these deficits and we were going to bring this government under control and produce a budget—a budget that balances.

In addition, it is claimed and asserted that this legislation represents a permanent fix—that we will not have to continue to come forward each year

to come up with the funding or some legislation to keep the doctors paid at a reasonable rate. But it is not a permanent fix, either. It is not a permanent fix, as has been reported. It is only about 9 years, and there are huge, long-range concerns.

There is another thing it does, and, colleagues, we have to understand this. Being on the Budget Committee, we went through it. It is so important. One of the greatest manipulations and gimmicks we are doing is in the way we are spending the taxpayers' money, why our deficits are so large and our debt has become \$18-plus trillion—on which we paid interest—\$220 billion last year, and it will grow every year, according to CBO.

Why? We double count money. It is unbelievable.

This is what they are going to propose. They are going to cut Medicare Part A in this legislation. That is the benefit that goes to doctors and hospitals. They will cut it about \$55 billion—I believe the figure is—and then they will use this \$55 billion to pay the physicians under Part B and D of Medicare—the non-trust fund money. So they are gutting the Medicare trust fund. That money is money that comes off of your paychecks every week and goes to pay for your Medicare when you retire. That money goes into a trust fund. It has trustees. If you cut the cost of doing business for Medicare, the sponsors of the bill say it will extend the life of Medicare 1 year.

That is probably correct. If you cut what you pay to doctors or hospitals or medical devices or drug companies, you reduce what you pay, you could extend the life of Medicare, its financial solvency. It is becoming insolvent just as Social Security is becoming insolvent. So we need to do some things to help extend its life so our seniors don't have to worry about not having health care in the future.

How is it double counted, JEFF?

Well, they are using the money—the trustees. It is the trustees of Medicare's money that is being saved.

How did it get outside of the Medicare trust fund and get spent for doctors in that part of Medicare? How does it get out of there?

The trustees of Medicare loan the money to the U.S. Treasury. Now we have it, colleagues. The money that is used to pay the doctors that comes from Medicare cost reduction is borrowed money, just the same as if they had borrowed it from a financier in London or Beijing. Interest is paid to the Medicaid trustees.

You cannot count the money twice. You cannot save the money here and say it improves Medicare—legally it does improve Medicare—but it provides no money to spend on new programs outside of Medicare, and the Congressional Budget Office has told us this. Yet they are scoring, I think, \$55 billion they claim is going to pay for this new expenditure by double counting the money.

ObamaCare did that, I believe—by about \$500 billion. They cut Medicare expenses and used the money to fund an entirely new program. But the money didn't go directly to the U.S. Treasury. It went to the trustees of Medicare, who loaned it to the U.S. Treasury and double counted the money.

If you would like to know why we are going broke, this is one of the big reasons this country is on a reckless course. Nobody wants to talk about it or confront it, because if you do, it reduces spending, and people around here like spending too much.

By the way, I note our hospitals would like to see the doctors get paid more and have this problem fixed, but a big chunk of what is claimed of that portion of this new expenditure that is actually paid for appears to be \$31 billion in cuts to providers such as hospitals. So we are cutting hospitals here to pay doctors, and our hospitals are struggling too.

To conclude, this is why the American people don't trust Congress. Some of our Members get their feelings hurt when they go home and some tea party person or somebody else accuses them of wasting money, not managing well, and they are offended by it.

I have to say the tea party got more right than wrong. This is another example of reckless, irresponsible spending.

Before adjourning for our recess 2 weeks ago, in the middle of the night, at 3 a.m., we passed a balanced budget plan, and we were proud of it. We went home the last 2 weeks and told our constituents we were going to work to accomplish that balanced budget goal and try to make sure it becomes a reality.

But what is the first bill we consider since adopting the balanced budget goal? What is the first bill? We are taking up a bill to dig us \$174 billion deeper in debt in the first 10 years. The first major legislative accomplishment of our new Congress is going to be adding almost \$200 billion to the debt over 10 years and then perhaps \$500 billion or half a trillion over 20 years.

It is not necessary. I don't see how we can look our constituents in the eye and say we are producing a balanced budget, when, if this bill passes, we don't have a balanced budget.

Well, was the plan really to balance the budget, people might ask, or just to use as talking points, just a fun campaign claiming we have a balance? Our new Congress was sworn in only 3 months ago, and we are already shattering our promises to our constituents.

I think it is fair to say we are acting irresponsibly. Not only are we continuing to allow the debt to explode, but we aren't really being honest with our constituents about it.

Before they cast their votes, House Members were told this bill "pays for all new future spending" and that it "offsets all new spending." But this is

not accurate. It is not true. It adds to the deficit every single year.

We are going to offer an amendment so that this bill lives up to the promises of the sponsors. A good amendment, a PayGo amendment that I think Senator LEE will probably offer which will put us on a path to ensure that this new expenditure is paid for.

I think we need to have that vote, and I think it needs to pass. That would be responsible. Then we could honestly say we made choices. That is what you should do in this body. There is a limited amount of money and a virtually unlimited number of requests for good projects that we should spend money on.

We are sent to the Senate to make choices, set priorities, do the right thing, and manage money carefully—that is why our constituents from all over the country sent us here, and they had their tax money extracted from them and sent to Washington—to be spent wisely and honestly, I suggest.

One of the most amazing things is that we spend \$3,800 billion a year now. We can't find \$15 billion a year to fix the doctor payments? We can't find \$15 billion in this whole \$3,800 billion a year that we spend that will actually be able to fund the doctors in the way that we should fund them without adding to the debt?

You bet we can. I have a list of them. Others have a list of them. There will be some suggestions as to how this could be done.

We don't need to gimmick up this legislation, but it is legislation that undermines the promises we made that we are going to be fiscally responsible.

We don't vote on talking points. We vote on legislation. Legislation can be studied, and it becomes law. Our Congressional Budget Office, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and Maya MacGuineas and the Center for a Responsible Federal Budget can read and add the numbers. They have read them, added them, and they don't add up.

This is legislation. We are not voting on talking points.

Without change, it is a massive debt increase that puts a balanced budget even further out of reach.

It means a lot to me that we, as a Congress, establish credibility with those whom we serve. One of the parts of doing that is to be honest and to say we do have a tight situation here. We are going to have to make some choices—but not brutal choices.

We can find the money we need without doing anything but eliminating fraud, waste, abuse, duplication, and unwise spending. We don't have to savage children or the military to do so, but it is hard work. Every time you talk about reducing this program or that program, a group shows up and pushes back, but that is why we are here.

As my wife says to me when I complain: Don't blame me; you asked for the job.

That is what we asked for—to be in the Senate and make these tough choices.

I hope, in the hours that are ahead, we will be able to have some amendments—and there are several that would fix this and would allow the doctors to receive the pay they are entitled to—and they are entitled to it—but at the same time would not add to the debt.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would just add that this isn't just my opinion about these cost overruns in the legislation. Here is a Wall Street Journal article from a few days ago: "Two-thirds of \$214 billion cost would be financed through higher deficits. . . ." That is the subheadline on that. The headline is: "Senate Wrangles Over Medicare-Payments Fix."

So I don't think there is any real doubt about that. The article goes on to say:

The deal reached by House leaders would shift some of those costs onto Medicare beneficiaries—

So some of the Medicare benefits, such as Part C, are not part of trust fund money. It is not paid for when you have that withholding from your paycheck, and people with higher incomes probably ought to pay a higher percentage of the cost that they can reasonably afford, if they have a higher income, when they go see a doctor. I think we could use that. But at any rate, this bill would shift some costs to Medicare beneficiaries. The article continues—

while providers such as hospitals also would shoulder some costs.

So they are paying for some of these costs by having reduction in payments to hospitals that are hurting this year. And the article states:

The rest would be financed through higher deficits.

No doubt about it.

Forbes magazine comments here in an article by Stan Collender, saying that "the procedural choices Congress is making all favor increasing the deficit rather than at least requiring it not get any worse."

This is what the article says about the SGR—the physician's payment: "The SGR change without a full offset is projected to add an average of around \$14 billion a year to the deficit."

Here is a headline from The Fiscal Times: "Medicare 'Doc Fix' May Be No Fix at All."

Paul Winfree, an economic policy expert with the Heritage Foundation, said this:

Rather than a permanent replacement to the Sustainable Growth Rate—

Remember, we have been promised this would be a permanent replacement—

it is much more likely that the House doc fix will be a shorter-term patch requiring another series of patchwork legislation just nine years from now.

They also conclude in this article that the permanent fix would "add \$141 billion to the deficit over the first 10 years and could go as high as \$500 billion over two decades, as previously reported here."

I did want to emphasize it is really not \$141 over 10 years, it is \$174, because when you add up \$141 billion in additional debt over 10 years, you pay interest on that. You borrow that money and pay interest, and when you calculate the interest that is paid, the increased interest is \$174 billion added to the total deficit of America.

Colleagues, our interest payment on our debt is staggering. The highway bill is about \$40 billion to \$50 billion a year. Aid to education is nearly \$100 billion a year, for example. The interest we pay annually on the current \$18 trillion debt, in spite of the fact we have some of the lowest interest rates we have ever had, was more than \$220 billion-plus last year.

The Congressional Budget Office, however, says that 10 years from now, with interest rates projected to return to the mean and with the deficit every year out for 10 years, we will be over \$900 billion in interest in the 10th year. That is just in 10 years. We go from \$200 billion to \$900-plus billion.

This is why the Congressional Budget Office Director, chosen by our Democratic colleagues, Dr. Elmendorf, a very capable, wise man, has said we are on an unsustainable path. This is a path of fiscal destruction. It is not responsible.

So day after day, week after week, we in Congress are going to have to start saying, no, we don't have the money. Do you not understand? We can't keep digging the hole deeper. We are supposed to be trying to figure out a way to reduce deficits and balance the budget, not to pass more legislation that is going to cost more money than we have to spend on these things. The only way we will be able to honor that legislation is to borrow more. That is what we are doing.

So I don't think there is any doubt about what I have said. If somebody can come down and prove this bill is paid for I will shake their hand and I will be happy because I want to do the doctors fix, and I want to be sure we do it in a responsible financial way. If not, we will have legislation, amendments will be offered that I think can fix it and that will require Congress to come up with the money in a proper way, do the assistance we need to provide to our doctors and not add to the debt.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ALFRED H. BENNETT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alfred H. Bennett, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we yield back all remaining time.

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

All time is yielded back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Alfred H. Bennett, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Cassidy	Flake
Baldwin	Coats	Franken
Barrasso	Cochran	Gardner
Bennet	Collins	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Coons	Grassley
Blunt	Corker	Hatch
Booker	Cornyn	Heinrich
Boozman	Cotton	Heitkamp
Boxer	Crapo	Heller
Brown	Daines	Hirono
Burr	Donnelly	Hoeven
Cantwell	Durbin	Inhofe
Capito	Enzi	Isakson
Cardin	Ernst	Johnson
Carper	Feinstein	Kaine
Casey	Fischer	King