

So as we stand here about to go home and celebrate with our big plates of food and our full pitchers of wine, as we read our cards calling for peace in the world, as we offer our prayers, let us not forget those who suffer in the Middle East. Let us not forget the families who lost their family members on October 7 in Israel. Let us not forget the families in Israel whose family members are still held hostage. Let us not forget those on the West Bank suffering the inflictions of local violence. But most of all, let us not forget the victims in Gaza and do all we can, under our moral responsibility, under our legal responsibility, to come to their aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 849, Benjamin J. Cheeks, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tammy Baldwin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Chris Van Hollen, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Andy Kim, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Christopher A. Coons, Adam B. Schiff, Jeff Merkley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Benjamin J. Cheeks, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 329 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Bennet	Cardin	Duckworth
Blumenthal	Carper	Durbin
Booker	Casey	Fetterman
Brown	Coons	Gillibrand

Hassan
Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Merkley

Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed
Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema

Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—47

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Coryn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst

Fischer
Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Mullin

Murkowski
Paul
Ricketts
Risch
Romney
Rounds
Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—4

Manchin
Rubio

Schiff
Vance

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 766

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in a moment, I am going to be making a unanimous consent request. I am going to wait for Senator GRASSLEY to be on the floor.

Let me just, if I might, explain what the unanimous consent will be. It deals with H.R. 766. I am a proud sponsor of the Preventive Health Savings Act since the 113th Congress as it stands. The Congressional Budget Office scores budgetary implications of preventive health legislation in a 10-year time-frame, limiting Congress's ability to understand the long-term impacts of meaningful prevention policies.

This bicameral, bipartisan legislation would direct CBO to more accurately reflect the long-term cost saving potential of preventive healthcare initiatives and encourage the use of data-informed preventive health measures.

On March 19 of this year, the House of Representatives passed this legislation by voice vote.

Now, here is the challenge we have. This legislation will allow us to implement preventive healthcare sooner. That will save lives and will save dollars. To just give you one example, we now have a multicancer blood screening test that could be implemented for certain targeted populations.

The longer that is delayed—and being reimbursable under our healthcare system—the more people are not going to have the advantage of that, and more lives are going to be lost. And later detection of cancer, we know, is a more costly type of care that is needed, and it costs more money.

So we have a chance today, because this is a House-passed bill, to send this bill to the President, and that is why I will be making a unanimous consent request in regards to the bill.

I know that Senator GRASSLEY has other legislation that he has been trying to get attached. I will urge him not to do that because it will, obviously, mean this bill will not pass. His issue is not related to the issue that this bill is about.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator GRASSLEY for their help on the Budget Committee itself. But this is our last opportunity to do something meaningful to implement preventive healthcare that will save lives and actually save dollars for the taxpayers of this country. There is no question about it. This bill saves money, and we can get it done now.

Any amendment on it, obviously, would have to go back to the House, and there is no possibility that the House would agree to it.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 766, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a counteroffer. But before I get to that, I want to say, first of all, it is not easy for me to stand here and object to something the Senator from Maryland wants to bring up, because he is a gentleman in the 100 percent way in the U.S. Senate. So it is not easy to go against his ideas.

But I want you to know, I have been working on the this with Representative BURGESS, the leader in the House of Representatives, and we offered four amendments to him. In the negotiations, he agreed to two of them, and two of them he didn't agree to. And we agreed not to push for that amendment.

So we felt that we had good discussions with Representative BURGESS. But now we are working on the House bill here, and none of those things that Burgess agreed to could be. So where we are is that, even though Burgess agreed to some compromise, Senators over here have issues with preventing Congress from depositing savings into the Medicare Improvement Fund in budget years 11 through 30, based upon CBO estimates of preventing health savings legislation.

Now, I have no doubt that preventive medicine saves money, but putting money in a fund for 11 to 30 years out can only lead to what we know happens too often here in the U.S. Senate of budget gimmicks, saying that we are going to use funds in a certain fund. Well, that is a perfectly legitimate thing to do, but you have to have confidence that what CBO says about that is going to be legitimate and have credibility.

And so what I have been trying to work out with Representative BURGESS

is just exactly to do that: Put this fund out there. As you say, it is going to save money. But I want to make sure that CBO, when they say something, we have a way of verifying that.

So I want to say that I appreciate the intentions of this bill. Increasing preventive healthcare to improve health outcomes and help patients and taxpayers avoid costly treatment and services down the road is a laudable goal. However, I am concerned that, as currently constructed, this bill will lead to budget gimmicks that will ultimately increase rather than decrease health spending.

The sponsors are well aware of my concerns. I worked in good faith to offer up ideas to address my budget gimmick concerns. I made it clear I am willing to compromise. I have already done so with my most recent offer and dropped commonsense budget process reform provisions that I thought were important. And these budget process reforms were what was in the famous Enzi-Whitehouse bill that Senator Enzi—former-Senator Enzi—and, now, Senator WHITEHOUSE worked out in Budget Committee reform. And I have said that BURGESS was willing to go along with my changes to establish commonsense guardrails and to prevent budget gimmicks. But these changes have been rejected in the Senate, and my concerns haven't been addressed.

The bill before us contains no commonsense guardrails, such as requiring a disclaimer that a supplementary estimate doesn't replace a CBO 10-year cost estimate, ensuring supplementary estimates are separate and distinct from the 10-year cost estimates, and requiring the Congressional Budget Office to be transparent in their modeling.

That latter point is based on the proposition that we expect CBO to show us how they arrived at figures dealing with cost savings of some particular preventive medicine program.

The bill also doesn't address concerns about how supplementary analysis could be used for budget gimmicks in the future, such as depositing uncertain out-year savings into the Medicare and Medicaid Improvement Funds.

The bill needs commonsense guardrails to prevent budget gimmicks. So I would like to suggest this alternative.

So I ask the Senator from Maryland to modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I might—and, again, I appreciate Senator GRASSLEY's comments about this Senator. I feel the same about Senator GRASSLEY. He has been an incredible voice in the U.S.

Senate, particularly on transparency, particularly against waste, and has taken on some of the most challenging battles here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I have worked on this legislation now for several Congresses. My partners are Senator CRAPO, Senator CRAMER, Senator KING. We have all worked on this bill together.

And the bill is very simple. It just allows a more realistic budget window for preventive healthcare. And it is something that we have been talking about for a long time so that we don't get trapped with high upfront costs that have large savings, and we never get to the savings because CBO cannot score it under the current budget rules.

The challenges that Senator GRASSLEY is raising are not in this bill. We have worked very closely with the budget people to make sure that this bill does not contain the concerns that Senator GRASSLEY is raising.

The Senator might be raising a very legitimate concerns, but it is not this legislation that is causing it. This legislation only allows us to be able to implement in a more realistic way preventive healthcare services with legitimate cost estimates and offsets so that we can get the savings from preventive healthcare and implement preventive healthcare sooner, saving lives and dollars.

We can make progress on this issue now. The problem is twofold with the request that is being made. First, the potential abuse is not in this legislation. It deals with a broader issue. And then, secondly, if this bill is amended, I think Senator GRASSLEY also understands the chances of passage are zero. There is no possibility that this bill can be taken up in the House at this late stage.

So this is our last opportunity. I came to the floor today and not before because I respect greatly Senator GRASSLEY and his concerns, and I was hoping we could find a path forward for that to happen. But there is no path forward for that to happen now, and by including the request, I would be sacrificing both bills. And I would hope the Senator would recognize that and allow this modest improvement for preventive healthcare to go forward.

With that, I regretfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection on the modification is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yes, I object. I would like to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Around here, we use the words "budget gimmickry" pretty freely. And I want to say, as an example, that every Senator in this Senate knows the term "Medicare sequester" as a budget gimmick, so something at the end of the 10-year window we are going to draw in to spend money today. That is one example of a budget gimmick. I just want to make sure that we don't widen that down the road.

I yield the floor.

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

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

COUNTER-UAS AUTHORITY EXTENSION ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 5639, which was introduced earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5639) to extend the authority for the protection of certain facilities and assets from unmanned aircraft.

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

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 5639) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 5639

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Counter-UAS Authority Extension Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF COUNTER-UAS AUTHORITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Section 210G(i) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n(i)) is amended by striking "December 20, 2024" and inserting "September 30, 2025".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, as we near the deadline to fund the government tonight without a clear path from my Republican colleagues in the House, it appears that we are once again on the brink of a government shutdown. When the clock runs out at midnight, the current authorities that the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI have to safely disable drones that pose a security threat will also expire, and we simply cannot let that happen.

I just received unanimous consent to pass a bill that will extend the current authorities for 1 year. I appreciate my Senate colleagues for joining me in passing this legislation so that our Federal law enforcement Agencies can continue to protect against dangerous drones while giving us additional time