

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael G. Waltz, of Florida, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the Rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 529 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Boozman	Grassley	Moreno
Britt	Hagerty	Murkowski
Budd	Hawley	Ricketts
Capito	Hoeben	Risch
Collins	Husted	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cotton	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kelly	Shaheen
Crapo	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Curtis	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fetterman	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—8

Banks	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Blackburn	Lee	Sullivan
Cassidy	Mullin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays 45.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael G. Waltz, of Florida, to be the Representative of the United States of America to

the United Nations, with the Rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

VOTE ON WALTZ NOMINATION

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

Mr. COTTON. 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 530 Ex.]

YEAS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Boozman	Grassley	Moreno
Britt	Hagerty	Murkowski
Budd	Hawley	Ricketts
Capito	Hoeben	Risch
Collins	Husted	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cotton	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kelly	Shaheen
Crapo	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Curtis	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fetterman	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—10

Banks	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Blackburn	Lee	Sullivan
Cassidy	Mullin	
Durbin	Sanders	

The nomination 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 Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1337

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I am going to be very clear. The clock is

ticking. On October 1, if Congress fails to reauthorize the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act, we are set to lose an absolutely invaluable cornerstone of our national cyber security defense.

For the past 10 years, this law has enabled private companies and Federal Agencies to share cyber threat information both quickly and securely before attacks spread. The protections in this law enable us to mitigate threats before cyber security systems become compromised and irreversible damage is inflicted across our country. If those protections are allowed to lapse, our Nation's information networks will be exposed, vulnerable, and defenseless more so than ever before.

We face unrelenting cyber security threats from criminal hackers and foreign adversaries each and every day. Just this year, hackers backed by the Chinese Government exploited a vulnerability with Microsoft's SharePoint—a platform that runs on many of our computers right here in the Senate—allowing them to access critical infrastructure and compromise sensitive government systems. The Colonial Pipeline ransomware incident, which was linked to a ransomware group based in Russia, brought down a critical gas pipeline, disrupting the daily lives of millions of people on the east coast. The Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act ensures that the government can quickly work with companies experiencing these attacks to stop them from becoming even more widespread.

Adversaries like Russia, China, and Iran are actively working to develop better tools and utilize artificial intelligence to supercharge their cyber attack capabilities. If we don't take immediate action to prevent these cyber security protections from expiring, we will lose one of our Nation's best defenses and empower our adversaries to launch attacks. A lapse in these protections will also embolden cyber criminals to use the same malicious tools to wreak havoc on our economy, exploit America's personal information, disrupt critical services, leaving our government unable to stop them.

The bottom line is, if we don't extend these protections today, our Nation will be significantly less safe from cyber security attacks on October 1.

This should be straightforward. Ten years ago, CISA 2015 was voted out of the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support. Most recently, our colleagues on the House Homeland Security Committee just moved an extension of these authorities for 10 years out of that committee by a vote of 26 to 0—unanimous. It has a proven track record, and that is why. Over the past 10 years, it has established a trusted public-private partnership that safeguards our Nation against ever-evolving cyber security threats.

This is a voluntary program that industry stakeholders and the Trump administration are asking us to renew. Organizations, including the Business

Roundtable, the Business Software Alliance, the Bank Policy Institute, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Information Technology Industry Council—and I can go on and on—all support extending these critical protections to ensure that businesses can effectively share information with the Federal Government and work collaboratively when a breach occurs. There is no question that, as cyber attackers get more sophisticated, we will need to do even more to shore up our defenses, but we absolutely—absolutely—must prevent any further harm that would result from a lapse of this proven law.

That is why it was disappointing to see that, after making a public commitment to working on renewing this legislation earlier this year, the Republican chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee abruptly canceled a committee business meeting this week where we were expected to debate and vote on this very important bill and extension. Committee members on both sides of the aisle want to see action to prevent this law from expiring in the next few days, but we were blocked from even having a discussion about the policy or draft legislation.

The chairman's actions are not only at odds with our committee and my colleagues who sit on the Homeland Security Committee but with our colleagues on the House Homeland Security Committee and Trump administration officials, including Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem and National Cyber Director Sean Cairncross—all who want to see this extension for 10 years.

In April of this year, Senator ROUNDS and I introduced a bipartisan bill that would provide a clean extension for the law for 10 years, ensuring that the private sector can continue to rely on these protections for years to come.

With just days before this law will expire and without action from the chairman of the committee, I urge my colleagues to quickly pass this bill. Keep one of our strongest cyber security defenses in place. If we don't move now, we will essentially open the door for cyber criminals and foreign adversaries to do irrevocable damage to our information networks, our major industries, and our economy as a whole.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1337 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS
AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise to discuss the Democratic continuing resolution proposal that was on the floor earlier.

Neither proposal gained sufficient votes, and that means we have work to do to find a compromise that will enable the government to stay open, and I want to make clear why I believe the Democratic proposal has some real strong merit for Virginians and for Members of this body, both Democratic and Republican, and why I think this is such a strong proposal.

My advocacy for the Democratic position is basically focused on two issues: healthcare and the underlying basic notion that we all get—that a deal should be a deal.

During August, I think, as most of us did, I traveled around my home State of Virginia a lot and talked to many people. The Senate had passed the reconciliation bill—that partisan bill—in July, and during the August recess, I heard a boatload from Virginians about their concerns.

Because of that reconciliation bill, six hospitals in Virginia are at risk of closure. These hospitals are all in the rural parts of the Commonwealth.

There are 302,000-plus Virginians who will likely completely lose their health insurance, 136,000 will lose the health insurance that they are currently able to access through the Affordable Care Act, and another 166,000 will likely lose health insurance because of cuts to the Medicaid Program. Virginia has a population of about 8½ million; 302,000 people losing their health insurance is pretty significant.

Those who continue to have health insurance will see significant premium increases. According to the State Corporation Commission, which is the body in Virginia that regulates industries like insurance companies, the 10 insurers that participate in the Virginia individual market in 2026 have requested rate increases from their 2025 rates, with most insurers proposing average increases of 20 percent or higher.

What would that mean? The Kaiser Family Foundation says a family of four, with two adults aged 50 and two kids under 21, are likely to pay an additional \$311 per month, or \$3,729 per year, because of the reconciliation reduction of ACA tax credits.

Virginia hospitals stand to lose up to \$26 billion in Medicaid cuts over the course of the next 14 years because of the reconciliation bill. That is the reason why a number of rural hospitals that are sort of on the edge in terms of their financial situation are on the list of concerns about closure.

Just within the last 2 weeks, we actually had the first closures in Virginia. A well-respected healthcare network in the Shenandoah Valley that has a hospital in Augusta County but then has primary care clinics sort of throughout the region that serves patients who can

be served there instead of a hospital announced that three of the primary care clinics are closing, and the CEO of the Healthcare Network said they are closing because of the Medicaid cuts made in the reconciliation bill that this body passed in July.

I also heard a lot of stories just from individuals. These are the statistics about what is going to happen in Virginia because of the reconciliation bill, but we talk to constituents all the time.

Mary from Springfield, VA—Northern Virginia—and Kim from Mecklenburg County on the North Carolina border both have children with disabilities who rely on Medicaid for access to care to allow their children to remain in their homes instead of in institutional settings. These moms are very worried that Medicaid cuts won't be available for their children's long-term care.

Brenda is a mother in Salem, VA, near Roanoke. She relies on Medicaid to help her remain in her home and not have to be institutionalized, and she worries that the Medicaid cuts will cost her access to the supports that she needs.

William in Virginia Beach, VA, on our eastern coast, says that his son has Marketplace coverage but is worried that the cuts to the ACA premiums mean that the son will no longer have access to that insurance now that the reconciliation bill has put those premium subsidies on a path to expiration.

Maria works as an employee of an affordable housing community for seniors in Fairfax, right here in the DC area. She said that since the passage of the reconciliation bill, she has seen a growing number of low-income seniors come into her office frightened that their Medicaid coverage will be reduced or terminated.

Sharon lives in Lancaster County, which is in a part of Virginia called the Northern Neck, near the Chesapeake Bay. She has called to ask my office if Rappahannock General Hospital was in jeopardy of closing due to the reconciliation bill. Rappahannock hospital is a facility I know well because my in-laws lived right there in Lancaster before they passed away in the last couple of years. It is one of the six hospitals that is listed on the national list as a hospital in jeopardy as Medicaid cuts phase in.

Then, finally, Caroline from Lynchburg, VA, in Central Virginia, has had coverage through the Virginia Marketplace and is concerned that she will no longer have access to the tax credits and subsidies that have helped her afford health insurance.

These are just seven examples of citizens from all over the Commonwealth whom the reconciliation bill—I read the big statistics about it, but these are individual families who have significant challenges.

What the Democratic CR proposal does is something that many Republicans in this body have said needs to

be done. In the aftermath of the reconciliation bill, we are hearing similar stories from our constituents and that we need to fix especially the ACA premium support so that people do not lose health insurance, and we also need to fix some of the Medicaid cuts that caused the concerns that I expressed from these seven individuals.

My visit around Virginia in August sort of made me see this healthcare concern as sort of a spectrum. When you make cuts to Medicaid or to these premiums, five different things happen:

People lose health insurance.

Those who retain health insurance see their premiums go up often because the folks without insurance go to the emergency rooms. That is more expensive care. It has to be paid for, and that tends to assist in driving up the premium cost of those who retain insurance.

Third, as I have indicated has already happened in Virginia, providers close. And when providers close, there is a fourth effect, which is people lose their jobs.

Then the fifth effect is one that I think we should talk about as well. It is not just people losing health insurance and having their premiums go up and seeing their providers close and seeing healthcare professionals lose their jobs; there is a fifth effect.

I was a mayor, and I was a Governor. I did a lot of economic development work in Virginia. I know that one of the things that businesses really care about, if they are looking for places to locate or expand, is what is the local availability of healthcare? It is really difficult to be in a community and try to pitch an economic development project but have the question asked: "Tell us about your hospital. Tell us about your healthcare network" and to explain that "we had a hospital, but it closed. We have had healthcare clinics that closed." That makes it very, very difficult.

This fifth effect is an economic effect. The decline in healthcare clinics and hospitals, actually, is sort of like a theft of a community's future because it makes it very difficult to get people to come.

That is why I think the Democratic proposal is a solid one. And I do recognize that in the aftermath of the passage of the reconciliation bill, many Republican colleagues—both in this Chamber and the House—have said that it is important to come back and fix particularly the expiration of the ACA premium tax subsidies. I think that would be a very smart thing for us all to do.

Finally, there is a second reason I really like the Democratic proposal, and it is this: A deal should be a deal. The Democratic proposal has some components in it that would ensure that when Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate reach a deal that goes to the President's desk and he signs it, that the President then can't immediately take the money away unilaterally.

I think everybody around my Commonwealth—Democrat, Republican, Independent, or the vast majority who don't really care that much about politics—they get that a deal should be a deal. When you negotiate and you shake hands, a deal should be a deal.

This actually is related to healthcare as well. In last year's budget, we had a deal about spending on healthcare priorities. Early in this administration, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., announced that he was clawing back billions of dollars of healthcare funding. To Virginia, it was \$400 million—\$400 million of healthcare funding that we had planned on using during the worst increase in measles, for example, in recent years. It got clawed back from Virginia, and 500 workers and contractors lost their jobs as we were trying to deal with measles and other health epidemics.

I have communities in Virginia that had had economic development projects announced, and they were counting on them for their future. Often, the announcements were attended with great fanfare by our Governor—Governor Youngkin, who is a Republican, who believed these economic deals were a good thing. They were reliant on funding from the Inflation Reduction Act or from the CHIPS manufacturing bill, but those funds, in many instances, have been clawed back.

A deal should be a deal. When we reach a deal, it should be honored so that communities do not plan for healthcare workers, do not plan for economic development projects and feel the rug pulled out from under them.

So those two features of the Democratic proposal: fixing some of the healthcare cuts in the reconciliation bill that, even by many Republicans' accounts, have gone too far; that have already led to closures of clinics in Virginia and great anxiety among individuals.

We can fix those, and we can establish a principle that should be one that we would all agree on that a deal should be a deal.

I hope as we grapple with the two proposals on the table, neither of which we were able to get 60 votes and be passed, we can take some of the wisdom in these Democratic proposals that would serve Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all over this country and make sure that we include them going forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to con-

sider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar No. 433 through Calendar No. 437, Calendar No. 438, with the exception of Brig. Gen. Gary R. Charlton, II, Calendar Nos. 439 through 447, and Calendar No. 449 and Calendar No. 450, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk, with the exception of PN89; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154:

To be general

Gen. Christopher J. Mahoney

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Sara A. Stigler

Col. Robert B. Taylor

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joshua D. Armstrong

Col. Ryan D. Ayers

Col. Gavin M. Batchelder

Col. Jesse R. Carlson

Col. Travis J. Crawford

Col. Ryan F. Dannemann

Col. Joseph P. Geaney

Col. David L. Halasi-Kun

Col. Chad E. Holesko

Col. Amee C. Howard

Col. Jared P. Kennish, Jr.

Col. Carol J. Kohtz

Col. Matthew S. Komatsu

Col. Brock E. Lange

Col. Jeremy C. Phillips

Col. Derek B. Routt

Col. Denise K. Sweeney

Col. Natasha S. Taylor

Col. Eric A. Underhill

Col. Bart T. Van Roo

Col. Leah V. Voelker

Col. Sheldon B. Wilson

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Lynn M. Lee

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Daniel M. Fesler