

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2983

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, on October 1, critical cyber security protections expired, and, as a result of that, our Nation is now more vulnerable to cyber attacks than ever before. For nearly a decade, businesses and government Agencies have been able to rely on these authorities to share information about cyber attacks and help prevent them from becoming more widespread.

That is why I introduced the bipartisan Protecting America from Cyber Threats Act with Senator ROUNDS to restore these vital protections. A broad coalition of nearly 80 stakeholders, from healthcare and financial services to energy and utilities, to transportation and technology, support passing this legislation to ensure that they can continue voluntarily sharing information about cyber security threats with the Federal Government.

Here is what a few of them had to say.

The Business Software Alliance said we need to pass this legislation quickly, arguing that “further delays in renewing this program will only serve to entrench information-sharing silos between government and industry and needlessly set back United States’ over all cybersecurity posture.”

The Connected Health Initiative said:

The healthcare ecosystem is uniquely vulnerable to cyber incidents, and the damage caused by them particularly severe—so the reasonable liability protections the legislation would reauthorize are [absolutely] desperately needed to ensure patient security and privacy.

The CEO of USTelecom said:

The Protecting America from Cyber Threats Act reaffirms what has always made our nation’s cyber defenses strong: the trusted partnership between industry and government. By reauthorizing key information sharing protections, Congress ensures that private innovation and public stewardship continue to work hand in hand to safeguard our networks, protect our citizens, and reinforce the shared resilience that defines Americans cybersecurity leadership.

The American Bankers Association said:

The information exchanges that this legislation facilitates will significantly enhance the financial sector’s ability to respond to large-scale cyber incidents, strengthen our defenses, and safeguard customer data. Allowing these protections to lapse chills threat sharing and impedes rapid response, leaving banks, customers, and the broader economy more vulnerable to adversaries.

Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has weighed in and said:

Lawmakers must quickly reauthorize these cyber information-sharing authorities to give businesses legal certainty and protection against frivolous lawsuits when voluntarily sharing and receiving threat data.

The Alliance of Automotive Information has said:

This policy has worked. And as vehicles get more digital and more connected—and

connect to other devices, vehicles, and infrastructure—the cyberattack surface will [only] grow exponentially. We need this landmark law to stay on the books to secure the mobility ecosystem from current and future cybersecurity threats.

The National Association of Manufacturers said:

Sharing information about cyber threats and risk mitigation measures is [absolutely] fundamental to manufacturers’ efforts to improve their cybersecurity posture and protect themselves and their customers.

Bottom line: These are just a few of the leaders across key industries who are calling for us to pass this legislation immediately—today. This is about protecting the systems that power our homes and connect our families and keep our economy running. It is about giving our cyber defenders the tools that they need to act fast and to act smart.

Our adversaries are not going to stop their attacks. But without this law in place, many of our Nation’s companies and critical infrastructure will be in the dark as they try to defend themselves.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation today so we can protect our economy and our entire Nation from the threats of cyber attacks.

As if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 182, S. 2983; that the Peters substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VOTE ON PRATT NOMINATION

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Pratt nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 592 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Cornyn	Grassley
Barrasso	Cotton	Hagerty
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hoeben
Britt	Cruz	Husted
Budd	Curtis	Hyde-Smith
Capito	Daines	Johnson
Cassidy	Fischer	Justice
Collins	Graham	Kennedy

Lankford	Mullin	Sheehy
Lee	Murkowski	Sullivan
Lummis	Paul	Thune
Marshall	Ricketts	Tillis
McConnell	Risch	Tuberville
McCormick	Rounds	Wicker
Moody	Schmitt	Young
Moran	Scott (FL)	
Moreno	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Ernst

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). 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.

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 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. 457, Edmund G. LaCour, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Katie Boyd Britt, Chuck Grassley, James Lankford, Pete Ricketts, Markwayne Mullin, Tim Sheehy, Jon A. Husted, Eric Schmitt, Jim Justice, James E. Risch, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, Ted Budd, John R. Curtis, John Boozman.

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 Edmund G. LaCour, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 593 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Padilla

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edmund G. LaCour, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on the confirmation of the LaCour nomination at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no earlier than Wednesday, October 29; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED TO IMPOSE DUTIES ON ARTICLES IMPORTED FROM BRAZIL

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask the Chair to execute the order of October 7 with respect to S.J. Res. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session, and the Committee on Finance is discharged of S.J. Res. 81, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) terminating the national emergency declared to impose duties on articles imported from Brazil.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 29

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about my Sunshine Protection Act—a bipartisan, bicameral bill that returns power to each State and its citizens and that will end the twice-yearly time change and make daylight saving time the national, year-round standard.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the Sunshine Protection Act, which is at the desk; further, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do object to the legislation, and I will outline my reasons a bit more later. But I defer to my good friends from Florida, Alabama, and Rhode Island to speak on behalf of that bill before I explain my opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. First, I want to recognize the Senator from Rhode Island to speak about the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, each November, we fall back into darkness very literally. If we pass my Sunshine Protection Act and make daylight saving time permanent, we would gain an hour of afternoon sunlight in the winter months for families to soak up after work and after school.

This measure has been so bipartisan that it has previously passed this body by unanimous consent.

Here is what President Trump said about it:

The House and Senate should push hard for more Daylight at the end of a day. Very popular and, most importantly, no more changing of the clocks, a big inconvenience and, for our government, A VERY COSTLY EVENT!!!

My cosponsor before Senator SCOTT came here was his predecessor from Florida, Senator Rubio, who is now our Secretary of State, who said that we should “stop enduring the ridiculous and antiquated practice of switching our clocks back and forth. Let’s . . . end the need to ‘fall back’ and ‘spring forward’ for good.”

I don’t always agree with President Trump and with former-Senator, now-Secretary Rubio, but I sure do agree about this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I would like to recognize my cosponsor from Alabama, Senator TUBERVILLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to once again talk about the outdated practice of changing our clocks twice a year.

This weekend, my constituents back home in Alabama and across America will be forced to change their clocks. As a result, it will be dark in Washington, DC, at 5 p.m. next week. In the 5 years I have served here in the Senate, making daylight saving time permanent is the No. 1 issue that I hear about back home.

I am proud to have joined my colleague RICK SCOTT earlier this year in reintroducing the Sunshine Protection Act to make daylight saving time permanent on the Federal level. Unfortunately, it hasn’t been brought to the floor for a vote. So here I am advocating once again to make the outdated practice of changing our clock a thing of the past.

For nearly 60 years, Americans have changed their clocks back and forth twice a year, but the roots of daylight saving time trace back much further. Daylight saving time was introduced during World War I and then reused again during World War II as a temporary way to help conserve fuel and energy. Following the ends of both wars, the decision to spring forward and fall back was returned to individual States. It wasn’t until 1966 that the system of changing our clocks twice a year that we use now was made permanent.

Changing our clocks twice a year might have made sense in the 1960s, but it doesn’t make sense anymore. The twice-a-year time change doesn’t make sense today.

We know the devastating impact the disruption from so-called standard time has on Americans’ health. Studies have suggested that disruption of sleep patterns due to time changes increases the risk of cardiovascular disease and physical injury. Northwestern Medicine found that “fall back” and “spring forward” are connected to a 6-percent spike in fatal car accidents and a 24-percent higher risk of heart attacks. Think about that. Additionally, the long-term health effects linked to changing our clocks include weight gain, cluster headaches, and depression. You would think we would listen to all of that.

The bottom line is that shifting our clocks disrupts sleep patterns, and it has been proven time and time again to be harmful to our health.

Thanks to R.F.K., Jr.’s, great work at HHS, a lot of Americans are taking