



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2023

No. 130

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Majestic God, You have been our dwelling place in all generations, and we are sustained by Your unfailing love.

Today, surround our Senators with the shield of Your favor as they labor to keep our Nation strong. Lord, teach them to be obedient to Your commands, doing Your good will as Your presence fills them with joy. May they be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger. Manifest Your power throughout their labors so that this Nation will be exalted by righteousness. May Your angels guide us all in our ways.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 27, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KING thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2226, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2226) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer (for Reed-Wicker) amendment No. 935, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 936 (to amendment No. 935), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

S. 2226

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today the Senate will continue to process the

National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA. I believe we have had a really good process so far, and I hope this bipartisan work can get us through to the finish as soon as possible.

We made good progress on amendments last night. It took a while, but we have voted on 19 amendments to the NDAA and have at least 8 more amendment votes lined up for today. We have a lot of votes to get through, so I urge Senators—I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to be cooperative, to remain in the Senate Chamber as the series of votes progresses through the afternoon so we can keep the process moving.

Last night, we ran a hotline that includes a few additional votes and a managers' package of 48 amendments—23 from Democrats, 23 from Republicans, and 2 bipartisan. Each side of the aisle has amendments they really want in that managers' package and a good number of them were bipartisan. We have had an open and constructive amendment process for the NDAA, with both sides—both sides—working together in good faith. This is exactly how the process for the NDAA should look: bipartisan, cooperative.

I want to thank all of my colleagues, particularly Senators REED and WICKER, for their good work.

I am also proud of our first managers' package that had 51 amendments—21 from Republicans, 21 from Democrats, and 9 bipartisan. And some of the biggest accomplishments in this bill, I am proud to say, are broadly bipartisan, like progress on our efforts to outcompete the Chinese Government.

As I have been saying for weeks, passing the NDAA is a chance to show the American people how the Senate can productively work.

Another really important thing that is in this bill is the FEND Off Fentanyl Act, which will help give the administration tools it needs, including emergency powers, to stop the precursor

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3713

drugs from flowing out of China—the Chinese Government has done virtually nothing to help us thus far—going to Mexico, being made into fentanyl, and then being shipped to the United States to kill our children. Over 100,000 people have died of fentanyl last year.

So as I have been saying for weeks, the NDAA is a chance to show the American people the Senate can work productively on significant things they care about as well as on national security matters, which they care about as well.

What is happening in the Senate is a stark contrast to the partisan race to the bottom we saw in the House, where House Republicans are pushing partisan legislation that has zero chance of passing. House Republicans should look to the Senate to see how things get done. We are passing important bipartisan legislation. They are throwing on the floor partisan legislation that has no chance of passing. The contrast is glaring. If House Republicans would look to how we are working here in the Senate and emulate us a little more, they could be far more productive.

We have every reason today to believe that we can finish the NDAA as soon as possible, and I am hopeful we can get it done.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, off the floor, our appropriators continue to make good progress on the appropriations bill. This morning, the Appropriations Committee is marking up the remaining four appropriations bills.

It is just like the NDAA. Both sides—Democrats, Republicans—have been working really well together. This is never an easy process. But I really want to thank Chair MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS. They have worked together in a really supremely bipartisan, almost exquisite, way for shepherding these bills through committee with bipartisan support. It ain't easy in this time when the country is so divided.

This is a model for how appropriations processes should always work: both sides coming together, finding common ground, and advancing bills that invest in American families, keep communities safe, drive down our costs, and keep our government open. It is this type of bipartisanship that has prevented any government shutdowns last Congress when Democrats had majorities in the House and Senate. And the American people certainly don't want to see a shutdown now.

So there is a lot of work left to do, but I am pleased that our appropriators are making progress on these markups, and I thank them again.

You look at the NDAA bill and you look at the appropriations bill, you compare the House to the Senate, the contrast, as I said, is glaring. And House Republicans should look to the Senate for how to really get things done and help the American people instead of just shouting partisan screeds.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, on the AI briefing, yesterday, we held our third all-Senate briefing on AI. This was our final briefing, in a three-part series on AI, and it focused on U.S. investment and innovation and American leadership in AI technology that will continue to shape our world over the next decade and beyond.

The presentation was informative. Our briefers did a superb job highlighting just how quickly AI technology is developing.

I want to thank our briefers: Rick Stevens from the Department of Energy; Dr. Geri Richmond from the Department of Energy; Dr. Sethuraman Panchanathan, nicknamed affectionately “Panch,” head of the National Science Foundation; Dr. Kathleen Fisher from DARPA; and our moderator, Dr. Jose-Marie Giffiths.

We had great attendance on all three of our AI briefings. Both Democrats and Republicans were engaged and asked a lot of really good questions. It shows there is real bipartisan interest in AI, which will be necessary if we want to make progress on what really is imperative for this country: putting together AI legislation that encourages innovation but has safeguards to prevent the liabilities that AI could present.

Later this fall, we will continue our work on AI by convening the first ever AI Insight Forums. These forums will bring the top AI developers, executives, and experts together to lay the foundation for action on AI.

And, again, I want to thank my colleagues who attended our briefings, including, of course, Senators HEINRICH, ROUNDS, and YOUNG, part of our little group that helped to organize them.

REMEMBERING TONY BENNETT

Mr. President, finally, on a great, great American icon, Anthony Dominick Benedetto, more affectionately and widely known as Tony Bennett. We lost an American icon last week, a son of Astoria, Queens, and one of the most beloved singers of our time—the incomparable, wonderful, caring Tony Bennett. On Tuesday, I introduced a resolution declaring Tony Bennett's birthday, August 3, as “Tony Bennett Day.”

It didn't matter if you were young, old, or in the middle, if you were a close friend or a new fan, everyone just loved Tony. Just to hear him sing a few bars, you knew he cared about you and he really cared about the words of the song. He wasn't just getting up there to make some money. He really wanted to show his love for music and for people.

Tony Bennett leaves behind a tremendous legacy that will inspire generations of artists to come, and I look forward to passing this resolution honoring him today a little bit later.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana.

MARC FOGEL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I would like to use my time today to raise awareness about an important issue. Actually, it is about an important person, and his name is Marc Fogel.

Marc is a beloved father and husband. He is also a son, a brother, and an uncle. Over the course of his life, he has been a formative mentor to many young minds. You see, Marc Fogel spent 35 years teaching American history at American international schools around the world and most recently in Moscow. But after dedicating so much of his life to the service of others, he is currently detained in a Russian labor camp.

On August 14, 2021, as Marc returned to Russia for 1 final year of teaching before a much-deserved retirement, he was arrested in a Moscow airport for carrying about half an ounce of medical marijuana in his luggage. Marc had been prescribed the medical marijuana as an alternative to opioids to manage his chronic pain after undergoing multiple back surgeries, including a spinal fusion and various other challenging and painful procedures. Marc did not think that this healthcare decision would cost him his freedom and maybe even his life, but following his arrest, a Russian court convicted Marc of “large-scale drug smuggling” and sentenced him to 14 years in a maximum security penal colony. He has been there ever since.

In 2021, the same year as Marc's arrest, the U.S. State Department described the conditions in Russian prisons and detention centers as “often harsh and life threatening.” They reported overcrowding, abuse by guards and inmates, limited access to healthcare, food shortages, and inadequate sanitation as common occurrences—many practices that most Americans can't even imagine.

Considering the inhumane and harsh treatment reported in these centers and especially given the health challenges that Marc was already facing upon his arrest, Marc's family now fears he is not going to survive his sentence.

This is an injustice at the highest level, and it must not be tolerated by our government.

It is important to recognize that Marc is not the only American illegally detained abroad. U.S. Marine Paul Whelan and Wall Street Journal reporter Evan Gershkovich are both still trapped in Russian prisons as well.

But while all three of these men are wrongfully detained in Russia, only Paul Whelan and Evan Gershkovich have been recognized as wrongfully detained by the State Department. The State Department considers a formal

wrongful detention status as being one of the first steps to getting an American who is detained abroad back home. This determination mobilizes multiple U.S. Agencies to work with the State Department and the family of the detained to secure the prisoner's release.

There are currently over 50 American citizens the State Department lists as wrongfully detained in Russia, China, Iran, and Venezuela. However, despite being unjustly detained for the last nearly 2 years—with no end in sight—Marc is still not designated as wrongfully detained by the U.S. State Department.

You may recall the Biden administration's high-profile negotiation to bring WNBA star Brittney Griner home after she was detained in Russia, just after Fogel, over a similar drug-related offense. Ms. Griner is, thankfully, home. One of the key differences between Brittney Griner's and Marc Fogel's cases is that, less than 3 months after Griner's arrest, the State Department classified her as wrongfully detained. Fogel deserves the same justice, and we should be using every tool at our disposal to bring him home.

I have had the privilege of getting to know some of Marc's family, some of whom are Montanans. They have been fierce advocates here stateside, but they fear they will never see their brother's face again or hear their father's voice. We can't let that happen.

In working alongside the Fogel family, I have also teamed up with President Obama's U.S. Ambassador to Russia, Mike McFaul. Mike McFaul was my former Bozeman High School debate partner, whose son was actually a student of Marc Fogel when Ambassador McFaul was serving in Moscow. Mike McFaul and I are working together to implore the State Department to finally declare Marc as wrongfully detained.

This week, I also worked with colleagues across the aisle to introduce a resolution highlighting the unjust and disproportionate criminal sentence by Russia and calling for the immediate release of Mr. Fogel.

Time is of the essence. Tomorrow is Marc's 62nd birthday, but instead of celebrating with his friends and family, he will be spending it illegally detained in a Russian labor camp.

No American should ever have to endure this type of injustice. It is time the country and the world know about Mr. Fogel's case, and I urge the administration to help bring this American back home once again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Senate Democrats celebrated the anniversary of their reckless taxing-and-spending spree. As the Democratic leader put it, "this legislation is paying huge dividends." Well, he is right about that, but the windfalls from the deluge of liberal spending are headed all in the wrong directions.

Last year, Senate Republicans warned anyone who would listen about the dangers of our colleagues' plan. We explained how green slush funds dreamed up by leftwing activists wouldn't bring on the American industrial renaissance that Democrats were claiming it would, how half-baked climate schemes that relied on Chinese components and raw materials would give American workers and job creators the short end of the stick, and how crucial industries would face even heavier reliance on foreign supply chains.

But Washington Democrats paid these warnings no mind. They rammed through their radical spending on a party-line basis. Afterward, the senior Senator from West Virginia boasted that he "did it to help America." The senior Senator from Montana said he "look(s) forward to seeing the benefits of that bill." And President Biden summed up their action by saying:

We are going to invest in America again. . . . That's been my economic vision.

Well, it is now crystal clear. Either Democrats didn't know what their own bill was actually designed to do or they knew exactly what it would do and decided to sell out American workers and job creators.

Here is the inconvenient—and dangerous—truth. Of the \$110 billion this scheme has spent on green projects so far, foreign companies are involved in over 60 percent of it. In fact, foreign entities have their hand in 15 of the 20 biggest projects receiving money from the bill, and a full \$8 billion is benefiting companies either based in or with significant ties to the People's Republic of China—over \$100 billion in leftwing spending, and the majority has some tie to foreign countries, including America's biggest strategic adversary.

So our Democrat colleagues sold their reckless spending spree as a "Made in America" investment, but the only thing it appears to be making in America is a mess.

S. 2226

Now, on another matter, Mr. President, almost 2 years ago, the United States took an important step toward deeper cooperation with two of our closest friends: Australia and the United Kingdom.

The AUKUS agreement promises to equip our Australian allies with cutting-edge U.S. attack submarines to help deter aggression in the Indo-Pacific and clear the way for closer col-

laboration between all three nations on advanced defense technologies.

Like Ranking Member WICKER, Vice Chair COLLINS, and many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have been supportive of this important effort. Outcompeting China is going to take a coalition of committed allies and partners. Senate Republicans want AUKUS to be more than just a talking point or a one-time summit deliverable. We want it to be an enduring contribution to our collective security and a major expansion of defense cooperation with our closest allies.

But standing in the way of the historic opportunity—AUKUS—is the same persistent roadblock holding back our other efforts in military modernization. President Biden's defense budget request grossly—grossly—underestimates what is required to meet the challenges his own national defense strategy identifies.

If we are serious about deterring conflict in the Indo-Pacific, we must address America's aging attack submarine fleet.

Senior military leaders say they need 66 attack submarines to carry out necessary missions, but the Navy currently has 49. Right now, our defense industrial base produces 1.2 new submarines a year, but the Department of Defense will need to double production capacity just to avoid further reductions in the fleet.

Our allies' significant investments in shipbuilding are welcome steps that will improve our mutual security, but if the United States doesn't increase our own shipbuilding capacity and production rate, we will both fall behind, as China erodes our key advantage in the undersea domain. As Ranking Member WICKER has pointed out, that means funding for more attack submarines and concrete investments in the production lines that will help us meet our goals.

If the administration is serious about making AUKUS a success, it should work with Congress this fall to make urgent supplemental investments in meeting military requirements in the Indo-Pacific. Importantly, the administration should also prioritize removing barriers in the technology transfer process that prevent more effective long-term cooperation with our closest allies.

The reforms laid out in Pillar Two of AUKUS are essential not just for putting more cutting-edge U.S. technology in the Indo-Pacific but also for tapping into our allies' own technical advances and industrial bases.

If we are serious about building secure, high-tech supply chains, we should go further to shore up this critical pillar of AUKUS and lower barriers to cooperation with our closest allies. As I have said before, for the purposes of defense technology cooperation, we should treat Australia and the United Kingdom like we treat Canada.

So, today, I joined Ranking Member WICKER, Vice Chair COLLINS, and several of our colleagues in making the

case to President Biden. I hope and expect that the administration will recognize the need to invest further in our capacity to counter growing threats in the Indo-Pacific. And for our part, I expect the Senate to continue our work to provide for the common defense in earnest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 266, Tara K. McGrath, to be U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of California; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANCE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, my objection is not specific to this nominee. I think the Biden administration is not sending its best to the Department of Justice. Many of the nominees are unqualified. Some of them seem actively corrupt, and some, I assume, are good people. But the problem is not this specific nominee. The problem is the fact that the Department of Justice has been corrupted under the Biden administration, and there needs to be some reckoning with the American people and with this body and with the nominations process before we allow these nominees to glidepath to the confirmation process.

Let's just talk about a tale of two leaders in this country right now, one a Democrat and one a Republican. Of course, for the President of the United States, his son Hunter Biden has multiple Federal charges, multiple Federal investigations that implicate directly on the President's business dealings and may very well implicate the President directly and plausibly could lead to some significant problems for the President in the Presidential election.

Yesterday, the plea deal that the Department of Justice cut with Hunter Biden fell apart with minimal scrutiny from the Federal judge in that case. That is how the Department of Justice treats the Democratic leadership in this country, with kid gloves, even in the face of very serious corruption.

Let's ask ourselves how they treat the former Republican President in the face of a classified document scandal, where, literally, the claim is that the President of the United States mishandled the documents of his own administration.

Now, nobody doubts that President Trump had the right to declassify documents at issue in this case. The argu-

ment is that he didn't, and, therefore, they want to throw him in jail. Is that really what we are doing at the height of the Presidential campaign—trying to throw the former President in jail, the likely leader of the opposition, in prison, because he didn't cross the t's and dot the i's on the classification or declassification process? This is a ridiculous scandal in our entire country.

Look, whether these nominees are qualified or not qualified, we should have the vote and make that determination as a body. It is not, at the end of the day—as I have learned in 8 months—all that difficult and all that hard to vote. But we have to stop giving these nominees a glidepath until Merrick Garland commits to using the Department of Justice for justice and not for politics, as it is being used today.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, let me just add that it is beyond disappointing and beyond frustrating that our colleague from Ohio continues to hold the Senate process hostage for political gain.

I won't get into the credentials and stellar qualifications that Ms. McGrath has to serve in this capacity. I will reserve that for a more constructive day relative to her confirmation. But I will note this with a sense of urgency. In the Southern District of California, the current acting U.S. attorney is due to step down on August 4. So there is an urgency to this particular confirmation—a confirmation which was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, by the way, but has not been voted on by the entire Senate.

And it is not just this confirmation. I am not going to talk about Federal judges. I am not going to talk about military promotions that are on hold because of politics being played on the other side of the aisle.

I believe the American people deserve to know that when even the confirmation of U.S. attorneys are being held up, it is impeding the investigation of crimes. It is impeding the enforcement of our Nation's laws. It is impeding the cooperation and coordination between various prosecutors' offices throughout the country. That is the job of a U.S. attorney. And it is shameful that Republican colleagues are holding these confirmations up, particularly of candidates for these positions who are far and above the qualifications necessary to serve in these capacities.

ENERGY

Mr. President, I also rise to speak today on this hot summer day in Washington, DC, where the forecast, as I was on the way in, showed that it was going to be 99 degrees today. Well, 35 years ago, on a scorching 98-degree summer day here in Washington, NASA scientist Dr. James Hansen testified in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to share an alarming conclusion.

Thirty-five years ago, he said this: Manmade pollution was causing our climate to change. It was one of the earliest major scientific warnings that, without action, one day our planet would be at risk of catastrophic climate events.

So colleagues, I am here to say that day has come. This past May, in a report in the Environmental Research Letters journal, researchers found a direct correlation between increased carbon emissions and wildfires in the Western United States.

Eight of the last ten largest wildfires in California history have occurred in just the last 6 years. In June, last month, New York City experienced the worst air pollution recorded on the planet, while Washington, DC, was blanketed in smoke not because of wildfires in California but because of wildfires in Canada. And over the last several weeks, a heat wave has brought record-breaking temperatures from coast to coast and put over 140 million Americans under heat alerts. And just today, we learned that this July is set to be the hottest month in recorded history.

So the question is no longer hypothetical; the question is real: How viable of a planet are we going to leave to our children and our grandchildren? We must act, colleagues. Yet, even in the year 2023, with indisputable proof in many scientific studies, too many of our Republican colleagues remain defiant.

Now, I will acknowledge that the deliberate attempt to distract from the problem at hand has evolved over time. What was once "climate change is a hoax" has become "defense of industry" or "market-based solutions." What was once the Republican chair of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee bringing a snowball onto the floor of the U.S. Senate to somehow disprove the dynamic of a warming planet has been replaced with press conferences promising energy independence if we only allow continued polluting.

It is a new kind of climate denial, a sophisticated campaign to create delays and undermine climate progress in order to enrich major corporations' bottom lines. But, make no mistake, the result is the same: Republicans continuing to obstruct desperately needed solutions.

They vilify President Biden and all of us Democrats for having the courage to fight for bold action, and all too often they hold up California as the punching bag for enacting lifesaving policies that they disagree with. That is right; they bash California for having the audacity to lead.

So, today, I want to set the record straight. Yes, in California we have long accepted the truth about climate change, and as a result, we have been trailblazers for enacting environmental protections and leading our clean energy transition. As far back as 1966, California established the first tailpipe

emission standards for passenger vehicles in the Nation. Three years later, after a catastrophic oil spill off the coast of Santa Barbara, Californians rose up and demanded environmental protections, spurring the birth of the modern-day environmental movement and eventually creating the very first Earth Day, which we now celebrate every year.

Mr. President, flash forward to 2006, when California passed AB 32, also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act—legislation with the bold goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. I was elected to the State senate that year, eager to be part of implementation of that measure, and I went on to serve for 6 years as chair of the State senate Committee on Energy.

Now, since then, California has continued to lead the Nation with increasingly ambitious goals for cutting emissions, conserving public lands, becoming the first State committed to conserving 30 percent of our lands and water by the year 2030, a goal that President Biden has called for nationally.

Just this month, California's environmental leadership came in the form of the Nation's heavy-duty truck manufacturers agreeing to comply with California's first-in-the-Nation zero emission truck standards, which will advance the adoption of 100 percent zero-emission trucks by 2036, a truly historic achievement. And I think it is important to repeat and emphasize here, I am talking about a standard that truck manufacturers have agreed to.

But let me make another point, Mr. President, just to demonstrate just how partisan this conversation ought not to be. It has not just been Democrats in California who have led the way. As President, former California Senator Richard Nixon signed into law landmark legislation, including the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act of 1970, the Endangered Species Act, and the creation of the EPA. That is right; a Republican President did that.

As President, former California Gov. Ronald Reagan built on California's leadership when he signed the first national energy efficiency standards for appliances into law. That is right; a Republican President did that.

It was Republican Gov. Pete Wilson, who established the California EPA, and it was Republican Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, who signed the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act that I referenced earlier.

The net result in California's efforts is that, in 2023, our State has a diverse portfolio of clean energy resources, not hypothetical—operational solar, wind, and geothermal energy—all while fostering a growing economy that is on its way to becoming the fourth largest economy in the world. It is that long-term vision and commitment to clean energy and a transition to it that will

bring the first-ever transition to Caltrain's all-new electric fleet in 2024, a three-decade-long project that will result in the first transition from diesel trains in the West. It is that same vision that diversified our energy sources so that, after a winter of extreme storms like we saw this last year, we can take advantage of torrential rains with hydropower capabilities or reap the benefits of our expanded solar capacity and battery storage.

I raise these examples, colleagues, not just to showcase California's leadership but to prove that these aren't just lofty climate aspirations. California is proving that a clean energy transition is not only possible; it is actually good for our economy. And, today, the Federal Government is smart to follow California's lead.

Over the last 2 years, we have made huge strides toward transitioning our Nation's energy sector to clean, renewable sources and adopting California's clean vehicle emission standards. When we passed the bipartisan infrastructure law, we also chose to invest in clean schoolbuses, to invest in electrifying public transit across the country. We chose to expand electric vehicle charging stations to make the switch to electric vehicles that much more convenient for Americans.

Last summer, we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, which is jump-starting clean energy and clean transportation projects, providing tax credits for Americans to upgrade their appliances and their homes and making electric vehicle ownership more affordable.

And, more recently, we were able to defend our hard-fought gains during the debt ceiling negotiations from Republicans who wanted to undercut our progress.

Now, part of making sure we fully realize the investments in the IRA is speeding up the permitting process for transmission lines that are needed to deliver the renewable energy from where it occurs as a natural resource to the communities where it is needed. It also means pushing Agencies like the EPA to embark on ambitious regulatory efforts on light- and heavy-duty vehicles, trains, and ships, thanks to investments in the IRA.

So when we hear the defeatist attitude of Republicans who say this is going to hurt jobs, we can show them the millions of good-paying jobs being created by the Inflation Reduction Act.

When we hear about alleged overreliance on foreign imports, we will show them badly needed investments in domestic manufacturing and a new generation of American solar, wind, geothermal, and green hydrogen.

And when we hear cynics who prefer inaction to intervention, a planet burning to Congress acting, we will show them that the audacity to lead has paid off before, and it can pay off again.

Now, I am willing to forgive all that has been said—all the misinformation

about climate change, all the ranting about California—if my Republican colleagues were just willing to do what is right. Now, in the end, I wouldn't even ask my Republican colleagues to reverse their positions and have the courage to lead. I will settle for their courage to follow or at least get out of the way because California has already shown us the path forward.

Have the courage, colleagues. Have the courage for the sake of our children and future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Senator from Wyoming.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 999

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Energy to establish a Nuclear Fuel Security Program, expand the American Assured Fuel Supply Program, establish an HALEU for Advanced Nuclear Reactor Demonstration Projects Program, and submit a report on a civil nuclear credit program, and to enhance programs to build workforce capacity to meet critical mission needs of the Department of Energy)

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, at this point, I call up my amendment No. 999 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRASSO], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 999.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 20, 2023, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BARRASSO. For decades now, Russia has flooded America's uranium market. Russia has driven America's nuclear fuel suppliers out of business. Russia now supplies 24 percent of our enriched uranium imports. Russia is our third largest supplier. We spend nearly \$1 billion each year on Russian uranium. Russia uses these revenues to fund its invasion of Ukraine.

Here in America, we have the resources to fuel our own reactors. My amendment authorizes the Department of Energy to take the steps necessary to expand U.S. nuclear fuel production.

The Energy Committee passed this legislation by voice vote in May. The Senate passed this legislation by voice vote last December. It was included in last year's Senate Defense bill.

I would like to thank Senator MANCHIN, Senator RISCH, Senator MARK WARNER, Senator BUDD, and Senator COONS for their effort and their support and cosponsorship on this critical issue.

I urge you to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back all time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Baldwin	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Hagerty	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Ricketts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Braun	Hirono	Rounds
Britt	Hoeben	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Tuberville
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Merkley	Vance
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Mullin	Warnock
Ernst	Murkowski	Welch
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young

NAYS—3

Markey	Sanders	Warren
--------	---------	--------

NOT VOTING—1

Durbin

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 3.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 999) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RORY STANLEY

Mr. MANCHIN. First of all, I want to take time for recognizing a gentleman who has given 10 years of service being our nuclear expert on the Senate Energy Committee, Rory Stanley. He is leaving us, but he is not going far. He is going to the Department of Energy's Department of Nuclear Energy.

Rory, thank you for the service you have given us. We appreciate it very much.

S. 2226

Next of all, I want to thank everyone for voting for this amendment. Finally, the United States is going to start taking care of its own and producing the enriched uranium that we need rather than depending on Russia. It is long past due, and we, finally, with this amendment, will get started in the right direction.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for voting for that.

Again, Rory, thank you for your service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 1030

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1030 and ask that it be reported by number.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 1030.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce military spending)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REDUCTION IN MILITARY SPENDING.

The total amount of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act is hereby reduced by 10 percent, with the amount of such reduction to be applied on a pro rata basis among the accounts and funds for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act, excluding accounts and funds relating to military personnel, the Defense Health Program, and assistance to Ukraine. The amount of reduction for each account and fund subject to such requirement shall be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by such account or fund.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, before a vote on the Sanders amendment No. 1030.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, our healthcare system is broken. Eighty-five million Americans are uninsured or underinsured, and we don't even have enough doctors, nurses, or mental health providers. Unbelievably, our life expectancy is actually declining. Our childcare system is dysfunctional. Millions of parents are unable to find affordable sites for their kids.

We have a major housing crisis, 600,000 Americans are homeless, and—oh, yes—the planet is on fire, and the world we are leaving future generations will be increasingly unhealthy. But somehow we never have enough money to address those crises.

Mr. President, if we have learned anything from the COVID pandemic, where we have lost over 1 million Americans, and climate change, which is causing massive destruction throughout the world, it is that national security is not just about nu-

clear weapons, submarines, and fighter planes; it is about making sure that all Americans have decent healthcare, education, housing, and other necessities of life.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Year after year, with very little debate, we pour hundreds of billions of dollars into the military-industrial complex. This year, it is about \$900 billion. While defense contractors make huge profits, while the Pentagon remains unaudited, with massive waste and fraud, we now spend more than the next 10 nations combined.

Enough is enough. It is time to change our national priorities, and cutting military spending by 10 percent is a good way to begin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

An across-the-board cut of 10 percent makes no distinction between those programs that are actually vital and necessary for the defense of the country and those programs that may be subject to reduction based on our evaluation of the program.

The Senator's amendment excludes defense health programs, military personnel accounts, and assistance to Ukraine, but that means the actual cuts on every other function will be much greater than 10 percent.

The other point that I think should be made—he has made a very rousing description, an accurate description of some of the issues facing us domestically, but we are now involved in an existential conflict, helping the Ukrainians to defend democracy. That costs money. We are in a situation where China has increased their military dramatically, and we must be prepared to react to such a change.

This world is more dangerous perhaps today than at any time, and to simply walk away from adequately funding our Defense Department would be, I think, an error.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1030

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 88, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Baldwin	Paul	Warren
Markey	Sanders	Welch
Merkley	Smith	Wyden
Murphy	Van Hollen	

NAYS—88

Barrasso	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blackburn	Grassley	Reed
Blumenthal	Hagerty	Ricketts
Booker	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Britt	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Budd	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Manchin	Tuberville
Crapo	Marshall	Vance
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Mullin	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fetterman	Murray	
Fischer	Ossoff	

NOT VOTING—1

Durbine

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). On this vote, the yeas are 11, the nays are 88.

Under the previous order requiring 60 affirmative votes for adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1030) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—AMENDMENT NOS. 1078 AND 944

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of amendments under the previous order, that it be in order to call up the following amendments to S. 2226: Schatz No. 1078; Scott No. 944; further, that with respect to the amendments listed above, the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed, with no further amendments or motions in order, and with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption, and that there be 2 minutes, equally divided, prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 705

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 705 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], for himself and Mr. YOUNG, proposes an amendment numbered 705.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 13, 2023, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator YOUNG, my coauthor of this amendment that deals with our foreign policy being grounded in our democratic values to fight corruption. I also want to thank Senator WICKER for his help, particularly in the Helsinki Commission where this issue was debated.

I also want to thank Senator MENENDEZ and Senator RISCH, the chair and ranking members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This bill has been reported out by that committee at least twice by near-unanimous or unanimous votes.

I think we all recognize that corruption provides the fuel for Mr. Putin and other corrupt leaders to do their nefarious actions, including the war in Ukraine. It is in our core national security interests to fight corruption, as has been declared by President Biden.

So this bill patterns the efforts we have made in the trafficking of persons to have the State Department evaluate the capacity of what countries are doing to combat corruption using standard evaluations such as criminalizing corruption, investigating and prosecuting, adopting measures to prevent corruption, adequate resources, and protecting victims of corruption.

This amendment will continue the U.S. leadership in fighting corruption globally. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 705

Mr. President, it is my understanding that we can do this by voice vote. If that is the case, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold with respect to this amendment be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 705) was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be amended so that consideration of the Scott amendment No. 944 occur immediately, with all previous provisions remaining in effect.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 944 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 944.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require an assessment of the impact and feasibility of restricting gifts and grants to United States institutions of higher education from entities on the Non-SDN Chinese Military-Industrial Complex Companies List)

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1269. ASSESSMENT OF GIFTS AND GRANTS TO UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FROM ENTITIES ON THE NON-SDN CHINESE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX COMPANIES LIST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of gifts and grants to United States institutions of higher education from entities on the Non-SDN Chinese Military-Industrial Complex Companies List maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall include in the assessment required by subsection (a) an estimate of—

(1) a list and description of each of the gifts and grants provided to United States institutions of higher education by entities described in subsection (a); and

(2) the monetary value of each of those gifts and grants.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) GIFTS AND GRANTS.—The term "gifts and grants" includes financial contributions, material donations, provision of services, scholarships, fellowships, research funding, infrastructure investment, contracts, or any other form of support that provides a benefit to the recipient institution.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, my amendment is a very simple amendment. It directs the Treasury Department to provide transparency on the state of Chinese military donations to U.S. universities. Every year, undisclosed sources within the People's Republic of China sends millions of dollars in gifts, grants, and other financial means to U.S. colleges and universities, and the sad fact is we know too little about that. My amendment would be the first step in understanding their impact.

I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold with respect to this amendment be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we do this by voice vote as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 944) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Marshall amendment is next.

The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 874

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 874, and I ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MARSHALL] proposes an amendment numbered 874 to amendment No. 935.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the flying, draping, or other display of any flag other than the flag of the United States at public buildings)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. ____ PROHIBITION ON FLAGS OTHER THAN THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term “flag of the United States” has the meaning given the term in section 700(b) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) PUBLIC BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “public building” has the meaning given the term in section 3301(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “public building” includes—

(i) a military installation (as defined in section 2801(c) of title 10, United States Code); and

(ii) any embassy or consulate of the United States.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subsection (c), no flag that is not the flag of the United States may be flown, draped, or otherwise displayed—

(1) on the exterior of a public building; or

(2) in the hallway of a public building.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibitions under subsection (b) shall not apply to—

(1) a National League of Families POW/MIA flag (as designated by section 902 of title 36, United States Code);

(2) any flag that represents the nation of a visiting diplomat;

(3) the State flag of the State represented by a member of Congress, outside or within the office of the member;

(4) in the case of a military installation, any flag that represents a unit or branch of the Armed Forces;

(5) any flag that represents an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)); or

(6) any flag that represents the State, territory, county, city, or local jurisdiction in which the public building is located.

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask unanimous consent that there be up to 4 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, every time our flag is unfurled, I would ask you all: What emotion is stirred in your hearts? Old Glory means many things to many people. Some stand and some kneel. Some salute her while others burn her.

Regardless of your sentiments, what no one can deny is that hundreds of thousands of Americans have died for this one flag that gives you the freedoms we all enjoy. Few, if any, Americans have died for any other flag.

As for me, every time this flag is unfurled, I think about my own family members who have served. My family has had someone from every generation

serve under this one flag since the Civil War. Four of my grandfathers' grandfathers enlisted in the Union to preserve this Republic, three of whom died on a bloody battlefield. My mom's uncle served in World War I and was exposed to mustard gas in the Argonne Forest, and two of my dad's uncles stormed the beaches of Normandy. My own uncles and cousins have served. My father served. My brother served. I served. My son is serving. And we all serve under one flag. My family who served, that is what I think of when this flag is unfurled.

Look, many Americans have died to give you the freedom to honor or disgrace the flag as you see fit for your own home. Wouldn't you think that, to honor America and those who serve, especially for those who have made the ultimate sacrifice and the Gold Star families, our country should honor one American flag?

I hope you will agree with me as patriots that it would be right and proper that on the buildings and grounds owned by we the people, only one flag, with reasonable exceptions—the flag so many Americans have fought and died for, the one flag that represents this idea of America—should be unfurled. This is exactly what our amendment does.

A vote against this amendment is a slap on the face of those of us who have served, and it is disrespectful to the families whose loved ones have died in defending this one flag and the Republic for which it stands.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The author has not truly revealed what the amendment does.

On all of our Federal buildings, we often see many different flags—the U.S. flag that we all join in pledging in this body but also, in certain States, the State flag. We see the MIA flag. I will tell you, in Madison, WI, at the State capitol, during the month of June, it adorns the Pride flag.

This really is thinly veiled. Let's be clear that this is about not being able to fly the Pride flag.

I was so proud last year to work across the aisle with both Democrats and Republicans to pass the Respect for Marriage Act. It was a milestone for equal rights for all Americans. But like so many other Americans in leading this march toward equality, I am reminded of how much work we have yet to do.

LGBTQ+ Americans are our neighbors, our loved ones, our constituents, and our colleagues. They serve in our Armed Forces and in the Federal Government, making sacrifices every day for their country. They work in our Federal buildings, our post offices, and in our own offices. They serve in our military and put their lives at risk for our country. These Federal buildings connect Americans to their govern-

ment—a government of, by, and for the people. But, for too long, LGBTQ+ Americans have felt unwelcomed and sometimes unsafe in these spaces—these spaces that are meant to serve them too.

I think the American people are getting tired of politicians who make their support for our military service-members and their families contingent upon pushing a discriminatory agenda whether that be about women's rights or LGBTQ+ rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. BALDWIN. I urge opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be amended so that the consideration of the Kennedy amendment occur immediately preceding the Gillibrand amendment, with all previous provisions remaining in effect.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 874

The question is on agreeing to the Marshall amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Britt	Hoeven	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schumer
Booker	Kelly	Shaheen
Brown	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Lujan	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Durbin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 874) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1034

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1034. I ask that it be reported by number. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MENENDEZ and I each have 3 minutes to discuss this amendment.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 1034 to amendment No. 935.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization)

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1299L. PROHIBITION ON ALLOCATIONS OF SPECIAL DRAWING RIGHTS AT INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR PERPETRATORS OF GENOCIDE AND STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION.

Section 6 of the Special Drawing Rights Act (22 U.S.C. 286g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States vote to allocate Special Drawing Rights under article XVIII, sections 2 and 3, of the Articles of Agreement of the Fund to a member country of the Fund, if the government of the member country has—

“(1) committed genocide at any time during the 10-year period ending with the date of the vote; or

“(2) been determined by the Secretary of State, as of the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024, to have repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, for purposes of—

“(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4813(c)(1)(A)(i));

“(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

“(C) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

“(D) any other provision of law.”.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we all know, the International Monetary Fund—or the IMF, as we call it—is an international bank. Most countries belong to it—190, in fact. Virtually every country in the world is a member of the IMF—there are 190 countries—and everybody puts up money. When another country gets in trouble, the IMF helps bail them out.

Now, not every country in the IMF is equal in voting rights. The countries that put up the most money get most of the voting rights and have most of the control. And you will not be sur-

prised to learn that the United States of America puts up over \$100 billion, and we have the largest share of voting rights.

Periodically, the IMF issues what are called special drawing rights. The technical definition of a special drawing right is an international reserve asset created by and issued by the IMF. But forget that. Let me tell you what a special drawing right is. A special drawing right is like a dividend. Think of it as a poker chip. So the IMF says: We are going to give dividends or poker chips to every member of the IMF.

Well, what can you do with this poker chip? Well, if you are Iran, for example, you can take this poker chip and go to the IMF and say “Here is my poker chip, and I want \$1.42”—that is the exchange rate—“of U.S. dollars,” whether Iran needs it or not. Pretty sweet deal.

Iran would never have to pay back that money. The IMF does charge Iran interest on those U.S. dollars. Iran wouldn’t have to pay it back, but they have to pay interest. Guess what the interest rate is. It is .05 percent—not 5 percent, .05 percent. Sweet deal for Iran, especially when they don’t need the money.

My amendment would simply say that the United States cannot—Secretary of the Treasury—cannot vote to approve special drawing rights, or these poker chips, for any country that, according to the State Department, sponsors genocide or state-backed terrorism—genocide or state-backed terrorism—unless Congress approves.

I will reserve my time but yield to Senator MENENDEZ, my good friend from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, that only means I got there before you.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senator KENNEDY’s amendment. I have a great deal of respect for my colleague. No one—no one—in this Chamber has taken a harder line against the Iranian regime than I have. No one. But in this case, a well-intended motion can produce very bad consequences. So let me speak to why I oppose the Senator’s amendment.

These special drawing rights—I always love how my colleague from Louisiana can bring it to an earthy tone. We have poker chips we are throwing around, but these aren’t quite poker chips; they are a critical liquidity tool to support lower income countries in response to global financial crises. It is in our interest to do so, to create stability. They assist in creating economic stability. They are an absolutely essential part of U.S. foreign policy tools, especially as we are dealing with the China challenge. We want to help these countries instead of China helping them.

The Biden administration supported a new round of special drawing rights allocations at the IMF. This funding

played an essential role in helping countries address the COVID-19 pandemic and the related economic fallout of the pandemic, which we are still hearing about from many of these countries. Without this funding, many of these countries would have fallen to economic crisis, which means political instability, which means chaos, which means refugees coming to the shores of many countries.

The International Monetary Fund’s rules dictate that a new general issuance of special drawing rights must go to all members. That means a requirement to prohibit SDRs for one country would prohibit SDRs for all countries. As a consequence, Senator KENNEDY’s amendment would effectively kill the possibility of issuing SDRs to any country ever again.

Now, Senator KENNEDY offered the same exact amendment with the Endless Frontier Act on the floor in May of 2021. That amendment failed by a significant vote.

Of course we oppose those state sponsors of terrorism. Of course, we oppose those who would be responsible for genocide.

But I would note that most of our adversaries the Senator wants to pursue—which I would agree if we could do it antiseptically, but we can’t—already face obstacles to drawing special drawing rights because of the sanctions that we have against them.

So due to the harmful impact this amendment would have on the Treasury Department’s ability to respond to deficit in the global supply of reserves on a global crisis, I would vote no and I would recommend my colleagues do so, as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much additional time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You have 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill will not take poker chips—and that is what they are—away from any country unless they are engaging in genocide or State-sponsored terrorism. That is it. The world will not spin off its axis. If you think a country that commits genocide or State-sponsored terrorism should get poker chips, vote against this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If we were talking about poker chips, I would be all in with Senator KENNEDY. But what we are talking about is the ability to prevent a crisis in the world. That is something we can use. That is why the Senator’s amendment needs to fail.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1034

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WICKER. 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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Graham	Murkowski
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Braun	Hagerty	Ricketts
Britt	Hawley	Risch
Budd	Heinrich	Romney
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warnock
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warren
Fetterman	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Reed	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin
Scott (SC)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FETTERMAN). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1034) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 2 minutes and that Senator GILLIBRAND be given 2 minutes on this amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1065 TO AMENDMENT NO. 935

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my dear friend Senator GILLIBRAND for her work on this amendment and for being such a fierce advocate for 9/11 responders and survivors.

I would like to thank the Republican cosponsors, including Senators Braun and Lummis, for their support. And Senator WICKER, I thank him as well as thanking Leader MCCONNELL.

This amendment is a huge step forward in making sure the first responders and those injured on 9/11 are never left behind.

Before the smoke even cleared on 9/11 and before the rubble even quit burn-

ing, our first responders—our firefighters, our police officers, EMT, FBI agents, construction workers—were just running to danger, trying to do their jobs and save lives. For their sacrifice, many first responders developed severe health complications from working in the aftermath of the attack—lifelong injuries, serious cancers. Many of them are no longer with us, and some of them were friends of mine. Twenty-two years later, people are still getting sick from the dust, the air, the poisons.

We have created the World Trade Center Health Program so that 9/11 responders could afford the necessary healthcare, but we can't let funding for the program dry up. We cannot fail to properly care for those who answered the call of duty. Our work is not done. Just as the first responders have been there for us and for America, we will continue fighting for them.

This will fund \$450 million to the World Trade Center Health Program and another over \$200 million for the military employees who rushed to danger at the Pentagon and in Shanksville. It will be fully paid for. It will also, for the first time, help those, as I said, at the Pentagon and the DOD.

I hope, from all of my colleagues, that we can have unanimous and broad support for this amendment.

I yield to the Senator from New York, my colleague, who is such a leader on this legislation.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator SCHUMER for his unbelievable conviction and persistence in helping our 9/11 first responders.

I also want to thank my Republican colleagues who helped us write this bill—Senator BRAUN, Senator LUMMIS, and Senator COTTON.

I am just going to give you a vignette of what this is about.

Mariama, a New Yorker, came home after 9/11 to find her apartment covered in a thick coat of ash. Her children have all developed life-changing respiratory conditions.

Jamie, a 19-year-old, was a volunteer with the Sayville Ambulance that day. He spent weeks cleaning up at Ground Zero. He developed a rare 9/11 cancer as well.

Another amazing person is Nate, who responded to the attack at the Pentagon. He spent weeks climbing in and out of the wreckage, searching for remains. He is now a disabled veteran who is suffering from PTSD and another rare, life-threatening disease.

It has been over two decades since 9/11, but, still, thousands of people like Mariama, Jamie, and Nate suffer from these terrible cancers and conditions.

In 2011, when Congress created the World Trade Center Health Program, which provided medical treatment and monitoring for the survivors, it was not fully funded then, and we are hoping to get closer to fully funding it with this addition. My amendment brings us one step closer to this fund-

ing gap, and it includes the Pentagon and Shanksville responders.

9/11 was a horrible day for everyone, but one thing I can say is that this body has stood with those responders every single year since then, and this body has never given up in making sure they have the healthcare they need to survive.

AMENDMENT NO. 1065

(Purpose: To amend title XXXIII of the Public Health Service Act with respect to funding for the World Trade Center Health Program.)

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1065, and I ask that the Gillibrand amendment be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. GILLIBRAND], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 1065 to amendment No. 935.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 26, 2023, under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, there is widespread bipartisan support for this amendment. I am going to vote for it, and a number of Republicans have cosponsored it. Although we are going to have to call the roll, perhaps this could be the moment when a 10-minute vote actually means that.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WICKER. I yield.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this vote be 10 minutes, that subsequent votes be 10 minutes, and that we all hang around and get the job done.

Mr. WICKER. I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1065

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Baldwin	Britt	Cassidy
Barrasso	Brown	Collins
Bennet	Budd	Coons
Blackburn	Cantwell	Cornyn
Blumenthal	Capito	Cortez Masto
Booker	Cardin	Cotton
Boozman	Carper	Cramer
Braun	Casey	Crapo

Cruz	Lankford	Schatz
Daines	Lujan	Schmitt
Duckworth	Lummis	Schumer
Ernst	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Feinstein	Markey	Shaheen
Fetterman	Marshall	Sinema
Fischer	McConnell	Smith
Gillibrand	Menendez	Stabenow
Graham	Merkley	Sullivan
Grassley	Moran	Tester
Hagerty	Murkowski	Thune
Hassan	Murphy	Tillis
Hawley	Murray	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Ossoff	Vance
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Warner
Hirono	Peters	Warnock
Hoeven	Reed	Warren
Hyde-Smith	Ricketts	Welch
Johnson	Risch	Whitehouse
Kaine	Romney	Wicker
Kelly	Rosen	Wyden
Kennedy	Rounds	Young
King	Rubio	
Klobuchar	Sanders	

NAYS—4

Lee	Paul
Mullin	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin	Scott (SC)
--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 4.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1065) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 1058

(Purpose: To extend the period for filing claims under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act and to provide for compensation under such Act for claims relating to Manhattan Project waste, and to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining.)

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I would like to call up my amendment No. 1058 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 1058.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 26, 2023, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask for 6 minutes of debate prior to the rollcall vote.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, for 50 years—50 years—the Federal Government has put into the water, into the soil, into the air of St. Louis and surrounding regions radioactive nuclear material.

They have not told the people of St. Louis. They have not compensated the people of St. Louis. They have not helped the people of St. Louis—in fact, just the opposite. For decades—decades—they told the people of St. Louis: No problem. There is no problem here.

Meanwhile, children were dying of cancer, and people all over the region were contracting autoimmune diseases. Why? Because the groundwater had been poisoned, because the creeks

where they played in had been poisoned. And now we know for a fact that the government has covered it up for decades.

Mr. President, it is time to make this right. The amendment we are about to vote on is a very simple amendment. It is about basic justice: compensating the victims of the Federal Government's negligence for what the government itself has done.

And it hasn't only happened in Missouri. It has happened around the country, which is why this amendment would reauthorize a victims fund for those who have suffered because of the government's negligence. And by "suffered" I mean gotten sick and had family members die—in Missouri, in States across the country. It reauthorizes it, and it makes it available to those who have been the victims of what the government has done.

This is a bipartisan bill. I am proud to have worked with Senator LUJÁN, Senator CRAPO, Senator SCHMITT, and others.

Now I would like to recognize the Senator from New Mexico, Senator LUJÁN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I want to commend Mr. HAWLEY and Mr. CRAPO for the work they have done here and all of our colleagues and staff who have contributed to telling this story and the support that I expect to see today and that I hope will get this across the finish line.

Almost 80 years ago, New Mexico became ground zero for the detonation of the first nuclear bomb. Millions of people across the country traveled to theaters this weekend, and they saw a blockbuster centered around this infamous date. But not enough people have focused on the collateral damage caused by our Nation's nuclear weapons testing. People who sacrificed on behalf of our country for national security purposes, working day in and day out, in States like Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Missouri, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nevada, Texas, Oregon, North Dakota, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and others—they deserve our support.

Folks have traveled to Washington with lung cancer, oral cancer, asthma, heart problems, begging us to extend and expand the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act. A few years ago, an elder from the Navajo Nation traveled here to testify, and she looked us all in the eye, and she asked a simple question: Are you waiting for us all to die for the problem to go away?

I ask this body to show these victims compassion, understand their pain and suffering so that they know it has not gone unnoticed.

I respectfully ask for your vote.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, when America conducted nuclear tests in Nevada, New Mexico, and the Pacific, we

had little understanding of how radiation spread.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have advocated for expanding the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to cover the forgotten victims of these tests, including the residents of all the affected States that have been identified here today.

Downwinders, those affected by these tests, deserve to be compensated for the effects of these weapons. I am grateful for working with Senator LUJÁN and Senator HAWLEY and our other colleagues to ensure that we do not leave our downwinders behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment, and I am proud to work with my colleague from Missouri and others in a bipartisan way to provide some relief to the people who have been affected by this.

Here in Missouri, I can tell you—a couple weeks ago, I gave my maiden speech, and I talked a lot about where I grew up. I grew up in a blue-collar town in the shadow of the airport in Bridgeton, and that is the epicenter of where this happened—near the airport, near a landfill.

In those areas in the city and north county, people work hard. They always have. Little did they know that this hazardous toxic waste was being dumped in their water, in the ground where their children play.

And all this amendment does is reauthorize something that has been on the books for decades, and it allows people who have been affected to apply.

So I am proud to support the people who have been affected who are looking for some measure of justice. Nothing will make them whole, but this is a step, and I am proud to work with my colleagues in that regard too.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1058

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Carper	Feinstein
Bennet	Casey	Fetterman
Blumenthal	Coons	Gillibrand
Booker	Cortez Masto	Graham
Braun	Crapo	Hassan
Brown	Cruz	Hawley
Cantwell	Daines	Heinrich
Cardin	Duckworth	Hickenlooper

Hirono	Ossoff	Smith
Kaine	Padilla	Stabenow
Kelly	Peters	Tester
King	Reed	Van Hollen
Klobuchar	Risch	Vance
Luján	Rosen	Warner
Markey	Rubio	Warnock
Marshall	Sanders	Warren
Menendez	Schatz	Welch
Merkley	Schmitt	Whitehouse
Mullin	Schumer	Wyden
Murphy	Shaheen	
Murray	Sinema	

NAYS—37

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cassidy	Lankford	Thune
Collins	Lee	Tillis
Cornyn	Lummis	Tuberville
Cotton	Manchin	Wicker
Cramer	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin	Scott (SC)
--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 37.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1058) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 638

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 638 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 638.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reauthorize the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2018)

At the appropriate place in subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. —. REAUTHORIZATION OF VOLUNTARY REGISTRY FOR FIREFIGHTER CANCER INCIDENCE.

Section 2(h) of the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act of 2018 (42 U.S.C. 280e-5(h)) is amended by striking “\$2,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022” and inserting “\$5,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028”.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that there be unanimous consent for 3 minutes, equally divided.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this amendment is to reauthorize the Firefighter Cancer Registry, which was passed unanimously by Congress and signed into law in 2018.

The Firefighter Cancer Registry improves our Nation's ability to conduct research and gather data on the cancer risk associated with firefighting. It is a vital program, one that furthers our understanding of how to protect the brave first responders who run toward danger when everyone else runs away from it. And yet, on October 1 of last year, the program expired.

My bipartisan, commonsense amendment would reauthorize the program for an additional 5 years while bringing it into line with the current appropriation level.

Supported by Senators MURKOWSKI, BROWN, KLOBUCHAR, FISCHER, RUBIO, and TESTER, it would benefit both career firefighters as well as volunteers like my constituent Edward Diaz. He was the son of Eduardo Diaz, a North Bergen firefighter who tragically passed away in 2017 from pancreatic cancer. Today, he carries on his family's legacy of service as a volunteer firefighter in Hasbrouck Heights, NJ.

I submit to my colleagues, the Diaz family, along with their fellow brothers and sisters in the profession, are the reason we should all support this amendment today. Firefighting is more than a job. It is a calling, a calling that sometimes takes your life as we saw in the loss of two Newark firefighters within the last month.

Let's honor that calling by reauthorizing the Firefighter Cancer Registry Act with this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it and reserve the balance of my time.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 638

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Baldwin	Fetterman	Mullin
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murphy
Blackburn	Graham	Murray
Blumenthal	Grassley	Ossoff
Booker	Hagerty	Padilla
Boozman	Hassan	Peters
Braun	Hawley	Reed
Britt	Heinrich	Ricketts
Brown	Hickenlooper	Risch
Budd	Hirono	Romney
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cardin	Johnson	Rubio
Carper	Kaine	Sanders
Casey	Kelly	Schatz
Cassidy	Kennedy	Schmitt
Collins	King	Schumer
Coons	Klobuchar	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Luján	Sinema
Cotton	Lummis	Smith
Cramer	Manchin	Stabenow
Crapo	Markey	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Tester
Daines	McConnell	Thune
Duckworth	Menendez	Tillis
Ernst	Merkley	Tuberville
Feinstein	Moran	Van Hollen

Vance	Warren	Wicker
Warner	Welch	Wyden
Warnock	Whitehouse	Young

NAYS—2

Lee	Paul
-----	------

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin	Scott (SC)
--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 2.

Under the previous order requiring 60 affirmative votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 638) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 1078

Mr. SCHATZ. I call up my amendment No. 1078 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. SCHATZ], for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 1078.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, before the vote on the Schatz amendment No. 1078.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I want to urge passage of an amendment to reauthorize this critical housing law for American Indians, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives, NAHASDA. This amendment would reauthorize NAHASDA for 7 years, promote greater local control over NAHASDA programs, streamline environmental reviews for Native housing projects, and incentivize private partnerships.

Senator MURKOWSKI and I introduced a stand-alone bill to reauthorize NAHASDA, which cleared our committee unanimously.

This amendment is an important win for Native communities to address their urgent housing needs. It has gone through regular order and has been well studied for years.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I join my colleague in supporting this very important reauthorization, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, NAHASDA. This has been 10 years in the making. This has seen process, this has seen input, this has seen extraordinary effort, and, as the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee has noted, this process has led to a place where we were able to incorporate this into the NDAA last Congress. Earlier this year, we moved it out of committee by voice vote.

We need to move it. People need housing. It is a priority in so many of our States. I thank those who have been working with us over the years to

accomplish this, and I would ask for strong support in this body for housing within our American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian communities.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, due to my mother's sudden hospitalization late this afternoon for a serious illness, I need to leave Washington unexpectedly and immediately. As a result, I will miss the vote on final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act, as well as any remaining amendment votes.

I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that I support final passage of this legislation. When I return to Washington following the August work period, I will submit another statement to the RECORD detailing how I would have cast my vote on each of the amendment votes I was forced to miss.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1078

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Ricketts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Braun	Hirono	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Budd	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Lujan	Sullivan
Coons	Lummis	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cramer	Menendez	Warner
Crapo	Merkley	Warnock
Cruz	Moran	Warren
Daines	Mullin	Welch
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Ossoff	Young
Gillibrand	Padilla	

NAYS—11

Blackburn	Lee	Schmitt
Ernst	Marshall	Tuberville
Hagerty	Paul	Vance
Kennedy	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—3

Casey	Durbin	Scott (SC)
-------	--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 11.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1078) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the information of the Members, we are getting very close to locking down a final agreement, which will allow us to vote on a number of things, including the managers' amendments and final passage this evening. We are still waiting for some final paperwork to be done. So, in the meantime, I am going to introduce and ask unanimous consent for a resolution praising Tony Bennett, making August 3, his birthday, Tony Bennett Day.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND ENTERTAINMENT CAREER OF TONY BENNETT

Mr. SCHUMER. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 322, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 322) commemorating the life, legacy, and entertainment career of Tony Bennett.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 322) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am really proud today that my resolution declaring Tony Bennett's birthday, August 3, as Tony Bennett Day has just passed the Senate. I would like to thank Senator CORNYN for joining me in this bipartisan resolution, as well as Speaker Emerita Pelosi for working on a companion resolution in the House.

As we all know, we all loved Tony Bennett. Tony is an American icon, a son of Astoria, Queens—a New Yorker through and through—and, without doubt, one of the most beloved singers of our time. You only come across a Tony Bennett once in a lifetime.

I would like to think Frank Sinatra got it right when he called Tony Bennett "the best singer in the business."

Known for his unparalleled talent and his exceptional vocal range, Tony spanned generations and genres. He touched the hearts of millions around the world.

It didn't matter if you were young or old or somewhere in between, it didn't matter if you were a friend or a fan, just about everyone loved Tony, and Tony loved just about everyone.

And you could feel that he was in it for the right reasons, not for the money or the fame, but he just loved making music and having people enjoy it. Just to hear him sing a few bars, you knew he cared about the song and he wanted to share that caring with everybody. And he cared about you, as he sang it to you, just about more than anything.

And let's not forget, as great a musician as Tony was, he was a very good human being. He fought and served our country admirably during World War II. This always amazed me: He was a lifelong champion of civil rights and marched along Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma in 1965, at a time when the agents of most entertainers discouraged them from marching in these kinds of things because they might lose some fans. But Tony didn't care. He believed in equality.

And he raised money for great causes, including the very disease he was fighting, Alzheimer's.

If that still wasn't enough, he was an accomplished painter, and he drew his inspiration from his little bench in Central Park.

Tony Bennett's legacy will live on in the hearts of fans, friends, and countless artists he inspired along the way. I am proud we could come together to pass this resolution honoring an extraordinary man and his immeasurable contribution to the arts and our society.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024—Continued

Now, until we get the paperwork done and can lock everything in, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments to S. 2226: Rubio, No. 523; Young, No. 230; Daines, No. 1084; further, that with respect to the amendments listed above, the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed, with no further amendments or motions in order, and with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption and that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; further, that upon disposition of the Daines amendment, that it be in order to send to the desk a managers' package of 47 amendments, and after the clerk reports it, I ask that the clerk