

DOD leaders, we have the Armed Services Committee coming to us and saying: I don't know what to tell him. I don't know how to satisfy him, but he is blocking the staffing of the senior leadership at the Department of Defense.

This comes from a guy who raised his fist in solidarity with the insurrectionists. This comes from a guy who, before the Russian invasion, suggested that maybe it would be wise for Zelenskyy to make a few concessions about Ukraine and their willingness to join NATO. This comes from a guy who, just about a month ago, voted against Ukraine aid. He is saying it is going too slow. He voted no. He voted no on Ukraine aid, and now, he has the gall to say it is going too slow.

And this final insult is that until—what—Secretary Austin resigns? That is not a serious request. People used to come to me during the Trump administration all the time: Do you think Trump should resign? Do you think Tillerson should resign? That is stupid. Of course, I think all the people I disagree with should quit their jobs and be replaced with people I love; of course, I think they should all resign. That is not how this world works. That is not a reasonable request from a U.S. Senator: Until the Secretary of Defense quits his job, I am going to block all his nominees. That is preposterous—and coming from a person who exonerated Donald Trump for extorting Zelenskyy for withholding lethal aid.

They withheld lethal aid until—unless—Zelenskyy would release false smears against Joe Biden's son, and then he voted to exonerate President Trump for this. So spare me the new solidarity with the Ukrainians and with the free world, because this man's record is exactly the opposite.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UKRAINE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I just want to make some comments regarding what the junior Senator from Missouri was just talking about on the floor, and I know that my colleague from Hawaii was providing commentary as well.

It is hard to comprehend how any Member of Congress, House or Senate, could come to the floor and make the criticism of the Biden administration regarding its Ukraine policy, especially with regard to the military assistance provided by this administration, and that same Senator, along with a long list of Republican Senators, voted against all the money for Ukraine just a couple weeks ago, \$13.6 billion.

But, unfortunately, it is entirely consistent with what those same 31 Senators have been doing for the last couple of weeks. They voted against all the money in March, and then they criticize President Biden. In fact, the day of President Zelenskyy's speech to the Congress—that inspiring speech—that so many of us were moved by, peo-

ple in both parties, both Houses, all across the country, in fact, across the world were moved by what he said and, frankly, challenged by what he said.

We have to do more, even in my judgment, than the \$13.6 billion. But as the junior Senator from Missouri should know—I hope he knows this—since the beginning of this administration, just on the military assistance, we have provided \$2.6 billion. So more than \$2.5 billion dollars just in military assistance, but the bulk of that is in that spending bill that we passed a couple of weeks ago that has the \$13.6 billion.

Here is what the Washington Post says, and I will read the headline and the date, and then ask consent to enter it into the RECORD. Here is the headline:

More than two dozen Senate Republicans demand Biden do more for Ukraine after voting against \$13.6 billion for Ukraine.

Mr. President, dated March 17, 2022, a story by Mariana Alfaro and Eugene Scott, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[March 17, 2022]

MORE THAN TWO DOZEN SENATE REPUBLICANS DEMAND BIDEN DO MORE FOR UKRAINE AFTER VOTING AGAINST \$13.6 BILLION FOR UKRAINE

(By Mariana Alfaro and Eugene Scott)

THIRTY-ONE SENATE REPUBLICANS VOTED LAST WEEK AGAINST THE \$1.5 TRILLION SPENDING BILL TO FUND THE GOVERNMENT, INCREASE U.S. DEFENSE SPENDING AND PROVIDE HUMANITARIAN AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE. IN RECENT DAYS, MANY OF THEM HAVE CLAMORED FOR MORE WEAPONS AND AID.

More than two dozen Senate Republicans are demanding that President Biden do more to aid war-torn Ukraine and arm its forces against Russia's brutal assault, after voting last week against \$13.6 billion in military and humanitarian assistance for Ukraine. Consider Sen. Rick Scott (R-Fla.), who heard Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy's emotional plea in a virtual address to Congress on Wednesday for more weapons and a no-fly zone over Ukraine.

"President Biden needs to make a decision TODAY: either give Ukraine access to the planes and anti-aircraft defense systems it needs to defend itself, or enforce a no-fly zone to close Ukrainian skies to Russian attacks," Scott said in a statement. "If President Biden does not do this NOW, President Biden will show himself to be absolutely heartless and ignorant of the deaths of innocent Ukrainian children and families."

Last week, Scott was one of 31 Republicans to vote against a sweeping, \$1.5 trillion spending bill to fund government agencies and departments through the remainder of the fiscal year, a bill that also included \$13.6 billion in assistance for Ukraine. Biden signed the bill into law Tuesday, saying the United States was "moving urgently to further augment the support to the brave people of Ukraine as they defend their country."

After casting a "no" vote, Scott assailed the overall spending bill as wasteful, arguing that it was filled with lawmakers' pet projects. "It makes my blood boil," Scott said last week.

Democrats quickly condemned what they saw as glaring hypocrisy among the Republicans who voted against the aid but were quick to criticize Biden as a commander in chief leading from behind in addressing Ukraine's needs. "We should send more lethal aid to Ukraine which I voted against last week" is making my brain melt," tweeted Sen. Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii).

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has highlighted divisions in the Republican Party on U.S. involvement overseas and the standing of the NATO alliance. For decades, during the presidencies of Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush, the GOP embraced a hawkish view, with robust military spending and certainty about coming to the aid of allies.

President Donald Trump's "America First" outlook and efforts to undermine NATO, including questioning why the military alliance even existed, secured a foothold in the GOP, reflected in the response of Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-Ga.) to Ukraine. In a video Wednesday, Greene blamed both Russia and Ukraine, and warned against U.S. intervention. Biden has said repeatedly that he would not send U.S. troops to fight.

Potential 2024 presidential candidates such as Scott have been highly critical of Biden, who also announced Wednesday that the Pentagon was sending nearly \$1 billion in military equipment to Ukraine, including 800 Stinger anti-aircraft systems, 100 drones, 25,000 helmets and more than 20 million rounds of small-arms ammunition and grenade launcher and mortar rounds.

In early February, Sen. Josh Hawley (R-Mo.), another possible White House candidate, sent a letter to Secretary of State Antony Blinken suggesting that the United States would be worse off if Ukraine were admitted to NATO, the military alliance of 30 mainly Western countries—including the United States—bound by a mutual defense treaty, and argued that the United States should instead focus on countering China.

Hawley, who voted against the spending bill with billions for Ukraine, said Wednesday that Biden needs to "step up" and send MiG jet fighters and other weapons to Ukraine, accusing the administration of "dragging its feet."

The Pentagon has rebuffed Poland's offer to send MiG fighter jets to Ukraine amid fears of further escalation involving a NATO country.

In a statement Thursday, Hawley said, "Aid for Ukraine should not be held hostage to the Democrats' pet projects and I did not support the massive \$1.5 trillion omnibus spending bill stuffed with billions in earmarks."

Sen. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.), a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee who also voted against the spending bill, told MSNBC on Thursday that the United States "can do more" for Ukraine.

"There were all sorts of particular ways where the administration yesterday said a lot of the right things, but just because the pen was in President Biden's hand yesterday doesn't mean that weapons are in Zelenskyy's hands today. And at every point we're too slow, and it feels like a huge part of the administration's audience is internal lawyers, and they do these offensive and defensive legal-hairsplitting arguments," Sasse said.

On the Senate floor Thursday, Sasse argued that the spending bill wasn't "really about Ukrainian aid," but a "whole bunch of schlock."

"Ukrainian aid was a little bit of sugar on the larger medicine of a \$1.5 trillion bill that nobody would actually want to go home and to defend to the voters, and to the taxpayers of America, as well thought out," he said.

Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) countered that the only way to deliver aid to Ukraine

and massive legislation is through compromise.

"Inside every piece of legislation are elements that many of us disagree with," Murphy said. "Inside that budget that you voted against are all sorts of things that I disagree with. But in the end, in order to govern the country, you have to be able to find a path to compromise."

Schatz, in an interview with The Washington Post after the exchange between Sasse and Murphy, said the vote in favor of the aid was an "easy" one.

"It's very simple: If you don't vote for the thing, you're not for the thing," Schatz said. "That is literally our job, to decide whether we are for or against things as a binary question."

"So you don't get to say: 'Even though I voted against Ukraine aid, that I'm actually for it, and here's my explanation,'" Schatz added, arguing that Republicans were trying to have it both ways by maintaining their fidelity to Trump—who has praised Russian President Vladimir Putin—and become "Zelensky fans" at the same time.

"They voted to exonerate Trump for this specific reason, which was to withhold aid from Zelensky, and here they are again, opposing aid to Zelensky," Schatz said. "So now they're doing it twice. They're still acting as if they're defenders of Western-style democracy."

The day before voting against the bill, Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), another possible presidential candidate, posted on Twitter about the need to come to Ukraine's aid. "Helping Ukraine defend itself against a ruthless dictator is in our best interest," he tweeted.

Sen. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.) tweeted a clip declaring the importance of assisting Ukraine. "It's not much of a deterrent when the assistance you provide comes after the invasion," he wrote. "We need to have President Zelensky's back and expedite aid to Ukraine."

Hours later, Cramer voted against the spending bill. Sen. John Neely Kennedy (R-La.) tweeted a clip the day he voted against the bill of him speaking to the need to give Ukraine more aircraft.

"The Ukrainian people and President Zelensky are fighting well above their weight, but they need planes," he said on Fox News. "He made that very clear to us on the phone Saturday."

"Give the man his planes," Kennedy added. Sen. Mitt Romney (R-Utah), the GOP's 2012 presidential nominee, was widely mocked when he called Russia the "number one geopolitical foe" during a debate with President Barack Obama, a remark that in hindsight seems prescient.

Romney, like other Republicans, has pressed Biden to send more aid to Ukraine. He also voted against the spending bill with billions for the country. Romney said that while he "strongly" supports providing aid to Ukrainians, he "ultimately could not support the rest of this bloated spending bill for the aforementioned reasons."

"Forcing us to swallow the bad to get the good is concerning, unsustainable, and no way to govern over the long term," he said.

In a statement to The Post Thursday, Romney added that he has "and will strongly support aid for Ukraine" and that he "called for a stand-alone bill to get a vote on Monday, four days sooner than the omnibus did."

Romney and Sen. Joni Ernst (R-Iowa) are separately leading an effort with 40 of their Senate GOP colleagues to urge Biden to work with Poland and other NATO allies to expedite the transfer of aircraft and air-defense systems to Ukraine. Of those 40 Republicans, 25 voted against the aid package.

While increasing domestic spending and keeping the government open, the sweeping

spending bill also increased spending for the U.S. military by 5.6 percent, totaling \$762 billion. The bill includes a 2.7 percent pay increase for all active-duty troops. Several Republicans were critical of Ukraine in 2017, when Trump began spreading a conspiracy theory that it was Ukraine—and not Russia—that interfered with the 2016 election. Two years later, Democrats accused Trump of leveraging military assistance and an Oval Office meeting with Zelensky in exchange for investigations of Biden and his son Hunter Biden, and the debunked theory alleging Ukrainian interference in the election.

The House impeached Trump; the Senate acquitted him on charges that he abused the powers of his office and obstructed Congress. All the Senate Republicans except Romney voted for acquittal.

Sen. Mazie Hirono (D-Hawaii) told The Post on Thursday that Republican lawmakers arguing for more aid for Ukraine days after voting against a bill to provide assistance is "the height of hypocrisy."

"Some of them will find every way they can to criticize Joe Biden," Hirono said. "And I think it's more than ironic that the president that they continue to support withheld aid to Ukraine for political purposes."

As several of these Republicans who voted against the bill criticized Biden, one Republican pointed to the disconnect.

Sen. Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.), who voted for the bill, advised his party to stop sending "mixed messages" and lamented that the spending bill with nearly \$14 billion for Ukraine didn't pass the Senate 100-0, according to Politico.

And on Thursday, Zelensky's chief of staff, Andriy Yermak, tweeted that he was "grateful" to the United States, which he described as Ukraine's "reliable partner." "[Biden] does more for [Ukraine] than any of his predecessors," Yermak tweeted.

Mr. CASEY. Here is the subheadline:

Thirty-one Senate Republicans voted last week against the \$1.5 trillion spending bill to fund the government, increase U.S. defense spending and provide humanitarian and military assistance to Ukraine. In recent days, many of them have clamored for more weapons and aid.

And it goes on from there, and I am not going to read all of it, obviously, but it chronicles the hypocrisy that we just heard here today and that we have heard for days now and weeks now, criticizing the President when they voted against all the money—so all the money from the \$13.6 billion that will go to pay for the Javelin missiles that are taking out Russian tanks every day and have for weeks—every penny of that out of the \$13.6. You could probably cut it in half in terms of what the military assistance will be.

So let's say, for sake of argument, probably half of that, \$6 or \$7 billion, but whatever the exact number is, that money is going to help pay for a lot more Javelin missiles that have been so effective. The Stinger systems that they have used, the antiaircraft systems, they are all going to be paid for. The ammunition and the body armor and all of the other assistance that we are providing is going to be made possible because most of the Senate—50 Democrats and just 19 Republicans, but we are grateful for their support—voted for the money.

So if you have a criticism about the administration's policy, you are cer-

tainly entitled to criticize the administration, but I think you lose your right to criticize the administration on military assistance and what we are doing or not doing on military assistance when you just voted against all the money—all the money. And yet they do it over and over again, as if no one is watching.

Well, I think the American people get it, and I think they know the difference between someone who can justifiably criticize any administration on foreign policy or defense policy or anything else. But I think you should admit on the record that you didn't vote for the money. Don't throw sand in the eyes of the people. Admit on the record that you didn't vote for the money, and then lodge your criticism. But, of course, he didn't do that and so many who voted the wrong way.

Now, the Washington Post also notes in this article that, obviously, it was a spending bill that will allow us to fund the government. We could talk about that, whether you support funding the government. But here is a point that was made in the article that I think a lot of people may have missed: It is that this funding bill also paid for a pay increase for our troops.

U.S. servicemembers got a pay increase in this bill, and yet you would never know that by listening to some of the folks who voted the wrong way on the bill. You would think that that wasn't part of this legislation.

So I think a lot of Americans probably expect that when you are making an argument against an administration, you have the right to do that, but I think it would be a lot more truthful if you were clear about where you voted on the biggest Ukraine spending measure in recent history, likely not just the biggest ever for Ukraine but the biggest ever for a lot of countries that we help.

So I hope that people across this Chamber and across the country will make note of that contradiction, because when you voted against those dollars for Ukraine, you were voting against not only the people of Ukraine and their ability to fight this war and obviously the soldiers in the field, but you were voting against that humanitarian support, as well, that will provide food and medical care and so much else.

Now, I am in no way satisfied that we have done enough. We have got to do a lot more. We have got to provide, in my judgment, a river, an ever-rushing stream of weapons—as many weapons as it takes to defeat Vladimir Putin.

So we are going to have more debates, and Senators will have more opportunities to vote the right way when it comes to supporting the people of Ukraine. But I think it would be better for the debate if folks would mention how they voted, that they voted against the Ukraine money, that they voted against the pay raise for the troops, and they voted against a lot of other provisions.

But to come on to the Senate floor and to criticize the President on military assistance, that is the height of hypocrisy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The majority leader is going to come to the floor, and I will yield the floor for him when he comes here, but I would like to yield the floor without losing the right to the floor.

#### JUDICIARY COMMITTEE STAFF

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to thank my staff who worked on this nomination.

First, I would like to recognize the contributions of Kolan Davis, my chief counsel and staff director. Kolan was assisted by Brendan Chestnut, my chief counsel for nominations.

The staff in the nominations unit also worked incredibly hard on this nomination. They include Lauren Mehler, Gabi Kenny, Vetan Kapoor, and Raija Munk.

The permanent nominations team received some reinforcements for this Supreme Court nomination. Annie Croslow joined my staff to lead the team of special counsels assisting on this nomination. That team includes Annika Boone, Kyle Cole, Isaac Fong, Jenna Lorence, Daniel Morales, and Luke Zaro. This team scoured Judge Jackson's record. They spent countless hours reviewing her opinions, her speeches, and pulling filings and transcripts for her cases. Their exhaustive review helped the Republicans on the committee prepare for her confirmation process.

I also want to thank the communications director, Taylor Foy, as well as the deputy communications director, George Hartmann, Aaron Britt, Annie Richardson, Jennifer Heins, and Megan Behrends also contributed to the communications effort.

Other staff also helped review and prepare for the nomination, including Dave Lewen, Lauren Stimpert, Rachel Wright, Erin Creegan, Tianna Torrejon, and Chesney Mallory, as well as law clerks Carly Hviding, Luke Bunting, and Noelle Daniel.

Finally, I want to thank the rest of my Judiciary Committee staff for their continued work during this process and also thank my deputy staff director, Rita Lari, for her advice and leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The majority leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 808.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lael Brainard, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 808, Lael Brainard, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie K. Hirono, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Ben Ray Lujan, Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, John W. Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 844.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lisa DeNell Cook, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2010.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 844, Lisa DeNell Cook, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2010.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie K. Hirono, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Ben Ray Lujan, Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher Murphy, Patrick J. Leahy, John W. Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 848, Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Baldwin, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan, Gary C. Peters, Mazie K. Hirono, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Mark R. Warner, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that