

enhanced by leaving the Pentagon without an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment during a war in Europe where the U.S. military is playing a very important role.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON COLORETTI NOMINATION

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Luján	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wicker
Grassley	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lee	Shelby
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton	Menendez
--------	----------

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 actions.

NOMINATION OF C.S. ELIOT KANG

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Dr. Eliot Kang to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Non-Proliferation, ISN.

At a time of increasing concern about the potential use of chemical or biological weapons in Ukraine by Rus-

sia, it is vital the United States have a Senate-confirmed official in place to counter these dangers, as well as other nuclear threats. ISN leads the State Department's efforts to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and biological—as well as the means to deliver them. We need a Senate-confirmed expert at the helm to coordinate prevention and response with the Ukrainian Government, our allies, and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Dr. Kang is eminently qualified to do just that. He has the substantive expertise to lead ISN and advance U.S. national security interests. During his 18-year career at the State Department, Dr. Kang has worked on a wide variety of nonproliferation issues. This includes the denuclearization of North Korea, international efforts to halt the spread of chemical weapons, and nuclear safety. He has held senior positions in ISN, where he currently serves as Acting Assistant Secretary, and served as the Department's most senior official for Arms Control and International Security.

But because of Republican delays he has not yet been confirmed, despite the fact that he was first nominated 341 days ago. Think about that—that was nearly a year ago—and he has not yet been confirmed.

The delays and obstacles facing nominees on the Senate floor and in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are hampering our national security. Each day that goes by without critical national security posts being filled does a disservice to our country and our national security interests. Dr. Kang could have and should have been confirmed long ago.

I strongly support confirming Dr. Kang, and I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me in advancing his nomination, along with all of the foreign affairs nominations pending before this body.

VOTE ON KANG NOMINATION

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

Mr. DURBIN. 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 New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

Collins	Leahy	Schatz
Coons	Luján	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Shaheen
Duckworth	Markey	Sinema
Durbin	Merkley	Smith
Feinstein	Murkowski	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Murphy	Tester
Hassan	Murray	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Ossoff	Warner
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Warnock
Hirono	Peters	Warren
Kaine	Reed	Whitehouse
Kelly	Romney	Wyden
King	Rosen	
Klobuchar	Sanders	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Rounds
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hooven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Toomey
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Graham	Paul	
	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton	Menendez
--------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HAS-SAN). 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 actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, a lot of Americans are tracking day by day what is happening in Russia and Ukraine, as we watch the Russian Army continue to be able to roll its way through Ukraine and, city by city, pummel innocent people—so, literally, to shell homes, apartments, businesses; to level whole cities to the ground for the sake of Russia's aggression.

This Congress and this body in particular, in the Senate, have spoken out often on this issue. I am grateful that the President has engaged to be able to apply sanctions, to be able to cut off purchases with Russia, to be able to slowly open up the weaponry that we are giving to the Ukrainians, as they continue to ask for more. They are looking for help. The Oklahomans whom I talked to want us to provide help.

But it is ironic, and some people may not know, that while we are isolating Russia in every way that we possibly can, right now, this administration is working with the Russian representatives to be our spokesmen to Iran negotiating a revised nuclear deal with Iran. We are not doing face-to-face negotiations with Iran. We are working through the Russian representative to represent our beliefs to the Iranians.

Now, if anyone in this room could say they trust the Russians to represent our values at the table with Iran, please, rise, because we don't and we shouldn't, and it makes absolutely no sense that a revised nuclear deal is

being done with Iran through the Russian negotiations while Russia is currently pummeling Ukraine. I wish I could tell you that is even the worst part of this deal.

Iran has a couple of things that they need to be able to get to a nuclear weapon. The two things they need are time and money. They have the technology. They have the know-how. They have the facilities. They have the advanced centrifuges. They just need time and money. My frustration with the Iranian nuclear deal that was done under the Obama administration was that it gave them both time and money. It set a 10-year window where they couldn't have nuclear material that could be usable for a nuclear weapon, but it allocated \$100 billion in relief of sanctions to the Iranians—\$100 billion to the Iranian regime.

Now, I have no beef with the Iranian people. They are remarkable people, extremely well educated, but they live under the thumb of a horrible regime.

What did the Iranian regime do with the \$100 billion that they were given?

Well, we saw the advance of the war in Yemen that happened as the Iranians were supplying the Houthis to be able to attack the Saudis and the Emiratis. We saw what happened in Lebanon with the support for Hezbollah to be able to attack Israel and to continue to destabilize. We saw what the Iranians did in Syria, supporting Bashar al-Assad and becoming his army in many areas across Syria, and that ruthless dictator is still there today because of Iranian support, because of the \$100 billion that was given to Iran so they could prop up Assad and so he could stay in place. That is what happened with the \$100 billion that Iran was given last time.

Then, the Trump administration came in and took away that and imposed maximum pressure on the Iranians, walked away from the deal, and said: We are not going to give the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world billions of dollars of access to capital; that seems like a terrible idea.

And I can assure you, the people of Syria understood that was a terrible idea.

But now, what? President Biden has reopened negotiations, as I mentioned before, by using Russia as our proxy to be able to negotiate this. Today, we had negotiators that were brought on by the Biden administration, who are former negotiators under the Obama administration, to renegotiate this deal, who have quit the negotiating team and who have said that this negotiation is going so badly that they will not be a part of it, and they walked away.

We don't know everything that is in this deal, and I would say to you, quite frankly, I am not encouraged by what bit of rumors that I am hearing in this deal. I am hearing that this deal puts us back into the timetable that was done years ago under the Obama administration to give the 10-year win-

dow, that we are back into that same window that allows them to move to a nuclear weapon at an end-time period, that it doesn't challenge their terrorist activities, that it doesn't challenge their missile development.

Literally, they are developing ballistic missiles designed to carry a nuclear warhead, and that is not part of this agreement, apparently, to restrict their development of a missile capable of carrying nuclear material, as long as they don't actually work to develop that nuclear material.

It releases sanctions to them. So, again, they get billions of dollars. And in the negotiations we hear, at this point, it lifts sanctions on the entities in Iran that took away the property and the homes from Iranian Jews in 1979, which we have had sanctions on. We understand it takes the sanctions off of those responsible for the Beirut bombing in 1983 that killed 243 Americans, mostly marines.

We also understand that it changes the status of Iran from being recognized as a state sponsor of terrorism—even though they are—and that there is a negotiation to take the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps off the list of a foreign terrorist organizations.

Are you kidding me?

This is not a good deal for the peace of the region. This does not prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power. This continues to destabilize our relationships with our allies in the region, as Saudi Arabia and the Emiratis and the Israelis and everyone stare at the Americans and say: Why in the world would you make this deal that would allow Iran to become a nuclear power in the days ahead?

Let me tell you, this is personal for many American families who lost a loved one in the battle in Iraq, when Iran engages the Iranian Revolutionary Guard to provide lethal equipment to the Iraqis so they could kill more Americans. Many Americans died in Iraq because of Iranian actions.

On March 11, 2020, Technical Sergeant Roberts from Owasso, OK, was killed in Iraq when an Iran-backed militia group, equipped by Iranians, supported by the regime, arbitrarily launched rockets at American forces in Iraq, killing Technical Sergeant Roberts.

Listen, this is personal for a lot of families. This is not some theoretical negotiation. This is a problem.

Why we would say to the Russians, "Negotiate on our behalf," while they are slaughtering Ukrainians and we are sanctioning those same Russians. Makes no sense. But a deal that lifts the sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, on those that killed Americans in 1983 in Beirut, to give access to missile technology and to look away from their terrorist activities with Hezbollah and Hamas and in Yemen and in multiple other places in the world is not a deal Americans should make.

Mr. President, walk away from this. There is a reason that your own staff is

walking out of the conversation—because you are headed the wrong way.

CHINA

Madam President, this body is also in the process of negotiating issues with China.

I have had quite a few folks from Oklahoma who have caught me and have said: Hey, while the world is focused on Russia and Ukraine, have we taken our eye off the ball in China?

I would pray we have not, and I continue to be able to encourage our Pentagon and officials across our government to not lose focus on Taiwan and to not lose focus on what is happening in trade agreements.

Right now, the Senate is actually negotiating a bill dealing with China, and I have to tell you I didn't support this bill and don't. It is a quarter trillion dollars in new spending—a quarter trillion. It is enormous in size, but the basic philosophy is, the Chinese have a state-controlled system for how they are putting out semiconductors and research; so we should do that in America and invest a quarter trillion to try to keep up with them in the way they are doing it.

Can I tell you? The United States and our free market system have raised up the greatest entrepreneurs the world has ever known in areas of research. There are quite a few areas wherein we have government and private sector cooperation, both in disease research and in technology. There are all kinds of research that have happened that have been very successful in transitioning into marketable products. Yet a quarter trillion dollars is a big number and philosophically shifts us into a very different structure of trying to be able to "keep up with the Chinese."

Now, I do have to grant that the Senate bill is much better than the House bill. The House put together a bill dealing with China that is classic House of Representatives at this point. They sent over a bill to us that they called their China bill, but it actually uses the word "climate" in it more than it uses the word "China" in it. It actually authorizes \$4 billion a year into the U.N. Green Climate Fund, which actually gives grants to Iran, China, and North Korea to help with their green transitions.

The House bill—also, again, their China bill—has a whole section in it on providing access to financial institutions for marijuana. Now, if you are wondering why marijuana banking is ending up in the China bill, so am I. The only thing I can come up with is, if you are nervous about China, smoke some weed, and you will be more relaxed, I guess. I am not sure why that ends up in the China bill—to have a whole marijuana section in the United States on it.

A meaningful China bill would focus in on critical minerals, which neither bill does. All of us see the supply chain issues that are happening with China right now. We all see it, but neither bill actually deals with the serious