

What is going to happen to the elderly in nursing homes who, despite all their Social Security payments and despite all of their Medicaid reimbursement, still don't have enough resources for the basic care they need to stay alive? When they cut back on that Medicaid coverage, what happens to them? What do their families do to make up the difference? Reach into their savings? Bring mom home from the nursing home in the hopes that they can take care of her in their own home? Those are choices no family should face and no family need face.

I hope the Senate will show the courage and leadership on a bipartisan basis to say no to this terrible bill that passed the U.S. House of Representatives just 2 weeks ago. We need to put together a bill that expands the coverage of health insurance, gives people more peace of mind; a bill that addresses some of the built-in challenges we had with the Affordable Care Act, which is far from perfect. There are things we can do to improve it.

We need to do something about the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. The current law doesn't really affect that. They are out of control at this point.

Secondly, I think we ought to offer a public option. There ought to be a Medicare-type program available across the United States for those who wish it. Medicare enjoys a very positive reputation in America for good reason. Most Americans would feel honored and happy to be protected by a Medicare-type program.

We also need to go to those premiums that are too high and ask why. In many cases, there are individuals who are buying health insurance from very narrow pools of people who are older and sicker. We need to expand that pool so it is real insurance, and we can bring those premiums down. There are ways to do that.

There are many things we can do with reforming the Affordable Care Act, but what the House of Representatives did, what some want to do, is just repeal it and walk away. It would be devastating to the women in America who rely on Medicaid to pay for their delivery expenses, as well as prenatal and postnatal care. It would be devastating to seniors who are in nursing homes and are dependent on Medicaid supplements and for those who are disabled with chronic conditions and have to turn to Medicaid just to make sure they can maintain their lifestyle and still be productive, happy, and safe. These are the elements and these are the costs we would have to charge if we are not careful.

Wouldn't it be great, wouldn't it be terrific, wouldn't it be a headliner to say that Democrats and Republicans came together in the U.S. Senate to make the Affordable Care Act better, to make sure there was more accessible, affordable, quality coverage for more Americans? I think that is why we were elected, and I hope we can achieve that goal.

Mr. President, before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls until 12 noon today be charged equally to both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

YEMEN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, colleagues, I am very pleased to be joined on the floor today by Senator YOUNG. We are both members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and both have an interest in Middle East security. We have joined together on the floor today to give remarks and perhaps have a short colloquy about a humanitarian crisis that is unfolding before our eyes in the Middle East.

Today, inside the country of Yemen—a country that, frankly, not a lot of our constituents give much thought to—every 10 minutes a child under the age of 5 is dying due to preventable causes. Today, 18 million Yemeni civilians—two thirds of the entire population of this country—cannot survive without humanitarian or protection support, and 7 million of those are on what we would call a starvation diet, which means that on a daily basis they don't know where their next meal is coming from. They don't have enough food to eat in order to remain healthy. Three million have already fled their homes because of the violence that has been caused by a civil war—that both Senator YOUNG and I will talk about—inside their country and the humanitarian catastrophe that has resulted from that civil war.

This is one of four current famines that exists in the world today. But I would argue that this particular humanitarian crisis is in some ways the most relevant to the discussions we will have here in the Senate because the United States is participating in the military campaign that is, in fact, causing in part this humanitarian crisis.

The United States is an active participant with a Saudi-led military campaign seeking to regain control of Yemen from a group called the Houthis, who overran the capital and now control large portions of the country.

We, of course, are allies of Saudi Arabia. The President will be visiting Saudi Arabia very soon to solidify that alliance. But it is time we started asking some really hard questions about the conduct of the Saudi campaign inside Yemen and whether we are, in fact, helping to create a humanitarian catastrophe on the grounds that is im-

possible to defend on moral grounds but also is hard to defend based on national security grounds as well.

Let's be honest about what is happening here. The Saudis are deliberately trying to create a famine inside Yemen in order to essentially starve the Yemenis to the negotiating table. Saudi Deputy Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman said:

Time is on our side. Being patient is in our interest. We have the supplies and we have the logistics and high morale. The enemy does not have supplies and funds and is impatient. Time is on our side and we will exploit the time to serve our interests.

What are the Saudis doing to try to exploit this question of time and supplies? First, they are coming directly after the main port city, which brings 70 percent of food into Yemen and about 80 percent of all of the oil. That port city is called Hodeidah.

Senator YOUNG has been very good in meetings to draw issue with what is believed to be deliberate targeting by the Saudis of the cranes and infrastructure in this port which allow for the supplies to come off of boats and move into these desperately, desperately needy areas of the country.

Second, they are requiring an additional screening process for this humanitarian aid above and beyond the one the United Nations has put into place. The United Nations is vetting supply ships coming in to Hodeidah to make sure there is really food and aid on these ships, not weapons, and it is working. But the Saudis are putting an additional process on top that is adding up to a month from the time the aid gets off the ship and into the country. Between that and the military campaign targeting the port and its infrastructure, this has essentially resulted in an effective blockade being put in and around Hodeidah, such that humanitarian support cannot effectively get into the country. But that is just the beginning.

The Saudi bombing campaign has deliberately targeted roads and bridges throughout the country, many of them in and around north Yemen. There are reports that the bombers have engaged in something called double tapping, which is where you hit a humanitarian—a civilian—asset. You wait until the workers come to try to address that first strike, and then you hit it a second time to take out the civilians who have responded to the emergency. This isn't just my opinion of the situation. Representations have been made by multiple aid organizations on the ground, and, more importantly, by U.S. officials who have been embedded with the coalition.

This is a quote from Dafna Rand, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who was in charge of the Saudi coalition portfolio at State:

In 2015, the U.S. Government offered technical training on cyber, ballistic missiles, border security, counterterrorism, and maritime security, [and] the precision guided munitions were transferred in 2015 on the hopes that they would enable better and more precise targeting by the coalition of the targets

itself. [But instead,] what we have seen since is not an improvement in the targeting, and the issue itself is the target selection. It is not the precision of the target itself, but it is the choice of targets and adherence to the no-strike list.

That is a really important statement, a really important sentence, because what is happening is that the United States is telling the coalition: What are the civilian targets you should stay away from, so the humanitarian aid can move into the country? The coalition is deliberately ignoring that advice. It is not a matter of mistakes being made on the ground, though there have been mistakes. It is also a matter of a no-strike list being ignored.

I mention that this is not just about the millions and millions of Yemenis who are starving today because of this civil war. It is also a question of whether this is accruing to the U.S. national security interests. Again, I am speaking just for myself on this matter.

We are allies of the Saudis, and there is no doubt that an Iranian proxy state inside Yemen presents a threat to the Saudi State. There is no doubt that Houthis have been launching attacks into Saudi Arabia. This is a real security threat for our allies. But we do have to acknowledge that there are other players that exist inside Yemen today. It is not just the Houthis and those Yemeni forces supported by the Saudis. There is also al-Qaida—a branch of al-Qaida we know well because it has traditionally been the piece of al-Qaida that has the most advanced threats to the U.S. homeland—and ISIS, which is growing inside Yemen. They have taken advantage of this civil war to fill in the ungovernable spaces.

Recently, with the help of the UAE, we have begun to hit back against al-Qaida and ISIS inside Yemen. But for a portion of time, they controlled a sizeable amount of territory and revenue inside that country. ISIS is growing as well.

As a group of Yemeni Americans told me in my office about a year ago, to Yemenis the bombing campaign is not perceived as a Saudi bombing campaign; it is seen as a U.S. bombing campaign or, at the very least, a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign.

So when responsibility inside Yemen is allotted and attributed for this starvation campaign, it is placed upon the United States, as well as on Saudi Arabia. We have to think about what that means, given the fact that there is the potential for millions of Yemenis to be radicalized in a place with very sophisticated radical infrastructure. This is a real national security concern for the United States.

I think it is time for us to draw a hard line with this coalition and say that we will not continue to support it if there is not a real commitment made to change the way the targeting happens and to make sure that relief sup-

plies can flow into that country to try to address this unfolding famine and humanitarian catastrophe. We can be allies with the Saudis. We can be military allies with the Saudis. But they have to understand and their partners need to understand that this humanitarian nightmare inside Yemen is both immoral—to participate in a campaign that perpetuates that kind of humanitarian crisis—but it also, in the end, doesn't benefit the long-term security of the United States or our partners in the coalition.

So we come down to the floor today to try to explain to our colleagues what is happening on the ground and to see if there is a bipartisan way for us to have a policy that brings significant relief to the suffering of the Yemeni people and strengthens our national security in the region.

With that, I notice Senator YOUNG is going to say a few words, and then I think we will engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MURPHY to discuss the importance of this humanitarian crisis in Yemen. As he so cogently emphasized, this is, at once, a humanitarian crisis and also a security crisis in the region and beyond.

I am a new member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I have to say that I have quickly come to admire Senator MURPHY for his forceful advocacy of our values of universal human rights and of American international leadership. So I commend him for his leadership on this issue in particular.

I share many of the concerns articulated by Senator MURPHY with regard to the situation in Yemen and the Saudi-led coalition there in that country. Before getting into the specific situation in Yemen, however, I think it is important to step back and look at the big picture.

The world currently confronts humanitarian crises of a magnitude we haven't seen in many, many years. Parts of Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen are all in famine or pre-famine stages. According to the United Nations, 20 million people are at risk of starvation within the next few months in these four countries.

The Director-General of the International Committee of the Red Cross appeared before our Senate Foreign Relations Committee just weeks ago, and he called the crises "one of the most critical humanitarian issues to face mankind since the end of the Second World War." He warned that "we are at the brink of a humanitarian mega-crisis unprecedented in recent history."

Each of these crises are unique. They have their unique man-made causes. But in each case, the crises are preventable. They have been exacerbated by war and restrictions on humanitarian access. Now, they are complicated. The situation in Yemen is certainly a complicated one. But the

United Nations calls the situation in Yemen the largest humanitarian crisis in the world. According to their Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Yemen has almost 19 million people in need of humanitarian or protection assistance, including approximately 10 million who require immediate assistance to save their lives or to sustain their lives.

This is an urgent matter, which is why I am so glad we have the leadership of Senator MURPHY on this matter and some of my other colleagues on various fronts. This is why I led a 10-Member letter to Secretary Tillerson on March 23 calling for a diplomatic surge to address the political obstacles preventing the delivery of humanitarian aid. I note that Senator MURPHY joined me on that letter, which I personally hand-delivered to Secretary Tillerson. It is also why I raised the issue with Ambassador Haley in New York City. It is why I introduced a resolution on April 5 calling for the very same thing. Senators CARDIN, BOOZMAN, COONS, GARDNER, and RUBIO joined that resolution.

Throughout this process, rather than just studying the problem, I—working with my colleagues—have tried to focus on tangible steps we can take to save lives and address this very troubling national security situation. For that reason, on April 27, joined by Senator MURPHY and several other colleagues, I sent a letter to the incoming Saudi Ambassador. Noting the important security partnership between the United States and Saudi Arabia and Saudi Arabia's essential role as a regional leader and an ally and a partner, I asked Riyadh to consider five specific steps related to Yemen that would prevent thousands or even millions of additional people from starving there.

There is no doubt that the Houthis and the Iranians bear a very large portion of the blame for this whole situation. I asked our ally Saudi Arabia to take these steps because the United States has a valuable security relationship with Saudi Arabia and because we can oppose Iran's activities in Yemen while ending unnecessary delays in the delivery of desperately needed humanitarian assistance. These two goals are not mutually exclusive.

I didn't receive a satisfactory response, so I subsequently raised these issues with the Saudi Foreign Minister in a meeting on Capitol Hill. In that meeting, I cited the fact—confirmed again by the administration within the last week—that the Saudi-led coalition continues to impose significant delays on the delivery of humanitarian aid to the port of Hodeidah on the Red Sea. Again, this is important because the port of Hodeidah processes roughly 70 to 80 percent of Yemen's food and other critical imports. I mentioned to the Foreign Minister the U.S.-funded cranes for the port of Hodeidah that would dramatically improve the ability to offload humanitarian supplies at that port. I expressed concerns to the

Foreign Minister about the humanitarian impact of an attack on the port of Hodeidah. Yet, as the suffering of the Yemeni people continues and even worsens, these issues regrettably remain unresolved.

According to the administration—confirmed again this morning—the Saudi-led coalition continues to be responsible for an average of 16 days of additional delays to humanitarian shipments into the port of Hodeidah after vessels are cleared by the United Nations Verification and Inspection Mechanism for Yemen. Think about it. Your children are starving to death. Perhaps your entire village is starving to death. And you have a delay of an additional 16 days in humanitarian shipments. Think of the impact that has on security in the region as desperate people are forced to take desperate measures to associate themselves with bad actors in the area. It is certainly troubling to me.

For that reason, I have decided to cosponsor Senator MURPHY's legislation, S.J. Res. 40. Before the United States can transfer air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia, the legislation requires the President of the United States to make a number of certifications. One of those includes a certification that Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners are making demonstrable efforts to facilitate the flow of critical humanitarian aid and commercial goods. I don't believe the President could credibly make that assertion until the Saudis take some of the steps I have called for.

As President Trump prepares his visit to Saudi Arabia, I urge him to raise these critical issues with the Saudi Government. I urge our President to emphasize that these are humanitarian and national security issues that are priorities of the American people. I urge the administration to ask the Saudi Government to take the following concrete actions: First, renounce any intention to conduct a military operation against the port of Hodeidah; second, redouble efforts to achieve a diplomatic solution; third, end any delays to the delivery of humanitarian aid caused by the Saudi-led coalition; and fourth, permit the delivery of much needed U.S. funded cranes to the port of Hodeidah that would permit the quicker delivery of food and medicine.

I have said it before: With more than 10 million Yemenis requiring immediate humanitarian assistance, there is no time to waste. I stand ready to work with our Saudi partners to fight Iran's malign influence and to take these specific steps to begin to address the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Yemen.

I again thank Senator MURPHY for his leadership and for the opportunity to join him on the floor today. I look forward to working together again in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Indiana. I think he walked through his thoughtful approach to this issue, which has led him to cosponsor this resolution placing these very commonsense conditions upon the transfer of further munitions.

I might ask him a question. In his list of steps he has asked the Saudis to take—I have joined him in that letter, as have many of our colleagues—amongst them is a commitment to not take military action against the port of Hodeidah.

We both met with the Foreign Minister, who talked about the need to use increased military pressure inside Yemen backed by U.S. participation in the coalition to try to draw the Houthis to the table. We have both expressed reservations about the effectiveness of that tactic, and we have something to say about it because none of this can occur without U.S. military support.

Can the Senator talk a little bit about our joint fears or his personal fears about a major new campaign on this port that brings in so much of this aid and how, in the end, that really doesn't further the goals of the coalition, the United States being amongst the partners?

Mr. YOUNG. It is a critical question, and it is one I have been asking so many stakeholders involved in this issue. No one has presented to me persuasive evidence indicating that a Saudi-led attack on the port would result in defeat of the Houthis-Saleh bloc. No one has presented to me evidence that I find compelling that that action would even force the Houthis bloc to the negotiating table.

The onus ought to be on those who might take a military action—which would exacerbate the worst humanitarian crisis in the world—to present that evidence. I have asked for it. I haven't received it.

I think it is just as likely that an attack would push the Houthis, as I alluded to earlier, into further alignment with and dependence on the Iranians, with whom they are allied. That is the exact opposite of what we are trying to accomplish in the region, as the Iranians continue to spread their influence and their terroristic activities across the Middle East. So this is not in the interests, as I see it, based on all the evidence available, of the United States, UAE, or Saudi Arabia, and it would result in both a humanitarian catastrophe and exacerbate the national security situation.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank Senator YOUNG for making it clear in his prepared remarks that while we are focusing on the Saudis because we are part of this coalition, the Houthis do not have clean hands here either. Part of the reason humanitarian supplies have a hard time getting to places that need them is because there are roadblocks put up by the Houthis as well. And there is this known connection between the Houthis and the Iranians—

sometimes, in my opinion, a bit overplayed by some foreign policy thinkers, but it is real.

To your second point in answer to my question, Senator YOUNG, that is, to my mind, also a likely result of a deepening of the military conflict. If the Houthis had nowhere to turn, then the calculation might be different, but because the Iranians are there as a support system to lean on, a continued military campaign against Hodeidah would push them deeper into a corner and just broaden the scope of the military conflict.

There ultimately has to be a political resolution here, and by simply upping the military ante and continuing the humanitarian crisis, you get further away from that political negotiating table rather than closer to it.

Mr. YOUNG. Indeed. The last thing we want to do is to exacerbate a situation where we already have 10 million desperate people on the cusp of starvation or passing away on account of a lack of medical supplies.

We need assistance here, which is why it is important for the President to elevate the importance of this issue in his conversation with the Saudis during his coming visit, and I believe he will do so. I believe he will do so because the international community, NGOs, understand the importance of this. Many at the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development have spoken about what a serious crisis this is. And we don't want to be shortsighted with respect to what a bombing of the port could catalyze.

We also need to recognize that there are other players in the Saudi coalition that can be constructive as well. The Emirates, I would note, have shown a willingness to be helpful on a couple of different fronts.

I had the opportunity to visit with the Crown Prince yesterday and received his assurance that he would seek to resolve without delay a situation related to the forward stationing of inspectors in his country so that they can pre-inspect cargo before it goes into the port of Hodeidah, and that would expedite the process and help mitigate a lot of the suffering that is occurring. Also, I had an opportunity to discuss with the Crown Prince this issue of four cranes. U.S. taxpayers paid for these cranes. I mentioned them in my prepared remarks earlier. And I have heard from the Crown Prince; he made a commitment there as well. So I am grateful for his commitment, and I look forward to following up with the UAE Government on this front. They are good allies to the United States.

Mr. MURPHY. It goes without saying that it is in no one's interests in the region for this civil war to continue at its current pace. So this is an important moment at the beginning of a new administration, with a pending arms sale on the table with the Saudis, to

use that transition moment and the leverage that exists with this new proposal for major arms sales to the Saudis to make sure we get this right.

I think there is nothing political about this. We all join together in trying to abate humanitarian crises and famines around the world, and we all want a policy that is going to bring an end to this civil war because, as I said, it is just as important to remember that the most immediate enemies of the United States—those terrorist groups who want to do harm to us—find their most fertile ground today inside Yemen. The sooner we can put an end to this civil war and be able to have a central government structure that spreads across the scope of the country, the quicker we can all be focused on trying to eliminate the ISIS and al-Qaida presence—AQAP, as we refer to them—in Yemen from that battlespace.

I say to Senator YOUNG, I don't know if you have closing remarks, but I appreciate your willingness to speak up and your leadership here, and I hope we can get others on both sides of the aisle to propose and support these common-sense conditions upon this new military transfer so that we can get the situation right inside Yemen.

Mr. YOUNG. I say to the Senator, let me end by reiterating my gratitude to you, of course, for your exceptional leadership, for walking points on this issue, and I look forward to our continued work together.

I thank all our colleagues who have engaged on this matter. And I, of course, before the U.S. Senate here, want to invite others to engage in this. If they have questions with respect to this matter, which is critical for our national security, I know they can reach out to the Senator or me, and it is imperative that we send a respectful message to the administration that we think this is something that needs to be addressed in the near term.

I have nothing else to say.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1150 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I came to you today and told you we had received a job application from somebody to work for the government, and you and I looked at her job application and we saw she had graduated from Harvard Law School, if we looked at her job application and we saw she had worked for a Presidential campaign, if we saw she had practiced law in the

private sector, if we noticed from her resume that she had actually worked as a counsel, as a lawyer, in the White House, if we saw she had clerked for a Supreme Court Justice, Justice Anthony Kennedy—each Justice of the United States, I think, has four law clerks every year. I don't know how many tens of thousands of lawyers and law students apply, but to be chosen is one of the highest honors you can receive as a young lawyer. If I told you this person who applied for a job in government used to work at the Department of Justice as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy, if I told you she had also worked for one of the most prestigious law firms in the country, Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale & Dorr—I remember them as Wilmer, Cutler, but they have changed their name since then. They have been around forever. If I told you all of those things, I think any reasonable person would say: Wow, let's hire her here immediately. Let's do it before she finds another position. Well, that person has applied for a job in government. Her name is Rachel Brand. She has been nominated by President Trump to be Associate Attorney General.

That is a position that is vitally important within the Department of Justice. It is responsible for the oversight of the Civil Division, the Civil Rights Division, the Office on Violence Against Women, and many other important components of the Department of Justice. I think no matter what political party you happen to be in or whatever your political persuasion, we can all agree that right now it is particularly important not only to have a Department of Justice that is fully staffed but to have it fully staffed with extraordinarily qualified people whom every American can look at and go: Wow, is she qualified. I am so pleased she is working for the Federal Government and my tax dollars are being well spent.

Ms. Brand has broad experience, as I indicated, both within the Department of Justice and in the private sector. As I indicated—I am going to say it again—she worked for Justice Anthony Kennedy of the U.S. Supreme Court. Wow, what an honor. She has served as Assistant Attorney General under President George Bush. She has been in private practice, as I indicated. She has been chief counsel for Regulatory Litigation in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and I could go on and on and on.

I fully support Ms. Brand's nomination. I sit on the Judiciary Committee, the committee of the Senate that vetted her. She is highly respected, she is whip smart, she is well qualified, and she is fully prepared to hit the ground running. That is exactly what we need.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). 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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jeff Flake, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds, John Kennedy, John Thune, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General, 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Donnelly	King
Bennet	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Durbin	Leahy
Booker	Feinstein	Manchin
Brown	Franken	Markey
Cantwell	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Cardin	Harris	Menendez
Carper	Hassan	Merkley
Casey	Heinrich	Murphy
Coons	Heitkamp	Murray
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Nelson