

SULLIVAN is talking about, the percentage of their GDP that they are spending on defense. So I think this is another reason why we have countries that we want to add to the alliance. We have 30 strong now. This will even be stronger with Finland and Sweden being added to the NATO alliance.

But what is unique about the two countries that we will have a chance to vote on in a few moments is that they give us added value to our alliance. They make our alliance stronger. It is in our national security interest to include Finland and Sweden. They add value militarily and economically to this alliance.

The geostrategic location of these two countries is critically important to our national security. Just think for a moment about the threats to the Baltic nations that we have seen by Russia—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Think about where Poland has been threatened because of Russia's aggression in Ukraine.

Adding Finland and Sweden will help us round out the security alliance necessary to provide the security that we need. Both of these countries are already committed to interoperability with the NATO alliance. They are already familiar with how NATO's process and procedures are utilized.

So we have two countries that are ready from day one to be active participants in the alliance. They both participate in regular participation and training exercises with NATO and U.S. forces. Both Sweden and Finland have done that. They have contributed troops. Sweden has contributed troops to NATO-led operations in Kosovo, to Afghanistan, to Iraq. So we have countries that have already stepped up to help us in security and now will be a formal part of the security alliance.

They will add, also, a dimension that is important for us in regards to winter warfare. The cold response winter warfare exercises have been participated in. Finland has the arctic capabilities that will be critically important to us as we move forward. So we are adding value to the NATO alliance as well as expanding the number of countries.

I want to mention one other area: cyber and misinformation. We have two countries that have been very active in being victimized by the misinformation campaign by Russia. Sweden has a Psychological Defence Agency that they created in 2016 that is going to be important for us. As we know, Mr. Putin uses every weapon in his arsenal, including misinformation, in order to try to bring down democratic states. We know that in Sweden's case, they are already taking decisive action to counter the misinformation. Finland has an anti-fake-news initiative, which is actually fascinating. They recognize that Russia is trying to invade their country through misinformation, and they have an active way of defending against it. So, as I said earlier, we have two countries that will add value to the alliance.

The timing here couldn't be better. We have stood up an international resolve to support Ukraine in the invasion by Russia. Expanding NATO at this moment is a clear message to Mr. Putin that we stand with the democratic countries of Europe and we are prepared to expand our NATO alliance to guarantee their protection.

So these two stalwart, democratic nations, Finland and Sweden, have been robust partners to the United States and Europe on countless fronts. They have provided humanitarian aid to many countries in need, including Ukraine during the unprovoked invasion by Russia. Combined, Finland and Sweden provided over \$120 million in military and humanitarian aid to Ukraine between February and June of 2022.

These two nations have also shown a commitment to democratic governance, ranking third and fourth respectively on the global Democracy Index of 2020, according to an economist group. So we have two of the leading democratic states.

Finland and Sweden have proven time and time again that they have the defense capabilities and commitment to democracy in Europe to make them essential NATO allies. The Senate must act now to bolster this global peace and security by voting in favor of Finland and Sweden's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty. I urge my colleagues to do that.

AFGHANISTAN

Madam President, I would ask that I be permitted to enter comments about the 1-year anniversary of the fall of Afghanistan, pointing out that the Biden administration has been able to assist in the evacuation of so many American citizens and people who helped our U.S. mission, those who were involved in the democratic reforms in that country, but there is still a mission that we need to participate in to save people.

So I would ask unanimous consent that those comments be printed in a separate part of the RECORD.

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

Mr. CARDIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled votes: Senator COLLINS for up to 10 minutes, Senator GRAHAM for up to 5 minutes, Senator BLUNT for up to 5 minutes, Senator ROMNEY for up to 5 minutes, Senator RISCH for up to 5 minutes, Senator PAUL for up to 10 minutes, Senator SULLIVAN for up to 1 minute, and Senator MENEZES for up to 10 minutes.

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

NATO

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the accession of Finland and Sweden into the NATO alliance.

In May, I visited Helsinki and Stockholm as part of a Senate delegation to

encourage the Finnish and Swedish efforts to join the alliance. Our trip, however, started in Ukraine. There, after a long, secret journey under cover of darkness, our contingent of four Senators met with President Zelenskyy for 2 hours. We discussed the military, humanitarian, economic, and security consequences of Russia's unprovoked, brutal war against Ukraine. I asked President Zelenskyy whether he thought Vladimir Putin's attack on his country had had the opposite effect of what he had intended. For example, the Russian-speaking sections of eastern Ukraine are now embracing their Ukrainian identity, and NATO is more united than ever. President Zelenskyy told me that Putin's war of aggression not only had been the opposite of the easy conquest that Putin had expected but also had strengthened the NATO alliance and the European Union.

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, one cannot understand how Russia's invasion of Ukraine has upended decades and, in the case of Sweden, centuries of security policy for these countries. For 200 years, Sweden has maintained a policy of neutrality, but, as Swedish Prime Minister Andersson put it to me, "February 24 changed everything." That was the date of the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Finland, which shares an 830-mile border with Russia, likewise concluded that Russia's aggression required a dramatic rethinking of its security. To demonstrate the reality on the ground, the Finnish President took us outside of his home and pointed to his right, where Tallinn, Estonia, is only 50 miles away across the Baltic Sea. He then pointed to his left and told us that St. Petersburg, Russia, is only 200 miles away.

Our visits to these leaders came just as the Parliaments of Finland and Sweden were voting to formally request admission into NATO. We assured their leaders that there was strong, bipartisan support in the Senate for their accession and that adding their capabilities to the alliance would improve, would strengthen our collective defense and security.

This is, indeed, an important point. Sweden and Finland will both bring enormous geographic advantages and military capabilities to NATO. Finland is expected to exceed NATO's 2 percent defense spending target this year, and Sweden has committed to meeting that target as soon as possible. Finland has the largest reserve military force in Europe and has recently decided to upgrade its current fleet of American F-18 fighter jets with the fifth-generation F-35. For the past several years, Sweden has been increasing its arms spending, and the country has advanced defense industrial capabilities.

The addition of both of these nations to NATO will bolster deterrence against Russia in the Arctic, Nordic, and Baltic regions.

For decades, Finland and Sweden have had a strong history of support for NATO. Their advanced militaries are, for example, interoperable with member nations. Both countries also have supported NATO-led operations over the decades, including in Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Iraq. They frequently participate in alliance-led exercises and capacity-building operations in Africa and elsewhere.

During the current crisis in Ukraine, Finland and Sweden have been invaluable partners to the Ukrainians. They have been sending vital military aid to Ukraine, as well as humanitarian assistance, since February, including anti-ship missiles, rifles, body armor, and anti-tank weapons.

There are a few critics who contend that this NATO expansion, which will more than double NATO's direct border with Russia, is somehow provocative to Vladimir Putin. This assertion ignores a clear pattern of Russian aggression extending back years.

In 2008, Russia invaded its neighbor, Georgia. In 2014, Russia invaded Ukraine for the first time, occupying and seizing Crimea and areas of eastern Ukraine. Then, earlier this year, of course, Russia launched the largest and most devastating land war in Europe since World War II without any justification or provocation when it invaded the free and democratic nation of Ukraine.

This expansion of NATO is warranted precisely because of Russian provocations across the region.

As always, NATO and the United States have no desire to see a war with Russia, but we will defend the territory and sovereignty of each of its members.

Russia's brutal and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine has permanently changed the European security environment. Enlarging NATO to include two of our most capable and supportive European allies, Finland and Sweden, is a necessary and deliberative response.

I urge all of my colleagues, in a strong vote, to join me in the swift ratification of Finland and Sweden's accession into NATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, one, I want to associate myself with the comments of Senator COLLINS from Maine. That was a great story about why we should all be happy today with Finland and Sweden and why this makes a lot of sense.

There is one person I want to thank whom I don't usually give a big shout-out to: President Putin from Russia. Without you, we wouldn't be here. You have done more to strengthen NATO than any speech I could ever hope to give.

John McCain, I wish you were alive today to celebrate because what we have been able to accomplish here through Putin's invasion of Ukraine is to remind everybody in the world, when it comes to bullies, you better

stand up to them before it is too late. So our friends in Finland and Sweden have decided to join NATO. That is a good thing.

But let me put Ukraine in perspective right quick. Our military leaders and our experts told us: After the invasion, 4 days, they would be in Kyiv. Well, they miscalculated. They overestimated the capabilities of the Russians, and they certainly undercalculated the resolve of the Ukrainian people.

We are 160 days into this fight. Ukraine is still standing, bloodied but unbowed; NATO is bigger; crippling sanctions on the Russian economy; the ICC is investigating war crimes committed by Putin and his cronies. You have 100 U.S. Senators—we can't agree on Sunday being a day off—have agreed that Russia should be a State sponsor of terrorism under U.S. law.

So 160 days into this fight, I am telling you right now, things are looking pretty good for the good guys. And I say that knowing how much suffering has gone on in the Ukraine. But today, we are here to admit two new members of NATO.

NATO has been the strongest force for good, I think, on the planet since 1949. It is a group of countries organized around democratic concepts that have pledged to one another mutual defense—an attack on one is an attack on all. It has deterred war. It has been a stabilizing influence in Europe since the end of World War II. And along comes Putin.

So NATO today is going to be bigger than it was before the invasion. NATO today is going to have more military resources than before the invasion by Russia into Ukraine.

Again, I want to thank President Putin. You have done something for the democratic world that we have not been able to do for ourselves.

To NATO, as an organization, keep your eye on the ball; pay your 2 percent.

To my friends who suggest that expanding NATO makes us weaker against China, what movie are you watching? How can you believe for one moment abandoning Ukraine or showing less of a commitment to European stability will make China more afraid of us and less likely to invade Taiwan?

The best thing we could do right now as a world—particularly, the democratic world—is to become stronger in the face of aggression, to make NATO bigger. And we are going to accomplish that in a few minutes.

To all my colleagues who have come down here and spoken on behalf of the admission of these two countries, God bless you; you are on the right side of history.

One regret I do have is my great friend Senator McCain could not see today come about because he would be exceedingly pleased that the democratic world has rallied in the face of the aggression by Putin.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in my appreciation for the expansion of NATO—as others have said, the greatest alliance, maybe in history, certainly in the last 200 years, an alliance that has served great benefits and now is growing. NATO has been there since 1949.

The two countries that we are going to be voting to admit today have resisted since 1949 being part of NATO, but with the recent actions, they decided you now have to choose a side.

Now, they are not countries that have been on the sideline just hoping nothing would happen. They are countries that had significant defense capacities, significant military capabilities. They will be net security contributors to NATO. They bring to the alliance these advanced capabilities. They bring a neighborhood understanding of Russia, greater than maybe almost any other country, particularly Finland, which has been mentioned has an 800-plus mile border that will double the NATO border with Russia. They have been defending that border since World War II, and the Russians understand their capacity to defend it.

They, frankly, bring good real estate and good location. I wish I had a map here on the floor with me, but I don't. The Baltic really becomes a NATO sea. And that is an important thing—Norway already in NATO, Sweden joining NATO, Finland joining NATO; right across from the three Baltic countries that are much more in need of assistance than these two countries that are joining an alliance that will give them that assistance. It is an incredible day for NATO.

The Baltic Sea, the Arctic—I have heard more on this floor and in this country about the Arctic in the last 5 years than I think we have talked about in the previous 25 years. The Arctic basically becomes NATO territory with the sole exception of Russia.

The United States, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Finland become the countries that are bound not only in the neighborhood of the Arctic but also in a supportive alliance.

We have been hearing about how China wants to become an Arctic power. I think the change in NATO makes it incredibly harder for China to become an Arctic power or for Russia to become an Arctic abuser. And we are seeing that happen right here.

Again, great capability. The Swedes have an Air Force, a Navy. They have the best cyber offensive and defensive capability in Europe—that large industrial base. Finland just agreed to buy 64 F-35s to replace their F-18s.

Both countries have been working with us in military exercises for years. They are virtually immediately interoperable. They bring capacity to the NATO alliance that it doesn't have without them.

I am grateful that they are joining. Finland is already at the 2 percent goal

of their commitment to their own national defense. Sweden will be there by 2028.

Senator DURBIN, who is here on the floor with me, and I met with both of these countries recently. And they are absolutely committed that this is the moment when the NATO alliance takes on new meaning, not only to their two countries but I think to—and not only Western Europe but, frankly, to the world.

This is an alliance that stands for shared values, that stands for border integrity, that stands for being sure that those things go into the future.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this today. I am glad we are able to be among the first. We were hoping we would be the first country to approve the admission into NATO of these two countries, but we will be among the first. I think it sends a signal to the world and hopefully to all Americans that not only is NATO important, but it will be stronger with Sweden and Finland than it has ever been. And I look forward to the opportunity to cast this vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Paul amendment to the resolution of advice and consent to ratification for the extension of the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden to NATO.

Like virtually all of my colleagues, I support the admission of Sweden and Finland into NATO. Their commitment to democracy, their military capabilities, and their resolve in the face of Russian aggression is welcome.

With Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine, NATO has been united in providing support for the Ukrainians to defend themselves. NATO is also united in its adherence to the revisions of the NATO treaty. The world is watching to see if there are any cracks in that commitment, particularly with respect to its provisions for mutual defense.

We must not in any way appear to be going wobbly on article 5. I fear that the Paul amendment would do just that. Further, Senator PAUL's amendment is unnecessary. The NATO treaty specifically states this:

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

That is in the NATO treaty itself.

So adding the language of the Paul amendment would only add confusion and potentially communicate to the world that this body seeks something in addition to the adherence to the constitutional process that the treaty already requires.

Now, it is well and good for Congress to consider war powers and our role in military conflicts. But doing so as part of the accession of Sweden and Finland to NATO while Ukraine is under attack and while Russia may potentially be eyeing violence against NATO nations is surely not the time.

Our commitment to NATO and article 5 must be clear and unambiguous. Throughout our Nation's history, the United States has not once ratified NATO protocols with a reservation.

I am going to say that again to make sure I got it right.

Throughout our Nation's history, the United States has not once ratified NATO protocols with a reservation. Now should be no different. Doing so could send the wrong message to the people of Ukraine, to our other friends and allies. It could even be propagandized as a nod to Putin.

I urge my colleagues to vote down Senator PAUL's amendment. Our message must be clear: We stand with NATO, with article 5, and with the admission of Finland and Sweden into our alliance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I hope that my remarks are even less.

I stand in solid support of the accession of Finland and Sweden into NATO. Just a few weeks ago, I was fortunate enough to visit Lithuania. It is a country that means a lot to me and my family. I met with the former President Valdas Adamkus.

Adamkus, a Lithuanian immigrant to the United States, had a distinguished record in our government's service here and then returned to Lithuania after his retirement from the U.S. Federal Government and ran successfully for President.

He had the vision to realize that the future of Lithuania and the Baltic States was in the European Union and NATO and worked strenuously to achieve those goals, and I was happy to be joining him in that effort.

Now, this moment in history really complements his leadership because the accession of Finland and Sweden to NATO is a confirmation that the Baltic Sea is safer than ever when it comes to the West. If Vladimir Putin thought that by invading Ukraine he could somehow inhibit the future of NATO or in some way limit its future, the opposite has occurred.

NATO is stronger than ever. And the United States' commitment to NATO is stronger than ever. The fact that only a handful of Senators from either political party are even questioning the accession of Sweden and Finland are good indications to me that we have bipartisan support for this NATO coalition now more than ever—and we should, first, for the Ukrainians and, secondly, for the United States and its future.

Those who are speaking against the accession of Finland and Sweden suggest that we ought to focus our attention on Asia. Well, we cannot ignore Asia. It is an important part of our

near-term future. And we have got to show strength throughout the world. Why don't we start right now? With this accession of Finland and Sweden, the strengthening of the NATO alliance says to any adversary of the United States, even to China and its future, that this country does business with other countries in the world on an arm's-length basis and a respectful basis and can deal with democracies in a constructive way in building their economies for the future.

I will gladly join in the support of the accession of Finland and Sweden to NATO. I believe it not only strengthens that alliance when it comes to this war in Ukraine, it prepares us for challenges in the future, and it is the right thing for America's security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, I rise and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Accession Protocols for Finland and Sweden to join NATO. This is probably one of the easiest votes I will ever make in the U.S. Senate.

I have listened to arguments about Asia, somehow that it comes in here. Look, we can walk and chew gum at the same time. Certainly, we need to look at what is going on in Asia, pay attention to what is going on in Asia, but what we are talking about here is the defense of the North Atlantic.

This organization was put together many years ago. It has grown over those years to be 30-strong. And now we are going to add two more.

I have characterized NATO as the most successful political and military alliance in the history of the world; certainly the most powerful alliance in the history of the world. And today we have the opportunity to expand the alliance by including Finland and Sweden.

Over the years, we have added various countries, and debates could be had about those countries as to whether or not they are sufficient to join NATO and be part of the article 5 "an attack on one is an attack on all" alliance. But on Finland and Sweden, there really is little, if any, argument. These are two very successful countries.

This accession process is an important chance for the United States to demonstrate leadership in NATO—we have over the years, and we will continue to do so—and the United States' commitment to its modernization and to its future.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has carefully consulted and coordinated with our NATO allies, the Governments of Sweden and Finland, and with the administration to ensure this process could move as efficiently as possible. I can tell you that, personally—and others have done the same over recent years and particularly over recent months, have pressed Finland and Sweden to change their view as to

whether or not they should remain neutral and instead move into the NATO alliance.

On February 24, we all know the world shook. Things changed dramatically. After Putin's unprovoked attack on Ukraine, Sweden and Finland, I am sure, woke up and said: You know, that could be us next, but it won't be us if we join NATO. So their polling in their country changed dramatically on February 24 as to whether or not NATO membership was appropriate for them. They have now enthusiastically said that NATO is appropriate for them, and we have shown in this body bipartisan support for Finland and Sweden joining NATO.

Finland and Sweden will make model members of the NATO alliance. Both have strong and capable militaries in place now and are already net contributors to the security alliance. As was pointed out earlier by Senator COLLINS here, they have been very active in NATO, even though they are not members of NATO, by participating in various drills that have taken place and also by participating in the duties that NATO does strengthening the eastern flank of NATO. They have also demonstrated interoperability with NATO, which is extremely important, and the commitment necessary to join the alliance.

I would say that today, with what is going on in Ukraine, Finland and Sweden joining the alliance is even more important. When the shooting is over in Ukraine, it won't be over. NATO is going to reexamine what they need to do to strengthen themselves, and certainly one of those will be an examination of hardening the eastern flank. Finland and Sweden, obviously, are on the eastern flank and will add considerably to that. Not only that, it is going to cost more to defend the eastern flank simply because of what Russia has done. Finland and Sweden will be a contributor, as will everybody.

Adding these two nations as full members of our alliance will further deter any temptation by Russia to engage in military adventurism in the Baltic and Arctic regions. I believe Russia is already deterred when we say and our NATO allies say and European nations say to Putin: Not one square inch. Whether it is on the eastern border of one of the Baltic States or whether it is downtown London or in the United States, an attack on any of the NATO countries is an attack on all of them, and the response will be swift.

Today's ratification of Finland and Sweden as new members of NATO will both send a strong message of transatlantic unity to Putin and strengthen NATO against Russia's ongoing threat. NATO has pulled together regionally to push back on Russia, and it is obvious that need has not gone away.

I want to urge my colleagues to vote yes. This is a really easy vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 5191

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to expand the NATO alliance to include Sweden and Finland. A crucial question that should be answered is whether Sweden and Finland's accession to NATO is in America's best interests and whether their joining will cause more or less war.

Well, for every action, there is a reaction. What do our adversaries say? Putin's immediate response to it was that Russia "does not have a problem" with Sweden or Finland applying for NATO but that "the expansion of military infrastructure into this territory will of course give rise to reaction and response." So from Russia's perspective, they likely will tolerate Sweden and Finland in NATO but likely will not tolerate certain weapons systems in Finland or Sweden.

Advocates of NATO expansion said we can't be held hostage to Russia's threats. Perhaps. But if a country announces they will do X if you do Y, shouldn't someone at least contemplate the potential scenarios? The Russians have already announced that placing certain weapons systems in Finland is a redline. Whether the redline is justified is not the issue. The issue is, knowing your adversary's position, is it worth the risk of pushing missiles into Finland?

The world has changed since Putin invaded Ukraine. Arguments that admitting Sweden and Finland to NATO could provoke Russia are less potent now since Putin's war shows he can be provoked by actions short of Ukraine's actual admission to NATO.

Diplomats, though, should try to envision how the Ukraine war might end. One possible end would be, as Zelenskyy has stated, a neutral Ukraine not militarily aligned with either the West or the East. Neutrality doesn't have to always be a weakness. Neutral nations can serve as intermediaries in conflict resolution. Often, our discussions with Iran use neutral Sweden as a conduit. When all nations are aligned, who will be the mediators? The world will soon lose the important roles played by a neutral Finland and Sweden.

But Putin's invasion in Ukraine has changed the world. In this new world, I am less adamant about preventing NATO's expansion with Sweden and Finland, but I am still adamant about the reality that NATO's expansion will come at a cost.

I am here today to propose a reservation to ensure that this expansion will not come at the expense of losing our ability to determine where and when the United States goes to war. My reservation merely reasserts that article 5 of the NATO treaty does not supersede Congress's constitutional responsibility to declare war before the United States commits troops to war.

The Founders designed the separation of war powers to ensure that the decision to engage in hostilities would be made only after serious delibera-

tion. According to our Constitution, the United States would resort to war only after the collective wisdom of the people's elected representatives determine war is in the best interest. We know this because our Founders told us so.

At the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, James Wilson stated that the proposed Constitution would not allow one man or even one body of men to declare war.

In Federalist No. 69, Alexander Hamilton explained that the President would be restricted to conducting the armies and navies, which Congress alone would raise and fund.

The Father of our Constitution, James Madison, argued:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature.

Some have argued that a vote for my amendment is to go wobbly on NATO's article 5 commitment. I would argue that the Gold Star parents and our men and women in the field don't want Congress to go wobbly on the Constitution.

There is no more serious question that we are entrusted to answer than whether to commit the men and women of the armed services to war. We cannot delegate that responsibility to the President, to the courts, to an international body, or to our allies. This is our constitutional responsibility, one that we have freely taken and one that our constituents expect us to uphold.

I also want to assure my colleagues here that adoption of my reservation will not jeopardize the NATO treaty. Some will argue that while the substance of my reservation is unobjectionable, the process of adopting the reservation threatens the expansion of NATO. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It is true that reservations must be accepted by the other parties, but the other parties are NATO allies. The other parties are NATO allies who are all dependent on us to come to their rescue. Do you think they are going to lecture us on obeying our own Constitution? We should expect those allies to respect article 11 of the NATO treaty, which states that the provisions of the treaty are to be carried out in accordance with each country's respective constitutional process.

Additionally, my reservation does not require any other country to take action or renegotiate the treaty. The reservation will be deemed accepted if our allies do not object after a period of 12 months.

I call on my colleagues to support my proposal to reaffirm that our Constitution and the NATO treaty are abundantly clear: Our international obligations do not supersede Congress's responsibility to declare war. It is in our Constitution. It is the supreme law of the land, and we should today reassert that we will obey the Constitution above all else.