

in its efforts to undermine public confidence in our democratic institutions. Those raising such accusations without proof are, wittingly or unwittingly, doing the Kremlin's bidding.

For months, Democrats (a.k.a. "The Resistance") have been spinning the false narrative that President Trump was under FBI investigation to call into question the validity of his presidency. In March, Democrats used it as a pretext to argue that Trump did not have the legitimacy to fill a Supreme Court vacancy. Senate Democratic leader Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.) declared in a floor speech that the Senate should not vote on Neil Gorsuch's nomination because Republicans "stopped a president who wasn't under investigation" from filling the seat. Two days later, Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) said the same thing, declaring, "The FBI has revealed that the sitting president of the United States is under investigation. And it raises a really, I think, important question and that is whether or not a president who is under investigation by the FBI ought to be ramming through a Supreme Court nominee that would have a lifetime appointment."

The media gleefully echoed these false claims. The day before Comey testified, CNN blared: "In testimony, Comey will dispute President Trump's blanket claim that he was told he wasn't under investigation." In fact, Comey said precisely the opposite. When Sen. James Risch (R-Idaho) asked, "While you were director, the president of the United States was not under investigation. Is that a fair statement?" Comey replied: "That's correct." Even then, CNN was not willing to concede its error, declaring in a so-called "correction" that "Comey does not directly dispute that Trump was told multiple times he was not under investigation" (emphasis added).

No, Comey did not fail to "directly dispute" it, he directly confirmed it. The CNN story—and its non-correction correction—was "fake news."

Not only that, Comey also testified that Trump never tried to get him to stop the probe into Russia's election meddling, which Comey explained was a separate matter from the FBI's investigation of disgraced former national security adviser Michael Flynn. Not only did Trump not ask Comey to stop the probe, the former FBI director told Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), "He went farther than that. He said, and if some of my satellites did something wrong, it'd be good to find that out." Rubio pressed Comey, asking whether he was testifying that Trump effectively said, "Do the Russia investigation. I hope it all comes out. I have nothing to do with anything Russia. It'd be great if it all came out, people around me were doing things that were wrong." Comey replied, "That was the sentiment he was expressing. Yes, sir."

Given these facts, Trump has legitimate reason to be frustrated. If you knew you were not under investigation by the FBI, but everyone was saying you were, you'd want the truth to get out. And you might be upset with an FBI director who refused to lift the "cloud" hanging over your administration by confirming that he was not investigating you.

That said, Trump has been fueling the liberal feeding frenzy with his tweetstorms taking his critics to task. If Trump knows he did nothing wrong—and if he really wants to find out whether any of his "satellites" did—he should stop talking and tweeting about the investigation, let special counsel Robert S. Mueller III do his work and focus on his job: governing. His daughter Ivanka Trump was recently asked how she dealt with the media frenzy over Russia. She replied, "I'm trying to keep my head down, not listen to

the noise and just work really hard to make a positive impact in the lives of many people."

That's a good strategy—and one her father ought to emulate.

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

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, today we finally got a look at the monstrosity of a bill that the Republicans have been hiding behind closed doors for weeks. Yes, it is finally clear how the Republicans were spending their time, locked in those back rooms.

Now we know the truth. Senate Republicans weren't making the House bill better—no, not one bit. Instead, they were sitting around a conference room table, dreaming up even meaner ways to kick dirt in the face of American people and take away their health insurance.

Remember, the Senate Republicans worked for weeks on this new bill. They worked really, really hard on it. It is pretty clear now exactly who they were working for. This bill has one flashing neon sign after another telling us who the Republican Party cares about, and it is not American families.

The Senate bill is crammed full with just as many tax cuts as the House bill—tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, tax cuts for wealthy investors, and tax cuts for giant companies. All those tax cuts don't come cheap. They start to add up after a while.

Senate Republicans had to make a choice—how to pay for all those juicy tax cuts for their rich buddies. I will tell you how: blood money.

Senate Republicans wrung some extra dollars out of kicking people off the tax credits that help them afford health insurance. They raked in extra cash by letting States drop even more protections and benefits, like maternity care or prescription drug coverage or mental health treatment.

Then they got to the real piggy bank, Medicaid, and here they just went wild. Senate Republicans went after Medicaid with even deeper cuts than the House version—the Medicaid expansion gone, ripped up, and flushed down the toilet. The rest of the Medicaid Program? For Senate Republicans, it wasn't enough that the House bill was going to toss grandparents out of nursing homes or slash funding for people with disabilities or pull the plug on healthcare for babies born too soon. Senate Republicans wanted to go bigger.

The Republican bill claims to protect kids with disabilities by leaving them out of the calculations that decide how

big the Medicaid cuts will be in each State. I don't know if the Republicans were expecting a round of applause for pitting kids with breathing tubes against vulnerable seniors or someone needing treatment for addiction, but I do know this so-called exemption will not do a thing to help these kids. The Republican cuts still slash hundreds of billions of dollars for Medicaid, leaving States with no choice—no choice but to cut services that kids with disabilities desperately need.

Medicaid is the program in this country that provides health insurance to 1 in 5 Americans, to 30 million kids, to nearly 2 out of every 3 people in a nursing home. These cuts are blood money. People will die. Let's be very clear: Senate Republicans are paying for tax cuts for the wealthy with American lives.

Think about what would happen if the Republican bill becomes law next week. Picture a woman in her eighties who lives at home. She is shaky on her feet. She needs help preparing her meals or taking a bath, but her only income is her Social Security check. Right now, Medicaid helps pay for home and community-based services so she can stay in her home, someone who comes by to help for a few hours a week. Because of that help, she gets to stay home, to live independently. The Republicans are determined to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, so their healthcare plan cuts Medicaid money that helps millions of seniors stay in their homes.

Without these services, this elderly woman can't live alone. Where does she turn? The usual answer would be a nursing home. Wait. Medicaid pays for most nursing home care in this country. The Republicans are determined to cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, so they have cut Medicaid funding so much that there is no help for this woman at home and no nursing home bed for her either.

What does she do? She stays home without help. She can't climb the stairs anymore. Her world shrinks. Eventually, most likely, she falls and ends up in the hospital. The care is expensive, and she is miserable.

Finally, let's say the hospital gets her back on her feet, but there is nowhere for her to go when she is discharged. She heads back home to wait for the next fall, maybe the one that will be fatal.

In their determination to cut taxes for the rich, is this what Republicans have planned for frail seniors in our country? Wait until they are all used up and then leave them out at the curb for the next trash pickup?

It isn't just seniors who will be hit hard. How about a premature baby born with lung defects? His parents both have full-time jobs, but no matter how hard they work, no matter how many hours they put in, they will never be able to pay for the millions of dollars in surgeries, equipment, medicine, and therapy that their child

needs. Right now, Medicaid makes sure that kids with complex medical needs have coverage for feeding tubes and medication and surgery and physical therapy.

Senate Republicans were so determined to offer tax breaks for the rich that they have taken away this baby's Medicaid. What happens next? Maybe the parents try their best, but they can't pay. Maybe they try a Kickstarter campaign, but it is not going to bring in enough to cover the medical bills. They take out a second mortgage, and then they go bankrupt and lose their home.

Is that the Republican plan for this family—go live in a homeless shelter with your little baby, whose only crime was to be born 14 weeks early?

Senate Republicans can wave their hands and say that everyone will be fine, but it is time for the rest of us to take a long, hard look at exactly what would happen to the people who have to live with the Republicans' reckless cuts.

Senate Republicans know exactly what they are doing with this healthcare bill. Their values are on full display. If they want to trade the health insurance of millions of Americans for tax cuts for the rich, they better be ready for a fight because now that this shameful bill is out in the open, that is exactly what they are going to get.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss, for just a couple of minutes this afternoon, the issue of healthcare and, in particular, the legislation that was unveiled today, what is referred to as a "discussion draft." It is legislative text, but it is not the final word on this issue. So we have to begin in earnest to engage in debate because we are going to be very limited in the time that we have.

I think the best way to describe this legislation can be very simple, actually, in terms of the impact on a lot of Americans. Unfortunately, I don't think this is really an effort to improve the healthcare system. I think it is a scheme. It is a scheme that sells out the middle class. It hurts seniors and children and devastates the protections and healthcare for individuals with disabilities over time, and all of that is done to finance tax breaks for the very rich. There are other ways, of course, to describe it, but I will focus mostly on Medicaid.

As it relates to Medicaid, this isn't a repeal and replace, or repeal and improve, or repeal and reform. This is repeal and decimate when it comes to Medicaid. The cuts may be stretched out, but they are, in fact, deeper over time.

So if you are one of the 1.1 million children in Pennsylvania who receives Medicaid or one of over 720,000 Pennsylvanians with a disability who benefits from Medicaid, your healthcare could be at risk. My test would be that if any of those individuals lose their Medicaid benefits, it is a bad bill. I would hope that would be the test for every Member of the Senate.

The other adverse consequence of this legislation is that it will cripple efforts to battle the opioid addiction in our country. We just had a great consensus at the end of last year where both parties came together on two pieces of legislation—one that dealt directly with the opioid epidemic, the so-called CARA bill, or the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. Then later in the year, there was another bill that provided some additional funding. All of that would be compromised, undermined, or degraded, at least, if this legislation went through because the biggest payer—certainly, in the top two, in terms of our paying for opioid treatment and services—is, of course, the Medicaid Program.

So what we have here before us is a bill that is a tax giveaway to the wealthiest. The top one-tenth of 1 percent would receive thousands and thousands, if not tens of thousands, of dollars. One estimate of the earlier version of the House bill said, if you were in the top one-tenth of 1 percent, you would get \$197,000 each. Those people don't need \$197,000 from a tax break from a so-called healthcare bill. They would, I think, expect that we would take care of the people that need healthcare: Vulnerable children. Some 40 percent of the children in America get Medicaid. Almost half the births in the country are paid for by Medicaid. People with disabilities are disproportionately dependent upon Medicaid, and they should have a right to expect—and their families should have a right to expect—that, if you have a disability, you should get Medicaid today, tomorrow, years from now, decades from now, and as long as you need it. You should have that guarantee. This bill takes away that guarantee for those families with a loved one with a disability.

One of the many stories that we get from back home are from parents. Many of them are writing because their child has a disability or multiple disabilities, and they are dependent upon Medicaid. Here is just one:

My son, Anthony, was born at 25 weeks and he weighed one tiny pound. We were overcome with medical bills which Medicaid thankfully paid for us. Since his birth he has had multiple health crisis, seizures, sleep disorders just to name a few.

Most recently, Anthony was diagnosed with Autism spectrum disorder, Tourette's syndrome, severe obsessive compulsive disorder and Dyspraxia. He has suffered the most physically and mentally because of his Tourette's. It's severe and he is frequently unable to attend school due to his "tics." They are painful and debilitating. They make him unable to eat, breathe and see at

their worst. Far from what is commonly depicted in the movies and on TV.

Then, this father goes on to say:

Two years ago I was forced to quit my job of twenty years as a therapist to stay at home and care for Anthony because of the amount of doctors' appointments he has and the number of days of school he misses every year. Luckily with medical assistance—

That is the Pennsylvania version of Medicaid—

covering his services I am still able to do so. If we lost coverage, we would not be able to provide the support he needs. We are sure of that.

I truly realize that unless you are actually living this kind of life, it's easy to turn a blind eye. I can assure you that my story is much like thousands of others that DEPEND—

And he has that word "depend" in all capital letters—

on funds from medical assistance to cover doctors, medications, therapies and durable medical equipment that children with disabilities require. Families of children with disabilities are desperate to not lose those benefits.

My son Anthony is currently attending school almost regularly and functioning the best he has for a very long time thanks to the services he received from medical assistance.

That is otherwise known as Medicaid.

So that is the reality for a lot of families. Now, I can hear some folks in the Senate saying: Well, maybe Anthony will not be affected because the Medicaid provisions are going to be up to the States, and the States can handle that. We are just going to put a cap on the dollars, and we are going to wind down the Medicaid expansion that covered 11 million Americans at last count, and the States will handle it.

So we are sending back these challenges and the disproportionate burden that States will have to bear to make sure that Anthony—who has all those challenges in his life—has the coverage of Medicaid. The Federal Government will just wash its hands of that responsibility.

No, Medicaid is a guarantee now, based upon your eligibility. That guarantee should remain. We are a great country. We have the strongest economy and the strongest military in the world, and we have the Medicaid Program. We don't have to sacrifice those kids or sacrifice the healthcare for one child who depends on Medicaid. We don't have to sacrifice that child in order to have another part of our budget funded appropriately. That is an insult, and anyone who is going to choose to support legislation that would fund tax cuts for the wealthiest, while at the very same time and in the very same bill would result in others losing coverage—and I am not only talking about children with disabilities. I am talking about adults who have coverage—20 million people in the last couple of years. Any Member of the Senate who chooses tax cuts for the wealthy over those children and over those individuals, I think, should examine their conscience, to use an old expression, because this kind of policy

that results in the most vulnerable among us losing their healthcare coverage is obscene. There are a lot of other words we could use—words we can't use here—because that is the definition of an insult to our values and to our country.

We are a better country than what we will become if this Chamber votes in favor of a bill that will decimate Medicaid, the way this bill will. I realize it might take a long time. I realize it might be another Presidency or many Congresses from now, but the deed will be done here that will lead to that kind of misery. We have no sense of the misery that will be imposed upon those families because we have never had this before.

We had a program in place for 50 years, and it has helped a lot of kids with disabilities. It has helped a lot of families to be able to hold down a job while their child gets the benefit of Medicaid because of a disability. It has helped a lot of poor children rise up from poverty and overcome terrible poverty because when they were kids—when they were very, very young—they got early periodic screening diagnosis and testing—the kind of early intervention and good healthcare that children get on Medicaid.

A lot of seniors get into nursing homes. A lot of middle-class seniors from middle-class families get into nursing homes solely because they get the benefit of Medicaid, in addition to Medicare.

The last thing I would say is that I think Senators in this Chamber should think about the basic inequity when they have healthcare. Everyone here has healthcare. All the families here have healthcare. All of our loved ones who are dependent upon us have healthcare. Yet some will vote to take away healthcare from some, and, in the very same bill, vote for gross, obscene tax cuts for the wealthiest among us—most of whom, I would bet, don't want those tax cuts. They would rather see us take care of the vulnerable.

So it is a basic choice. This isn't complicated. This is a very simple choice. I hope that in the course of this debate, some will come forward with some courage, some guts, and some compassion and do the right thing and vote this bill down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, last month, Republicans in the House of Representatives passed a healthcare bill. They call it the American Health Care Act. It has been widely described as cruel and poorly crafted. Last week, President Trump described it as “mean.”

The House bill, by design, would take health coverage away from tens of millions of Americans. It ends the guarantee of affordable coverage for people with preexisting conditions. It cuts Medicaid, which is the principal program for ensuring children, people with

disabilities, and seniors in nursing homes. It cuts Medicaid by more than \$800 billion, and to compound that cruelty, the same legislation gives an enormous tax cut—over \$30 billion—to those at the top of the income scale.

We just heard this morning some of what is in the Senate bill, the Senate version of the American Health Care Act. In fact, not only does it not do what President Trump claims the Senate was working on—it doesn't address the mean aspect of it—but it actually makes it worse. In a State like New Hampshire, it provides for even deeper cuts to our expanded Medicaid Program, a bipartisan program that provides for treatment for substance use disorders for people dealing with the heroin and opioid epidemic. It would tax older Americans more than younger Americans for their health insurance and defund Planned Parenthood. There are all kinds of reasons. It would eliminate the requirement that people with preexisting conditions are able to have healthcare coverage. And all of this was done in secret behind closed doors.

My office has been deluged with messages from constituents who oppose the Republican leader's bill. This shows whom we have heard from in recent weeks. I have received more than 5,400 messages opposing the bill and 108 in support, so 5,461 are in opposition, and 108 are in support.

I am sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle must be receiving similar volumes of mail and phone calls from their constituents, and they are hearing what I am hearing from my constituents: that if we go forward with this legislation that the House passed and that the Senate is considering, we are going to have people lose their access to healthcare and many people will have to pay more.

So I appeal to Republican leaders. I urge you to stop and reconsider what you are doing. I want you to listen to some of the people we have heard from in New Hampshire, everyday Americans whose lives would be devastated by this legislation.

Several months ago, I asked people across the State of New Hampshire to tell me their stories about the Affordable Care Act, to tell me their concerns, to let me know how it has made a difference for them.

Here we see one of the people I heard from. This is Deodonone Bhattarai and her son Bodhi. They live in Concord, NH. As you see, Bodhi is in a special chair. Deodonone writes:

Our three-year-old son is a bright, curious, funny little boy who also has Spinal Muscular Atrophy.

That is a degenerative neuromuscular disease that causes his muscles to be very weak.

Our insurance initially denied coverage for his wheelchair, but because of the Affordable Care Act—

The ban on discrimination against those with preexisting conditions—my son is now able to explore his world independently.

She goes on to say:

I have [read news reports about the Republican legislation], and I fear for our ability to maintain not just insurance coverage but the type of quality coverage my son's life depends upon.

Next we have a picture of the McCabe family. They are from Kingston, NH, and this is their story:

Our daughter, Ellie, was born with a rare and serious heart defect called Hypoplastic Left Heart Syndrome.

You can see Ellie there. She looks like a healthy, inquisitive little girl, and she is looking healthy because she underwent her first surgery when she was just 3 days old.

The McCabes go on to say:

It terrifies us to think about what would have happened to our family if Ellie hadn't been protected by the pre-existing conditions protections in place thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Without those protections, either we would be in serious debt for the rest of our lives or Ellie would not have had her life-saving surgeries.

Next, this is Dr. Marie Ramas. She serves at the Lamprey Health Care Center in Nashua, NH. That is a clinic I recently visited. She wrote to me:

I have a 24-year-old patient who was born with a congenital condition that did not allow his leg bones to grow completely. This patient was unable to afford proper care and had been walking with an old prosthetic for the last 3 years.

Imagine not being able to get your prosthetic replaced for 3 years.

Thanks to expanded Medicaid and to the ACA protections for those with pre-existing conditions, he's now getting quality care and can afford a new prosthetic.

So his life has been changed by the Affordable Care Act.

I have also heard stories from scores of entrepreneurs and small business owners who have benefited from the Affordable Care Act.

This is Steve Roll of Keene, NH, and he wrote:

In late 2015, I left my job to start my own business. I've built a profitable business and expect to hire employees within a year or two. Before the ACA, I wouldn't have taken the risk to start a business because I have a pre-existing condition and I wouldn't have been able to get an individual health insurance policy. If the ACA is repealed, I'm concerned that I'll need to put my business on hold in order to go back to a corporate job just to get the healthcare benefits.

Well, the healthcare legislation that has been produced by the Republican leadership in the Senate would take away the requirement that people with preexisting conditions have to have access to healthcare.

We have another businessperson here, Dave Lucier. He is the owner of Claremont Spice & Dry Goods in western New Hampshire. Dave wrote this:

Before the Affordable Care Act, insurance costs were more than a third of my business expenses. Now they're less than an eighth. The ACA made it possible for me to go out on my own and realize my dream of starting a small business here in Claremont.

And his business is doing well.

Many women have written to me about how the Affordable Care Act has

ended discrimination against them by the health insurance industry—discrimination because of their gender. In particular, they are grateful that the Affordable Care Act includes maternity care and contraception among the law's essential health benefits.

This is Maura Fay of Exeter, NH. I talked about her last night when I was talking about the impact of this Republican bill on women's health. Maura wrote:

My husband and I are self-employed. Before the ACA, we were paying rates that were simply unsustainable for a middle-class family like ours. When I was pregnant in 2013, we were forced to pay a maternity rider of an additional \$822 a month. I'm worried about the rollbacks in regulations around essential health benefits, especially since so many of them impact women. Maternity coverage shouldn't come with an additional \$800 a month price tag.

Here in Washington, some folks seem to think that repealing the Affordable Care Act is all about politics, that it is about winning this debate. But for ordinary people in New Hampshire—people like Maura, like the McCabe family, like all the people I have shown pictures of this afternoon—for ordinary people in New Hampshire and across America, repealing the Affordable Care Act isn't about politics. For so many of them, it is about life-and-death. It is about the kind of lives they are going to lead. It is about whether they are going to be able to continue to afford healthcare, whether they are going to continue to pay their mortgage and buy prescription drugs. We need to listen to these ordinary people in each of our States whose lives and financial situations will be turned upside down if the Affordable Care Act is repealed.

This process has really not been in keeping with our democratic process in America. For the Republican leadership here in the Senate and before that in the House to pursue a partisan approach to healthcare, to deny Democrats and even deny many of my Republican colleagues the ability to engage in the writing of this bill—it is deeply misguided to deny the public access, to deny a hearing on this bill, legislation that we know is going to hurt tens of millions of Americans.

There really is a better way forward for both the Senate and for our country. If we put ideology and partisanship aside, if we work together, we can strengthen the parts of the Affordable Care Act that aren't working. We can continue Medicaid expansion so it can help people with substance use disorders, so it can help kids with disabilities, so it can help elderly people in nursing homes. We can fix what is not working, and we can improve on this law and make it better, but we can't do that if we continue to be divided up on our partisan sides, if we are not willing to talk about the issue, not willing to work together.

The American people want us to work together here in Washington to address their concerns. Well, it is time to respect their wishes. Let's strength-

en the Affordable Care Act so that it works even better for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

REQUESTS FOR AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They do not have the approval of the Democratic leader; therefore, they will not be permitted to meet, but I ask unanimous consent that a list of committees requesting authority to meet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Committee on the Judiciary

Committee on Intelligence

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

NOMINATION OF KRISTINE SVINICKI

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of President Trump's nomination of Kristine Svinicki to continue serving as a nuclear safety regulator.

Ms. Svinicki has served as a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for more than 9 years. In January, President Trump designated Ms. Svinicki as the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. She is well qualified. In her time in office, she has proven to be knowledgeable, dedicated, and an outstanding public servant.

She also has been very responsive to Congress. Since becoming a Commissioner, she has testified 18 times before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Before becoming a member of the NRC, she served as staff in the U.S. Senate, as a nuclear engineer at the Department of Energy, and as an energy engineer for the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

She has already been confirmed twice to serve on the NRC. In both 2008 and 2012, her nomination was approved by the Environment and Public Works Committee and by the full Senate, each time by voice vote. Earlier this month, the Environment and Public Works Committee approved her nomination for a third time, again by voice vote.

Her nomination has garnered support from groups like Third Way, which is a think tank once labeled as "radical centrists" by the New York Times. Josh Freed, who is the vice president of the Clean Energy Program at Third Way, said this: "Svinicki's work at the NRC has resulted in improved readiness to regulate small modular and advanced reactors that could provide enormous benefits for climate, American leadership, and domestic job creation." He went on to say that Chairman Svinicki's continued leadership at the NRC is needed now more than ever.

The Senate must act quickly to confirm Ms. Svinicki. Unless she is confirmed by June 30, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will no longer have a quorum of its members. We can't let that happen. The NRC has an important mission of regulating America's nuclear industry. The Commission serves to protect public health and the environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission needs a quorum of its members in office to meet its mission.

We need to confirm Kristine Svinicki, and I urge all Senators to vote yes on her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired and the question occurs on the Billingslea nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Billingslea nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoover	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Coons	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Strange
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	King	Tester
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young
	Moran	

NAYS—35

Blumenthal	Franken	Merkley
Booker	Gillibrand	Murphy
Brown	Harris	Murray
Cantwell	Hassan	Peters
Cardin	Heinrich	Reed
Carper	Hirono	Sanders
Casey	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Markey	Shaheen
Feinstein	Menendez	