it because it is the only thing that works. Here, the system has been so degraded, this is what we end up with.

I will end with this: Most of my colleagues here, I think, view this place as a growth business, but a growth business is based on a few things. You generally make a profit. That is not what this is about. But you balance your budget, you do things that make sense year after year. And when you are spending money that constitutes almost 20 percent of our GDP, you would think you would put more into it than dropping 2,700 pages in our lap and thinking that you can get through it.

For those who want more of this, for the sake of the institution, you ought to be concerned about what it is going to look like down the road when we add another $1.5 trillion in debt to our current $30 trillion, and there is no end in sight. A lot of stories have been written throughout history on where that ends up, and it is in the ditch.

That fund will be completely exhausted in about 4 1/2 years; 18 percent benefit cuts when that happens.

Actuarially, we have known the Social Security fund is going to go broke in about 10 or 11 years. What will we do? We will probably wait until the year before it happens, not make any other reforms, and then borrow the money to backfill it and put more and more obligation on our kids and our grandkids.

I am going to call up my amendment in a bit. I will yield the floor at this time.

**EB-5 REFORM AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 2022**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator LEAHY for joining me to discuss the EB-5 Reform and Integrity Act of 2022. He and I have worked together on the issue of EB-5 reform for many years.

Because of that, we are proud that the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2022 includes the provisions of the EB-5 Reform and Integrity Act of 2022, of which we are the primary authors.

Congress originally authorized the EB-5 Regional Center program in 1993 as a pilot program, and, in recent years, its reauthorization was often included in appropriations bills. However, due to lack of an agreement to reauthorize and reform the program last year, it lapsed on June 30 and has remained lapsed since that time.

This legislation formally repeals the pilot program created by Congress in 1993 and codifies in its place a new regional center program reflecting a number of reforms that we have pursued for many years.

All regional centers which operated in a bit.

The bill also requires that DHS issue regulations regarding the redeployment of investor funds if certain conditions are met. We expect USCIS to oversee redemptions and take action as necessary. Investors should not be left vulnerable and regional centers cannot be allowed to deploy funds in any way they please. We expect capital to remain at risk, as required by the law, and the redeployment of funds to be in projects that are preapproved.

The legislation codifies the definition of and the designation process for a “high unemployment” targeted employment area that was found in the 2019 Immigrant Investor Program Modernization Rule. As under the 2019 rule, the bill allows only DHS to make such designations.

The codification of the so-called donut model from the 2019 rule will significantly limit the number of census tracts that may be used to seek a designation as a “high unemployment” TEA.

This limitation, combined with the exclusive authority of DHS to make high unemployment TEA designations, will crack down on the notorious practice of TEA gerrymandering, the practice of creating elaborate configurations of multiple census tracts strung together so that a census tract with high unemployment at one end can be used in order to obtain a TEA designation for a building project within an affluent census tract at the other end, perhaps many miles away.

It is also our expectation that “high unemployment” designations will be reserved for census tracts that have experienced persistently high unemployment for a number of years and not because of temporary anomalous circumstances such as local unemployment caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Finally, the legislation puts in place specific visa set-asides for rural area projects, high unemployment area projects, and infrastructure projects. The investment-setsides for infrastructure projects is limited to true public infrastructure projects—that is, those that benefit the public and the American people—not public-private partnerships or projects for a private business.

The EB-5 Reform and Integrity Act of 2022 is the result of years of hard work and negotiation, and it is our hope that it brings meaningful reform to a program badly in need of it and, most importantly, much-needed investment capital and the permanent jobs that will be created in that city and rural areas where it is normally difficult, if not impossible, to attract investment capital. We are grateful that it was included in the Omnibus bill and look forward to seeing it signed into law.

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022**

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2022. This bill would reauthorize our Nation’s critical law to respond to domestic violence. It is long overdue.

Last month, I introduced the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act alongside Senators Ernst, Durbin, Murkowski, and others. A number of advocates joined us, including Angelina Jolie, to speak about the importance of this bill.

This bill has received strong bipartisan support, including from 11 Republican cosponsors. And it has now been included in the Federal Omnibus spending bill we are set to vote on this week.

I want to thank my colleagues for working with me to authorize the Violence Against Women Act through 2027. And the bill includes important updates to modernize the Violence Against Women Act to do an even better job of protecting and supporting the survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

I was proud to support the original Violence Against Women Act in 1994. And I have supported each reauthorization of the law since then.

This includes the most recent reauthorization in 2013, which passed the Senate by a strong bipartisan vote of 78–22.

I was honored to be able to sponsor this new reauthorization, which expands protections for survivors.

This bill is the result of a truly bipartisan effort. I would like to thank Senators Ernst, Durbin, and Murkowski for working with me to prepare this important piece of legislation.

We have also had help from a number of our Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have made important contributions to this effort.

I would also like to thank the many advocates who provided valuable input and support for this effort. This bill was written in close consultation with the people who are on the frontlines helping survivors of domestic violence every day.

Together, we drafted a bill that preserves the good work of the last Violence Against Women Act reauthorization and strengthens existing programs.

For nearly 30 years, the Violence Against Women Act has played a vital role in the Federal response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. I hope that this bill will be an effective tool to build on those efforts.

The need to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act is clear. These programs are vital tools that provide thousands of domestic violence survivors with the resources they need.

For instance, according to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, in a single day in 2020 there were
76,525 survivors of domestic violence who received assistance thanks to programs funded and supported by the Violence Against Women Act.

Despite the progress made over the last three decades, sexual, emotional, and physical abuse are still painful realities for many Americans.

More than one in three women and more than one in four men will experience rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, in my home State of California, approximately 35 percent of California women and 31 percent of California men will experience violence from intimate partners in their lifetimes.

All too often, these instances of domestic violence have fatal consequences. Nationwide, an average of three women each day are killed by a current or former intimate partner.

Based on a recent study of domestic violence occurring in Orange County, CA, just under half of domestic violence-related homicides involved an individual with a known history of violence.

The Violence Against Women Act plays a critical role supporting law enforcement in their efforts to stop these perpetrators before it is too late.

It is clear that the programs created by the Violence Against Women Act are not enough. They need to be continually updated to meet the needs of survivors.

The bipartisan reauthorization bill that will soon be considered by the full Senate would reauthorize these important programs and provide the necessary updates to strengthen them.

This bill enhances and expands services for survivors of domestic violence, including survivors in rural communities, LGBT survivors, survivors with disabilities, and survivors who experience abuse later in life.

This bill reauthorizes and strengthens the criminal justice response to domestic violence, including by improving the Justice Department’s STOP grant program and strengthening the ability of Tribal courts to address instances of domestic violence on Tribal lands.

This bill establishes a pilot program on restorative practices that focuses on addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking through community-based, victim-initiated efforts to seek accountability.

This bill invests in prevention education efforts and improves the healthcare system’s response to sexual violence across the country.

These updates can have a real impact. According to analysis by the International Association of Forensic Nurses, only one in four hospitals throughout the country currently has a sexual assault forensic nurse on staff. These gaps in our healthcare system have critical impacts on a survivor’s ability to seek necessary medical attention after they experience sexual violence.

Our bipartisan bill seeks to remedy this problem by providing additional funding and training to increase access to forensic nurses, particularly in rural areas.

Though this bipartisan bill makes significant improvements to our Nation’s response to domestic violence, it is not a perfect bill. I regret that certain provisions were unable to be included in this bill.

In particular, I wish that we had been able to include a provision in this bill closing the “boyfriend loophole.” This provision would have ensured that individuals convicted of domestic abuse against a dating partner could not purchase firearms.

Individuals who are convicted of domestic violence against a spouse are already prevented from purchasing a firearm. It is deeply disappointing that there is no adequate support for this commonsense provision to close this dangerous loophole.

Though we still have work to do, this bipartisan bill represents a strong step forward in protecting and supporting the survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

It is time for the Senate to pass this long-overdue reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation as it is considered on the floor. This bill is not for us; it is for the millions of brave survivors that deserve action from Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 4989 and ask that it be reported by number.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Lee] proposes an amendment numbered 4989.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funding for COVID-19 vaccine mandates)

At the end of division HH, add the following:

TITLE VII—PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR COVID-19 VACCINE MANDATES

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR COVID-19 VACCINE MANDATES.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any division of this Act (notwithstanding section 3) may be obligated or expended to—

(1) implement or enforce—

(A) section 1910.501 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation); or

(B) Executive Order 14042 of September 9, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 50985; relating to ensuring adequate COVID safety protocols for Federal contractors);

(C) Executive Order 14933 of September 9, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 50988; relating to requiring Coronavirus Disease 2019 vaccination for Federal employees);

(D) the interim final rule issued by the Department of Health and Human Services on November 5, 2021, entitled “Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Omnibus COVID-19 Health Care Staff Vaccination” (86 Fed. Reg. 61555); or

(E) the memorandum signed by the Secretary of Defense on August 24, 2021, for “Mandatory Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination of Department of Defense Service Members and by those covered persons, including for our purposes today military employees, Federal workers, employees of businesses with government contracts with the Federal Government, and medical professionals who contract with CMS—basically anyone involved with the provision of services through Medicare or Medicaid must get the COVID-19 vaccine on condition of termination.

One way these mandates work is particularly nasty, especially if they work for one of the private companies, as is the case with CMS and independent contractor mandates. If they don’t fire all their workers who don’t get vaccinated, then they basically are rendered out of business.

Yes, the Federal Government was going to just impose these crippling costs that no corporation could afford to carry. They knew that this was creating a big issue and that this would force people into getting vaccinated.

Here is the problem with that. Now, I want to be clear. I have been vaccinated. My family has been vaccinated. I believe that vaccines have executive orders safer than for hundreds of millions of people. I also believe that, like any medical procedure, it is not without risk, particularly to some people who might have extreme sensitivities, who might have an idiosyncratic response to the vaccine. So it is not right to force this on everyone and to render those who refuse to get it not only unemployed but unemployable.

I have received communications from countless people—for example, military professionals, police officers, and enlisted personnel who have worked for the U.S. military for nearly two decades, who are actually coming up on retirement, who are saying that, for one reason or another, they don’t want to get the vaccine. Sometimes, it is religious; other times, it is based on a history of poor reactions to other vaccines or a prior medical condition that they believe would cause them to respond poorly or based on natural immunity.

They don’t want to get the vaccine, and they are being told that, in the case of military personnel, if they don’t get it, then they will not receive...
We have a chance to make this right. Yes, over time, sadly, Senates and Houses of Representatives and White Houses of every conceivable partisan combination have contributed to this because, yes, we have given Executives too much power. I complained about it during the Obama administration in response to specific actions taken by the previous President—who was a Member of my own party—sometimes at great personal expense because I believe Congress has given the Executive too much power. It is harmful. It is dangerous. We have to stop it somewhere.

We have a chance right now. We have a shot with something that is wildly unpopular and inherently immoral, and that shot exists with not funding it. We don’t have to fund that part of government that goes to fund these dangerous, immoral, unconstitutional vaccine mandates. We shouldn’t do it. I en-courage all of my colleagues, all within the sound of my voice, please end this madness now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. There are two reasons why I am standing against the Lee anti-vaccination amendment that affects our dedicated healthcare workers and our superlative military.

First, vaccines for healthcare workers protects the most vulnerable, particularly seniors and those with chronic illness. Three in four COVID deaths in America were seniors. Two hundred thousand were people living in long-term care. Vulnerable people are safer when their homes, hospitals, and doctors’ offices are safe. Furthermore, flu shot requirements for healthcare workers were already common. Health workers know vaccinations are part of the job.

Turning to the Armed Forces, I am simply going to quote the letter General Milley wrote with respect to the vaccination requirement. Here is General Milley:

We need each and every Soldier, Sailor, Airmen, Marine and Guardian healthy and capable of performing our duties. COVID-19 is a threat to force protection and readiness.

General Milley went on to say:

With this in mind, the Secretary of Defense intends to mandate vaccinations for all Servicemembers.

And then it makes it clear:

The Joint Force medical professionals recommended this as a necessary step to sustain our readiness and protect our force, our coworkers, our families, and our communities.

For these reasons, when we get a chance to vote on the Lee anti-vaccination amendment affecting healthcare workers in the military, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Lee amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am rising to support the amendment that my colleague Senator JOHN KENNEDY will introduce. So I will speak before he introduces it, but I speak in support thereof.

Senator KENNEDY is going to introduce an amendment that would in-cancel that which would grant disaster relief to several states in the country, but I speak on behalf of those in Southwestern Louisiana.

A picture tells a thousand words. If you recall back 3 years ago, Hurricane Laura hit Southwest Louisiana. Two weeks later, almost on the exact same track, Hurricane Delta followed up, destroying that which had not already been destroyed by Hurricane Laura.

The devastation of these storms was dramatic. Now I thank the American people. There has been aid that has been given by fellow Americans to these communities, but it has been less than what is required. And flying over, the picture tells a thousand words. There are still blue tarps on top of rooves, you place the tarp so that it hopefully provides protection that shingles otherwise would.

I am on the ground and you go through the neighborhood, there are homes that are blighted, boarded up, and as they have been boarded up, criminals have come in and businesses have closed. This particularly affects lower income communities. Those who have more resources, they will recover, but those folks who need a little extra help, they are not.

And so, as we think about the aid that my fellow Americans are asked to give to their fellow Americans, I just will give some statistics. Hurricane Laura cost $19 billion in damages; Hurricane Delta another $3 billion; and Ida, of course, not only hit Southwest Louisiana, but cost $75 billion in damages from Louisiana to Texas.

That is a lot that has happened. I ask for additional support as outlined in my colleague JOHN KENNEDY’s amendment to finish the recovery for these folks who have endured so much.

I humbly ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to urge my colleagues to support the Omnibus appropriations bill before us.

The bill represents a massive bipartisan effort that rests upon a framework that preserves all legacy riders, rejects poison pill policy provisions from both sides, and achieves dollar-for-dollar funding parity for defense and nondefense increases.

As political compromise has become more and more difficult here, great credit goes to Chairman LEAHY for making the tough choices that needed to be made and showing leadership to reach this agreement tonight.
The senior Senator from Vermont, who also serves this body as the President pro tempore, has accomplished many things in his long and his distinguished career. Each and every one of these accomplishments were made possible by his unparalleled ability to get things done, and this bill needed to get done.

Because the international security situation demands a greater emphasis on and investment in our national defense, this omnibus bill provides $782 billion for the Department of Defense and for other defense functions; $4 billion more than the level authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act; $30 billion more than President Biden’s budget request; and nearly $42 billion more than 2021.

The bill also provides an 11-percent increase over fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Homeland Security, including $6.5 billion for much needed investments in border security resources and a one-percent increase for ICE operations. Critically, the package restores $2 billion in funding for wall construction on the southwest border.

The bill also cuts nearly $65 billion in wasteful nondefense spending proposed in the budget administration’s budget—a nearly 10-percent decrease from the requested level.

Finally, the package also provides critical emergency assistance to our military, to Ukraine, and to our European allies, without reducing base defense spending by a single dollar.

Is an omnibus appropriations bill ideal? I will tell you tonight, the answer is, no, it is not, but at this critical time and this late date, it is necessary.

My hope is that we can pass this bill and use the same framework that made this bill possible as we begin the 2023 appropriations process.

I have no illusions that once again it will not be a difficult process. It will be. The chairperson can get it done, and I look forward to continuing to work with Senator LEAHY and the Appropriations staff—with him and one last time for both of us.

Before I complete my remarks, I would also like to recognize the incredible—and it is incredible—effort put forward by the staff members of both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, as well as the staff of the respective leaders’ offices. Without them we couldn’t be where we are tonight. I asked them to do the impossible, and they delivered as they always do. And on behalf of the entire Senate, I want to thank them very, very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given a minute to describe my amendment and a minute be given to the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is unkind for us to tell Americans—just moms and dads, ordinary people who are trying to live their lives and put food on the table—that they can’t put food on the table and that they are going to be rendered unemployed and unemployable unless they defer to Presidential medical orthodoxy. It is not who we are as a country, and especially not who we are as is the case with these mandates. There are not adequate provisions made for those with preexisting medical conditions, for those with religious objections, and for those with natural immunity. That is what we are dealing with. It is illegal; it is immoral; it is unkind; and we should not fund its enforcement.

I plead with my colleagues to support my amendment to defund the enforcement of these mandates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have had this debate before many, many times.

Vaccines are safe; they are effective; and they are lifesaving. Because of our ability to get safe and effective vaccines out to Americans, nearly 100 percent of our schools are open again. More than 90 percent of people are in communities with low or medium levels of COVID, and people are finally getting back to a sense of normal in their everyday lives. Vaccines have helped to make that happen.

Here we are once again. It is hard to believe that we are in the second time that a few Senate Republicans have decided they want to risk a damaging government shutdown in order to oppose steps that save lives. I hope, for the sake of the people of this country, it is the last time this happens.

There are problems real families want us to solve. They want us to bring down costs with steps like the Democrats have proposed. They want us to stand up for democracy and the people of Ukraine, who are facing a war and a humanitarian crisis. They want us to learn from this pandemic so we are better prepared for whatever is next. I am going to focus on finding steps that we can actually take to help families, and I believe that is what most of us want too.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, which risks derailing this important bipartisan bill, delaying needed aid to Ukraine, and causing a dangerous government shutdown. Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 20 seconds to respond.

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

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is not helpful to American families to threaten the breadwinner—the mom or the dad or, maybe, both of them in some cases—with being rendered unemployed and unemployable and unable to put bread on the table.

This is not about being anti-vaccine. I am not that, and neither are any of the Senators who are supporting this effort. This is about supporting American families. It is not supporting them to order them fired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 499

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 4989, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

Mr. LEE. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Barrasso
Risch
Inhofe
Romney
Bennet
Rounde
Blumenthal
Sanders
Booker
Schatz
Brown
Sinema
Capito
Sasse
Cardin
Schumer
Capuano
Shaheen
Cassidy
Sinema
Corzine
Smith
Cory Booker
Smith
Cotzen
Smith
Cotton
Smith
Cruz
Smith
Cramer
Sullivan
Crapo
Tuberville
Cramer
Tuberville
Corman
Young
Crapo
Young
Cruise
Zeigler

BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The yeas and nays.

There appears to be a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if we want to hasten the evening, I would suggest everybody stay around. Try to sit in your seats. We are going to try to limit the rest of the votes to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote in relation to the Braun amendment. No. 4990.

The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 4990

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I call up my amendment, No. 4990, 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 Indiana [Mr. BRAUN], for him and others, proposes an amendment numbered 4990.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit funds from being used for earmarks)

At the end of the matter preceding division A, add the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.

(a) In general.—Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, none of the funds made available under any division of this Act may be used to implement any earmark, Community Project Funding, or Congressionally Directed Spending specified in any provision of any division of this Act or in the explanatory statement described in section 4.

(b) Rule of construction.—Nothing in this section shall prevent funds allocated for any earmark, Community Project Funding, or Congressionally Directed Spending specified in any division of this Act or in the explanatory statement described in section 4 from being awarded under a merit-based process under existing law.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, this bill has 367 pages worth of earmarks, roughly 5 pounds of paper. Before it came to the Senate, dozens of House offices deleted their public disclosures. I think the swamp is rising again.

Dr. Tom Coburn, he would be appalled by this. He called earmarks—Madam President, I think it is clear that most aren’t interested in talking about earmarks—something else. I believe they lead to waste and abuse. That is why Congress got rid of them 10 years ago. They should have never been allowed back.

My amendment would cut every one of them from this bill that should have been run through regular process, through the Budget Committee, to where appropriators should have known what was in it until it landed in our laps last night.

For those of you who love the institution, you ought to have enough common sense that $1.5 trillion deficits that are embedded in this bill aren’t a good business plan for the institution. I ask you all here this evening: Make a statement—a symbolic one—to get rid of these earmarks.

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

Mr. BRAUN. And let’s quit shoving all the debt onto the next generation and on our kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Senator asked those who love this institution to speak up. I am the Dean of the U.S. Senate. I have served here for 48 years. I love this institution.

I know the Constitution vests the power of the purse in the Congress. Certification of these earmarks have been available to the public on our committee website at my request and Senator SHELBY’s request for 8 months. Everybody knows what is here.

Vote for them or not; but, frankly, if I have to speak of what is needed for my State of Vermont, I want to be the one speaking for it—not somebody downtown. I would hope every Senator feels the same way.

I yield back the rest of my time. I oppose the amendment.

(Applause.)

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 4990

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

Mr. BRAUN. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NGO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 64, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Barrasso

Blackburn

Boozman

Braun

Correa

Cotton

Cramer

Crapo

Cruz

Daines

Ernst

Fischer

Gillibrand

Graham

Hassan

Gillibrand

Graham

Hassan

Booker

Brown

Baldwin

Benning

Blumenthal

Burr

Cassidy

Carper

Capito

Collins

Coons

Cornyn

Cortez Masto

Durbin

Feinstein

Gillibrand

Graham

Hassan

Risch

Romney

Rubio

Sasse

Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)

Stefanik

Toomey

Tuberville

Young

NAYS—64

Baldwin

Benning

Blumenthal

Burr

Cassidy

Carper

Casey

Cassidy

Collins

Coons

Cortez Masto

Durbin

Feinstein

Gillibrand

Graham

Hassan

Reed

Rosen

Rounds

Sanders

Schatz

Schumer

Shaheen

Sherley

Sinema

Smith

Stabenow

Sullivan

Tillis

Van Hollen

Warner

Warrick

Warren

Whitehouse

Wyden

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself and Mr. CASSIDY, proposes an amendment numbered 4983.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide emergency assistance for disaster response and recovery, and for other expenses, directly related to Hurricanes Laura, Delta, and Ida and to provide assistance for the Port Infrastructure Development Program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) In general.—In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the “Community Development Fund”, for necessary expenses related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure, housing, and economic revitalization in areas in States for which the President declared a major disaster under title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5170 et seq.), relating to Hurricanes Laura, Delta, and Ida, $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, for activities authorized under title 1 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), of which—

(1) $600,000,000 shall be for activities related to Hurricanes Laura and Delta; and

(2) $1,400,000,000 shall be for activities related to Hurricane Ida.

(b) DEPOSIT OF C-BAND SPECTRUM AUCTION PROCEEDS IN TREASURY.—Section 308(j)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(G), and (H)”;

(2) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “(G) and (H)”;

and inserting “(G), and (H)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) C-BAND AUCTION PROCEEDS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the proceeds (including deposits and upfront payments from successful bidders) from the use of a system of competitive bidding conducted under this subsection to award licenses in the band of frequencies between 3700 megahertz and 3980 megahertz (designated by the Commission as ‘Auction 107’), $2,500,000,000 shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury and used for emergency assistance under section 240(a) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022.”.

SEC. . ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE PORT INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated $450,000,000 for the Port Infrastructure Development Program within the Department of Transportation’s Maritime Administration, to equitably administer grant awards to ports that incurred damages from Hurricanes Laura, Delta, Zeta, and Ida and Tropical Storm Carlotta.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 2 minutes of debate; Senator CASSIDY for 1 minute of debate; and Senator SCHATZ for 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, in 2020, Hurricane Laura hit Louisiana,
then Hurricane Marco hit us, then Hurricane Delta hit us, then Hurricane Zeta, then Hurricane Ida—all in a period of 2 years.

Those storms caused $150 billion in damage. My amendment and Senator Cassidy amendment will appropriate $2.5 billion in emergency aid to Louisiana. That would include $600 million for housing aid for Hurricanes Laura and Delta and $1.4 billion in housing aid for Hurricane Ida. The amendment would also provide for $500 million in funding to rebuild Louisiana ports.

I am mindful of the fact that we should make sure this aid is paid for. I would remind everyone that through the heroic efforts of Senator SCHATZ and Senator CANTWELL, in which I played a small part, that we forced our FCC not to give away the C-band to our European allies. It was not agreed to by Republicans in the supplemental were in this bill, but the Ukrainians do not have the luxury of time. We should have passed a Ukraine supplemental last week, even if imperfect. It would have passed overwhelmingly, sending a strong message to Ukraine, our eastern flank allies, and the aggressor Putin.

Now, the much needed Ukraine supplemental has been rolled into a giant Omnibus bill. This package has some things I strongly support, or even helped write. But these provisions are riding along with a big growth in spending, which I do not support.

I typically vote against giant take-it-or-leave it omnibus bills. They are no way to legislate.

Senators who are not on the Appropriations Committee never see the contents of an Omnibus spending bill until we face a deadline for government funding running out—and an up-or-down vote; with no amendments. I urged my party's leadership to insist on a separate vote on the Ukraine funding package in our negotiations with Democrat leaders, but here we are, nevertheless.

Urgent aid for Ukraine shouldn't be wrapped up in an Omnibus full of unrelated spending. A cynic would say Ukraine aid was added to the Omnibus intentionally to help it pass. Well, this is a town where cynicism is often well-deserved.

Senators who support helping heroic Ukrainians defend themselves from a barbaric onslaught are being forced to swallow a giant, bitter pill.

So, for the record, I oppose the spending level in this Omnibus bill and the broken process by which it was cobbled together. I am not happy about being pushed into a corner yet again. Be advised—I will not roll over and play nice going forward.

But I cannot in good conscience vote in a way that would further delay urgently needed support for Ukrainians fighting for their freedom on the front lines against tyranny.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. SHELBY, Madam President, I have got a minute here, and I hope I don’t use it all. Everybody wants to leave, and I understand. But this has been a lot of work to put this omnibus together. I want to thank
Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the State Opioid Response grant program has been critically important to communities that have been affected by the ongoing opioid epidemic. Rates of substance use disorders have grown exponentially, particularly during the pandemic, taking lives across the country, and opioids are the main driver of drug overdose deaths. Congress developed the State Opioid Response grant program to enhance our response to the opioid crisis. As a result of this funding, States have been able to expand access to lifesaving prevention, treatment, and recovery services to frontline communities.

I know this funding has been important to Vermont in addressing the opioid crisis, and I ask the senior Senator from Washington if this has been her experience with the program as well.

Ms. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Vermont, who has been such a leader in addressing the substance use disorder crisis and who I have been proud to work with on this issue. The Senator is correct. The State Opioid Response funding has been important to all States, particularly those hardest hit by drug overdose deaths.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would like to ask the junior Senator from New Hampshire about her experience with this program.

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I would also like to thank my friend, the Senator from Vermont, who has been a champion for helping address substance use disorder cliffs for this program. Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Vermont, who has been such a leader in addressing the opioid crisis, and I ask the senior Senator from Washington if this has been her experience with the program as well.

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I do. The fiscal year 2021 joint explanatory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriations bill directed the Secretary to avoid significant funding cliffs between grant cycles for this program will hamper States’ ability to effectively address the opioid epidemic.

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I do. The fiscal year 2021 joint explanatory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriations bill directed the Secretary to avoid significant funding cliffs between grant cycles for this program will hamper States’ ability to effectively address the opioid epidemic.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to ask, given this context, if the Senator from New Hampshire agrees that both the House and the Senate have made clear that funding cliffs for this program will hamper States’ ability to effectively address the opioid epidemic?

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I do. The fiscal year 2021 joint explanatory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriations bill directed the Secretary to avoid significant funding cliffs between grant cycles for this program. Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I do. The fiscal year 2021 joint explanatory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriations bill directed the Secretary to avoid significant funding cliffs between grant cycles for this program will hamper States’ ability to effectively address the opioid epidemic.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to ask, given this context, if the Senator from New Hampshire agrees that both the House and the Senate have made clear that funding cliffs for this program will hamper States’ ability to effectively address the opioid epidemic?