

United States of America. That is what it is about today.

I yield the floor.

### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:50 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MURPHY).

### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 2, Treaty Document No. 117-1, amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the "Montreal Protocol"), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the "Kigali Amendment") and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 1 declaration.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Mazie Hirono, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Sheldon Whitehouse, Alex Padilla, Brian Schatz, Patty Murray, Jacky Rosen, Edward J. Markey, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the "Montreal Protocol"), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the "Kigali Amendment") and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 1 declaration, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 341 Ex.]

#### YEAS—64

Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schumer
Capito	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Cassidy	Markey	Tester
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	
Grassley	Peters	

#### NAYS—30

Barrasso	Hawley	Rounds
Blackburn	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tillis
Fischer	McConnell	Toomey
Hagerty	Paul	Tuberville

#### NOT VOTING—6

Baldwin	Duckworth	Risch
Cramer	Leahy	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 30.

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

### AMENDMENT TO MONTREAL PROTOCOL ("KIGALI AMENDMENT")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the treaty.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Calendar No. 2, Treaty Document No. 117-1, Amendment to Montreal Protocol ("Kigali Amendment").

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5503

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 5503.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5503 to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment (No. 5503) is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

#### SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution of ratification shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after ratification.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

I thank the leader for bringing this important legislative initiative to the Senate floor, and I want to thank our Republican colleagues who have joined in a bipartisan effort to send a very strong message that this is about America's competitiveness; this is about America's security; this is about challenging China.

For more than 20 years, U.S. manufacturers have been hard at work pioneering new technologies for our refrigerators and air-conditioners. They defined the global standard, and they have the competitive advantage over companies in China and India which have doubled down on yesterday's technology.

Our companies want and need the Senate to support them so that they can continue to lead, to create jobs, and to export their goods to global markets.

So this is why I come to the floor today, to urge my Senate colleagues to provide advice and consent to the Kigali Amendment, the fifth technical update to the incredibly successful Montreal Protocol, a treaty amendment that passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by bipartisan voice vote—a bipartisan voice vote. That just shows the depth and scope of bipartisan support. Each of the four prior updates were approved by the full Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to do the same for Kigali.

The amendment is a success story of business and government working together, dating back to the George W. Bush Administration. It is an update that will ensure U.S. leadership in exports into the future, and it is the only way—the only way—to keep our businesses from being locked out of markets across the world.

American businesses are clear. It is time to phase down antiquated chemicals, known as HFCs, which American manufacturers want to leave behind. It is time to usher in a new era in which the modern products are purchased all over the world.

Our companies already lead in this space. They have been investing billions of dollars to develop new technologies—alternatives to HFCs—and they have done so in ways that will ultimately decrease costs—decrease costs—for U.S. consumers. That is why, for the time being, we have the competitive advantage over China and others.

So the choice on this is clear: Ratifying Kigali means ensuring U.S. companies dominate the export markets. Failure to ratify means a wasted investment and a missed opportunity. Ratifying means we will see thousands more domestic manufacturing jobs—33,000, according to industry estimates. Failure to ratify means U.S. businesses that employ tens of thousands of people across the country will not—will not—be able to sell many of their products in key countries. We are talking about \$4.8 billion annually—annually—

of increased exports; \$12.5 billion of increased economic output per year. So do we want billions of dollars a year in more exports and economic output or do we want to have lost jobs? Do we want lost exports? Do we want our companies suffering needlessly?

Beginning in 2033, the nations all around the world that have already joined Kigali—137 of them and counting that have already done this—will be required—required—to block the imports of most HFCs from the countries that have not joined Kigali. So we would be blocked if we don't, in fact, ratify this amendment.

We don't want U.S. manufacturers to be on the outside looking in. They employ thousands of people all over the country. We don't want them to be unable to sell products that they had been at the forefront of developing. Adopting this treaty amendment is the only way to keep our businesses from being locked out of global markets.

So let's not waste the engagement and encouragement by the Bush administration that led U.S. manufacturers to develop alternatives to these harmful chemicals. Let's not waste the accomplishments made by the AIM Act, which President Trump signed into law. We need to remember that the AIM Act provides for the exact same chemical phasedown required by Kigali, which means that we have already taken the required steps domestically.

This means that we wouldn't be required to do anything more—anything more—if we ratify Kigali, but we will miss out on billions in exports and thousands of jobs if we fail to do so.

That is the essence. That is why manufacturers all over the country in States like Wisconsin, Texas, and Kentucky support Senate approval of Kigali. That is why there has been an outpouring of support from the business community, including major employers like Walmart, Carrier, Trane, Lennox, and others.

That is why the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the impacted industries all support this practical and bipartisan Senate action.

So, in closing, I ask my colleagues to fulfill our constitutional role in the treaty process by providing advice and consent to the Kigali Amendment. That requires 67 votes. I think we are well on our way there. Let's support American businesses. Let's continue to be the global leader. Let's support American consumers. Let's make sure the United States stays ahead of the competition. And let's beat China, instead of help China, at the end of the day. We can do all of that and so much more by adopting today's amendment.

And I want to thank so many who have worked on this in a bipartisan effort. Senator KENNEDY has been working very hard. I want to thank my colleague Senator CARPER, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, who has been so passionate

about the Kigali Amendment and such a force to bring us to this moment today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, while he is still here on the floor, I just want to express to Senator MENENDEZ, my thanks, our thanks, to him and others on the Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership and for setting us up for great success—American businesses up for extraordinary success here today. The path is clear. We need to use some common sense and work together, and I think we will benefit from that and so will the men and women who have sent us here to serve them and to represent them.

Mr. President, I rise today in support of ratification of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

I have worn many hats throughout my life of public service, including naval flight officer, State Treasurer, Congressman, Governor, and a U.S. Senator. Today, I rise to speak from my heart as a recovering Governor, if you will.

During my 8 years as Governor of Delaware, I realized quickly that my job was not to create jobs. That is not why they elected me. Rather, it was to help provide a nurturing environment for job creation—to help create a nurturing environment for job creation. More jobs were created in the 8 years that I was Governor of Delaware, I am told, than any other 8-year period in the history of the State of Delaware. I didn't create one of them, but we did work very hard with the legislature and with the business community and others to create a nurturing environment that made possible extraordinary job creation.

The most successful economic development policies were the policies that provided business with long-term certainty and predictability. As it turns out, that is not unique to Delaware or to New Jersey or to Connecticut or any other State represented here. It is something that we still hear from businesses across the country in all 50 States, and I am sure my other colleagues hear that message, too, on a regular basis.

That is why I am so passionate about working with our friend and colleague Senator JOHN NEELY KENNEDY to ratify the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

During the Trump administration, we successfully enacted the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act, known as the AIM Act, which phases down HFCs in accordance with the Kigali Amendment.

Ratification of the Kigali Amendment, along with implementation of the AIM Act, will provide businesses with certainty and with the predictability that they need for future investments.

Ratification will unleash billions of dollars in U.S. economic benefits—bil-

lions of dollars in U.S. economic benefits—and create some 150,000 American jobs by 2027.

I am going to repeat that. Ratification will unleash billions of dollars in U.S. economic benefits and create some 150,000 American jobs by 2027. These jobs are jobs in my State. These are jobs in every other State throughout our country. Why would we ever pass up this opportunity?

Let me be clear to my colleagues. I am not the one telling industry that ratification of the Kigali Amendment is good for business and economic growth. No, I am not telling them that. Industry leaders are telling us that Kigali is good for their businesses. Everyone from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the American Chemistry Council, to the Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, to the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy support ratification for Kigali. In fact, it is hard to find anyone in the business community who is opposed to ratification.

I would like to share with my colleagues today one statement that I think is particularly noteworthy from the National Association of Manufacturers. Here is what they have to say on this score:

Kigali ratification will protect American workers, grow the economy, and improve our trade balance all while encouraging further innovation to strengthen America's technology leadership. If we work together—if we rise above politics and partisanship and focus on solving problems—we can make our vision of a brighter tomorrow into reality.

But for my colleagues who are still hesitant to support the Kigali ratification and worried that ratification may hurt, not help, global competitiveness, here are a few points I would like for you to think about before tomorrow's vote.

First, I have heard concerns that ratification might benefit China and hurt the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. While the United States contributes roughly \$40 million annually to the Montreal Protocol's financial assistance programs, which facilitate the transition to next-generation technologies, it is not true that this assistance goes solely to China.

In fact, China only receives a very small fraction of these funds. According to the U.S. heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, and refrigeration industry, financial assistance to China under the Montreal Protocol supports less than 2 percent of China's \$37 billion refrigerant market—less than 2 percent of China's \$37 billion refrigerant market. Moreover, China's share of these funds is decreasing, not increasing. In fact, funding to China under the Montreal Protocol has decreased—has decreased—by nearly 70 percent in recent years.

Mr. President, the truth is, the small amount we pay every year under the Montreal Protocol is worth the investment and then some. Through Kigali

ratification, American businesses are set to gain nearly \$40 billion—\$40 billion—in economic benefits by 2027, according to a 2018 study by the University of Maryland. Ratifying Kigali will guarantee that American businesses continue to have access to international markets for refrigerants long into the future.

However, without ratification, American companies could lose full access to international markets for refrigerants after 2033, closing the door to billions in future economic opportunities for U.S. companies. Why would we want to allow that to happen?

Ratification also protects U.S. business investments. While China has doubled down on HFCs and the production of HFCs, a dumping of HFCs—and to this day illegally dumping HFCs into this country—the United States leads the world, I am proud to say—it leads the world in HFC alternatives. Ratification would protect against the illegal HFC dumping and smuggling. These are protections that U.S. businesses have sought.

I have also heard fears that ratifying the Kigali Amendment will somehow raise consumer costs. That is just not true. We are already transitioning away from HFCs similar to the way we transitioned away from ozone-depleting substances through the 1987 Montreal Protocol under President Reagan's leadership.

With the transition away from HFCs, we expect consumer costs to fall. Now, why is that? New refrigerants and related products run more efficiently. According to the EPA, use of HFC alternatives will save consumers and businesses billions of dollars in costs. Again, ratification means lower costs for consumers and for businesses while enhancing U.S. competition.

In closing, I hope our colleagues will join Senator KENNEDY and me in supporting the ratification of the Kigali Amendment. This is a treaty that fosters job creation—a lot of jobs. This is a treaty that promotes economic growth. This is a treaty that strengthens American leadership. This is a treaty of “Made in America,” not “Made in China.”

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NDAA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is this old document that no one reads anymore called the Constitution, and I think some of my colleagues should give it another read today.

The Constitution tells us what Congress is supposed to be doing here in DC, and that is national defense. It is

right there at the top. Now, some of my colleagues don't agree with it. They don't have that as the No. 1 concern. I think the majority do, but there are some who don't.

I would say this: For 61 years now, for 61 years in a row, Congress has fulfilled this duty by passing the National Defense Authorization Act to strengthen the common defense and support our troops. That is 61 years. That is a long track record. And this year will be my 62nd, and I am proud to say that I have had the opportunity to vote on over half of them in that timeframe. So I think I have a pretty good understanding of what it takes to get this bill done and the significance of this bill.

The way this typically works is the House does their bill; then the Senate does ours; and then we go into conference and create a bipartisan, bicameral conference report. That is commonly, normally what takes place. But that takes time. It really takes months. You know I have been in a position of being active in this for a long period of time. So when I look at the legislative calendar right now, I get concerned. The days are ticking down, and, frankly, we are running out of time to get this bill done, to do it the right way, and we are talking about the most important bill that we consider all year. Now, some people don't agree with that, but I certainly do. This tells us our ability to defend and help America to survive.

Senator REED and I believe deeply in this bill. We held a markup on June 15 and reported out a strong bipartisan bill. That was 3 months ago. Now, we have got an election in November that will likely eat away at the limited time that we have.

We saw last year what happens when this bill isn't given enough floor time. Last year, Majority Leader SCHUMER waited until the last possible moment to try to jam through the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, without debate right before Thanksgiving. If he delays it again, we don't get an open amendment process where every Senator has a chance to improve the bill. Now, we are talking about every Senator—not just the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee but all the others who are out there who have an interest in how to make this a better bill.

We have a virtually unlimited amendments process that we have enjoyed in the past. Now, if he delays, we get jammed in negotiating a conferenced bill with the House. The whole process would take longer, which leaves our military with more uncertainty and prevents them from moving out and getting things done. There are real consequences to waiting this long. It is bad for this institution. It is bad for our troops. It is bad for our national security.

Now, I understand some of my colleagues, including the majority leader, have different priorities than I do, but

I think this is the most important bill that we do all year. So this year, that is as true as ever. We have threats. We have two countries out there, Russia and China; they have capabilities that we never believed they had, and some capabilities are better than ours.

Now, people have this assumption—when I go out to Oklahoma or anywhere around the country and I talk about what we are doing here and explain to them that we have other countries out there, we have threats that are there, most people now agree that we are in the most threatened position that we have been in in a long period of time and the scope of threats that we have.

Senator REED and I deeply believe in this bill because it responds to those threats and it takes care of our troops. We finished markup 3 months ago. We could have gotten started—we could have been finished by now.

I have to admit, Mr. President, that I have a selfish motive. Now, how many Members of this body are going to stand up and admit they have a selfish motive, other than me? And that motive is that I want to get this bill done because it will be the last national defense authorization bill of my career. I want to make sure it is done right. I would hate to leave here without finishing the NDAA, without fulfilling our promises to our troops and the American people. I would hate even more to see the bill's six-decade track record broken. For the last 4 years as chairman and now ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, I have fought tirelessly to pass this bill.

I know the majority leader doesn't want to be responsible for the demise of Congress's last remaining annual authorization bill. There is really no time to waste. We are out of time now. The Senate is going to have to do, now, the NDAA.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Ms. SINEMA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE  
CALENDAR

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to seek consent to advance the nomination of a Virginian and friend, Leopoldo Martinez, to be Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank. The IDB is the largest source of development financing for Latin America and the Caribbean. It is a critical part of the ability of the United States to engage diplomatically with our American partners to counter a growing influence of Russia and China and Iran and other nations in the Americas. And it is very much in the national interest of the United States

to build up economic prosperity of countries in the Western Hemisphere.

We have seen over and over that when countries have troubled economies, it is not a distant or faraway problem. It drives government corruption; it drives organized crime; it drives drug abuse and drug trafficking. And then it expands migration that could start as a country's problems but very quickly become our country's problems as well. When we don't step up, we see that other nations—China and Russia, in particular—in the Americas fill the vacuum.

As Latin America and the Caribbean countries continue to face challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic—where the region has had the highest global per capita infection and death rates in the world and is experiencing the largest economic contraction of any region in the world—the IDB has a key role to play in improving economic outcomes for the region.

But the problem is the IDB is without an executive director. It is without leadership confirmed by the Senate at this critical moment in time.

Leopoldo Martinez brings decades of experience in the public and private sectors, as well as academia. He has extensive experience advising Fortune 500 companies, private equity funds, international businesses, and nongovernmental organizations. He is the CEO for the Center for Democracy and Development of the Americas, as well as a commissioner for small business in the Commonwealth of Virginia. He is on the board of one of our public universities, the University of Mary Washington.

And as I have said, he is not just a constituent; he is also a friend. And in all respect, he is outstandingly qualified for this position.

Now, I understand that there are differences of opinion in the Senate about the success, or lack thereof, about the Biden administration's policies in Latin America. Earlier this week or late last week, some of my Republicans challenged the Biden administration as being too soft on corruption issues in the Americas.

I was asked about my Republican colleagues' critiques, and I would say: Well, I got a critique, too. I wouldn't say they are too soft, but I would say they are too inattentive. I don't think we have, under this administration or the previous administration or the previous administration—going back nearly to the beginning of this country, I don't think we paid the attention to the Americas that we should.

And when we only pay episodic attention to the Americas, a lot of bad things happen in Western Hemisphere countries that end up making things worse for us. But if there is a critique to be laid against the Biden administration, or any administration in the Americas, we don't solve the critique by leaving key positions vacant that could be used to strengthen our activities in the hemisphere.

I understand that some of my colleagues have objected—and this was raised in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—to some, frankly, partisan tweets—some annoying and nasty tweets—that my friend Leo Martinez put on his social media accounts.

I want to say to pages: You might want to think about this now because in 10 or 30 years when you are running for the Senate or you are up for a position that is a Senate-confirmed position, anything you tweet is going to be held against you.

But I do think they have to be put into context. My friend Mr. Martinez is a Democrat. And no surprise, he is being nominated by a Democratic administration. He has let his tongue race ahead of his brain on a couple of occasions. But I think all 100 of us have seen this pretty often in the last 10 years, and we have learned to apply a little bit of a discounting to it.

I have voted for many Trump administration nominees who had some negative tweets and even said negative things about me. I didn't like them and I wouldn't have nominated them, but I would acknowledge that they are qualified for the job. And I believe that Mr. Martinez is more than that.

Finally, I want to speak, in particular, to my colleague from Texas, who is here. My colleague from Texas serves with me on the Foreign Relations Committee. I believe I am going to be accurate about this, but I will be corrected if I get any details wrong. He asked Mr. Martinez in some written questions about working together with faith-based organizations in his role in the IDB should he be confirmed because throughout the region and throughout the world, sometimes faith-based organizations are some of the most effective in, for example, providing humanitarian aid, working with refugees, et cetera.

The initial responses from Mr. Martinez, I believe, were not satisfactory to my colleague, and maybe other colleagues as well, but I do believe that Mr. Martinez has tried to amplify those and meet and discuss this issue.

I worked as a missionary in Honduras. I know very powerfully the role that religious organizations do in the region. I know how important it is for us, whether it is USAID or State Department or IDP, to work in tandem with some of these faith-based organizations who do such a powerful job. And everything I know about my friend Mr. Martinez suggests that he would see the value of those partnerships as well.

So with that, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Committee on Senate Foreign Relations be discharged and the Senate proceed to the following nomination: PN1028, Leopoldo Martinez Nucete, to be Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank; that the Senate vote on the nomination, with no intervening action or debate; that the motion to re-

consider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that no further motions be in order as to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

Let me start by expressing agreement with my friend from Virginia on two points he just raised: No. 1, his very good advice to the pages here and to any Senate staff that might be listening. The best thing to do probably is do not tweet. But if you must tweet—and I am guilty of that offense myself—remember that your tweets can and will be used against you; that the internet is forever. And as the father of daughters, I sometimes am terrified of what our children will say and to see it come back to haunt them years and decades later.

And the second thing my friend from Virginia said that I also agree with is he said, administrations from both parties have neglected the Americas. I think that is a serious problem. I am a strong believer in the Monroe Doctrine. I think the United States of America has a pivotal leadership responsibility in North America and in South America. And I think under both Republican and Democrat administrations, too often the executive branch has neglected the vital role of Central America, of South America, of our friends throughout the Americas. I think that problem has been exacerbated under the Biden administration because under the Biden administration, not only have they neglected the hemisphere, but what little attention they have given has had the effect of elevating the extreme left in Latin America—elevating socialists, elevating Marxists, elevating terrorists, and elevating enemies of America.

We see this tragically in the recent election in Colombia, where a strong friend and ally of America is now led by someone who had been a hard-left active terrorist, and I believe the Biden administration's actions, including delisting multiple terrorists from our official terrorism list, played a role in elevating an anti-American leftist in Colombia.

Well, how does that relate to this nomination? I rise to express very significant concerns with the nomination of Mr. Martinez Nucete.

For one thing, at the outset, Mr. Martinez Nucete is a man of the left—a man of the hard left. Now, the Senator from Virginia suggested that he may have sent an ill-advised tweet now and then, and that is true, but that is not the basis of my opposition.

He has been a hard partisan his entire life, and even further than that—and this is really quite remarkable—Mr. Martinez Nucete was actually a Socialist congressman in Venezuela. Under Hugo Chavez, he was a member or his party was a member of Socialist International, and he was a man of the hard left, the anti-American hard left.

Hugo Chavez was an unshakable enemy of America. Nicholas Maduro continues to be a brutal dictator, an illegitimate leader, and an enemy of America.

I believe President Biden nominating a fellow traveler, a Socialist congressman from Venezuela, for a major role dealing with Latin America is astonishingly ill-advised.

Secondly, Mr. Martinez Nucete has expressed an unusual—an odd—hostility to and antipathy for people of faith. This is not something we have seen in many nominees, but his answers have been peculiar in this regard. It is particularly inappropriate for the job to which he has been nominated.

For example, here is what the World Bank says about their role:

The Bank recognizes—

This is speaking of faith-based organizations.

—their distinct strategic value given their unique attributes, including the fact that more than 80 percent of the world's population claims religious affiliations. [Faith-based organizations] are found in every country and offer opportunities for partnership and advocacy on a broad range of key development issues.

It is not just the World Bank. Here is what USAID said:

Faith-based . . . organizations serve some of the most vulnerable populations in the world. They are often the first in and the last to leave, and [are] uniquely qualified to identify and meet local needs.

Indeed, here is what a study actually funded by the Inter-American Development Bank, where Martinez Nucete would be representing the United States, said, the IADB:

All institutions surveyed partnered with community groups and faith-based organizations to provide information.

Now, what are Mr. Martinez Nucete's views? Well, I asked him about them specifically when he came in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I asked him the extent to which he believed faith should be disentangled from development, because he had previously been quite vocal on his passions in that regard.

Here is his answer:

There should be no entanglement between government and religion. That is a bedrock constitutional principle for us in America. I don't think any particular culture or religion is superior to others in terms of achieving socioeconomic development.

Now, that answer was odd, and it was nonresponsive to the question I asked, so I asked more precisely for Mr. Martinez Nucete to describe the role that faith plays in economic development as a constraint and a contributing factor. And I remind you that these organizations repeatedly said faith-based organizations are integral to success in their mission.

Here is his answer:

Education and respect for human rights, promoting social mobility in market economies, is the key to development, not faith.

That is unusual. That degree of I think myopic hostility to faith and those with faith is odd in any nominee

but particularly one who would be required to deal with faith-based organizations on a daily basis.

I raised these arguments in committee, and he was defeated in the committee. We had an even—a deadlocked vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee precisely because of his answers, and then after that, he came back and revised his answers. I would say his revised answers were terrific. Clearly, someone wrote them who apparently does not have a manifest hostility to people of faith. But there is no reason to believe that his first answers were not true and honest and a reflection of his views.

There was a time not too long ago where the U.S. Senate found bipartisan consensus on many issues, including a defense of religious liberty. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed this body; I believe the vote was 97 to 3. Numerous iconic, liberal Democrats voted for RFRA. President Bill Clinton signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act into law. Sadly, we are no longer in that era. Too many in the Democratic Party now have embraced a view that is hostile and antagonistic to people of faith, whether people of the Christian faith, people of the Jewish faith, or people of other faiths. I wish that were not the case.

Nevertheless, I believe it is inappropriate for the U.S. representative on a development board that is required to deal with faith-based organizations on a regular basis to be both an extreme man of the left who was a Socialist congressman under Hugo Chavez and an individual who has expressed repeated antipathy to people of faith. Accordingly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, just a brief response. I will not respond to Senator CRUZ's representation of Mr. Martinez's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He has his opinion about what those words mean, and I think he quoted them accurately. But I would just say for anyone, you can go and look at that quote and decide for yourself whether you think that was a statement that was hostile to faith or whether that was a statement by a bank or business guy financier about what he thought were the most important issues that an international development bank should be focused on.

I read those same comments as not hostile or antipathetic to faith; I view them as comments of an individual who has been in the finance industry who knows what the remit of the international development bank is and is talking about his own priorities in terms of how that bank should program their work.

But I do want to respond to the first point. Senator CRUZ is correct about Mr. Martinez's past. He grew up in Venezuela. He was initially in a government that apparently had a lot of

promise to offer to Venezuelans because Mr. Chavez was elected by Venezuelans in a democratic election overwhelmingly. But my colleague didn't tell you the rest of the story.

Mr. Martinez is now a political exile from Venezuela who was part of the Venezuelan opposition, who has been strong in critiquing the human rights' record of both the Chavez and Maduro regimes, and I think that is actually one of the reasons that President Biden nominated him for this position. If anyone knows the danger of authoritarian governments, including authoritarian governments from the left in the Americas, and knows what it will take for America to counter that with smart strategies, it is somebody who grew up in that culture and came to realize the dangerous path that his country was on.

I think whoever is the IDB President is going to have an awful lot of work to do, but the single largest challenge in the Americas right now, at least in terms of pushing refugees out of the country, is in Venezuela. And who better than someone who knows it firsthand and, after seeing it, decided to become a dedicated member of the Venezuelan opposition in exile in the United States—who better to counter that influence?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, for each of the past 61 years straight, the Senate has passed the National Defense Authorization Act. I still remember the Presiding Officer's predecessor, John McCain, who used to rail on the Senate to get this done and making the very correct point that this should be the No. 1 priority of the U.S. Congress—making sure that our men and women in uniform received the training, the support, and the weapons they need in order to keep America safe.

The annual Defense bill is part of Congress's commitment to give our men and women in uniform the resources they need to surmount the growing threats of today and prepare for the ones that inevitably will come tomorrow.

As we know here in the Senate, the global threat landscape is not getting easier. It is getting more and more dangerous. Some of the changes happen quickly and can be traced to a single moment in time.

For example, September 11, 2001, changed everything in our conversation and our acts to fight terrorism across the world. That single day and that single act forced us to reexamine our longstanding military paradigm

and change course as rapidly as we could.

But other threats grow over time. Just look at the rise of the People's Republic of China. Over the course of roughly four decades, China has transformed itself from a poor, isolated country to the world's second largest economy. Its wealth is used to finance a powerful military, with increasingly aggressive and hostile acts.

Looking back over the last year or so, it is remarkable to consider how much has happened and how quickly the global threat picture has shifted.

Last year at this time, American troops were still on the ground in Afghanistan, but President Biden made the decision to retreat ahead of the 20th anniversary of September 11, and our servicemembers and diplomats were preparing for what we assumed would be an orderly withdrawal. There wasn't much optimism about the long-term fate of the Afghan Government, but it was expected to hold out for at least 6 months following our withdrawal.

At the same time, tensions between Russia and Ukraine were high, but nothing really much new. The countries have had a long, tense relationship since the collapse of the Soviet Union, but there didn't seem to be any reason for immediate alarm. Ukrainian cities were as vibrant, lively, and free as ever.

In a little over a year's time, though, all of that has changed. The Taliban took control of Afghanistan before our troops even exited, leading to a chaotic exit and the loss of 13 heroic servicemembers and other Americans left behind.

In this period of time, Russia has launched an unprovoked war on Ukraine, bringing death and destruction to the Ukrainian people. Over the past several months, thousands of Ukrainian civilians have died and more than 13 million have been displaced. Europe is now experiencing the largest refugee crisis since World War II.

To finance its ongoing war machine, Russia is developing even closer ties to communist China. Meanwhile, North Korea has declared itself a nuclear weapons state. Iran appears to be inching even closer to acquiring a nuclear weapon, and China's threats against Taiwan have only grown more dangerous in this period of time.

It is striking to consider how much has changed in such a short period. Last summer, it would have been nearly impossible for us to predict that this is where we would be some 14 months later.

I am reminded of former Secretary of Defense Bob Gates' words in 2011. He said:

When it comes to predicting the nature and location of our next military engagements, since Vietnam, our record has been perfect. We haven't gotten it right once.

Of course, he is absolutely correct. It is impossible to anticipate the challenges that face us and that are on the

horizon, but that doesn't mean we should sit idly by and hope that we are ready for what is coming. There is simply no security in that sort of fantasy. We need to start taking actions today to ensure that we are prepared for whatever comes knocking at our door.

Everybody knows that in order to secure our defense and be prepared to deter aggression from aggressive actors we need money. We need to make sure that we have the weapons that are needed not only to supply countries like Ukraine, not only to replenish the supply from our NATO allies that have been, in turn, supplying weapons to Ukraine, but we need to be ready for whatever comes knocking at our door.

Our military leaders need to plan and train every single day for the unknown, and that is exactly why a strong, on-time National Defense Authorization Act is absolutely critical. Now more than ever, we need to take stock of evolving threats and start preparing.

One of the problems that Britain faced in World War II is they did not heed Winston Churchill's warning about the growing military strength and ambitions of Nazi Germany. Britain, in the end, as a result, was hanging on by a thread, and that is where the United States got involved in becoming the arsenal of democracy in the Lend-Lease Program, which provided the Brits the military equipment they needed, the aviation platforms, and the weapons in order to defend themselves and to survive until the United States got involved in World War II, following the attack at Pearl Harbor by the Japanese.

Over the last 20 years, we have developed a military that is used to fighting unconventional, asymmetrical threats, like insurgent groups in the Middle East. We have been focused on the war on terrorism since 9/11, but things have changed in the interim. Now, a conflict with China or Russia seems more likely.

To prevent or to prevail in such a conflict, we need a more conventional, highly technological modern military.

In addition to determining what capabilities we need, we also have to ask ourselves whether our defense industrial base—that arsenal of democracy, as Franklin Roosevelt called it in World War II—whether our defense industrial base can even support the production of what our military will need to prepare for in the future.

There is clearly a lot of work that needs to be done, but, like a lot of things, it can't happen overnight. That is why it is so important that we get started today. In order for the military to invest in these new programs and capabilities to deter Chinese and Russian aggression against American interests and American allies and in order to send the demand signal to our industrial base for new and emerging defense requirements, we have to pass the National Defense Authorization Act.

It is not just the long-term threats that we need to address. We need to close the near-term security gaps too. If another conflict came knocking at our door today, we would be at a tremendous disadvantage; and that is, as I said, because the United States has been supplying weapons to Ukraine to defend its own sovereignty. But when we do that, that means those weapons are not available to us should President Xi decide to invade Taiwan or some other military conflict pops up around the world.

We provided Ukraine with unprecedented defense aid, including Javelins, Stingers, grenade launchers, small arms, ammunition, and much more. This assistance, to be sure, is not a handout. This is not a charity project. Like our allies, the United States has made a strategic decision to invest in the outcome. It is not just that we want Ukraine to win this war; we also need Russia to lose. We cannot risk a Russian victory that will embolden the Kremlin to push its fight even farther West.

There is no question that this is the right thing to do, both strategically and morally, but we must remain clear-eyed about the risks that our assistance carries. Every piece of equipment or weapon that we send is one less that we have ourselves in our arsenal. We need to ensure that the assistance that we provide does not end up weakening our own military readiness. The cards are already stacked against us, and we certainly don't need to weaken our own hand.

That is why Senator SHAHEEN and I have introduced the Securing American ARMS Act, which will help us replenish our defense stockpiles more quickly. The Pentagon is already working toward this goal, but there are a lot of bureaucratic hurdles and just redtape that stand in the way.

The Defense Department can't place an order for more Javelins and have them show up at the Pentagon 5 to 7 business days later. It doesn't work like that. The process of purchasing, manufacturing, and deploying lethal aid takes a lot of time which, frankly, we don't have.

That is where the Securing American ARMS Act comes in. This bill will remove some of those time-consuming hurdles to allow the Defense Department to fast-track the procurement process. It will allow us to provide critical support for our partners and allies now and in the future without compromising our own national defense.

I appreciate Senator SHAHEEN working with me on this bill, which now has more than a dozen bipartisan cosponsors. I am offering this legislation as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting its inclusion in the final bill.

Now more than ever, a well-prepared and well-funded military is an imperative. The rapid changes in the threat landscape should serve as a wake-up



call for anyone who thinks we can carry on with the status quo.

For our forces to continue fighting and defeating evil in every corner of the world, we need to provide that funding. They need the stability, and they need the unwavering support of the U.S. Congress.

As new powers rise and old powers fall, our country must be prepared for whatever changes are on the horizon. Congress has a critical role in that preparation, and we can't ignore our responsibility. We need to pass a strong National Defense Authorization Act as soon as possible, and I would urge Senator SCHUMER, the Senate majority leader, to bring that bill to the floor as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

#### REMEMBERING QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and service of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, who was laid to rest in Windsor Castle just yesterday.

Queen Elizabeth conducted herself with dignity and grace and represented the best of the United Kingdom to the world. She was unwavering in her support for the United States, and the American people reciprocated with their admiration and respect for her.

My sympathies to the royal family and to the people of Great Britain. We treasure our unique relationship and America stands with you once again as we mourn your loss.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. President, I am here on the floor of the Senate for the 23rd week in a row to bring to the attention of the Senate, to my constituents, and to the American people the latest news of Russia's illegal, unprovoked, and brutal war against Ukraine.

I will talk about the disturbing news from Ukraine, about more Russian war crimes, and I will discuss the upcoming vote on the supplemental spending bill for the effort in Ukraine and why it is so important right now to continue to support Ukraine as it makes progress in pushing back against Russia's war of aggression.

Last week, I spoke about Ukraine's stunning advances up here in the north around Kharkiv. After distracting the Russians with a counteroffensive here in the south near Kherson, the Ukrainian Army launched a surprise counteroffensive in the north and punched through the Russian lines. In just a matter of days—as you see in the light blue part of the map here, in just a matter of days, the Ukrainian Army

was able to liberate roughly 300 settlements across 3,000 square miles and liberate over 150,000 Ukrainians from Russian occupation. They also managed to capture hundreds of pieces of Russian military equipment and vehicles and ammunition. So now, instead of being used to kill and subjugate innocent Ukrainian citizens, these vehicles, the equipment, and the munitions can be used by Ukrainian forces to liberate their fellow citizens from Russian tyranny. There were stories of Russian soldiers abandoning their equipment and stealing Ukrainian cars to make their escape—even stealing motorbikes and bicycles.

Last Wednesday, Ukraine's President Zelenskyy visited a town in this area. The town is called Izium. Izium is located right here on the map. It is a very strategic town for the Russians. Just 4 days before he stepped foot there, this town was under Russian occupation, and even when he visited, the frontline was only about 6 miles away.

Izium had been used as an important logistics hub from which the Russians attacked south and east into the Donbas region—down into this area. This was supposed to be the northern part of the pincer that Russia would use to trap Ukrainian forces in the Donbas. The Ukrainian forces who were here had to deal with this area that would be used as a station ground to build a cut-off to Ukrainian troops. Instead, it is now under Ukrainian control.

There were reportedly 10,000 Russian soldiers in this town of Izium, and most thought it would be months before Ukraine would recapture it. But after just a couple of days of a lightning strike, this town, which had been held by the Russians for 6 months, is now free, its Russian occupiers on the run.

Unfortunately, what the occupiers left behind was not just military equipment, but clear evidence of Russian atrocities. Ukrainian officials say multiple graves have been found near the city's cemetery. President Zelenskyy has said it contained the bodies of civilians—civilian adults, civilian children—as well as Ukrainian soldiers showing signs of violent deaths including evidence of torture.

Oleksandr Filchakov, the chief prosecutor of the Kharkiv region, has confirmed that at least 445 graves were at one site in this town. Here is a photo of some of the corpses that had been discovered.

Some corpses had their hands tied behind their backs. Others had ropes around their necks. Some victims are still being identified, but as an example, investigators have confirmed that among the dead are the entire Stolpakov family—Elena, her husband Dmitry, 6-year-old Olesya, 8-year-old Sasha, and Elena's parents. They were killed by a Russian air strike on their home in this region. Again, another target—a civilian target of Russian missiles.

Nearly 400 civilian graves in Izium were found near a previous graveyard; but near there, they also found 17 graves of Ukrainian soldiers. Their hands were all tied, and they appeared to be shot at close range. They were in a single mass grave, bodies piled upon one another.

They were executed. So those killed in Izium were men, women, children, soldiers, and noncombatants alike—more victims of Russia's brutal and unprovoked war. CNN described the scene this way:

Even the heavy rainfall couldn't erase the smell of death in pine forests in Izium.

President Zelenskyy described it as “cruelty and terrorism.” Ukrainian Ambassador to the United States, Oksana Markarova said yesterday that the scene was one of “torture, rapes, killings, and war crimes of a massive proportion.” It is indeed inhumane and genocide, but it is not the first time we have seen evidence of Russia committing such horrible atrocities.

A commander in the National Guard announced that his team is also hunting for additional graves reportedly of people who were abused, victims who were abused, at a detention center in Kozacha Lopan, north of Kharkiv. It is this area up here. Certainly, we will learn about many more graves and many more atrocities in this area as we begin to discover more and more of these war crimes being committed by the Russians.

Over the weekend, President Zelenskyy also said that Ukrainian forces had found 10 makeshift torture chambers throughout the liberated territories in that Kharkiv region. According to him, some of these rooms had tools for Russian soldiers to conduct electric torture on innocent Ukrainians. This photo is from inside one of these cellars—one of these makeshift torture chambers—that were found in the Kharkiv region. Here you can see where a prisoner actually scratched the Lord's Prayer on the wall of the torture chamber.

The liberating soldiers are also recovering bodies on the battlefield, which is where they are aligned too often in farm fields or woods, just left to rot in the fields and the woods. This is what Russia has done to Ukraine. This is not a one-off event.

When Senator KLOBUCHAR and I were in Ukraine 3 weeks ago, we visited Bucha, a suburb of Kyiv, and we saw the spot where Russian soldiers had dug a mass grave for dozens of innocent civilians they had murdered during their occupation. Sadly, the murder, the torture, and the rape discovered in Bucha was not unique. These horrific events that happen behind Russian lines often aren't known to the world until that area is liberated by Ukrainian forces. One has to wonder what other Russian horrors are currently occurring in occupied areas that we will witness when Ukraine finally liberates the rest of its territory.

This is the grim reality of Russia's war. President Putin claims that his

war is about liberating Ukrainians and reuniting them with the Ukrainian “brothers and sisters,” but this photo is not what brothers and sisters do to each other. This is not a war of freedom or a war of liberation. This is a war of conquest and genocide. And over the weekend, we also got a glimpse of what happens to the Ukrainian children who have lost their parents in this war and fall into Russia’s hands.

Russia’s Presidential Commissioner for Children’s Rights, who by the way has been sanctioned by the United States, recently stated that Russian authorities are placing 125 Ukrainian orphans with Russian families. Of course, the natural solution here would be to put these children in the care of their extended family members in Ukraine, allow them to stay in their country, but that is not their objective. Russia’s goal isn’t to provide a better future for these children. Their goal is to erase their Ukrainian identity and turn them into Russians. Under the rules laid down by the United Nations, “forcibly transferring children of one group to another group” constitutes genocide. Another example.

Frustrated by Ukrainian gains in the northeast and in the south that we have seen on these maps, Russians have begun bombing civilian infrastructure at increased rates, like powerplants and dams, threatening the livelihoods of millions of innocent Ukrainians. Unfortunately, we have to expect more missiles being fired into Ukraine to terrorize civilians.

Just this weekend, a Russian missile struck about 300 yards away from a nuclear powerplant in southern Ukraine, threatening a nuclear disaster. Now this was not the Zaporizhia plant that we have talked about a lot on this floor. This is another powerplant. The Zaporizhia plant, as you know, is the largest nuclear powerplant in all of Europe. It provides 20 percent of electricity—or did—to the country of Ukraine. That is a plant that the Russians are using as a shield, much as they have used energy as a weapon, including in Europe, cutting off energy unless Europe agrees to stop the necessary sanctions. They have used food as a weapon, bombing grain bins in the Odesa region, keeping food from going to starving people in Africa. Now they are actually using nuclear powerplants as weapons in this war. It is all reckless; it is all dangerous, but this risks a catastrophe by creating a military zone around a nuclear powerplant and firing on Ukrainian forces from there and actually exploding parts of the plant that connect to Ukraine. This is incredibly dangerous and risks something like the tragedy we had at Chernobyl.

So all of this is precisely why we need to continue to give Ukraine the help it so desperately needs. Vladimir Putin will continue his reign of terror against the neighbor that just wants to live in peace, unless he knows that

there are consequences. He is betting that he can use terror to intimidate Ukraine and its allies into surrendering.

Let me be clear, I want this brutal war to end as much as anyone else in this Chamber, but the responsible way to end this war is not to stop providing our assistance to our allies and watch as Ukraine slowly falls to Russian domination. The right way to end this war is to actually win it, to continue to provide Ukraine the weapons it needs to keep advancing and liberating territory, like it did over these past few weeks. For the sake of global freedom, Ukraine must be allowed to end this war on its own terms, not Russia’s.

That is why, when this Chamber votes on the continuing resolution to keep government open next week, I urge my colleagues to also support the expected supplemental request for additional Ukraine funding. Most important to me, frankly, is the military support, including needed ammunition for the weapons they already have and including refilling our own stockpiles of military weapons and ammunition. This is one way we can show Vladimir Putin that we will not stand for his war crimes. The West and our allies all need to recognize that these Russian atrocities will not stop until there are more victories on the battlefield and until sanctions are more effective at cutting off funding to Russia’s war machine. The world is watching, and if President Putin’s military is not held accountable for these atrocities, it sends a signal to other rogue leaders that they will be able to get away with the same types of war crimes.

As Congress considers this latest request for support, I hope my colleagues will think about four things.

One, the mass graves I mentioned at the beginning of my speech. We should not turn a blind eye to the indiscriminate violence Russia has wrought on Ukraine. Vladimir Putin will continue his reign of terror against the neighbor that just wants to live in peace unless he knows, again, that there will be consequences. As President Zelenskyy said, “Russia leaves death everywhere and must pay for it.”

Second, despite these atrocities, Ukraine is turning the tide of the war, in large measure, because of our help. It is working. This map, to me, is very interesting because it shows here on February 24, after the invasion of Ukraine on that date, how much territory that the Russians controlled, not just the parts that they had already controlled, down here in Crimea, here in Luhansk and Donetsk. But look at all the territory that they controlled at that time, including right up to the city of Kyiv. This is where the famous battle occurred at the airfield outside of Kyiv where they had planned to bring in heavy weapons and more military and topple the government in the capital of Kyiv. But, look, all this in red, all of this in red; and today here we are. So we have made progress. The

Russians have come along the Donbas area. And now, more recently, of course, we have made additional progress, here and here, to push the Russians back. This would not have happened without the support of this body. And we must think about that as we look at this additional request for funding. We are making a difference. Specifically, thanks to this Congress, these long-range missiles called HIMARS have been extremely effective in enabling Ukraine to be able to strike behind enemy lines and disrupt Russia in ways no one thought possible. Before the Russians were sitting back and firing on Ukrainian positions and Ukrainians couldn’t respond because they couldn’t reach the Russian guns. They were firing with impunity, killing civilians, killing Ukrainian soldiers. Now, with these new weapons, these HIMARS, these longer range missiles coming from the United States, coming from the UK, coming from Germany, Ukrainians are able to hold their own and more, as we see with their advances in the south and in the northeast.

We need to keep it up, particularly at a time when Russia is getting help from its own partners. As our Republican leader, Senator McCONNELL, pointed out, Iran is equipping the Russian military with armed drones like the ones that they used against American forces in Syria and Iraq. Additionally, there are reports that North Korea has supplied Russia with artillery shells.

Third, I would ask my colleagues to remember this is not just about Ukraine. We have got to remember that Vladimir Putin has said that “the borders of Russia never end.”

Earlier this summer, President Putin said he views Ukraine as basically just the first step toward recreating the Russian empire. His advisers have made similar statements about their intent with regard to this war. It is not just about Ukraine.

What the United States does matters. What we do in defense of global freedom not only shows the world we will stand up for Ukraine against a rogue authoritarian attacking an ally, but our actions show our adversaries that we are ready to defend democracy around the world. And it is not just the United States providing this military support, just remember that. Forty-nine other countries are contributing, in one way or another, weapons, ammunition, training, and so on. And with regard to economic support, more countries than 50 are providing help to Ukraine.

Fourth, I ask my colleagues to remember that there are important guardrails to ensure this assistance from the U.S. taxpayers is very well accounted for, and there should be. While in Poland recently, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I met with the 101st Airborne to discuss their unprecedented end-use monitoring of our military equipment that goes into Ukraine. This has



ramped up even further with the addition of our Embassy staff on the ground in Kyiv, which we also heard about when we were there, to ensure there is no diversion of the military assistance that we are providing. Again, this is an unprecedented level of accountability, and it is necessary. Transparency is absolutely needed and promised by the Ukrainians. I will say that from President Zelenskyy to members of his government, to members of Parliament we met with, everyone said the same thing; they too want total transparency and accountability. It is very important to them. Just as they are continuing their reforms against corruption even in the face of this war, they want transparency with regard to all the aid. They have an accounting firm in Ukraine that is following the budgetary funding that goes from this place, this Congress, to Ukraine as well. And they have a need and an interest in transparency themselves.

With regard to the end game in Ukraine—and some have asked me about here on this floor—I believe Ukraine's Ambassador to the United States, Oksana Markarova, said it well: Ukraine will not rest until all our country is free, all our people are back and Russia is brought to justice.

As Russia's military suffers setbacks in Ukraine, that is actually good news for the freedom-loving countries of the world. For decades, Russia has used its military to threaten and coerce its neighbors. Think of Russia's invasion of Ukraine this year and back in 2014 when they invaded Crimea and the Donbas. Russia, under its current government, is a threat to all of its neighbors. Think about its invasion in Georgia in 2008, and its ongoing occupation of parts of Moldova, just to name a couple.

As Russia's military is weakened, Europe and the United States are made safer. So our support matters. Global support matters. I believe President Putin responds to strength, and weakness on our part would only invite more aggression. Helping Ukraine is just one way to show our strength and to show our resolve as a country and as an alliance. I noted last week that we are finally seeing the fruits of our labor when you look at the progress that has been made. The support now is more important than ever. Three thousand—three thousand square miles of territory has been liberated just in the past few weeks.

This is the battle of our generation. This is the fight between authoritarianism and democracy on the world stage—the fight between evil and good. Freedom is at stake. Ukrainians are fighting for that. They are fighting for democracy, for the right to live free, for the right to chart their own course; and, as we have seen, they will fight like hell for it. We see this every single day in their courage and their resolve. They are fighting for their family. They are fighting for

their homeland. They are fighting for their freedom.

When Senator KLOBUCHAR and I met with President Zelenskyy last month, he started and ended our discussion with expressing gratitude to the American people for their willingness to stand with Ukraine. He spoke about Russia's war on his country as our joint battle as all freedom-loving countries strive toward our joint victory. Ukraine is the shield of democracy. It is bearing the full brunt of the aggression that Russia has threatened against Europe for years and is still standing strong.

It is in our interest that Russia's military aggression ends here. The sword of Russian imperialism must be broken in Ukraine by Ukrainians, and the United States and our allies need to continue to provide those brave Ukrainians with the tools they need to be successful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 1120 and 1059; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the en bloc nominations of Randy W. Berry, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia; and Robert A. Wood, of New York, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

##### BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate a budget

scorekeeping report. The report, which covers fiscal year 2022, was prepared by my staff on the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This information allows the Senate Budget Committee to determine if budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation.

The report shows the effect on spending and revenues of congressional action through September 15, 2022, as compared to the levels the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2022, S. Con. Res. 14. Since my last scorekeeping report on April 28, seven laws with significant budgetary effects have been signed by the President, and I have revised the levels in the budget resolution two times for legislation.

The Democratic staff of the Budget Committee prepared tables 1 and 2. Table 1 compares the mandatory spending of each authorizing committee against the enforceable allocations under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act. It shows 10 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations, either because no legislation with significant budgetary costs was enacted or the legislation qualified under the budget resolution for an allocation adjustment. Most of the spending above allowable levels is attributed to either the CHIPS Act of 2022 or the Honoring our PACT Act of 2022.

Table 2 shows the Senate pay-as-you-go—PAYGO—scorecard tallying enacted legislation with significant effects on mandatory spending and revenues. The scorecard shows a savings of \$4.7 billion in 2022, a deficit of \$174 billion over the 2022–2026 period, and a deficit of \$528 billion over the 2022–2031 period. When compared to the allowable amounts on the PAYGO scorecard last adjusted on September 12, there is a deficit of \$1.3 billion on the scorecard for 2022, \$185 billion over the 2022–2026 period, and \$667 billion over the 2022–2031 period.

In addition to these tables, I am submitting a letter from the Congressional Budget Office with further detail. For fiscal year 2022, current budgetary levels are within allowed amounts. Current law budget authority is \$2.6 billion below the maximum allowed in the revised budget resolution, outlays are \$17 billion below the allowed maximum, and revenues are \$68 million above the allowed minimum. The tables also show that there has been no net change for Social Security.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying tables from CBO be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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