

McConnell	Rosen	Sullivan
Menendez	Rounds	Tester
Merkley	Rubio	Thune
Moran	Sanders	Tillis
Murkowski	Sasse	Toomey
Murphy	Schatz	Tuberville
Murray	Schumer	Van Hollen
Ossoff	Scott (FL)	Warner
Padilla	Scott (SC)	Warnock
Paul	Shaheen	Warren
Peters	Shelby	Whitehouse
Portman	Sinema	Wicker
Reed	Smith	Wyden
Romney	Stabenow	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The amendment (No. 5518) was agreed to.

VOTE ON RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION
(NO. 117-1)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The question occurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as amended.

Mr. CARPER. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 343 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoehen	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 27.

Two-thirds of the Senators present, a quorum being present, having voted in

the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein).

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the "Montreal Protocol"), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol ("The Kigali Amendment") (Treaty Doc. 117-1), subject to the declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3.

SECTION 2. DECLARATIONS

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, "Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries," made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117-1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very good day. We have just passed the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on a strong bipartisan basis. This is a win-win-win: win for U.S. jobs, win for U.S. investment, and win for U.S. leadership in the fight against climate change.

We have talked a lot about how this amendment will help U.S. businesses, U.S. jobs, and U.S. competitiveness overseas, but let's talk about how important this amendment will be for protecting our planet.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever undertaken.

Let me say that again: Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against cli-

mate change any Congress has ever taken.

In fact—amazing statistic, folks—people don't pay attention to this one, but it is vital. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

That is worth repeating as well. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

It is an easily overlooked victory, but a massive one, all coming from eliminating this family of dangerous chemicals, which are a thousand times more deadly per molecule than carbon dioxide.

And on top of it all, ratifying this amendment will give U.S. businesses a huge leg up. It will open exports to new international markets, generate tens of billions in new investments and help create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, and we will get a much needed edge against Chinese businesses that still lag behind in developing viable HFC alternatives.

Under Kigali, our exports will increase while China will lose out. So, once again, ratifying the Kigali Amendment is a win-win-win: a win for U.S. jobs, a win for U.S. investment, and, most of all, a win for our global campaign to defeat the climate crisis and preserve our planet for future generations.

I want to thank my colleague from Delaware who has been such a persistent advocate on this legislation. And there are so many others—the Senators from New Mexico and Hawaii and Delaware—who have worked so hard on it as well. I thank them for their steadfastness. The globe, our globe, is rejoicing today because of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to thank our leader for his leadership.

None of this would have happened without your leadership. I want to thank your staff.

I want to thank the relative respective staffs on our side here and the Senators especially on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I want to especially thank our friend JOHN NEELY KENNEDY from Louisiana, who has been a great partner, and his staff and other folks on the other side of the aisle.

My mother used to say to my sister and me when we were kids, she would say that things happen in threes. I remember she would say things happen in threes, and given what the leader just said, I am thinking about threes and especially with respect to making sure that this planet is going to be around for our children and grandchildren.

But if you go back to the bipartisan infrastructure bill signed into law roughly 10 months ago by the President, we did a whole lot there, you will

recall, with respect to roads, highways, bridges, water, wastewater, water infrastructure, flood control. But that legislation had the largest—at that point the largest climate title that we had ever put in a bill of any consequence here in the U.S. Senate. That is No. 1.

No. 2 would be the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act, that was signed into law just last month by the President and championed by any number of folks, including our colleague from West Virginia, JOE MANCHIN. I want to thank him and the majority leader for their good work. That was No. 2 because the investments, the clean energy investments we make in the Inflation Reduction Act, are just extraordinary—extraordinary.

Then, today, to pass the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol—people might be wondering, who are watching, and say: What in the world is that? And I will just walk you back in time.

People might remember that I was a naval flight officer in the Vietnam war, and near the end of the Vietnam war, maybe after I had moved to Delaware, I remember hearing something about speculation about a hole in the ozone and there might be a hole in the ozone. At first, people dismissed it. I dismissed it. But over time, the concerns persisted, and the hole in the ozone grew and grew.

Somewhere along about 1985, some updated scientific information, evidence, emerged that said there is a hole in the ozone, and it is big, and it is getting bigger.

Our President at the time, as I recall, was not a Democrat; he was a Republican—Ronald Reagan. Under his leadership, we as a nation joined in the Montreal Protocol. It was finalized in 1987, where we actually say that what is happening here is exactly clear, and what that is, is there is a hole in the ozone. It was being created by materials that are in our air-conditioners or refrigerators and our coolers. We call them refrigerants, and when they leaked out of the air-conditioners, refrigerators, and coolers, they actually created the hole in the ozone.

So the question is, Do we have to give up our refrigerators, our air-conditioners, our coolers, our freezers? Do we have to give those up in order to take care and address the hole in the ozone? As it turns out, we did not, but what we had to do was replace something called CFCs, chlorofluorocarbons, which were refrigerants at the time and contributed to the hole in the ozone. What we had to do was replace those CFCs with something new. Science and the scientists came up with that something new. What they came up with was not CFC plus 2; they came up with HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

What I know about chemistry you can fit on a fairly small thumbnail, but HFCs came along, and, guess what, the hole in the ozone started getting small-

er. We stayed cool. The air-conditioners worked, freezers worked, refrigerators worked, and the hole in the ozone started getting cooler.

What didn't get cooler was our planet because HFCs, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, are about 1,000 times worse than carbon dioxide with respect to global warming. We finally have realized that, and the question is, Can we do anything about it? If so, can we do it to make sure we stay cool or cold, if you will, and at the same time address climate change?

Some people say: You know, we can't do good things for this planet or we can't clean the air, clean the water, address the climate change, and create jobs and economic opportunity. But, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, that is just not true. This is sort of like having our cake and eating it, too, because we can create jobs.

A lot of them we are talking about creating with the phasedown of HFCs and for the next 15 years talking about creating literally tens of thousands of jobs not in some other country but here. We are talking about creating these jobs using technology developed here, and we are talking about the ability to export this technology and sell products using this technology all over the place.

I forget exactly what the economic value is from these activities, but it is in the tens of billions of dollars here, with American technology, created by American workers. Who wouldn't be for that? Who wouldn't be for that?

Some of our Republican colleagues offered an amendment today. Senator LEE and, I think, Senator SULLIVAN joined together on an amendment. I think most of us voted for that, and it has been adopted and added to this package.

The other thing I would mention is that about a month ago, you may recall, we stayed up all night during a vote-arama, working on the reconciliation legislation that led to the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act.

I remember the next day going home. I was just dog-tired. I went home on the train and got off the train, and before I went home, I drove to Wawa, which is a convenience store. We love Wawa. They are all up and down the east coast, especially in Delaware. I stopped at Wawa to get a cup of coffee. I got a small cup of coffee and went to the cash register, the cashier, to pay for it, and the lady at the cash register said: Your money is no good here.

I said: No, no. I want to pay. I want to pay for it.

She said: No, no. I am mindful of what you have been up all night doing. Your money is no good here.

I said: Could I get a larger cup of coffee?

She said: No, but your money is no good here.

She also went to say—she said: I have a son. I have a daughter. I want to make sure they grow up on a planet that is fit to grow up on and that they can grow old on.

I think that is a sentiment that almost any father or mother or grandfather or grandparent would feel and have. I would just say to them today: I know sometimes you look at what is going on here and our inability to work together. We have come together. We have come together on something that is extremely important for us, my generation, but even more important, for those who follow us.

Bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. This is a good bipartisan solution, and for everybody who has been a part of this, I want to thank you. I want to convey our thanks as well to the President and his administration for their help in getting this done.

This is a day, as my colleague from Delaware, Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, would say—she would say: This is a day the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Amen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1950

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, while we are standing here right now in Washington, DC, in the middle of an afternoon, protests are happening all over Iran right now.

The latest news reports coming out from social media and the very limited media that can get out of Iran—massive protesters are in the streets of 20 different cities in Iran right now. The latest count is nine people have been killed in those protests by Iranian forces trying to be able to shut down the protests that are now breaking out all over the country—including, by the way, protests in Tehran.

What is going on? This has been a simmering issue for a long time in Iran. As I have stated several times on this floor and in committee hearings, our opposition with Iran is not with the Iranian people. The Iranian people live in oppression underneath the Iranian regime, which pushes their thumb down on them and limits their progress in the world and in their own country.

The spark of this latest group of protests that are happening in the streets all over Iran is a young lady who was murdered in police custody in Iran named Mahsa Amini.

Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old Iranian woman, died in custody because she broke Iran's hijab law. In other words, she wasn't wearing her head covering, and so—brace yourself—the morality police arrested her. The morality police in Iran detained her, where she was apparently beaten to death while she was in prison. Now, the police and the regime have come out and said she had sudden heart failure, but with multiple injuries around her head, that is not sudden heart failure.

The nation—once again—of Iran is rising up to say: This has to stop.

Americans would be surprised at the number of social media posts that are getting out of Iran right now, where