

and Democrats, has failed to produce certain records to the Congress of the United States. The fact that the Trump administration has produced what the New York Times believes wouldn't be normally produced ought to be good news to the American people and good news to the New York Times. You see, these records are exactly the type that should be produced to Congress just as a matter of course, and the Trump administration understands that, and I thank them for their cooperation.

Now, I am still not fully satisfied. There are many more records that ought to be public. For many years, whistleblowers have been hard at work to expose those and many other records. As difficult as it may be for the partisan media to understand this, I have made public thousands of pages of records to this Congress pursuant to lawful whistleblower disclosures. True whistleblowers stick their neck out just for telling the truth, and they do it no matter the risk to them. And a lot of these whistleblowers ruin themselves professionally by just doing what the law requires. So when I do get records, I owe it to the whistleblowers to make those records public. That is called congressional oversight, and it is my constitutional responsibility to get the job of congressional oversight done as the Constitution requires.

This Senator's work will continue. I encourage the Trump administration to continue making records public for transparency, and hopefully the New York Times will get future stories right.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the previously scheduled vote to begin now.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin M. Flowers, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

VOTE ON FLOWERS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Flowers nomination?

Mr. HAGERTY. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Armstrong	Fischer	Moran
Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Ricketts
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Britt	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Husted	Schmitt
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Justice	Sheehy
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Curtis	Marshall	Young
Daines	McCormick	
Ernst	Moody	

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—5

Budd	McConnell	Tillis
Coons	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant executive 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. 829, Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Chuck Grassley, Jim Banks, Mike Crapo,

James Lankford, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons), is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Armstrong	Graham	Moran
Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Peters
Boozman	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hirono	Risch
Capito	Hoeven	Rosen
Cassidy	Husted	Rounds
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kaine	Shaheen
Crapo	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cruz	King	Slotkin
Curtis	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lee	Thune
Durbin	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Whitehouse
Fetterman	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—35

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Kelly	Schatz
Bennet	Kim	Schiff
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Lujan	Smith
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Budd	McConnell	Tillis
Coons	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 35. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

HONORING TYLER FEEHAN

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I am heartbroken on behalf of everybody in

Hawaii and everybody across this country about the death of 1LT Tyler Feehan of Ewa Beach, HI, who was among those killed in Jordan this past weekend while serving our country. His courage, his dedication, and his unwavering commitment to duty reflect the very best of our Armed Forces. We extend our deepest condolences to his family, his loved ones, and to his fellow servicemembers.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. President, it shouldn't be this difficult to get the State Department to follow the law. Earlier this year, when we passed the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill on a bipartisan basis, we were very clear that the spending requirements in it were not suggestions; they were a matter of law. We are not asking the State Department to do us a favor and spend the money we provided; we made a law. Yet we are still having to fight tooth and nail with the State Department officials to get money out to the people in places around the world that are counting on the United States of America.

Let's take funding for Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance. For months, the administration has been withholding \$600 million which is meant to help millions of children get vaccinated against preventable diseases, including Ebola, cholera, and mpox.

And even though the Secretary has told us repeatedly, including in a hearing last month, that he will personally see to it that this money is released, it is still stuck. Why? Because people at HHS, who have their own views and theories about vaccines, keep blocking it.

Here is the thing: This funding is in the State Department's budget. HHS has no jurisdiction here. And I want to be really clear about this. Sure, this is a jurisdictional dispute. Sure, this is a legal matter. A, this is a law, not a suggestion. B, this just doesn't go through HHS; they have no jurisdiction here.

Why am I so animated about it? It is because little kids are not getting vaccinated right now.

Gavi, the global Vaccine Alliance, they come to us, and they articulate to us that children across the planet are getting sick unnecessarily because they are not getting vaccinated. What happened was, because of the COVID pandemic and the disagreement about mandatory COVID vaccines, now certain people are so brain-poisoned that we think we shouldn't even prevent disease in children. And kids are dying because the United States is sitting on its butt, not disbursing money that is a matter of law.

Here is another example with the Global Fund. Last week, after months of fighting to release funding, the administration finally made a \$661 million contribution to the Global Fund, which will help to fight deadly epidemics like HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria by providing medicines and

strengthening health infrastructure. But even then, the administration is still withholding close to \$2 billion in additional contributions, all while HIV prevention is falling, malaria is surging, and we are trying to contain multiple outbreaks globally, including Ebola.

When the Congress got all animated about attacking USAID, it was because: Hey, we want to help PEPFAR; we want to help Gavi; we want to help the Global Fund. We want to be the good guys around the world, but let's not do all this cultural stuff. Let's not waste all this money on superfluous stuff.

And do you know what is happening? They eliminated a tiny portion of the tens of billions of dollars that get pushed out every year—tiny—and I mean we are talking tens of millions versus tens of billions. That was like cultural stuff and arguably—arguably—progressive or leftwing, a tiny portion of it.

But I want everybody to understand what they did in the process. They cut previously bipartisan priorities, and lots and lots of people died. These are not bureaucratic mixups. Every day that this money doesn't get to where it is supposed to go, every contribution worth hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars is delayed, people go hungry, people get sick, people die.

That is what has made what happened last year at USAID particularly cruel. The richest man in the world wanted to send USAID to the wood chipper, and this Congress and this Senate ratified those decisions. And yet we worked with the Secretary and we worked with appropriators on both sides of the aisle and we worked with the great, late Senator Lindsey Graham—may his memory be a blessing—to reestablish the principle that the United States is the good guys and that it is not just the example of our power but the power of our example that makes the United States the indispensable Nation. We are the good guys. And when a batch of aid medicine or communications infrastructure or food arrives with that little patch with "United States of America" on it, people go: Help is on the way. The good guys are here.

And so we got through this process on the appropriations side to reestablish the principle that USAID, in its new iteration, under mostly the State Department, is still a bipartisan priority. And there are lots of people who believe that. But the State Department is not executing on these dollars. And the consequences are geopolitical, but they are also human. People are still literally dying because we are not pushing this money out.

And just so you know that I don't think this is an entirely partisan question, there were Democrats, people who consider themselves Democratic strategists, who said out loud—who said out loud—that Democrats were walking into a trap because USAID doesn't poll well.

I don't care if it polls well. I am not here to have a pollster tell me that I shouldn't care that kids are getting malaria. I am not here to get talked out of the United States being the good guys because healthcare polls higher, because the cost of gasoline polls higher. I am not deciding what to put into a 30-second spot. I am deciding how to use the power given to me by the people of the State of Hawaii, and I think they care about whether people die unnecessarily because of the stupidity of this Congress. And I want everybody to know what is happening now, in addition to all that money being still throttled.

So there were parades and festivals and other things that were funded that ended up on a FOX News chyron that were embarrassing to USAID. And I would say about two-thirds of them were just flatly untrue, but some of them actually happened.

So the idea—I went to Lindsey, I went to Marco, I went to MARIO DIAZ-BALART, I went to LOIS FRANKEL, I went to JOHN THUNE, and I went to others, and I said: Look, you are pushing on an open door. If the principle here is USAID should stick to its knitting, stay in a narrow couple of lanes—foreign military financing, economic assistance, disaster response, and humanitarian assistance—and we should do nothing superfluous, you are pushing on an open door. If you would like USAID to be a little more aligned with the State Department and not working sort of against each other's interests—even in country—fine, you are pushing on an open door.

So that is what we tried to ratify in the last appropriations bill. But here is the crazy thing. It is not that they are not spending money on ideological projects. They have just decided to spend money on their own ideological projects. So instead of vaccinating little kids against deadly diseases, they are now spending millions of dollars to help British nonprofits—one of them recently established and now receiving \$7 million from United States taxpayer dollars—to help British nonprofits report on whether free speech is being censored in London.

This is how they explained the funding:

American diplomacy should continue to stand up for genuine democracy, freedom of expression, and unapologetic celebrations of European nations' individual character and history.

Just so we are all clear, they were trying to get out of the business of saving lives in order to get into the business of promoting "unapologetic celebrations of European nations' individual character and history." That is what we are now paying for with our tax dollars.

Here is another one. They want to send millions of dollars to protect free speech and foster dialogue in the UK, Europe, and Australia—not Equatorial Guinea or Eswatini, which despite