

on the watch as we speak. It is our obligation to them to give them the tools they need to protect us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest that this is the most significant bill we have passed in the last 59 years.

Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to the motion to invoke cloture on the veto message on H.R. 6395, the NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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 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 veto message on H.R. 6395, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Todd Young, John Cornyn, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Braun, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitt Romney, Susan M. Collins, Richard C. Shelby, Thom Tillis, Lamar Alexander.

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 veto message on H.R. 6395, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Alexander	Feinstein	Reed
Baldwin	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Harris	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rounds
Blunt	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Hoeven	Schumer
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kelly	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cooms	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Udall
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Peters	Young
Ernst	Portman	

NAYS—12

Booker	Lee	Sanders
Braun	Markey	Van Hollen
Hawley	Merkley	Warren
Kennedy	Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Cotton	Graham	Perdue
Cruz	Jones	Sasse
Gardner	Loeffler	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 12.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are going to go on to final passage, and I just want to make one comment that this is a really significant vote, not just because it is the NDAA and many of us contend, as I do, every year that the NDAA is the most significant vote that we have, but this year especially so in light of all the disruptions and problems that we have had.

Once again, I want to say how great it has been to work and show the American people that Democrats and Republicans can work together and get significant legislation passed. I am very proud that we had this bill, and I am proud to have worked with Senator REED and his staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this legislation is central to the national security of the United States and to the welfare of the troops and their families who defend us every day.

I would urge all my colleagues to vote to override the veto.

I want to thank Senator INHOFE for his leadership and congratulate John Bonsell on the Republican side and Liz King on the Democratic side.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON H.R. 6395

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate?

If not, the question is, Shall the bill (H.R. 6395) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Feinstein	Reed
Baldwin	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Harris	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rounds
Blunt	Heinrich	Rubio
Boozman	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Hoeven	Schumer
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kelly	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Cooms	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Udall
Daines	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Enzi	Peters	Wicker
Ernst	Portman	Young

NAYS—13

Booker	Kennedy	Sanders
Braun	Lee	Warren
Cotton	Markey	Wyden
Cruz	Merkley	
Hawley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Gardner	Jones	Perdue
Graham	Loeffler	Sasse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 13.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present and having voted in the affirmative, the bill on reconsideration is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Arkansas.

DRIFTNET MODERNISATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION ACT—VETO

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask consent that the veto message on S. 906, the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, be considered as

having been read and spread upon the Journal in full and that the message be printed in the RECORD.

The veto message is ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning, without my approval, S. 906, the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act. America's fishermen have made great sacrifices to ensure that our Nation's marine fisheries are a sustainable economic engine for coastal communities. Under my Administration, the number of United States fish stocks subject to overfishing is at a historic low. This achievement is the result of a transparent and collaborative regulatory process that is supported by regional fishery management councils. At council meetings, fishermen work with Federal Government and State government representatives to meet their statutory obligations under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

In passing S. 906, the Congress has ignored the fact that the regional fishery management process has had strong, bipartisan support since its creation. By forcing the West Coast drift gillnet fishery to use alternative gear that has not been proven to be an economically viable substitute for gillnets, the Congress is effectively terminating the fishery. As a result, an estimated 30 fishing vessels, all of which are operated by family-owned small businesses, will no longer be able to bring their bounty to shore. At a time when our Nation has a seafood trade deficit of nearly \$17 billion, S. 906 will exacerbate this imbalance.

Further, S. 906 will not achieve its purported conservation benefits. The West Coast drift gillnet fishery is subject to robust legal and regulatory requirements for environmental protection that equal or exceed the environmental protections that apply to foreign fisheries. Without this fishery, Americans will import more swordfish and other species from foreign sources that frequently have more bycatch than our own fisheries. If the Congress wants to address bycatch, it should insist on a level playing field for imported seafood instead of crushing American fishing families.

My Administration has done more for American fishermen than any President before me. On May 7, 2020, I signed an Executive Order on Promoting American Seafood Competitiveness and Economic Growth to bolster our domestic seafood industry while curbing illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing abroad. On June 5, 2020, I issued a Proclamation on Modifying the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument to open it to commercial fishing that is conducted in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable laws, regulations, and requirements. And as fishermen struggled to stay on the water during the pandemic, I issued a Memorandum on Protecting the United

States Lobster Industry and later made approximately \$530 million available, through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Seafood Trade Relief Program, to support the United States seafood industry and fishermen affected by retaliatory tariffs from foreign governments.

My Administration would support provisions of the enrolled bill, if passed separately, which would authorize fee collection in a different fishery—the Pacific Halibut fishery. This authority is needed to implement a provision of the International Pacific Halibut Commission Convention, to which the United States is a party. However, for the sake of American fishermen nationwide, I will not let the Congress circumvent the fisheries management process by effectively terminating a fishery without appropriate consultation and input from fishery management councils. If this occurred, it would increase our reliance on imported seafood and take away the livelihoods of hard-working Americans and their family businesses. It is my duty to return S. 906 to the Senate without my approval.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 1, 2021.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the time has come to declare victory and come home from the war in Afghanistan—the longest war in the history of our country.

Over 4,000 Americans have died fighting in Afghanistan, and over 20,000 have been wounded. It is time to bring our soldiers home.

After the 9/11 attacks, I supported going into Afghanistan. We were absolutely justified in rooting out the Taliban who harbored al-Qaida.

Had I been in Congress at that time, I would have voted in favor of going into Afghanistan.

But the people who attacked us on 9/11 have all been killed or captured. They are long gone. But we are still there.

Most of the people fighting us in Afghanistan today are the successors or children or the children of their children.

The cycle shows no sign of ending. The war shows no sign of ending. It is not sustainable to keep fighting in Afghanistan generation after generation.

Here is some perspective: We have been fighting in Afghanistan for so long that when the 9/11 attacks happened, our youngest soldiers fighting

there today weren't even born yet. American fathers who fought in Afghanistan are now watching as their sons fight in Afghanistan.

We have spent about \$1 trillion to establish an Afghan government—a government that is rife with corruption and dysfunction. It is a government that cannot perform much of any government function on its own. So we spend more to do for them what they still cannot do for themselves.

A trillion dollars and we have hardly progressed from where we started.

Yet instead of outrage—which is how most Americans feel—the reaction from Congress is, gosh, maybe let's spend a trillion more.

After World War II, much of Europe was reduced to rubble. It was utterly destroyed. So we rebuilt Europe through the Marshall Plan.

We have now spent many times more to rebuild Afghanistan than we did under the Marshall Plan. What has that money gotten us?

We have built infrastructure in Afghanistan and then watched it deteriorate and watched the Afghans be unable to even maintain the infrastructure we built for them, and then they ask us for more money to maintain the structure. So we rebuild the infrastructure we just built for them.

Meanwhile, our roads and our bridges here at home crumble as we spend millions upon millions to rebuild the infrastructure in Afghanistan.

I want to walk through some examples of how our money has been used in Afghanistan.

Several years ago, we reportedly hired a local security consultant to help secure road construction projects, at a cost of \$1 million per year. But according to the report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, American officials came to suspect that the money was being funneled to insurgents to stage attacks on our infrastructure, which could be used to justify the security contract.

So our money was going to a guy who was apparently paying insurgents to stage attacks against him so he could justify his security contract. It is crazy.

We spent \$43 million on a natural gas, gas station. Guess how many vehicles in Afghanistan run on natural gas. Zero. You can't even find the gas station. My staff actually went there to see how the money had been spent, and they were told they couldn't go there because it was too unsafe. Now the report is that the gas station has been abandoned—and with it \$43 million flushed away.

We spent nearly \$80 million on a luxury hotel. Why is the American taxpayer building luxury hotels in Kabul? Guess what. It was abandoned halfway through. It is a skeleton. The Taliban are now said to climb up into the structure and shoot down at our Embassy.

We spent about \$400 million on equipment and other things to create an Afghan Army Corps of Engineers. Except