

any point during this awful pandemic. The economic fallout of the pandemic spreads and spreads. November saw the largest single 2-week jump in unemployment benefit applications since early April, and enhanced job benefits are only a few weeks from expiration.

The time has come for Congress to pass a bipartisan COVID relief bill that meets the needs of our workers, our families, our schools, and our businesses. The Republican leader of this Chamber knows very well that the only way to pass legislation in the Senate is with a measure of bipartisanship. But time and time again, the Republican leader's idea of action on COVID has been to bring partisan legislation to the floor and then demand everyone accept it.

Every single iteration has included poison pills designed to ensure that the bill is bad—not consensus proposals. That is not what these poison pills are at all, and he knows darn well the Democrats don't agree to them. Well, that is no way to do business around here.

The leader's view seems to be that the only things that should be considered in the next COVID relief bill are items that Republicans approve of, even if the needs of the country go way beyond what is on their narrow list. So I would plead again to the Republican leader and to my colleagues on the other side, we need to come together. Both sides—both sides—must be willing to compromise.

While the Republicans in this Chamber enjoy a majority, they must grapple with the fact that Democrats hold a majority in the House. We cannot make a law without Democrats in the House, and, frankly, Democratic votes in the Senate because there are a good number of Republicans who won't vote for any proposal.

So we need a true bipartisan bill, not another round of partisan Republican proposals put forward by the leader and then he makes take-it-or-leave-it demands, and that is it. We need to come together and come to agreement that will not satisfy any one of us completely but gets the job done. I hope that as we get closer to the end of the year, partisan posturing on the Republican side will give way to some genuine compromises.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION NOMINEES

Madam President, now, on another matter. President-Elect Biden continues to roll out an impressive slate of candidates he intends to nominate to his Cabinet and other key administrative positions. They provide an incredibly stark contrast to the caliber of the nominees the Senate considered over the past 4 years. Not only are President-Elect Biden's nominees exceptionally qualified and familiar with the institutions to which they are nominated, but they have a broad range of backgrounds and experiences. They actually look like America.

Today, I will be meeting with President-Elect Biden's intended Secretary

of State, Tony Blinken, and his intended Director of National Intelligence, Avril Haines, who is the first woman to be nominated to serve in that position. Like most Americans are doing these days, our "meeting" will take place over a video chat, and I am looking forward to asking both Mr. Blinken and Ms. Haines about their views on a range of issues concerning American diplomacy, foreign policy, and national security, and how to repair some of the damage to America's reputation and relationships abroad done by the past administration.

Now, after what all we went through over the past 4 years, I would expect that almost all of President-Elect Biden's nominees would be widely acceptable to the Senate. After all, Senate Republicans confirmed several Trump nominees who lacked the necessary qualifications, who were mired in ethics scandals, and who made outrageous and inflammatory comments in the past.

Republican Senators often argued that a President deserves broad deference when it comes to their Cabinet and official appointments and blew past controversies that would in almost any other time be disqualifying. President-Elect Biden's nominees, of course, are in a different universe.

Well, we are already starting to see the switch start to flip now that President-Elect Biden is the one naming the names. To take just one example, Senate Republicans reacted to the historic nomination of Neera Tanden to run the Office of Management and Budget by calling her "radioactive," a "nutjob," and expressing alarm over some critical tweets in the past.

After spending 4 years pretending they didn't see the latest insane tweet from President Trump, Senate Republicans seem to have found a newfound interest in the Twitter feeds of Biden's Cabinet selections.

With respect to the Office of Management and Budget specifically, Senate Republicans lined up to confirm the previous OMB Director, Russell Vought, after he was at the heart of the scandal that led to President Trump's impeachment: withholding security aid to an ally at war, Ukraine.

If Senate Republicans are worried about someone with a partisan background in OMB, perhaps they shouldn't have voted to confirm Russell Vought, who used to work not just at the Heritage Foundation but for its partisan advocacy arm. If Senate Republicans are concerned about someone who made controversial comments running OMB, perhaps they shouldn't have confirmed Russell Vought, who once said: "Muslims do not simply have a deficient theology. They do not know God because they have rejected Jesus Christ his Son, and they stand condemned."

That was the previous OMB Director condemning an entire religion. The Republican majority confirmed him despite these inflammatory comments, despite his conduct as interim Direc-

tor, and despite his career as a partisan warrior.

But a few critical tweets about substantive policy positions have caused Senate Republicans to label Ms. Tanden's nomination "radioactive." Spare us the hyperbole. Ms. Tanden, we all know, is an eminently qualified nominee who would be the first woman of color to ever run the Office of Management and Budget.

As Biden continues to name his team, I am sure we will hear some more of these overblown complaints from Republican Senators, but after the caliber of nominees that this Republican majority confirmed over the past 4 years, it will be impossible—impossible—to take them seriously.

The Senate committees should prepare to hold hearings on President-Elect Biden's nominees in January, immediately after the Georgia elections. Let me say that again. The Senate committees should prepare to hold hearings on President-Elect Biden's nominees in January, immediately after the Georgia elections.

That is customary for a new President. The Senate holds several hearings in January so that key Cabinet officials can be confirmed on January 20 and shortly thereafter. That is what the Senate did for President Trump and President Obama. That is what the Senate must do for President-Elect Biden as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday drugmaker Moderna filed for an emergency use authorization from the FDA for its COVID vaccine. The FDA's Vaccine Advisory Committee is scheduled to discuss Pfizer's COVID vaccine next week and is expected to review Moderna's shortly thereafter.

That means that it is entirely possible that by the end of December the FDA will have authorized not one but two COVID vaccines that have so far shown more than 90 percent effectiveness in preventing the disease. This is very hopeful news, and it is a tribute to the innovative power of the private sector and the efforts of Congress and the Trump administration to expedite the development of COVID vaccines.

The light at the end of the tunnel looks like it is on the way. At the same time, it is essential that we not minimize what is happening with COVID right now. Cases are surging and are likely to surge further, and doctors and hospitals are struggling.

It is essential that we maintain key safety measures until those vaccines arrive. Now, more than ever, we need to keep wearing masks, wash our hands, and maintain social distance. The more responsibly we act, the more we can protect vulnerable members of the population and keep our doctors and hospitals from being overrun. Acting responsibly can also help avert further economic shutdowns, which would

be a devastating blow to a lot of struggling businesses.

I know that it has been a long, hard year and that everyone is tired of the additional safety measures we have had to take, but the beginning of the end is in sight, and we need to hold on for a few months longer and keep doing everything we can to prevent further virus spread.

At the same time, it is important that State and local governments use their authority responsibly and think carefully about the impact of the health and safety measures that they are putting in place. It is also essential that elected officials ensure that they are respecting our constitutional rights—notably, the right of assembly and the free exercise of religion—when imposing coronavirus restrictions.

I was pleased to see the Supreme Court uphold this principle in its recent decision suspending draconian New York measures targeting houses of worship. New York City is not the only place where churches have faced disproportionately strict restrictions. Earlier this year in Washington, DC, for example, the mayor celebrated mass protests that vastly exceeded recommendations for gathering size, even as she maintained strict restrictions on houses of worship.

I was pleased to join an amicus brief to the DC district court in support of Capitol Hill Baptist Church's lawsuit against the DC government asking that the church's constitutional right to free exercise of its faith be respected in the same way as the protesters' rights to freedom of speech.

Throughout this pandemic we have, unfortunately, seen a significant degree of hypocrisy from many on the left who have called for or imposed strict restrictions on activities that they deem nonessential while celebrating activities that they approved of but that posed a significant risk of coronavirus transmission.

The First Amendment cannot be applied selectively, and when imposing coronavirus restrictions, lawmakers need to exercise the greatest respect for our first freedom—the free exercise of religion—and ensure that churches are not subjected to disproportionately severe measures.

More than that, politicians should do everything that they can to ensure that religious worship is supported as far as possible during the pandemic. Worship is an essential activity, and it should be accorded the same respect and deference that governments have accorded to liquor stores, bike shops, and nail salons.

In the next couple of weeks, Congress will be passing key legislation, including a bill to fund the government. I am hoping that we will be able to add a COVID relief bill to that list. While the money Congress has already invested in COVID relief has gone a long way toward meeting the country's needs, there is more that we need to do.

Republicans put forward an additional targeted relief package months

ago, but Democrats spent the fall delaying additional COVID relief by insisting on bloated legislation filled with unrelated and unreasonable demands. It has been impossible to negotiate with Democrats for the simple reason that Democrats have made it clear that compromise is not an option. "It is our way or the highway," Democrats have said. It is either a multitrillion-dollar bill or nothing at all.

Democrats have to know that they don't have a chance of getting their bill through both houses of Congress and to the President's desk, so the reasonable thing for them to do, if they really want to help Americans, would be to work with Republicans to pass a bill that delivers at least some of what they want. Republicans and Democrats agree on a number of things, from more money for schools, testing, and vaccines to another round of Paycheck Protection Program relief for the hardest hit small businesses.

We should be able to arrive at compromise legislation that both sides can agree to, and we should pass that compromise legislation before the end of the year. I was encouraged to hear that a few Democrats are looking to develop bipartisan coronavirus legislation, and I hope we will be able to convince the Speaker and the Democratic leader here in the Senate that working with Republicans—really working with them—and not pretending to negotiate while refusing to actually compromise is the right thing to do for the American people.

It has been a rough year for the country. Let's close it out by working together to deliver the additional relief that Americans need to weather the rest of this pandemic.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how bad is the COVID-19 pandemic? I am sure we each look at it in personal and family terms.

We have just gone through a Thanksgiving like no other, for my family and for many others who decided that safety was more important than being physically in the same room with the family members we love. So we turned to FaceTime, Zoom, and every other contrivance we could find to maintain a connection with children, grandchildren, and other people we love.

But the situation is dire. The infection and death rate in my home State has been heartbreaking in terms of the number of people who have had their lives changed, and some have had their lives ended because of it.

I can use one example of how bad it is. It won't mean much to those who are listening. The city of St. Louis is a large metropolitan area—millions of people. I grew up nearby on the Illinois side of the river. One day last week the St. Louis hospitals were unable to take a COVID-19 patient, and, as a result, that patient was transported almost 100 miles away to Quincy, IL, to a hos-

pital so the patient could receive the care that they needed. Think of that: not an available space in the city of St. Louis.

Last month a dear friend of mine, feeling ill, who lived in Illinois, went over to the St. Louis area and went to one of the most outstanding hospitals in the city. She was told she couldn't be admitted because there was no room for her. She went to the second most reputable hospital in the city with the same report. Finally, with the third try, she was admitted to another hospital. Three days later she passed away. In a desperate situation, she was turned away from two major hospitals because they didn't have room.

So we can argue long and hard about the danger of this COVID-19, whether it is something to take seriously or not—and there are still those who insist it is not—but we can't escape the reality that 13½ million Americans have already been infected with the COVID virus and over 267,000 American lives have been lost.

My heart goes out to those families and their loved ones, some of whom were my friends—and one very close friend—who have lost their lives. And for all of those who are fighting COVID-19 today, including Members of Congress, I wish them well, Godspeed. Get well and come back and join us in a positive way.

As the number of infected Americans continues to rise, it is vital that we continue to take safety precautions: social distancing, wearing masks, and staying home as much as possible.

I am worried about the health and safety of our country, but I am also worried about the millions of Americans who find themselves in dire straits as the economic impact of this pandemic lingers. I think of some of the restaurants in Chicago and in my own hometown that I visited with my wife from time to time. They are gone. They are not going to return.

Sadly, every day, decisions are being made by businesses just like those that they just can't continue to lose money. It clearly is a call to action for Congress to do something.

Some choose to focus on the status of the stock market indexes and monthly job reports as proof that the economy has recovered. In fact, I met with a group of Senators from the other side of the aisle who said it is the dominant opinion of the majority of Republican Senators that we don't need a stimulus; that we have recovered; we are on our way. I don't see it that way at all. I think we clearly need to bring life into this economy that reaches families, neighborhoods, communities, and towns.

The Wall Street Journal and the Dow Jones average are interesting to read, but for most Americans, it is not part of their regular life experience; it is just a question about whether or not they can keep their family-owned business open or whether or not that store or that restaurant they always valued

as part of their community is gone forever.

We know the stock market or a single jobs report are not reliable measures of the economy's overall health. The fact is, too many Americans are still living life on the brink. Look at the long lines of people in their cars waiting for food, spending hours of their day trying to get a donation of food. Some of them are embarrassed by the experience, though they should not be. It reflects the reality of what life is like for many people who just a short time ago were volunteers at that same food bank or contributed to it. They are waiting anxiously for relief and wondering if Congress even knows it.

We set a record of 88,000 Americans hospitalized last Tuesday, a week ago. One-quarter of our hospitals are reporting critical shortages of doctors and nurses who have been fatigued with months on the frontlines. I can't help but be personally moved by these doctors and nurses who stand before us and talk about what it is like to be in that emergency room day after day after day. These are rock-solid professionals who have given their life to the medical profession. How many times have we watched them break down in tears as they tell us what they are going through? You talk about the emotional stress that we face, the depression we face having to stay home and away from our friends and family. Think about what they face every single day, plus the danger to their own personal health and the danger to their families that is part of this. It really begs for us to take this much more seriously here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

In the weeks leading up to Thanksgiving, 1 in 8 Americans—126 million—didn't have enough to eat. Millions of Americans are claiming some form of unemployment insurance. If we do nothing—if we do nothing—in the Senate, other than to act on the Executive Calendar, which the Republican leader referred to this morning, the day after Christmas, 12 million Americans will be cut off entirely from unemployment assistance—12 million. If we don't do something, those families will be in a desperate situation.

If Congress fails to act, that day is going to be an ominous, dark day in our history. The issues facing our State and local governments, which are at the forefront of combating this crisis, continue to be a priority. Their budgets are being hammered by shrinking revenues, and without additional aid, many will have no choice but to either cut important services that many rely upon or raise taxes on families already hard-hit.

We must take action to protect our State and local government workers, the firefighters, the teachers, the first responders. In the coming weeks, as many as 30 million Americans are facing the risk of eviction without additional help. Merry Christmas. You have been evicted.

Just a few weeks ago, nearly 12 million Americans indicated they would be unable to pay their rent or mortgage in December. Where will they go? Housing assistance that helps keep families in their homes during this public health crisis, as we move into winter months, has to be a top priority.

For those who are saying that we are out of the woods, we don't need a stimulus, look at those numbers on the Dow Jones index—I ask you to tell that to 20 million Americans receiving unemployment today or the countless small businesses that are facing closure.

There is still a lot of hurt out there, and we need to get more relief out to those who need it. News of the COVID vaccine development is promising, but we are many months from building up the immunity that we need. In the meantime, we must confront the virus with investments in testing, tracing, and healthcare.

I want to, at this point, say a word about an effort that was announced this morning that I have been part of for several weeks. There is a bipartisan group of Senators in Congress who have been talking about the very issues that I raised in this speech. I can't tell you how many hours they put into it. We have a group of eight Senators—four Democrats and four Republicans on this side of the Rotunda and a similar group on the other side of House Members—who have been trying to find a bipartisan path out of this current situation. I want to salute them. On the Democratic side, I want to thank MARK WARNER of Virginia, JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia, and JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire. It has been my honor to sit at tables on Zoom calls hour after hour after hour as we hash through some of the difficult choices that need to be made. On the Republican side, I want to thank SUSAN COLLINS, LISA MURKOWSKI, BILL CASSIDY, and MITT ROMNEY. They have put as much time as I have, and many times more, in this effort to bring us to a point where we can offer a solution.

They announced this morning that they have come to a conclusion that the spending part of this is going to be manageable—doable—on a bipartisan basis, and it should be called on the floor for passage. I will tell you that the \$908 billion package they put together is not what I wanted. I believe there should be dramatically larger amounts put into this effort. But there are some on the other side of the aisle who believe that little or nothing is needed. They have tried to find a middle ground, and I believe they have with the \$908 billion. The way it is allocated across the board in a draft framework hits the major elements that we need to act on before we go home for Christmas in this month of December. I am not happy with a lot of these figures, but that is what it is all about in this world of the U.S. Congress: You come together willing to sit down and listen to the other side and, if necessary, compromise, so at the end of

the day, you have something to show for your efforts.

The reason I didn't participate in the press conference this morning is because at the very end, an issue came up, which I believe is really so important, that has to be resolved and resolved fairly, and that is the issue of immunity from liability. Many of us believe that businesses—most businesses—are doing everything they can think of to keep their employees and their customers as safe as possible, and I salute them for it. But many of them as well believe that we need to have standards that they can live up to, so if they are ever challenged by an employee, by a customer, or even in court, they can turn to a standard of care and point that they did everything they could be expected to do at that moment in time.

I believe that is a good defense and always has been to any accusations of wrongdoing. But there are some who believe that there should be a different standard, an unreasonable standard—one that I think goes too far in providing immunity from liability, not just for good businesses but also for those that are not. And there are some. We need to have the courts available for those who have been treated badly. I think of the meat processing plants and some of the activities that were involved in the earliest stages, where the employees didn't receive the basic protection they needed. They came down with the COVID virus, and many had serious consequences in their lives. I believe they deserve a day in court.

I want to make sure that we pass this COVID-19 bill, as the group has brought together or something like it, for \$908 billion. We shouldn't be delayed or diverted from this effort by a debate over immunity from liability. It is an important issue, but some 38 States have already adapted their laws relating to COVID-19 liability. The others can certainly do it, if they wish, if they think they need it. That has resulted in some things which are worth reporting.

We are told that there is a tsunami of COVID-19 lawsuits that are being brought against individuals and businesses. It turns out that nothing could be further from the truth. There is a law firm known as Hunton Andrews Kurth that monitors all lawsuits that are filed in the United States every day. They have sought out how many lawsuits relate to COVID-19 and the coronavirus. Last week's report is this: Out of the some 12½ to 13 million Americans who have been infected with the COVID virus, only 6,273 lawsuits have been brought in the entire Nation in the year 2020 that mention the term COVID-19 or coronavirus. Well, you think: Boy, that is a lot of lawsuits to be filed against doctors and nurses and hospitals. Let me tell you, out of the total number, 6,000 lawsuits, only 10—10—nationwide have been filed for malpractice claims, medical malpractice claims—10 lawsuits.

To argue that we ought to close the doors of the court to people who are seeking relief, when so few lawsuits have been filed, makes no sense at all. How many personal injury suits? How many people have sued some person or entity or business saying, "On your premises, I contracted this COVID-19"? Well, out of 13 million who have been infected, you would think the number would be enormous. Twenty-two—that is the number—twenty-two personal injury lawsuits have been filed. One hundred and ten of these additional lawsuits have been filed by employees for workplace situations. Out of all these lawsuits in the United States of America for malpractice, personal injury, and workplace complaints, there are 142 lawsuits nationwide. Why would we hold up the \$908 billion economic relief over this phenomena? Do you want to know where most of the lawsuits are being filed? Most of the lawsuits are being filed between businesses, as well as businesses versus their insurance companies, and prisoners who are petitioning the court for release from what they consider to be dangerous circumstances. Those are the lawsuits that make up the bulk of the cases that have been filed so far.

There is no tsunami of lawsuits. The States are handling this matter responsibly and effectively, and there is no indication that our tort system in this country needs to be dramatically changed. That is why I really withheld my attendance this morning at this press conference. The group has not agreed on the basic issue of liability, but there were statements being made that I could not agree with that I didn't want to suggest that I did, and that is why I didn't attend. I am still ready to work on it. I want to work on it and find a bipartisan way to protect the rights of individuals who have been wronged for their day in court, not to extinguish or take away any rights from any people, to acknowledge that States have made decisions on COVID-19 and are moving forward and are doing a very fine job, as those numbers indicate.

Let us not make the best the enemy of the good. For those Republicans who believe that the Cornyn bill on liability is an essential part of this package, do not deny unemployment insurance and help to small businesses across America because we need to fight out this battle. If the Democrats had insisted that we would have no COVID-19 bill unless we had minimum-wage legislation or family leave related to economic circumstances, you would say: Why don't you save that debate for another day? We don't need it at this moment. We do need it as a nation but not at this moment. At this moment, we need to pass emergency assistance to the families and businesses across America.

I salute my friends who are part of this effort, this bipartisan effort. I am glad that I spent the time that I did, and I am still ready to work some

more. We can come to a conclusion, and we must.

For the U.S. Senate to finish this month without dealing with this very basic COVID-19 relief package is fundamentally wrong. It is the highest priority for families and businesses across America, and we owe them nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the vote on the McNeel nomination to begin now.

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the McNeel nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Harris	Loeffler	Schatz
Hawley	McSally	Whitehouse
Inhofe	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of J. Philip Calabrese, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Mitch McConnell, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Crapo, James Lankford, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Jerry Moran, Lamar Alexander, Mike Braun, David Perdue.

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 J. Philip Calabrese, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Braun	Cassidy
Barrasso	Brown	Collins
Blackburn	Burr	Cornyn
Blunt	Capito	Cotton
Boozman	Carper	Cramer