

Sullivan Thune Tillis Toomey Wicker Young

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Leg.]

NAYS—48

Baldwin Gillibrand Murray
Bennet Harris Nelson
Blumenthal Hassan Peters
Booker Heinrich Reed
Brown Heitkamp Sanders
Cantwell Hirono Schatz
Cardin Kaine Schumer
Carper King Shaheen
Casey Klobuchar Stabenow
Coons Leahy Tester
Cortez Masto Manchin Udall
Donnelly Markey Van Hollen
Duckworth McCaskill Warner
Durbin Menendez Warren
Feinstein Merkley Whitehouse
Franken Murphy Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson Paul

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 34

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services" (81 Fed. Reg. 87274 (December 2, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Friedman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Lamar Alexander, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds, Bill Cassidy, Thom Tillis.

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 David Friedman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

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

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—46

Baldwin Gillibrand Peters
Bennet Harris Reed
Blumenthal Hassan Sanders
Booker Heinrich Schatz
Brown Heitkamp Schumer
Cantwell Hirono Shaheen
Cardin Kaine Stabenow
Carper King Tester
Casey Klobuchar Udall
Coons Leahy Van Hollen
Cortez Masto Markey Warner
Donnelly McCaskill Warren
Duckworth Merkley Whitehouse
Durbin Murphy Wyden
Feinstein Murray
Franken Nelson

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Friedman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I would like to talk about U.S. support for Israel. It used to be that U.S. support for Israel was bipartisan. One of the most deeply disappointing realities in Washington today is that this support is becoming characterized as increasingly partisan. That is because—what happened was Republicans came out against one of President Obama's signature foreign policy achievements, the Iran nuclear deal.

That opposition came in the face of consensus among national security experts across the political spectrum, both here and in Israel, that this deal was good for the security of Israel. Ultimately, what happened is, it politicized our foreign policy in the Middle East to the point that what would have otherwise been a bipartisan vote for a bipartisan consensus Ambassador to the country of Israel from the United States, will now be confirmed along mostly party lines.

People will look at this confirmation and say: U.S. support for Israel now exists largely on a partisan basis. Let's be clear. It does not. I support every penny that goes to Israel. I think it is critical that the country maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, and I take a backseat to no one in my personal or professional passion for the United States-Israel relationship.

That is why I cannot support Mr. Friedman's nomination to be the U.S. Ambassador to Israel. He has radical views. He has made outrageous and offensive statements on a wide range of issues.

Here is a sampling of his past comments. Mr. Friedman has said that the State Department is anti-Semitic. He has said that President Obama is an anti-Semite. He has said that the two-state solution solves a "nonexistent problem." Mr. Friedman has called for Israeli citizens who are Arabs to be stripped of their civil rights. He has lobbed one of the worst words in Jewish history at large parts of the American Jewish community, calling them "kapos," which is a term for the Jews who worked for the Nazis in concentration camps. These are more than just provocative statements by Mr. Friedman; they are lies.

For decades, the United States has stood firm as an honest broker of peace. We have said to both sides that they can trust us to help end this conflict, and that is based on the principle that the United States is passionate about peace in Israel but dispassionate about how we get there. Mr. Friedman is not objective about how we get there. On the contrary, he is very passionately for settlements, and he is very passionately against the two-state solution, which means he is basically against decades of bipartisan U.S. foreign policy.

Just a few months ago, the organization he led advertised that they have a new program that will train students to "successfully delegitimize the notion of a two-state solution." This group is actively working to take the two-state solution off the table.

I understand that the Senate is not fully aligned on U.S. foreign policy when it comes to Israel. I understand we have our disagreements. We may disagree on whether a two-state solution is best, on where our Embassy should be located, and on how to approach the peace process, but there are some things we ought to be able to agree upon: that our Ambassador to Israel should not be more involved in Israel's politics than our own, that our Ambassador to Israel should not be so provocative that they wouldn't even be welcome at the negotiating table, and that our Ambassador should not be the kind of person who uses language to fuel violence, hate, and instability. That means we should be able to agree that our Ambassador to Israel cannot be Mr. Friedman.