

against vaccines. To safeguard the foods we eat and the drugs we use, we need a leader of the Food and Drug Administration with the courage to say no.

Cigarettes are responsible for more than 480,000 deaths each year. They were responsible for my father's death. So when I came to Congress, I vowed to fight this entity. While we have succeeded in reducing youth smoking rates, anyone who thought Big Tobacco would disappear was mistaken. They rebranded with flashy new products, vaping and e-cigarettes, and they followed the same playbook they used to drive sales of Marlboros back in the 1980s, target kids.

For years, the Food and Drug Administration utterly failed. This is during the Biden administration. As a Democrat, I am reluctant to say it, but it is true, and I am going to say it. For years, the Food and Drug Administration utterly failed to protect children from the lifetime addiction fueled by e-cigarettes, many of which are sold by the largest tobacco companies.

Under the law, a vaping product is required to first prove to the FDA that its product, e-cigarettes, is "appropriate for the protection of public health." That is a requirement under law. They have to prove that before they can sell on the market in the United States legally. It didn't happen under the previous Food and Drug Administration. Instead, thousands of dangerous, highly addictive e-cigarettes illegally flooded the market without FDA review, hooking a generation of kids.

By law, FDA is required to remove all unauthorized tobacco products from the market. In fact, it can do so today.

So the question is, Will the new President's FDA nominee follow the science and the law to protect our kids or will he align with the tobacco corporations that peddle this poison?

At the same time, President Trump and Elon Musk have fired thousands of Federal health workers. Before you run off celebrating efficiency, let me tell you who was terminated. One hundred twenty cancer researchers at the National Institutes of Health who were running clinical trials for new cures, disease detectives at the Centers for Disease Control who help identify and respond to outbreaks of new viruses. Does that sound like efficiency to you, to tell these cancer researchers that we don't need them any longer?

At the FDA, those fired include inspectors of drug manufacturing plants, regulators in charge of recalling faulty medical devices, and those monitoring the safety of infant formula.

For goodness' sake, we have a measles outbreak in Texas that has killed 2 and sickened 220 people, mostly unvaccinated children. It is the worst measles outbreak in a generation in America.

Instead of encouraging vaccinations to save these kids, Secretary Kennedy diminished their significance by falsely

stating that measles outbreaks are "not unusual"—his words—and issuing a statement about the outbreak stating that "the decision to vaccinate is a personal one." Of course, it is a personal one. But what is his position, questioning the efficacy of vaccines, doing to that personal decision process for the ordinary American?

NIH is cutting 40 grant awards for promoting the vaccine updates and addressing hesitancy, which breaks the promise that he made to Republican Senators who were skeptical of his nomination.

The list goes on. You cannot claim that you want to make America healthy again and then allow preventable diseases to come roaring back, all while firing scientists working to address these challenges.

Will Dr. Makary stand up to Mr. KENNEDY and encourage parents to vaccinate their kids? Will he stand up to the buzz saw of Elon Musk's chain saw? to Big Tobacco? I hope that he will.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum with respect to the Miran nomination be waived.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled roll-call vote begin immediately.

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

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 bill 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. 31, Stephen Miran, of New York, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tommy Tuberville, Katie Britt, Ashley B. Moody, Pete Ricketts, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Dan Sullivan, Roger F. Wicker, Cynthia M. Lummis, Eric Schmitt, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Jerry Moran, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stephen Miran, of New York, to be

Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Justice	Sanders
-----------	---------	---------

(Mr. RICKETTS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last night, the House of Representatives passed a short-term government funding bill that would extend funding through the end of this fiscal year. That is the end of September.

I was surprised to see only one Democrat in the House, JARED GOLDEN from Maine, saw the light that a shutdown is a bad choice. Nevertheless, 212 Democrats voted against the continuing resolution, effectively voting to shut down the government.

It remains to be seen whether our colleagues here in the Senate, our Senate Democrats, will vote for a SCHUMER shutdown or not. The cognitive dissonance, though, is striking and I think worth commenting on.

If I listen to our colleagues across the aisle, they claim to have a lot of

concern for the Federal workers that depend on government funding. They talk a pretty good game. So I find it interesting that so many of them in the House cast a vote that would put thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of Federal workers out of work, which is what results when the government shuts down.

Of course, I don't like continuing resolutions any more than the next person. They are certainly not the ideal way to govern, and I will talk about that in a minute. But it remains the second worst choice, a shutdown being the worst of all.

So let's take a look at how we got here in the first place. Last year, the Senate Appropriations Committee, on a bipartisan basis, passed all but 1 of their 12 appropriations bills. What did the majority leader—Senator SCHUMER at the time—what did he do? He simply refused to schedule any of those appropriations bills for a vote.

So it is because of Democratic dysfunction that we find ourselves now in a continuing resolution situation rather than having already attended to what in effect was last year's business and passing appropriations bills for the entire fiscal year.

Well, if our Democratic colleagues don't like voting for another CR, I would encourage them to take that up with their now-minority leader, as this falls squarely on his shoulders.

But the truth is, most of all, our Democratic colleagues are just mad about the outcome of the November 5 election.

Here in the Senate, I am glad that Senate Republicans are working to pass this necessary CR that will ensure that we prevent a government shutdown.

NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Mr. President, on another matter, I spoke last week about the importance of establishing a lasting peace in the ongoing conflict between Russia and Ukraine where Russia, without any chance of contradiction, is the aggressor. But I appreciate President Trump on his efforts as a peacemaker, and I congratulate the administration, particularly Secretary Rubio and National Security Advisor Mike Waltz, for working to negotiate a 30-day cease-fire—at least that is what Ukraine has agreed to. But now the ball is in Vladimir Putin's court.

As I said last week, this is a big deal. Hundreds of thousands of casualties on each side have arisen as a result of this 3-year war in Ukraine. It is important that these negotiations get it right.

It is true that a lasting peace would be no small achievement, but one of the most important aspects to getting this right is to make sure it does not result in nuclear proliferation—that is, more countries than currently have nuclear weapons getting those nuclear weapons because they feel insecure and they feel it is critical to their ability to continue to exist.

As I mentioned last week, the United States, along with Russia and the

United Kingdom, back in 1994 signed something called the Budapest Memorandum. In this agreement, these three countries gave Ukraine security guarantees, guaranteeing its independence and territorial integrity in exchange for Ukraine turning over its nuclear weapons arsenal. Ukraine, of course, had been part of the Soviet Union. After the Soviet Union fell, it had the world's third largest arsenal of nuclear weapons. So this was a landmark agreement where Ukraine agreed—now an independent republic—agreed to turn over its nuclear weapons rather than retain them.

Such agreements are important because in the absence of nonproliferation agreements, other countries may be tempted to seek and acquire nuclear weapons to provide for their own security and their own protection. This is another reason why it is so important to achieve a lasting peace in the ongoing war by Russia against Ukraine now going on 3 years.

Nuclear proliferation is different. It is a unique threat, and it is a threat to America's core interests and to peace in the world. It is much harder to create a safer, more peaceful world if the number of countries seeking nuclear weapons is growing.

I know President Trump concurs, and he has described nuclear weapons as an existential threat, which they are. I know that sounds dire, and perhaps we would like not to think about such terrible things, but we must because it is reality.

In the wake of weak or nonexistent security assurances and a more dangerous world thanks to Russia, China, and Iran, additional countries are starting to think about acquiring nuclear programs.

This is happening in Poland, where Prime Minister Donald Tusk suggested that Poland might "reach for opportunities related to nuclear weapons." Poland, of course, is a signatory to the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which prohibited all but five declared nuclear powers at the time from acquiring nuclear weapons. In a similar vein, Germany, through the newly elected Chancellor, has discussed the possibility that France and Britain might share their nuclear arsenal with Ukraine. Now, these are warning signs. These are flashing red signs that no one should take lightly.

While we, of course, welcome European countries—primarily members of NATO—to increase their defense spending for conventional purposes, nuclear proliferation is not the way to a more stable and peaceful world.

If we look back to 1956, the United States had to step in to prevent the Suez Crisis from escalating into a nuclear conflict between the Soviet Union, Britain, and France.

In the case of the 1973 nuclear alert during the Arab-Israeli war, U.S. nuclear forces were put on alert in response to what turned out to be, thankfully, a false alert.

Again, in 1999, the United States stepped in to stop nuclear escalation during the Kargil War between India and Pakistan.

So it is imperative that, while the United States facilitates a lasting and enforceable peace between Russia and Ukraine, that at the same time, we need to reduce the likelihood of nuclear proliferation. Suffice it to say the stakes could not be higher. We are living in one of the most dangerous times since World War II.

President Trump and Vice President Vance are correct in taking all reasonable and necessary efforts to end the war in Ukraine, but it requires a stable and lasting and enforceable peace to prevent this proliferation of nuclear weapons.

I applaud President Trump for his efforts to bring about this peace. If President Trump can successfully pull this off, it will be an accomplishment for which humanity will owe him a profound debt of gratitude.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 114, I was recorded as a "yes." It was my intention to vote no.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

TRIBUTE TO GERI SHAPIRO

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I want to tell you about an extraordinary woman, my senior adviser Geri Shapiro. Geri is in the final stages of a long battle with cancer, and so I wanted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks for her service to my office and to all of New York State.

Geri joined my staff in 2009 after having served as Hillary Clinton's Westchester regional director. But she is so much more than just a member of my staff, she is one of my closest confidants, mentors, and friends. She is truly one of a kind.

Geri is an institution in Westchester County, New York. She knows everybody, and everyone knows her name. Everyone knows that when Geri gives her word, it is as good as gold. She is an expert in so many important areas of policymaking. And the depth of knowledge she brings to any conversation is as impressive as her ability to make people feel at ease.

My staff, most of whom are decades younger, adore her energy and her spirit.

Geri is also one of the kindest people you are ever going to meet. She cares