

is one of—not the but close to it—one of the worst humanitarian crises on the planet today. In fact, what is going on there, it is going to get worse as this year goes on. As the Senator from New Jersey indicated, the Houthis have been really unhelpful in getting humanitarian supplies to the people of Yemen, who badly need it.

The Saudis, obviously, need the weaponry that is included in this sale. There are a lot of American citizens in Saudi Arabia, and we should support our allies when they are doing defensive things like this to defend themselves, to defend Americans who are present in their country. We all hope that this will reach a resolution in the near future.

The Iranians are the ones who are stoking this fire. The Houthis are not helpful to us. But we need to help the Saudis defend themselves. So I would urge a “no” vote on this matter before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, a disastrous retreat from Afghanistan gave our allies and partners reason to doubt that the United States could be counted on. Today, some of our colleagues want to double down on that mistake by blocking defensive support to yet another important partner.

Saudi Arabia is literally surrounded by violent threats conceived, funded, and orchestrated by Iran. To the north, they have got Iran-backed terrorists sowing violence in Iraq and Syria. To the east, they have a gulf filled with the flags of Iran's own increasingly belligerent navy. To the south, the Saudis have Iran-backed Houthi terrorists strangling Yemen and lobbying rockets, missiles, and armed drones over their border.

To be sure, this violence and the plight of the Yemeni people have only worsened since the Biden administration removed the Houthis from the terrorist list and imposed new restrictions on our support to the Saudi-led coalition.

Around the world, from time to time, we all have legitimate concerns about the behavior of our partners, but we are in a better position to influence their conduct if they trust in our partnership. So our colleagues don't get to vent their moral outrage in a vacuum without accounting for what comes next.

A vote to block the sale of defensive military systems to Saudi Arabia would undermine one of our most important regional partners, but there is even more at stake. Whether we help or not, our Arab partners will still be under siege tomorrow. They still need military capabilities to defend themselves. And we know that Russia and China will happily sell them advanced weapons systems. The importance of so-called great power competition is a matter of general consensus. So we

should be wary of turning our backs on longtime partners and of pushing them into the arms of our adversaries.

So here is what our colleagues' resolution would actually do. It would give the world yet another reason to doubt the resolve of the United States, and it would give our biggest adversaries a new foothold to exert their influence over a rapidly changing and important region.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask that all remaining time be yielded back.

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

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 67, as follows:

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

[Rollcall Vote No. 484 Leg.]

#### YEAS—30

Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Lee	Schatz
Brown	Lujan	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Casey	Merkley	Stabenow
Duckworth	Murray	Tester
Durbin	Ossoff	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Padilla	Warnock
Heinrich	Paul	Warren
Hirono	Peters	Wyden

#### NAYS—67

Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Johnson	Shaheen
Carper	Kelly	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sinema
Collins	King	Sullivan
Cooms	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Lummis	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Toomey
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Cruz	Menendez	Whitehouse
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Lankford	Leahy
--------	----------	-------

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Washington.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### BUILD BACK BETTER ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I can say with confidence to the senior Senator from Kentucky, who spoke this morning on childcare, that as a former preschool teacher, we can rest assured that we are not at risk of a toddler takeover in the U.S. Senate.

But seriously, I have never heard so much misinformation in such a short time from one person. It is not at all clear to me that the senior Senator from Kentucky read the bill—the Build Back Better bill.

So I want to set some facts straight. Under our bill, working parents will have way more options and pay way less to send their child to a high-quality childcare provider they choose. It is the same with pre-K. Parents of 3- and 4-year-olds will have more options to send their kids to quality preschool for free. We are talking about parents saving thousands of dollars a year on childcare and pre-K, which are huge financial burdens to families right now.

It is also, by the way, a great deal for our States who, by the way, are already working with the Federal Government on childcare, and 44 States already have some form of publicly funded pre-K. So this plan is not some new outlandish idea. And, finally, religious providers and family-based providers are absolutely eligible.

So this isn't a radical plan. It is a practical solution to, again, a huge financial barrier that parents are facing today. It is not a toddler takeover. It is giving parents more choices and more affordability. Though I would actually prefer toddlers on the Senate floor to what I saw today.

And it is not far-left propaganda because I can't emphasize this enough: This is not a political question for parents. To them, the question is, Can I choose the provider I actually like or do I have to go to this cheaper one just because I can't afford the one I really want to send my kids to; or is it worth me going back to work if I have to pay as much for rent or mortgage or college tuition as I do to send my child to a provider that I trust; or how long am I going to be on this wait list, and what do I do in the meantime?

What Democrats want to do is make sure there are more affordable options out there for parents. What Senate Republicans want to do is nothing but watch the prices keep rising.

And here is the thing. I have seen again and again, when someone says you can't do something, it is because they are afraid that you will. It is because they are afraid that we will. Senate Republicans are shaking in their boots because we are really doing something that helps working parents with a big part of their costs.

So I am sure they are going to keep calling affordable childcare “radical” and insisting that it would be better to do just nothing, and I am equally sure that Democrats are going to get this done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### DR. LORNA BREEN HEALTH CARE PROVIDER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 610.

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

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 610) entitled, “An Act to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals”, do pass with an amendment.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher Murphy, Ron Wyden.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4871

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment, with an amendment No. 4871, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], moves to concur in the House amendment, with an amendment numbered 4871.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4872 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4871

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the amendment No. 4871, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], proposes an amendment numbered 4872 to amendment No. 4871.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

#### MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4873

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to refer the House message to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 4873.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], moves to refer the House message to accompany S. 610 to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 4873.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 5 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4874

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], proposes an amendment numbered 4874

to the instructions on the motion to refer S. 610.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike “5 days” and insert “4 days”.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4875 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4874

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to amendment No. 4874, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], proposes an amendment numbered 4875 to amendment No. 4874.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike “4 days” and insert “3 days”.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Executive Calendar No. 486, Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, Chris Van Hollen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie Hirono, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Brian Schatz.