

money to the Palestinians. But really shouldn't they have to do something to earn the money? Shouldn't they have to at least say we believe Israel has a right to exist or that the massacre on October 7 was a bad thing? If they can't say that, should they get any of our money?

We need to know what America stands for. Why should we reward governments that have terrible human rights records?

If foreign aid is to project American values, then we should write those values into the law. Let's say you only get the foreign aid if you actually are exemplifying American values.

We have made such attempts in the past. For example, we have laws on the books named after Senator Patrick Leahy that prohibit U.S. assistance to countries where there is credible information that gross violations of human rights have been committed.

But if our government strictly adhered to the Leahy law, it would insist that recipients abandon their despotism ways before they can receive American money. If our government actually enforced the Leahy law, which is well-intended and I support, foreign aid to Egypt would have ended years ago.

There is always a loophole. There is always a Presidential waiver, and they always use it. The only thing for certain that never changes is your money will be sent to these foreign countries; there will be no accountability; the deficit will rise; but, by golly, the money gets shoveled out the door every year. There doesn't seem to be a concern for what it is doing to Americans, what it is doing to our dollar and to our economy.

Unfortunately, the government always has a way around the rules. They are incredibly effective at circumventing the Leahy laws, and so your money still flows around the globe regardless of the behavior of the recipients.

It may surprise many Americans to learn that we have provided hundreds of millions of dollars to the Palestinian Authority over the years. In 2023 alone, we spent over \$280 million in the West Bank and Gaza. Since 1993, the United States has provided more than \$7.6 billion in assistance to Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. I say not one penny more—not one penny more—of foreign aid to countries unwilling to renounce violence.

All American aid should be conditioned on recipients' practice of protecting basic human rights. I voted this way recently for one of our best allies, Israel. Their aid should be conditioned as well, not because I dislike Israel but because all foreign aid should be conditioned on how it is spent. It is our money. It should be conditioned on human rights.

It should not be too much to ask that the recipients of American aid renounce terrorism and cease trying to destroy Israel. Is that too much to ask? Are you willing to keep giving money

to the Palestinian Authority that will not and has not renounced and condemned the massacre of October 7?

After these attacks, this principle is even more relevant. The atrocities committed just over 100 days ago resulted in the killing of over 1,200 innocent men, women, and children, 250 people taken hostage. At least 33 Americans were killed, and at least 6 remain unaccounted for and are presumed taken captive by Hamas. That kind of barbarism cannot and should not be rewarded with American dollars.

How can we continue to allow the flow of money to groups that call for the destruction of Israel? How can we continue to allow taxpayer dollars to go to the very entities that lob rockets toward civilians in Israel? How can we reward the slaughter of innocent people?

The old ways of doing business have not brought peace to the region. We have not bought peace. We don't buy off and somehow create peace, and there is, all of a sudden, peace because of the \$7.6 billion we have given to the Palestinians.

They won't recognize Israel. They won't condemn the violence. They won't even condemn the massacre where 1,200 were killed October 7.

The time has come for the United States to mean what it says in the defense of human rights. This is why I offer an amendment to the spending bill today. That should be something every Senator can support.

The amendment would end American aid to governing entities in Gaza and the West Bank unless they, among other things, recognize Israel's right to exist, pledge to renounce terrorism and the October 7 massacre, terminate funding to anti-American and anti-Israeli enticement, as well as release all of the hostages abducted on October 7.

Additionally, my amendment requires that the Secretary of State report on Hamas and the Palestinian Authority's compliance with U.S. foreign assistance laws and any use of funds received from the United States that could have been involved with committing these atrocities.

American resources should always promote American security interests and values, and any recipient of our tax dollars should be more than willing to adopt the principles that recognize the liberty and dignity of the individual. But we cannot expect the recipient of aid to change their behavior if America does not demand it.

We speak of human rights but reward those who violate them. We can no longer afford empty rhetoric. It makes no sense to borrow money from China and turn around and give that money away to foreign countries. It is fiscally irresponsible, and it is weakening our national security.

America must demand a change, a change in behavior from those who do not accept Israel's right to exist, from those who actively seek the destruc-

tion of the State of Israel and murder innocent Israelis. To that end, I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment that will end aid to Palestinian Authority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The majority leader.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 358.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Koos, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 358, Christopher Koos, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Chris Van Hollen, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Baldwin, Edward J. Markey, John W. Hickenlooper, Laphonza Butler, Richard J. Durbin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeff Merkley, Peter Welch, Gary C. Peters.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony Rosario Coscia, of New Jersey, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years. (Reappointment).

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 357, Anthony Rosario Coscia, of New Jersey, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years. (Reappointment)

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Chris Van Hollen, Tammy Baldwin, Gary C. Peters, John W. Hickenlooper, Edward J. Markey, Mazie Hirono, Laphonza Butler, Richard J. Durbin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeff Merkley, Peter Welch.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 356.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joel Matthew Szabat, of Maryland, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant 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. 356, Joel Matthew Szabat, of Maryland, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Charles E. Schumer, Tim Kaine, Angus S. King, Jr., Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Chris Van Hollen, Tammy Baldwin, Gary C. Peters, John W. Hickenlooper, Edward J. Markey, Mazie Hirono, Laphonza Butler, Richard J. Durbin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeff Merkley, Peter Welch.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, January 18, be waived.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## AMENDING THE PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMP ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

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

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

H.R. 2872

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly, we are going to be voting on an amendment authored by our colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL, that deals with restrictions on U.S. support in regard to the Middle East. I want to urge my colleagues to vote against that amendment.

Our ally Israel is at war to destroy Hamas terrorists, not at war against the Palestinian people, but this amendment by my colleague threatens U.S. efforts that support stability and security efforts and that serve Israeli and U.S. interests. What it would do is put certain restrictions on what funds America can make available in the region, particularly in regard to the Palestinians. It would undermine the United States' ability to work in lock-step with Israel on critical security cooperation and on counterterrorism efforts with the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank.

Today, we have a partnership in regard to security on the West Bank. The United States is helping in regard to the training of Palestinian security forces.

Mr. President, one of the pleasant surprises, I would say, is during this war between Israel and Hamas, we have seen relative peace in the West Bank. The security forces are doing their job. It is not perfect by any stretch of the imagination. There is too much violence taking place everywhere. But the security forces have been successful in providing more stability in the region. That would be compromised or eliminated under the Paul amendment.

It would prohibit the United States from meeting longstanding commitments to providing lifesaving assistance for hospitals, vaccines for children, and water treatment facilities. This goes beyond Taylor Force in cut-

ting off potential funds to the Palestinians for their lifesaving type of activities, from hospitals to water treatment facility plants.

It would also prohibit future assistance—including humanitarian assistance—to any governing entity for innocent Palestinians the day after Israel has destroyed Hamas, undermining the United States' ability to work toward a political horizon for Palestinians that protects Israel's security needs.

We are all concerned about what happens after the war ends with Hamas, after Hamas is destroyed. We need to have an entity that has the credibility among the Palestinians, and that will require us all to have partnerships to make a lasting peace so we can have lasting peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The Paul amendment compromises that from being able to be done. It would restrict what we can do in partnership to make that a reality.

We know the tragedy of this war with Hamas, but we hope coming out of it will give us a new opportunity for peace in the region, and that will require us to be able to help deal with the crisis that has been created through Hamas's attack, particularly with the Palestinian people, and to work to make sure there is a future with the Palestinian people living in peace with Israel.

So this amendment does not serve our national security interests. It compromises our ability to have a successful conclusion after Hamas has been destroyed. It compromises our current abilities to keep peace in the region, particularly in the West Bank. It compromises what we need to do in regard to the humanitarian needs of the region.

For all those reasons, I would urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the Paul amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that we begin the vote on the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1384

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1384.

Mr. CARDIN. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Missouri Mr. HAWLEY would have voted "yea."