

doesn't deserve to have our most advanced fighter jets.

Last August, Mesut Hakki Casin, an adviser on security and foreign policy to Erdogan, claimed that "the Mediterranean Sea belongs to us, and no one should even think about raising a sword against us there. They [Greece, Cypress, and their allies] better not forget this."

These are the people banging the drums for war with another fellow NATO ally that we are sending these weapons to. Without a hint of remorse on their side, they just held us hostage over Sweden. Sweden gave in. Quid pro quo. You get your jets.

These statements from Türkiye sound more like the bombastic threats from North Korea's dear leader than a NATO ally.

Do we really think giving Türkiye more fighter jets will modify their behavior? Actually, withholding them was the only chance of modifying their behavior. This sale will only embolden Türkiye to continue its disruptive actions at the expense of American interests and regional stability. What do we get in return? Greater risk to U.S. troops in Syria, instability in the Caucasus, continued threats to Greece, and the privilege of defending Sweden.

While NATO is supposed to be a collective security agency, the reality is that if Sweden were ever attacked, it would be American forces doing the majority of the fighting—unless anyone truly thinks Turkish F-16s will come to their aid.

The \$23 billion sale is reckless. It fails to advance the security of the American people and does nothing to alter Türkiye's immoral human rights record, its unruly behavior within NATO, or its irresponsible actions in the Middle East, the Caucasus, and eastern Mediterranean. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the joint resolution of disapproval to reject this disastrous deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to respond for up to 2 minutes, please.

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

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, first of all, I want the record to be absolutely clear. This is not a gift to Türkiye; this is a sale to Türkiye. They are going to pay for the munitions they are going to get, the aircraft they are going to get.

As I stated when I started out, Türkiye is very, very less than a desired or good ally in the current NATO framework, and certainly, as I said, we have a long list of complaints with them.

One thing I think that I would disagree with my good friend from Kentucky—the accession of Sweden and Finland to NATO was a huge, huge matter. It wasn't something that was just a parenthetical thought. It added 800 miles of direct border against Russia, which is what NATO was created to

push back against. And the same thing with Sweden. Sweden has a very, very robust defense system itself.

With all due respect to my friend from Kentucky, I wouldn't put this in the vein or argument that we are going to come to the defense of Sweden. Sweden is going to come to the defense of NATO and in a very, very robust way.

Yes, we wanted them, and yes, that is exactly why I withheld the F-16 sale and refurbishment—so that we could get those two. It was extremely important.

Also, my good friend has reiterated some human rights violations that this country has. I would remind my good friend that Russia does the same thing. I have a resolution that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee that is on the floor that reiterates all those human rights and condemns Russia for those exact human rights things that my good friend reiterated, but he has a hold on it. There is one hold on that piece of legislation, and it is from the Senator from Kentucky, which I would respectfully request that he lift.

In any event, I am not here to defend Türkiye or the other things that they do. What I am here to do is to defend the importance of NATO, the importance of adding Finland and Sweden to NATO, and the fact that negotiations are the way these things get done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. The difference between Russia and Türkiye is no one is offering to sell F-16s to Russia. I am not for selling F-16s to Russia; neither am I for selling F-16s to Türkiye.

This is a clear case of quid pro quo. All of the folks who are now for it were against it just months ago. The reason they have changed their opinion is they have been given something. Türkiye extorted us. Türkiye said: If you want Sweden to be in NATO, you have to give us these planes.

So they gave up Sweden in exchange for getting the planes. It doesn't change any of the facts. The facts are these: Them having F-16s and Russian S-400s allows them to steal some of our technology, to match the technology of our fighter jets against a Russian defense system and potentially give that to Russia.

This is a problem. It has been a problem. It hasn't changed. These are the same problems that opponents of this were mentioning over and over and over again. That is why for 2 years they have been opposed to this. They have flipped. They have sold their opposition to Türkiye for admission for Sweden. It is a quid pro quo. It is a trade.

They made a trade, but publicly they will have to acknowledge they made a trade and they think somehow it is more important to sell these planes to Türkiye than it is to protect the integrity of the technology of these planes against Russian military systems.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 60

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I move to discharge S.J. Res. 60 from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 60, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Türkiye of certain defense articles and services.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I yield back my time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge?

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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 79, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—13

Braun	Paul	Warren
Fetterman	Peters	Welch
Lee	Sanders	Wyden
Markey	Scott (FL)	
Menendez	Stabenow	

NAYS—79

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Risch
Booker	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Hickenlooper	Rubio
Budd	Hirono	Schatz
Butler	Hoeven	Schmitt
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Sinema
Carper	Kelly	Smith
Casey	Kennedy	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Klobuchar	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Tuberville
Cotton	Lummis	Van Hollen
Cramer	Marshall	Vance
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Mullin	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Murray	
Gillibrand	Ossoff	

NOT VOTING—8

Barrasso	Daines	Romney
Britt	Manchin	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Moran	

The motion was rejected.

(Mr. FETTERMAN assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7463, which was received from the House and is at the desk, and that the only motions and amendments in order to the bill be the following: Paul amendment No. 1614; Marshall motion to commit, which is at the desk; Lee motion to commit, which is at the desk; and Cruz motion to commit, which is at the desk; further, that the Senate vote on the above motions and amendment in the order listed, with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption of amendment No. 1614; that upon the disposition of the Cruz motion to commit, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage, without further intervening action or debate, and with 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, prior to each vote; further, that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader but no later than Friday, March 8, 2024, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3853; that there be up to 1 hour for debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, all without intervening action or debate, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage.

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

EXTENSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2024

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7463) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am pleased that Democrats have just reached an agreement with the Republicans to pass a temporary extension of government funding tonight. We will have up to five votes: four on amendments and then final passage. This agreement is an important step because we not only avoid a shutdown on Friday, we also clear the way for passing the first six appropriations bills next week.

We want to move quickly. So I ask Senators to stay in their seats or near the floor until we finish our work. We are going to try, starting on the second vote, to keep votes limited to 10 minutes. So please stay in your seats.

Now, Mr. President, this year, the good Lord gave us an extra day in Feb-

ruary. So let's make sure we finish the job and don't drag this debate into March.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHUMER. Excuse me. Just one more thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all votes in this series after the first vote be 10 minutes in duration.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am really glad that we have cleared consensus that no one wants to see a government shutdown and that preventing one now will require a very short CR so we can continue making good progress on our full-year funding bills.

I have been at the table for a long time now pushing to make progress every single day, and we are genuinely close. And if bipartisan cooperation prevails, I am very confident we can, at long last—at long last—wrap up our fiscal year 2024 bills.

And, as my colleagues are aware, we plan to release the first six bills in the coming days to give everyone time to review them before a vote next week, while we continue to lock up the last six bills.

I am confident we can get all of our funding bills done in the next few weeks, as long as partisan poison pills are taken off the table.

We are working in a divided government. That means, to get anything done, we have to work together in good faith to reach reasonable outcomes. That has been true from day one of these negotiations, and we will only reach the last day of these negotiations if that happens.

Again, we are close. We are moving in the right direction. It is full speed ahead. And we will keep working hard with our colleagues to get this wrapped up and take a shutdown completely off the table by passing the strongest bipartisan spending bills we can and, hopefully, soon.

I urge all of our colleagues to vote yes on this CR so we have the time to get these done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, several of the amendments that we will vote on propose a full-year continuing resolution that would lock in dangerously inadequate funding levels for our national defense and lead to cuts in other vital programs serving our veterans, farmers, low-income families, and older Americans.

In a briefing last month, the Commander of U.S. Central Command told me that this is the most dangerous security situation in 50 years. The idea that we would consider hamstringing our military under a yearlong continuing resolution at such a time is unconscionable.

The Department of Defense has never operated under a yearlong CR. It would reduce defense spending by \$27 billion relative to the level called for under the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Further, there would be problems with the misalignment of funds that in many cases would prevent critical funding from being executed. For example, 30 percent of the Navy's shipbuilding request could not be spent because the funding would be misaligned.

According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, under a yearlong CR, "thousands of [defense] programs will be impacted with the most devastating impacts to our national defense being to personnel, nuclear triad modernization, shipbuilding and maintenance, munitions production and replenishments, and U.S. Indo-Pacific Command priorities."

Let us also remember that we would be wasting taxpayer dollars as we would forego billions of dollars in potential spending reductions and rescissions carefully identified by the Appropriations Committee.

A yearlong CR would result in a military that is less able to respond to serious security threats around the globe, and it would harm important domestic investments in biomedical research, infrastructure, and other priority areas. It would result in furloughs or hiring freezes for food inspectors and air traffic controllers, as well as slash housing assistance at a time when we already face a severe affordable housing shortage.

I urge my colleagues to reject these motions and support the responsible approach of passing the short-term measure to fund the government. We will then move to the six completed conference reports on appropriations bills and continue our important work on the remainder of the full-year appropriations bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1614

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up Senate amendment No. 1614 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 Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 1614.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish prohibitions relating to the purchase or sale of State or municipal securities)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO THE PURCHASE OR SALE OF STATE OR MUNICIPAL SECURITIES.

(a) EMERGENCY LENDING PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES.—The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may not establish any emergency lending program or facility, including pursuant to section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 343(3)), that purchases or sells any security issued by a State or municipality, including a bond, note, draft, or bill of exchange.