

[Rollcall Vote No. 411 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Risch
Bennet	Graham	Roberts
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Cruz	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—2

Hirono  
Sullivan

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	
Isakson	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 91, the nays are 2. The motion is agreed to.

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 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 Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, 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 Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Sen-

ator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 412 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Risch
Bennet	Graham	Roberts
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schumer
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Cotton	McConnell	Thune
Cramer	McSally	Tillis
Crapo	Menendez	Toomey
Cruz	Merkley	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—9

Blunt	Isakson	Paul
Booker	Kennedy	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 90, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the spending bill, which we are about to vote on, which is going to increase our deficit by almost a fourth of a trillion dollars over 10 years and of which I think I might be the first speaker. We are going to vote on this. We got it yesterday—Monday, maybe—and we are going to vote on it tomorrow.

I smile because this is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body, and we have not deliberated one bit on

far-ranging policies. Now, by the way, the mess is kind of bipartisan. We can spread the blame around.

Let me bring up the heart of it. When ObamaCare passed, President Obama famously said it would not increase the deficit by one dime. That is gone. I think that replaces "you can keep your doctor if you want to" as the greatest lie. What we did today is to repeal about \$400 billion in payments to pay for all the healthcare that is going out. It is kind of a joke on Republicans. We are getting ObamaCare, but we are not paying for it.

On the other hand, as I will explain in a second, it may ultimately be a joke on Democrats. Now, this concerns me because we didn't have a committee hearing on it, and we haven't had a floor debate, but we just committed that for almost \$400 billion that have been used to fund Medicaid expansion, people getting subsidies for their health insurance, and many other things, we just went poof, and it is gone.

Now, some of it, like the health insurance tax, was a tax that the insurance industry agreed to so that the Obama administration would force ObamaCare upon the rest of us. But now that it has been agreed to and ObamaCare is stuck, they don't want to pay the tax. They would rather that go poof.

Now, people say: Wait a second. If we get rid of that tax, maybe insurance premiums go down. One, they don't guarantee it, but, secondly, what we could have done is we could have taken that money, created reinsurance pools across the Nation, and that is estimated to lower premiums by 10 to 20 percent. In that case, not only would the insurance industry be fulfilling their bargain—hey, you stick the Nation with ObamaCare, but we will help pay for it—you would actually be able to use the money to lower premiums. That would be something good. One, they would have kept their word, and, two, it would have been good for the American patient, if you will.

The other tax that has gone just poof—\$300 billion just gone without debate, without deliberation, without a committee hearing, which is still there on Friday, and today we walk in on Monday, and it is poof, and we vote on it tomorrow, and I am the first person to speak on it—is the so-called Cadillac tax.

Now, on the Cadillac tax, that is a provision under ObamaCare in which for high-cost policies, if they go too high, you get taxed on them. The whole idea is to encourage wiser purchasing of health insurance. Now, frankly, I didn't care for the Cadillac tax. I get the reason it was there. But 100 different economists have said that it serves a purpose across the political spectrum. My preference is that if we had replaced the Cadillac tax, one, we would have paid for it. We shouldn't be getting ObamaCare without paying for it. Secondly, we would have gotten