

guess as to what it might mean, and a whole lot of them are already preparing their own policies—in some cases, already adopting them and enforcing them based on their own anticipation of what the mandate may be. What it means as a practical matter is, you can't sue anyone. You can't sue any administrator in the Biden administration or elsewhere in the Federal Government who is going to be enforcing this because you don't know what they are going to be enforcing. There isn't a dispute ripe for adjudication in any court anywhere because we don't know what that is.

For many people, this entire exercise could be rendered moot in the meantime, not just moot in the sense that the court would lack article III jurisdiction to entertain the dispute in question, but moot in the sense that they might lose their job, moot in the sense that they are going to have to face this awful Hobson's choice between maintaining their ability to provide for their family, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, receiving a medical procedure that they would deem harmful and objectionable based on their religious or other sincerely held beliefs. This is not America; this is not acceptable; and this is not and cannot possibly be constitutional.

We should be able to do this.

I am going to be back tomorrow, the next day, and as long as it takes to keep addressing this issue. Freedom matters, and the Constitution matters. President Biden has ignored them both. Thank you.

#### VOTE ON PHEE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Phee nomination?

Mr. MURPHY. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 388 Ex.]

#### YEAS—67

Baldwin	Duckworth	Markey
Bennet	Durbin	McConnell
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Menendez
Blunt	Graham	Merkley
Booker	Grassley	Murkowski
Brown	Hassan	Murphy
Burr	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Ossoff
Capito	Hirono	Padilla
Cardin	Inhofe	Peters
Carper	Kaine	Portman
Casey	Kelly	Reed
Collins	King	Risch
Coons	Klobuchar	Romney
Cornyn	Leahy	Rosen
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Rounds
Crapo	Manchin	Sanders

Schatz	Sullivan	Warren
Schumer	Tester	Whitehouse
Shaheen	Tillis	Wyden
Sinema	Van Hollen	Young
Smith	Warner	
Stabenow	Warnock	

#### NAYS—31

Barrasso	Hagerty	Rubio
Blackburn	Hawley	Sasse
Boozman	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Tuberville
Daines	Lummis	Wicker
Ernst	Marshall	
Fischer	Paul	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Moran
-----------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). 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.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Todd D. Robinson, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, we heard over the course of many hours last week and, indeed, over the many months that Foreign Affairs nominees have been languishing on the Senate floor, the concerns of the junior Senator from Texas related to the Nord Stream 2 pipeline. We also have heard at length from Members of this body about the humanitarian situation in Afghanistan—from the junior Senator from Missouri.

As I have said publicly and repeatedly, I share my colleague's concerns about the Nord Stream 2 pipeline. He put up a series of my quotes. They are all true. I am still of that view, but I am not of the view that you stop the national security apparatus in order to pursue a policy difference and create a whole host of other serious risks for the United States.

I believe and have said that the evacuation from Afghanistan was fatally flawed. In fact, the Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing and heard from Secretary Blinken about the situation in Afghanistan. The Foreign Relations Committee is holding a briefing tomorrow about the administration's efforts to bolster European energy security to counter Russia's efforts in this area. And I intend to continue oversight of the situation in Afghanistan and why, over the course of 20 years, we have failed.

What I fail to understand is the relationship between the foreign affairs

nominees pending before this body and those topics. These individuals are critical to confronting numerous other global challenges, promoting American values, and advancing the safety, health, and economic well-being of America. We need them confirmed today—today.

I therefore will rise to seek unanimous consent for the confirmation of 10 nominees, including seven career diplomats. Each of them moved through the Foreign Relations Committee with bipartisan support. There is no reason for Republicans to block their confirmation.

Let me speak to them for a minute or two.

This is especially the case at the U.S. Agency for International Development. The Administrator of USAID, Samantha Power, is the only member of that Agency's senior leadership that has been confirmed by this body. Ambassador Power needs her senior leadership team in place. Yet her two deputies are languishing on the floor because of Republican holds.

This Agency is grappling with the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and other humanitarian emergencies that are ravaging the globe. It simply cannot function at its best without senior leadership. So why is it that Republicans insist on blocking Paloma Adams-Allen and Isobel Coleman, two highly qualified nominees to serve as USAID Deputy Administrators?

Let me take a moment to once again raise Haiti. We hear a lot about Haiti here on the floor, particularly from our Republican colleagues, and the challenge at the border.

Well, in August, a massive earthquake in Haiti killed more than 2,200 people, injured 12,000 more, and destroyed tens of thousands of buildings. This comes after the assassination of Haiti's President. But here, again, Republicans are holding a senior member of Ambassador Powers' team, Marcela Escobari, the nominee to be the Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean at USAID. Escobari, who will manage our response to the Haiti earthquake, once confirmed, already held this very job in the Obama administration. Guess what. She was confirmed by voice vote then.

Now we want to deal with the challenge of Haitian refugees coming to the border and other refugees of the hemisphere coming to the border. Let's confirm the USAID Deputy Administrator who will deal with that issue so we can deal with the root causes. How do we create stability in Haiti? How do we provide relief for the Haitian people? How do we create feeding for the Haitian people so they are not fleeing their country? But, no, we are going to stop this nominee who is going to be at the very heart of that. So when you see a new group of Haitian refugees, blame yourself.

We spent many months in this body talking about the challenges posed by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The U.S. Innovation and

Competition Act, passed by this body in June, and the Strategic Competition Act, which passed almost unanimously out of the Foreign Relations Committee, 21 to 1, are proof of that. We have collectively come together on this much: to recognize China as the greatest geopolitical and geoeconomic challenge for U.S. foreign policy. We have rightfully focused on effectively confronting Chinese malign influence. Yet we are failing to ensure a fundamentally critical element of that strategy; that is, empowered leadership in our diplomatic corps across the world.

Our former colleague Senator Ken Salazar is the only—hear me—the only Biden administration nominee who has been confirmed to serve as a country Ambassador representing U.S. interests abroad, the only one in the 9 months of this administration.

Let me be clear. Holding up diplomats is effectively ceding influence to China and actively undermining U.S. national security interests. People come to the floor and talk about China. Well, they are empowering China by not having our people in position to counter their influence.

It is a fact that Congo and Angola owe over 40 percent of their entire national debt—to whom? To China. So I ask my colleagues, why have we not yet confirmed Tulinabo Mushingi, a career Foreign Service officer, as our Ambassador to Angola? Why have we not yet confirmed Eugene Young, another career Foreign Service officer, as our Ambassador to the Congo?

China and Somalia have recently entered into a new fishing agreement, and Chinese vessels are increasingly accessing Somalia's waters and strategic coastline adjacent to the Red Sea. Why have we not confirmed Larry Andre, Jr., a career Foreign Service officer, as our Ambassador to Somalia?

China's influence is spread across the continent of Africa, including its Belt and Road Initiative, which is branded as a development initiative but being used by China to advance its own interests. Why have we not yet confirmed Elizabeth Aubin and Maria Brewer, two career Foreign Service officers, as our Ambassadors to Algeria and Lesotho, respectively?

I spoke on the Senate floor several months ago about Chinese influence in Cameroon. We have not had an American Ambassador in Cameroon in over a year. Why have we not yet confirmed Christopher John Lamora, a career Foreign Service officer, as our Ambassador to Cameroon?

Vietnam sits on the border of China. It is on the frontlines of Chinese coercion in the South China Sea. Why have we not yet confirmed Mark Knapper, a career Foreign Service officer, as our Ambassador to Vietnam?

Colleagues, each of these nominees I mentioned deserves to be confirmed today, and our national security interests demand it.

In pursuit of what I hope will be a recognition of that—because at some

point, something is going to happen here in the world, in one of these countries or one of these regions. When it happens and we don't have our representative there, I think a Member who is objecting is going to have to live with that reality.

Let me ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 336, Paloma Adams-Allen to be a Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order in terms of the nomination; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Reserving the right to object, I appreciate the earnestness on this issue from my friend and colleague the Senator from New Jersey. He mentions that something could happen in the world, that something will happen in the world. Something, I submit to you, has happened in the world, and today we have been learning about it. I am talking about the crisis in Afghanistan, the debacle in Afghanistan.

All day, the Senate has been hearing testimony in the Armed Services Committee from Secretary Austin, from General Milley, and from General McKenzie about how it came to be that 13 American servicemembers are dead, 169 civilians killed, and hundreds of Americans left behind enemy lines there as we still speak—the greatest foreign policy crisis that this country has seen since Vietnam. And those aren't my words; those are the words—the comparison of the Democratic members of the committee who repeatedly referenced today Vietnam, the fall of Saigon. That is the level of crisis that we are dealing with.

What accountability has there been for this crisis, for this debacle? Because "crisis" isn't even quite the right word. That sounds like a natural disaster, as if it accidentally happened. That is not the case. This is a debacle, a failure of leadership in the first order, and what accountability has there been for it? Who has resigned? Who has been fired? Who has been relieved of command? Nobody. What actions have the administration taken? None.

What does Secretary Austin say today? He says: Well, we will take a hard look at ourselves, and we will ask some tough questions.

Mr. President, that is not nearly good enough. Americans are dead. Americans are stranded behind enemy lines. Our foreign policies are in a state of collapse. Our national security is in a state of collapse. Enemies around the world are watching what is happening in Afghanistan, are seeing an oppor-

tunity as the United States shows weakness and disarray and chaos. There must be accountability.

Let me say something more about what we learned today because we did learn quite a lot, and all of it is frightening. We learned that the President of the United States lied. He lied when he said to the American people in an interview on television just a few weeks ago that he was never told by any of his military advisers—never told that a drawdown on this timetable, his timetable, would result in catastrophe.

He was asked by George Stephanopoulos:

Your top military advisers warned against withdrawing on this [timetable]. They wanted you to keep about 2,500 troops.

President Biden:

No, they didn't.

Stephanopoulos:

They didn't tell you that they wanted troops to stay?

President Biden:

No.

Stephanopoulos:

So no one told—your military advisers did not tell you, "No, we should just keep 2,500 troops."

President Biden:

No. No one said that to me that I can recall.

Today, we heard from General Milley, General McKenzie, and Secretary Austin, who—each of them said that they advised the President—it was their considered military judgment that the President's plans were mistaken. They advised against it. They advised him against it. Yet he said: No, no one ever told me. I am not responsible. No one ever told me.

We also learned this: We learned that the President lied when he said that he had no idea that the Taliban would take over the country in such a short time period.

From the same interview, George Stephanopoulos said to President Biden:

Back in July, you said a Taliban takeover was highly unlikely. Was the intelligence wrong, or did you downplay it?

Biden said: No. I think that there was no consensus. If you go back and look, they said it is not going to happen.

Stephanopoulos:

[But] you didn't put a timeline on it when you said it was highly unlikely. You just flat out [said], "It's highly unlikely the Taliban would take over."

President Biden said:

Yeah.

We learned today, in fact, that his commander on the ground, General Miller, warned as early as March, March of this year, that the military situation in Afghanistan was deteriorating rapidly; that the Taliban was on the offensive; that the drawdown of American troops would likely result in the collapse of the Afghan Government and the Afghan security forces sooner rather than later. It was going to come fast is what General Miller said. Yet

the President says no one ever told him that. He never knew about it. In fact, his own commanders on the ground warned him about it.

What was the consequence of this? Well, the President is either forgetting or ignoring or just outright lying about what he was advised by his own commanders.

His administration was failing to plan for the collapse of the Afghan security forces. We learned that today too. Secretary Austin said: We just didn't plan for a scenario of an Afghan security forces collapse. We didn't plan for it.

Why didn't they plan for it? Why isn't somebody being held accountable for it?

The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan has been warning for years that the Afghan security forces were not ready, that they were not well equipped, that they were not well trained, and that they would not likely stand on their own. We know that the commander on the ground shared the same assessment. Yet the administration did not plan for—by their own admission did not plan for the collapse of the Afghan security forces or the collapse of the Afghan Government, which also meant that they did not order the evacuation of American civilians in time. They dilly-dallied. They waited. They dithered. They did not order the evacuation in time. They waited until the middle of August to undertake an evacuation of civilians in earnest, after American troops had withdrawn from the country. No wonder there was chaos in Kabul. No wonder there was a total disaster. That is the administration's fault. They waited because they hadn't planned. They waited because apparently they were fighting among themselves—the State Department, Defense Department, the White House—all fighting because President Biden wasn't leading. It was a total debacle, total chaos.

My friend the Senator from New Jersey quite reasonably wants to know, what is the connection? Why I am objecting to these nominees? Why do I want a vote?

Here is the connection: It is about accountability. No one has been held accountable. I note the Senator wants to hear from Secretary Austin in his committee. He should hear from the Secretary in his committee because what we learned today contradicts quite a lot of the testimony that the Secretary of State gave to the Senator from New Jersey and his committee earlier—quite a lot of contradictions. He is quite right to want to hear from Secretary Austin.

We need to do more than hear from him; we need to have accountability for what has happened. Until we get that accountability, until someone is held responsible, until there is some turn, some change, some shift in policy—and I have called for the resignations of General Milley, Secretary Austin, Secretary Blinken, and the na-

tional security advisers, all of whom planned and executed this operation. Until there is accountability, I think the least the Senate can do is actually vote, take at least a vote on this floor for nominees to leadership position at the State Department and the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I have remarks.

I ask that it be in order to make the same unanimous consent request to Calendar No. 337, Isobel Coleman to be Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 323, Marcela Escobari, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 237, Tulinabo S. Mushingi, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Angola, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 238, Eugene S. Young, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 233, Larry Edward Andre, Jr.,

of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Somalia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 234, Elizabeth Moore Aubin, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 235, Maria E. Brewer, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Lesotho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 236, Christopher John Lamora, of Rhode Island, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cameroon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to make the same request with respect to Executive Calendar No. 317, Marc Evans Knapper, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri wants accountability. That is fine. But from a slew of

career Foreign Service officers who had absolutely nothing—nothing—to do with whatever decisions were made in Afghanistan, that is where the accountability is going to come from?

These are people who have committed their lives to serving the United States of America. They have committed their lives either in Republican or Democratic administrations. It doesn't matter. They carry out the mission of the United States and its foreign policy as dictated by the President and Congress. They had nothing—nothing—Sao Tome and Principe? The Congo? Somalia? Algeria? Lesotho? Cameroon? Vietnam?—to do with the decisions in Afghanistan. Yet they are the ones we are going to extract a pound of flesh of accountability from—on people who had absolutely nothing to do with the decisions on Afghanistan and who have committed their lives to the career Foreign Service. These aren't political nominees. These are career Foreign Service officers.

I heard my colleague talk about—that our enemies around the world are emboldened. Well, guess what. They are really going to be emboldened when we have no Ambassador to counter them in these countries, because they have gotten clear sailing. They can do whatever they want. They can talk to those heads of state.

There is no American Ambassador to go in and talk to that head of state and say: Mr. President or Mr. Prime Minister—whatever the title may be—don't make that choice. It would be a bad choice. We offer you a different alternative. We offer you a different set of principles, a different set of values—ones that would inure to the benefit of your country.

But no, there is no one from the United States of America who is going to be able to go into those countries and say any of that, because we are going to extract—when I say “we,” I should retract that. The Senator from Missouri wants to extract accountability on people who have done absolutely nothing as it relates to making these decisions.

When we have problems in this hemisphere with migration, I want my colleagues to know, who are objecting, that they will bear a significant part of the responsibility, because if we can't deal with the root causes to stop people from coming to our southern border, whether they be from Haiti or Central America or any other place, then we are going to continuously have a flow of people as they avoid disaster, civil conflict, authoritarian governments. But, if we had people in place to develop the plans and the programs and implement them so we could stop the flow and so we could create stability in Haiti—guess what—we are less likely to have people come to the southern border. But, no, we are going to extract accountability on people who have absolutely nothing to do with Afghanistan.

Not only is this shortsighted, but for those who stand on the Senate floor

and talk about the national security of the United States, this hurts the national security of the United States. It hurts the national interests of the United States.

So I hope that there will be a reflection. Maybe there are better targets to pick than career Foreign Service officers in countries that have no decision, no policymaking on any of these issues that my colleague has a problem with. Maybe there are better ones to pursue.

In the absence of that, I will tell you there is going to be a rude awakening. Mark my words. I have been doing foreign policy for 30 years between the House and the Senate. It will happen sooner than you think, and you will remember this moment and wish you hadn't objected to some of these people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

RUSSIA

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I have spoken throughout these last several days about how the Nord Stream 2 pipeline—the Biden-Putin pipeline—runs counter to everything that the Biden administration professes to stand for, and, indeed, what much of the Democratic Party has been insisting for the last half decade are the most important issues of the country.

We, of course, spent 4 years, during the Trump Presidency, listening to Democrats say, “Russia, Russia, Russia,” over and over and over again. It was a newfound discovery. Some of us are old enough to remember Barack Obama turning to MITT ROMNEY in the 2012 Presidential election when MITT ROMNEY was advocating for strength in dealing with Russia and for taking on Putin, and some of us remember Obama looking at MITT ROMNEY and saying:

[Mitt], the 1980s called. They want their foreign policy back.

That was in 2012, when the Democrats thought it was passe to stand up to Russia.

Then 2016 happened, and Donald Trump was elected President. Suddenly, the Democratic Party got religion. Suddenly, Russia was bad. Now, I thought Russia was bad before. I thought Russia was bad when Trump was President. And I think Russia is bad now. I don't like dictatorial thugs like Vladimir Putin, who is a KGB thug.

But, interestingly, for our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, their outrage against Russia is situational. It applies only in the situation that a Republican is in the White House. When a Democrat is in the White House—when Joe Biden is there—suddenly, Putin is hunky-dory. Suddenly, Democrats don't have much of a problem with Joe Biden defying Federal law, ignoring Federal law, and giving a multibillion-dollar gift to Putin.

Suddenly, the Democrats have given all of these speeches on Russia, who passed CAATSA. I talked earlier about

CAATSA, the legislation that imposes mandatory sanctions on Russia to stop a President who refuses to impose those sanctions. Well, Joe Biden is in defiance of CAATSA. Do you see a single Democrat standing up, saying: Mr. President, obey CAATSA? No. They are whining that the deputy assistant under secretary of whatchamacallit has not been confirmed yesterday, and, clearly, the world is going to come to an end without a deputy assistant of whatchamacallit.

If our Democratic colleagues believed their rhetoric of the last 4 years, we would see Democrats stand up with me and say, “Joe Biden's multibillion-dollar gift to Putin is a mistake,” but they are not.

One of the ironies, in addition to the “Russia, Russia, Russia” thing—and the truth of the matter—is most of the Democrats never believed Russia, Russia, Russia. If you go back to the Soviet Union, if you go back to the Reagan administration, the Democrats had spent decades as apologists for Soviet Communists, as apologists for Russian dictators. But for 4 years, I have got to say that our Democratic colleagues can give a good speech. They sure sounded genuine when they said, “Russia, Russia, Russia.” But if they believed those words, then they would look at Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS, and they would say, “Russia, Russia, Russia.”

By the way, they didn't like Donald Trump's rhetoric on Russia, and by the way, I didn't like a lot of the things President Trump said on Russia. I wish his rhetoric had been stronger, but it is worth noting that Trump had the courage to call out Germany for Nord Stream 2. Trump had the courage to impose sanctions under the bipartisan sanctions legislation we passed into law. The Cruz-Shaheen legislation passed in 2019, and the second wave of the Cruz-Shaheen bipartisan legislation passed in 2020. President Trump imposed. What did Joe Biden do? Waived it. What did Joe Biden do? Ignored the law. What did Joe Biden do? He gave a multibillion-dollar gift to Putin.

So, if any Democrat meant a word they said about Russia, we have got to see them standing here. You will note the Democratic side of the floor is largely empty.

But not only is Joe Biden's rhetoric and the Democrats' rhetoric on Russia not matched by their action, but we also know that Biden's actions don't meet the Democrats' rhetoric on climate.

ENVIRONMENTALISM AND CLIMATE

Mr. President, what I want to address now is environmentalism and climate, which President Biden and the left tells us are existential issues.

There is nothing mattering more, they say, than climate change; that if we don't fight climate change, Nebraska is going to be underwater, they tell us. They say we need to follow the example of our European allies in