

doesn't have anything to do with this, but I know what it can be, and I know where I can help you. I am offering that assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate everything that my friend from Wyoming, my friend from Idaho, and my friend from West Virginia said, and I agree with what they said. I agree with the policy goals of this bill, and I am strongly committed to curtailing Russia's ability to use nuclear energy as a geopolitical tool.

Indeed, I have repeatedly introduced sanctions targeting Rosatom activities, and I am currently working on legislation that would go even further. We should absolutely end our dependence on Russian uranium, and the United States should not be dependent on any nation for our energy—nuclear or otherwise.

I know that my friend from Wyoming shares my conviction on American energy independence, and as the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he understands better than most anyone how the zealots in this administration have shackled our domestic energy producers.

And let me just say, I understand and appreciate how important this bill is to you, and I commit to work with you on this bill to get it passed into law.

But this bill is also important to the House. That was made clear by just how quickly they took it up and passed it on suspension with only a voice vote last week—even as, at the same time, the House stripped out and disregarded a number of the priorities of this Chamber which had been included in the Senate NDAA. One provision, which I worked very hard on with Senator KELLY, was to streamline permitting requirements for new semiconductor plants, and which 120 Senators and House Members—a little over a sixth of the entire Congress—had signed a letter supporting. That was one of the casualties of their casual disregard.

The House even stripped out of the bill my bill with Senator CANTWELL—the Senate version of the Informing Consumers About Smart Devices Act—despite the House having already passed their version of the bill earlier this year by a vote of 406 to 12.

Neither of these were partisan measures, and they are not wild policy changes. Instead, they are broadly bipartisan, widely supported priorities of Members of the Senate, and they have enormous impact. Unfortunately, our House colleagues—in particular, the leadership of the Energy and Commerce Committee—decided that they did not matter, and they insisted they be stripped from the bill.

Now we have come up with an important priority that they care about—and, to be clear, a policy with which I agree—asking for the blessing of the Senate.

The consequences of their stripping that legislation from the NDAA is they hurt thousands of jobs across this country. They have benefited communist China at our expense, and they have hurt our national security by making us more vulnerable to China, and they undermined the privacy of Americans across this country.

I hope and believe the House and Senate should work together cooperatively. I am eager to do so. I have extended an olive branch to the House for us to work cooperatively, but it is a two-way street. Until the House begins to take seriously the priorities of the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support and until they change course on the Senate priorities they disregarded arbitrarily, this bill and potentially others from the chairman of this House committee will not be moving in the Senate by unanimous consent.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, just briefly, I want to correct one thing that was said.

Because of the 117th Congress, when we all worked together, today we are producing more energy than ever in the history of the United States. We are producing 4.6 billion barrels of oil this year, 37 trillion cubic feet of gas, 13.5 billion cubic feet a day of LNG. In 2016, we didn't do anything.

So what we have done with all of the bills—the bipartisan infrastructure bill; the IRA bill, or the Inflation Reduction Act—is forced this administration to start taking seriously U.S. energy independence and security. They cannot just move them in one direction. It is a balanced approach, and it is working.

This is the part, now, that we need to shut down. We should not be relying on foreign supply chains, unreliable foreign countries of concern. You have China, you have Russia, you have North Korea, and you have Iran—four of the most notorious. To depend on anything that comes from those four countries that we need for our building blocks is a sin.

That is the only thing I am saying on the hold you have here. There are going to be other things that we can work together on to make sure that we all—I think you have them on this. I don't know if that is a No. 1 priority. They just didn't have any objection because they knew it was something that should be done. We are all for it.

You are using it because you need something else, and we are committing to help you on something else. This is desperately needed for our country. It really is. We have to center the market because, if not, they won't get invested. They just won't move. If they think Russians can dump enriched uranium, HALEU, on us, they will continue to do it, and it basically stymies the market for anyone that is invest-

ing the amount of money that needs to be invested to get our enrichment program up and running. That is really what the concerns are.

And we already have an NDAA. We would like for it—as far as the money, we are prepared to make sure that we have the necessary resources. But we can't do it unless we ban that because, if we don't ban it, people will, in this marketplace, buy wherever they can, the cheapest they possibly can. And, I guarantee, Russia needs the money for their war machine, and they will keep dumping and dumping on us.

So I would hope you would reconsider, sir. That is all I can ask. But I am committed to helping you. But this is the wrong one, I believe, to use.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, over the last few days, negotiations on a path forward to getting a national security supplemental done have made good progress. As I have said, if we believe something is important and urgent, we should stay and get the job done. That is certainly the case with the supplemental. It is important. It is urgent.

I spoke with Leader MCCONNELL this morning about the plan for next week and making sure the Senate continues to do our work.

So, for the information of all Senators, after we finish today, the Senate will return on Monday. That will give negotiators from the White House, Senate Democrats, and Senate Republicans time to work through the weekend in an effort to reach a framework agreement. It will then take some time to turn that framework into text.

To prevent unnecessary delays, I intend to move to reconsider the shell for the supplemental, as a vehicle, to move an agreement forward. The plan is for the Senate to act as soon as we are ready to move forward on the supplemental.

Members need to be here next week. We have to get this done. Our Republican colleagues who have said action on the border is so urgent should have no problem with continuing to work next week. We hope to come to an agreement. But no matter what, Members should be aware that we will vote on a supplemental proposal next week.

Mr. President, it is not easy to reach an agreement on something this complicated. This might be one of the most difficult things we have ever had to work through. But we all know that so much—so much—hangs on our success. We know the world is watching. We know autocrats like Putin and Xi are

hoping for us to fail. So we need to try, with everything we have, to get the job done.

I will update Senators when more information about schedule becomes available.

NOMINATION OF JERRY EDWARDS, JR.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Jerry Edwards, Jr., to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana.

Born in Shreveport, LA, Mr. Edwards received his B.A. from Georgia State University and his J.D. from Vermont Law and Graduate School before clerking for Judge Scott J. Crichton and Judge Jeanette G. Garrett on the First Judicial District Court of Louisiana. He then entered private practice in Shreveport, where he maintained a diverse litigation practice. In 2019, Mr. Edwards joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Louisiana as an assistant U.S. attorney. He defended Federal Agencies in civil cases and also handled affirmative work on behalf of Federal Agencies. In 2022, he was appointed first assistant U.S. attorney. In that role, he oversees civil litigation and the prosecution of various Federal crimes.

Mr. Edwards has significant experience in both State and Federal court, and he has tried nine cases to verdict, including two jury trials. Mr. Edwards has also been involved in a variety of legal activities outside of his legal practice. He is a member of the Louisiana Supreme Court Committee on Bar Admissions, and he previously served on the Louisiana Judiciary Commission.

Mr. Edwards enjoys the strong support of both of his home State Senators—Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. KENNEDY—as well as the Louisiana legal community. The American Bar Association unanimously rated Mr. Edwards as “well qualified” to serve on the Western District of Louisiana. If confirmed, he will be the first person of color to ever sit on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana.

During Mr. Edwards's confirmation hearing, Senator CASSIDY noted that “Mr. Edwards's commitment to his community and bar is a personal credit to the character required to be a successful judge.” I am confident that Mr. Edwards' character, strong ties to the Western District of Louisiana, and extensive legal experience ensure that he will be a successful judge on the Federal bench. I strongly support his nomination, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

VOTE ON EDWARDS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Edwards nomination?

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 345 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Booker	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Butler	Kaine	Rubio
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Capito	Kennedy	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Cassidy	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Cooms	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—24

Blackburn	Hawley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Braun	Johnson	Schmitt
Britt	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Budd	Lee	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Marshall	Sullivan
Crapo	Mullin	Thune
Cruz	Paul	Vance

NOT VOTING—10

Barrasso	Fischer	Tuberville
Blumenthal	Hagerty	Welch
Cramer	Hyde-Smith	
Daines	Lummis	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

The majority whip.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to resume consideration of the Long nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brandon S. Long, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

NOMINATION OF BRANDON S. LONG

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Bran-

don S. Long to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Born in Metairie, LA, Mr. Long received his B.B.A. and B.A. from the University of Texas at Austin in 1999 and his J.D. from Duke Law School in 2005. From 2005 to 2010, Mr. Long worked in the Washington, DC, office of King & Spalding, LLP, as an associate in the special matters and government investigations practice group. While in private practice, he focused on Federal criminal matters, internal investigations, corporate compliance, and civil matters involving securities law.

Mr. Long then served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia from 2010 to 2014. There, he tried approximately 27 criminal cases to verdict, of which 15 were jury trials and 12 were bench trials. Since 2014, Mr. Long has served as an AUSA in the Eastern District of Louisiana. From 2017 to 2018, he served as deputy chief of the narcotics unit. Mr. Long also served as the office's opioid coordinator from 2017 to 2020. For a brief stint from 2020 to 2021, Mr. Long served on detail as deputy chief of staff and acting chief of staff to FBI Director Christopher Wray. In 2021, he returned to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Louisiana, where he serves as a member of the financial crimes unit.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Mr. Long as “well qualified,” and his nomination is strongly supported by his home state Senators, Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. CASSIDY.

Mr. Long will serve the Eastern District of Louisiana with distinction.

I am proud to support his nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the Long nomination be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The cloture motion was withdrawn.

VOTE ON LONG NOMINATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Long nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the