

The United States has been doing a good job of maintaining our energy security. We developed domestic resources, both renewable and conventional, which meant that we were able to minimize our reliance on other countries. But President Biden upended that trajectory with his singular focus on Green New Deal policies, and now we are at an inflexion point, honestly.

President Biden's energy policies have put us on a dangerous trajectory, one that could easily result in significant disruptions to our domestic supply. For starters, there is the President's notable hostility to conventional energy production. Since the day he took office, President Biden has pursued an agenda that is hostile to conventional sources of energy—namely, oil and natural gas.

He set the tone on his first day in office when he canceled the Keystone XL Pipeline—a pipeline project, by the way, that was already underway and was to be paired with \$1.7 billion in private investment in renewable energy to fully offset its operating emissions. He also almost immediately froze new oil and gas leases on Federal lands, sending a clear signal to oil and gas producers that his administration would be reluctant to work with them to increase American energy production. And he has continued along the same lines ever since, with a recent notable example being his cancellation of seven oil and gas leases in the small portion of the ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, that is available for energy exploration and development.

The problem with the President's actions, of course, is that our Nation is nowhere near being able to end our reliance on conventional energy. And let me just say, I am a big and longtime supporter of renewable energy, but we are simply not in a position yet where we can rely predominantly on alternative energy technologies. The President himself admitted as much in his most recent State of the Union Address, but that hasn't stopped him from pursuing policies that seem designed to eventually force our Nation to rely on other countries for oil and gas, with all the attendant security and economic risk that brings.

And the President's energy agenda isn't limited to canceling oil and gas leases or discouraging investment in conventional energy production. Also of deep concern is the President's apparent determination to force Americans to adopt electric vehicles on a broad scale within the next decade. And why is this so concerning? Because our electric grid is nowhere near capable of supporting that kind of a widespread transition to electric vehicles. Rising electricity demand is already stretching our grid, which has been weakened by the move away from conventional energy sources.

In February, the PJM Interconnection, which manages a substantial part of eastern America's electric grid, warned that fossil fuel plants are being

forced to retire at a faster rate than new renewables can be brought online—at a rate of roughly 2 to 1. In other words, we are rapidly approaching a situation in which we simply don't have the ability to keep up with our current electricity demand. Add charging for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of electric vehicles on top of that, and we would be looking at a future of widespread blackouts and brownouts, to say nothing of soaring electricity prices.

So it goes without saying that a nation that can't reliably keep its lights on or its homes heated is a nation that is less than secure. To make matters worse, the Biden administration has proposed a rule that would severely constrain supply chain for distribution transformers, which is a critical component of America's electric grid.

Stakeholders are already facing significant backlogs for these critical components, whether they are trying to recover from a storm, improve the grid, or tie in new development. The Biden administration's proposed rule would guarantee that these problems would get worse.

Recent events remind us that we can't take our Nation's security for granted. We have to work constantly to maintain our Nation's strength, both to ensure that we are always prepared to meet any threat and because being strong is the best way to discourage any threat; and energy security is an essential part of maintaining that strength. If we want to maintain our energy security and if we want to maintain the kind of energy supply that can not only deal with all domestic energy demands but will leave us free from overreliance on other countries, we can't keep heading down the path the Biden administration has set us on.

I hope the President and his allies will realize this important point before it is too late.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 6126

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, time is of the essence. Yes, time is of the essence, and that is why I rise today, once again, in calling for the immediate passage of the House-led and passed bipartisan, standalone aid package for Israel that will provide our ally

with \$14 billion in military assistance for their ongoing war with the savage Hamas terrorists. This standalone bill does not use Israel as a lever to fund Ukraine funding or to make our border more porous to terrorists and criminals.

I want to start by sharing two stories—the stories of two gentlemen I met last week. I am going to start with Doran. Doran's brother was the mayor of a kibbutz located within a stone's throw from Gaza. As the mayor, he often welcomed Palestinians from Gaza. He shared meals with them and conversed with them. It was a peace-loving family. But on the morning of October 7, Doran's brother, the mayor, was brutally murdered by Hamas.

But that wasn't enough. Next, his brother's mother-in-law was murdered. Then, his son was murdered and, finally, a nephew. In a matter of a few hours, a woman lost her husband, her mother, her son, and her nephew.

The other story I want to share is of two brothers, Gal and Guy. Gal was the older brother. Guy was the younger brother. They went to the peace and love music festival, just about 3 miles away from the Gaza Strip. And, on the morning of October 7, Gal was watching over his brother Guy, and they heard gunshots, and they heard rockets going off, and they both decided to run for their cars. They were split up, and, while Gal made it home, Guy never did.

Later that same day, his family saw horrifying videos of his brother lying on the ground, handcuffed, and who remains a hostage to this day. And, of course, we have no idea if Guy is alive or not.

So I ask: Why is this important? Why is time of the essence?

Listen, Israel is a powder keg, and it is about ready to explode. For starters, since we were here last, Hamas leadership has declared its desire for a permanent state of war with Israel on all borders. There continues to be a barrage of missiles, rockets, and drone attacks on Israel that has worsened since the war broke out, with Hamas firing at Israel nearly 10,000 times.

Since October 7, 50 attacks have occurred on U.S. military installations. Some 52 American soldiers have been injured, not to mention that we lost 30-some Americans, killed on October 7 by these monsters called Hamas.

So why is time of the essence? Right now, there are still hundreds of innocent people, like Gal's brother Guy, being held captive, and, most likely, being tortured and raped by Hamas terrorists, including 10 Americans.

So I stand here today, again, calling on my Democratic colleagues to do the right thing, and today—yes, today—pass this aid for Israel in their time of need. It has been over 5 weeks since the Hamas army of terror launched its savage and brutal assault on our greatest ally in the Middle East. The House and its bipartisan solution have only been met with obstruction by my friends across the aisle in this Chamber, and

the American public wants to know why the White House and my friends here across the aisle insist upon leveraging this funding in order to fund their other priorities.

Is there really anybody across the aisle who objects to Israel receiving funding and to help stop this war against humanity?

This delay in providing this aid is not lost on Israel, raising questions about our commitment as an ally, and perhaps equally concerning is the message it sends to Hamas terrorists, emboldening them in their murderous endeavors. And our slow response reinforces the White House message that America has no redline, and they can continue to attack our military without significant recourse.

America is not a fair-weather friend. We must stand unequivocally with Israel, a country that has stood beside us as a staunch ally through thick and thin. We must pass this aid today.

Now, when I met with Doran—who lost, as you recall, four members of his family on October 7—he pledged with me to help get one clear message to the American people: Hamas does not use logic. We are not dealing with a civilized nation here. Their evil defies any type of logic. They don't make sense. These people are evil monsters who rape, torture, and kill their enemies.

And, by the way, every person in this room is one of their enemies. Anyone in America who does not believe in their religious ideas is their enemy, whom they have pledged to kill.

Hamas, Iran, and its proxies have all taken an oath to kill every American. Yet some of my colleagues across the aisle have attempted to delay the delivery of this critical military assistance, as they call for negotiations with these terrorists in a ceasefire.

I would ask each one of my friends across the aisle who is holding up this bipartisan funding to sit down with a victim of Hamas's savage attacks. Please invite any one of the 170 family members who are here on Capitol Hill today, who have family members currently being held as hostages—their friends and family members being used as a human shield by this evil terrorist group. I am asking you to sit down with them and listen to their stories of how Hamas terrorists tortured, maimed, and massacred the most Jewish people in a single day since the horror of horrors, the Nazi Holocaust.

I want to make sure it is clear today: Hamas evil defies any logic. There is no negotiating with them. There are no terms that they would seriously consider. All they understand are death, horror, and destruction.

Let's make this point perfectly clear. Our hesitation to provide bipartisan funding to our staunch ally Israel empowers Hamas and gives Iran and its proxies a green light to kill Americans.

I would like to urge everyone to take this measure and adopt it immediately. And, for now, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, my friend Senator VANCE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, thanks to my colleague from Kansas here. Look, this is pretty simple, and it is pretty obvious. The U.S. Senate would pass aid—much-needed aid—to Israel today, at this very moment, aid the House has already passed. It could go to the President's signature this afternoon if my Democratic colleagues would stand down. But they won't. Many of them here are gathered to push back against our very commonsense proposal to offer support to one of our most important allies as they face an existential threat. And it is important for us to be honest about that fact, to acknowledge that Israel would be getting support from this government tomorrow if our Democratic friends didn't stop it today.

Now, why are they doing this? You will hear over the next hour or so—we will hear—a lot of slogans but very little real discussion about our policy in Ukraine or our policy in Israel. The Democrats have decided that this must be combined into a massive hodgepodge package for it to pass the U.S. Senate. They are doing this because they know that America is united behind Israel, and they want to use our Israeli allies as a political cover in their time of crisis. That is all this is about. You will hear a whole lot, but that is, ultimately, what this is about.

They know they cannot defend President Biden's disastrous, pointless, and, ultimately, directionless Ukraine policy, so they would like to use Israel as a cover.

Now, we have before us a hodgepodge of a supplemental from the President of the United States. It combines a few billion dollars for Ukraine with a few billion dollars to Gazan support—because that makes a ton of sense, right? Let's give money to the Israelis to fight back against Hamas, and then let's give some money to Hamas too. I am sure they won't use it to kill Israelis. It will just be food and medicine, we are assured, even though we know that because Hamas is the functional government in Gaza, we know if we give them support, that support will all the way flow into the war effort. At least, some of it will. Let's be honest about it. Maybe some of it will flow to the Palestinian people. Call me skeptical, but we know that, at least, some of it will flow to the Hamas war effort. Let's be honest about that fact.

It is not just that, though. It is not just a few billion for Hamas, a few billion for Israel; it is a few billion to resettle migrants in the United States of America—because, God knows, we haven't had enough resettlement of migrants in the United States of America over the last couple of years. The fentanyl deaths and the chaos and crime in our country prove it.

And then on top of that, let's add \$60 billion to Ukraine, because, of course, we know that Israel and Ukraine are very closely connected. They are so

closely connected, in fact, that this Chamber can't have a separate debate on one aid package or the other. And then let's add some money to East Asia on top of that.

We will combine all of this into a \$106 billion dollar supplemental aid package that has very, very little—the gross majority of the money has nothing to do with Israel—and we will do it so that we can cover for the fact that the President of the United States has thrown the world into chaos.

What I would like to do is have a separate debate. Divide these questions into separate conversations and debate them separately. And, oh, by the way, use the political will of this Chamber to support our Israeli allies yesterday because they have needed it for much longer than that.

Now, let me close with just a couple of final observations here, and then I will kick it over to my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

I am getting sick, in this Ukraine policy debate, of hearing the same exact slogans repeated. This country has been governed for 30 years on bipartisan foreign policy slogans. Why don't we have a real debate? We are told again and again and again that Vladimir Putin is just like Hitler in the 1930s; if we don't stop him in Ukraine, he is going to march all the way through Europe.

What happened to our education system that the only historical analogy we can use in this Chamber is World War II? What about World War I where competing major powers threw the entire world into conflict because we didn't make smart decisions, we didn't deescalate conflict when we had the opportunity.

Why is it that we think Vladimir Putin, who has struggled to fight against the Ukrainians, is somehow going to be able to march all the way to Berlin when he can't conquer a country immediately to his east?

Why do we think that everything that happens in the United States and in the world in 2023 is Munich almost a century ago?

I am sick of us not having a real debate on this conversation. Vladimir Putin is a bad guy. He should not have invaded Ukraine. But our policy in 2023 has to be different than our policy in the 1940s because the circumstances are different.

As Lincoln said:

As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew.

You will also hear that China will be emboldened. China will be terribly emboldened if we don't stop the Russians in Ukraine. Well, call me crazy, but I think the Chinese would be emboldened if we use limited American weapons and give it all to the Ukrainians instead of giving it to the Taiwanese.

Now, maybe you disagree, but let's have the debate, and let's have the real debate on the President's Ukraine policy instead of holding Israel hostage.

There is nothing more shameful than taking an existential crisis—thousands of dead Israeli civilians—and using them as a fig leaf for a Ukraine policy.

If you want to defend the Ukraine policy, defend it. Let the Israel aid flow through, and let's let it flow through today.

I yield to my good friend from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I stand in solidarity with my colleagues on separating these issues. I think the American people think that is what we do here. I think the American people think we actually have an appropriations process where we have individual bills come forward and we are offering amendments and Senators can have their say and Republicans and Democrats can have different ideas, offer different amendments and we vote on those things.

That is actually not what happens here at all. And this is now compounding this with a supplemental aid package of putting on a bunch of unrelated issues to try to bootstrap Ukraine aid when the most pressing need we have right now, the most bipartisan support we have right now, is the Israeli aid. And, by the way, it is paid for.

Now, I know listening to the hallways buzz in this town about actually paying for something is, like, unbelievable. You know, it is going to be catastrophic if we actually have that discussion. But I think it is healthy. I think it is healthy. But I think we need to separate these issues.

This is supposed to be the most deliberative body in the history of the world, and what we are told is: We can't do that.

And to my friend from Ohio's point, history doesn't begin and end with Neville Chamberlain. There are a lot of lessons from history about how you confront these things.

And, by the way, each theater is very different. What Israel needs is different; what Ukraine might need is different; what Taiwan might need is different. Oh, and by the way, what the United States of America might need is different as we face our chief rival in the world. We have never had one like this in the history of this country with China. We have never had an economic rival, a nuclear power, a militarized rival like we have with China.

Maybe we should be talking, as we talk about this military industrial base—and I think there is broad support for this—for long-range capability.

Our military industrial base is strapped right now. We are at capacity. We ought to be growing that. I support that. But I think we ought to have a discussion about: What does the United States need too? But as it relates to Israel, they have a clear objective, a likelihood of success, broad support. I have yet to hear any of that as it relates to Ukraine.

All we get are, again, slogans and fearmongering. I think, by the way, if you brought up that for an individual vote, it might pass. I don't know. We ought to try it. But I know this would. It should today. But we are going to hear objections now from the Democrats. They are going to object to this and forestall this important aid that our allies in Israel, who are facing a real existential threat right now, need.

Again—and, by the way, we have thrown in, you know, border here, and call me skeptical as it relates to Joe Biden and his administration on his seriousness when it comes to the border. When I was attorney general of Missouri, we fought some of these fights in court, including keeping "Remain in Mexico" in place. We had to get court orders and contempt orders against this administration to actually follow the judge's order to enforce the law.

Now, I am going to support the strongest border package possible, but it is really hard when you have an executive branch that isn't interested in executing the law. And now we have 8-plus million people in this country who have come here illegally. They have admitted that, quite possibly, we have terrorists in this country because we have an open border. Let's have that debate also. But here we are with an opportunity to separate the Israeli funding, again, that has broad support.

Each one of these issues, each one of these funding requests have separate realities on the ground, political support, strategies, likelihood of success. Let's respect that, and let's respect the will of the American people that we can actually come up here and do the important work we were sent here to do, which is to have real debate in what is supposed to be the most deliberative body in the history of the world.

I yield back to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, let me start by thanking my colleagues from the great State of Ohio and Missouri for standing beside the people of Israel unequivocally.

But before we turn the floor back to those who protest too much, those who protest against this stand-alone Israel funding, let's address some of the objections made by the Senate Democrats last week.

It is important that we focus on the urgency of aiding Israel without tying it to other complex, timekilling, unrelated conflicts.

In last week's debate here on the Senate floor on Israel's safety and security, Senate Democrats mentioned Ukraine 77 times, more than twice of what they mentioned Israel.

I ask Americans to listen to this debate and count for themselves how many times my friends across the aisle mention Ukraine but turn their back, almost like they are allergic, to using the word "Israel."

They took 45 minutes of their hour-long speeches to make their case for Ukraine funding. Look, I get it. I get it: You want to fund Ukraine. But let's have that debate another day.

What Americans understand about Ukraine is that Joe Biden has thrown \$113 billion at the problem with minimal accountability. And in return, 200,000 people have died. Americans understand that the war in Ukraine is at a stalemate, and it is going to turn into a 7-, probably 10-year war. It is going to turn into a war of attrition. What is the plan, Americans want to know? How much more of their blood and treasure do we have to send overseas? Let's debate Ukraine funding another day.

Now, next, my friends across the aisle are going to use the pay-fors as an excuse. If that is the reason you won't support stand-alone funding for Israel, then give us a different pay-for. But, meanwhile, time is of the essence. Your caucus and our caucus are divided on funding for Ukraine. Your caucus and our caucus are divided on how to solve the open-border crisis.

And I don't hear any solutions offered from the Republican-controlled House, the people's House, that the first thing we don't hear from the White House and the Senate leadership is that it is dead on arrival, and vice versa. Anything that we are offering they say is dead on arrival.

Folks, we are no closer today on figuring out Ukraine funding or how to solve the open-border crisis than we were a month ago, two months ago, six months ago. We are months apart, I think we are infinitely apart, from solving these problems.

Meanwhile, Hamas and Iran grow more emboldened and World War III inches closer. I don't hear anyone saying, from either side of the aisle, don't fund Israel. So why don't we fund Israel today? Don't tell me why we should fund Ukraine. Don't tell me you don't like the pay-for. Stand up today and tell me why we shouldn't fund Israel today. Tell me why we shouldn't use Israel as a leverage for your other priorities.

Tell me why we shouldn't send a message to Hamas and Iran. And the message that we are going to send them is that we will not tolerate this barbarism, these atrocities, these crimes against humanity.

Time is of the essence. The House has passed a stand-alone bill to fund Israel. The Senate should do the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6126, which is received from the House. I further ask the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we cannot

send the message to our allies or to the world that America only stands by some of its allies, that our word is only good some of the time. We also cannot send our adversaries the message that they can simply wait us out, allow us to become distracted, allow our resolve to waiver, and that the United States will eventually fail to respond to all of the pressing challenges we face.

Our adversaries are watching carefully to see if we will let Putin win, and the answer must emphatically be, absolutely not. I have said it before; I will say it many times again. We cannot just do half our job here. That is not just wrong, it is dangerous, and it is naive.

There are fundamental flaws in the arguments I have heard from my colleagues for splitting up this aid. Let's start with this one: the argument that somehow we haven't debated Ukraine aid, even though we have been debating this even longer than aid for Israel and even though we have already been forced to punt this aid to an ally in need before.

Ukraine can no more afford a delay than our allies in Israel. Ukraine is at a critical point in a brutal war to defend its sovereignty against Putin's bloody invasion. Abandoning Ukraine is the same as surrendering to Putin and sends a message that he can invade any democracy he would like with impunity. Fortunately, Members on both sides of the aisle do understand this, and clear, overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both the House and Senate have shown they support aid for Ukraine.

We absolutely cannot allow Ukraine aid to get left behind yet again when they are at a critical moment in their heroic fight to protect their homeland and their future as a sovereign democracy.

If my colleagues really wanted more debate on this, we had a robust debate last week, and there was a very strong showing from Senators who discussed at length why it is so important that we keep this aid together in one package. Here is the key point that was raised time and again in that debate: The global challenges we face are all connected, and they are all urgent. We have to be strategic enough to understand that.

Do you know who met with Putin last month? The leader of Hamas. Do you know who is watching how committed we are to our allies in Ukraine? The Government of China.

When it comes to the serious humanitarian crisis in Gaza, let's get something straight: Making sure people have food and water and medical care is not just the right and moral thing to do, it is also very clearly in our national interest, as it promotes long-term stability and security.

Hamas is hoping we ignore the humanitarian needs in Gaza. It is hoping it can drive more people to despair and then anger and then, ultimately, extremism.

In this critical moment, if we only respond to some of the challenges before us, not only will the other challenges continue to fester, but we will be sending a dangerous message about the limits of American leadership in the world.

For our commitments to mean something in the world, they have to be ironclad. For our adversaries to take American leadership seriously, they have to know that we will stand by our allies, that we will stand up for democracy, and that we will stand up to dictators. The way we do that is by passing a strong, unified security package with support for Ukraine and Israel, humanitarian assistance, and smart investment in the Indo-Pacific to support our partners and strengthen deterrence.

I am continuing to work on this package to get it done, and that work cannot be more important, nor could it be more urgent. If my colleagues are serious about making sure we act quickly, I urge them to support us in that effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, I believe we must move forward with emergency funding for our allies—all of our allies, not just the State of Israel but also Ukraine. We are in a situation where both of these countries are under tremendous stress. But it is very clear that the proposal before us, this unanimous consent request to pass the bill including only funding for Israel, is just ironically an attempt to deny funding for Ukraine. It is not really about helping Israel; it is about making sure we don't continue our support and commitment to Ukraine. That commitment is just as vitally important to us as our solemn commitment to Israel.

If we fail to support Ukraine, we will send a very unfortunate message to our adversaries: You can succeed in overrunning America's allies if you simply wait us out.

My colleagues on the other side of the debate have been spinning a false narrative that says: By providing support for Ukraine, we will deny support for Israel. The truth is that the only obstacle to providing help to both nations is them. The truth is also that the United States is already supporting the State of Israel. The United States has provided Israel with over \$12.4 billion in military assistance and missile defense funding over the last 3 years. In response to the attacks of October 7, President Biden has moved two aircraft carrier strike groups into the region. He ordered marines into the region. U.S. forces have already engaged and shot down missiles from adversaries in the region. We have also suffered more than 56 injuries of American military personnel because of actions against the U.S. position in the Middle East.

We need to support Israel. We are supporting Israel. We will continue to support Israel. But we cannot abandon

Ukraine. They have lost hundreds of thousands of civilians and military personnel.

The horrors of October 7 were grotesque. I was in Israel last month. I saw the images—some that have not yet been released—of the slaughter. It was traumatic for the entire State of Israel—in fact, the Jewish community worldwide. But go to Ukraine. Go to Bucha. Dig up the graves of people shot in the back of the head while their hands were tied. You want to talk about atrocities? Those were atrocities perpetrated by the Russians.

So we are fighting forces that are dark and evil in two fronts, and we have to support all of those democratic nations—Israel and Ukraine. They are struggling against the darkness.

This is not my opinion alone. Two weeks ago, Mike Pompeo, the former Secretary of State for Donald Trump and a former Congressman from Senator MARSHALL's home State of Kansas, wrote this about Ukraine:

Make no mistake: The outcome of this war will have a direct impact on U.S. national security. Should Putin prevail—whether on the battlefield or through a war of attrition that leads to ill-conceived diplomacy—

And I would suggest that denying this aid is ill-conceived diplomacy—

the war would be felt well beyond Ukraine's borders.

Indeed, I would add that if we fail to support Ukraine with funding and equipment, then it is more likely that young American servicemembers will be called upon to fight and perhaps die and suffer in Eastern Europe because, as so many of my colleagues have suggested and as Secretary Pompeo suggested, Putin will not be satisfied with simply taking Ukraine, and we could see ourselves engaged in defending one of our NATO allies.

I have a very simple sort of notion about American military policy, having had the privilege to serve in our military. I would rather send resources to a country fighting than send American soldiers to do the fighting. And if we don't support Ukraine, that will happen.

Let me conclude by simply saying that it is time to get serious. We have 3 days before our government runs out of funding. Israel needs our support. Ukraine needs our support. American families and communities are counting on us to deliver critical disaster assistance. They need support for affordable, high-quality childcare. There are many needs we must address. We have to move now but not by isolating our Ukrainian allies. We are in the fight with them, and we will finish the fight with them.

At this point, I would yield to Senator DURBIN of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the concerns raised by my colleague from Kansas. I share many of them. We have all seen the horrifying videos and

images, the scenes of death and destruction perpetrated by Hamas terrorists from October 7—the deadliest single day for the Jewish people since the Holocaust. We all know that return to the status quo is unacceptable. So I support the Senator's sense of urgency that we must get security aid to Israel as it seeks to defend itself.

As a former chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, it was my privilege and honor to appropriate literally millions of dollars for Iron Dome, the air defense which today protects Israel. I believe in supporting our allies in France. In fact, I joined a quarter of my colleagues in the Senate in a letter to President Biden just last week with this very same message.

But I want to be clear. Many of my colleagues harken back in history to the days of Munich and say we are stuck in that thinking. I would say: Forget Munich for a moment. Think of the days of Moscow. Think of this impromptu visit by the Hamas terrorists to Moscow to sit down with Vladimir Putin. Coincidence? Just happened to be part of the travel plan? No. Hamas had already attacked Israel. They were branded as a terrorist group. Where did they go to find solace? Where did they go to find a friend? They went to Moscow and Vladimir Putin. Why would we get soft on Putin at this moment?

What is happening in Israel is a mirror of what is happening in Ukraine—a tyrant, atrocious conduct, an unprovoked invasion of a country, innocent people killed. That is the story in both places. Yet the Republicans come to the floor today and say to us: We are only concerned about one. We don't care about the NATO alliance and supporting it further. We don't care about supporting Ukraine further. We just want to help one of our allies.

I want to be clear. Just 2,000 miles north of Israel, there is another country fighting for its survival in the face of a brutal assault, also in need of sustained U.S. security assistance. That country is Ukraine.

Two months ago, I imagine, my colleagues all joined me and others, meeting in the Old Senate Chamber in a private, secret, confidential meeting with the President of Ukraine. President Zelenskyy told us without equivocation: Without the continued financial support of the United States and NATO, we will lose this war. He didn't say that once; he said it twice to make it abundantly clear. And now for the Republicans to say that we will step aside and let the aid to Ukraine—if it is ever going to come—come much later is to jeopardize their future and to really make a mockery of the amazing display of courage we have seen in Ukraine resisting the Russian aggression.

Just as Secretaries Austin and Blinken argued for emergency aid for Israel before the Senate Appropriations Committee recently, they also stressed the need for aid to Ukraine. Ukrainians have fought bravely, stood up against

Russian tyranny, with the United States, the European Union, and countless other countries around the world standing with them. We are the front-line of democracy in Ukraine, and to walk away from Ukraine, as the Republicans are suggesting today, is a travesty. To pull back now would be unconscionable, a reflection of an America no longer being the world leader it purports to be, and a boon for countries like Russia, China, and Iran, eager to fill the ensuing void.

Secretary Blinken said it plainly:

In both Israel and Ukraine, democracies are fighting ruthless foes who are out to annihilate them.

Secretary Austin went further:

Today's battles against aggression and terrorism will define global security for years to come.

The Republican suggestion today to walk away from assistance to Ukraine would unfortunately lead us to that conclusion.

And only firm American leadership can ensure that the tyrants, thugs and terrorists worldwide are not emboldened to commit more aggression and more atrocities.

In addition to Israel and Ukraine, we must also remain steadfast in addressing Chinese aggressions in the Indo-Pacific, including Taiwan.

Let me say a word about humanitarian aid. One cannot look at the scenes coming out of Gaza without realizing there are many thousands of innocent victims, people who are not part of the terrorism of the Hamas leadership, people simply trying to survive. The scenes coming from hospitals on a daily basis are a reminder to us that there is a desperate need for humanitarian aid.

Al-Shifa Hospital this morning displayed photographs of a dozen infants who have been separated from their ventilators because the electricity is off, and there is no water in the hospital.

To provide humanitarian aid to the helpless, guiltless victims in this part of the world is consistent with the values of the United States, and I support it without reservation. Humanitarian assistance is not only the right thing to do, it will save lives. It will help prevent the next conflict. It will serve as a downpayment on our own security in the future.

I urge my colleagues to resist this effort by the Republicans to walk away from Ukraine and to ignore the obvious consequences. The people of Ukraine have shown extraordinary courage. I hope a majority in the Senate will as well.

I yield to Senator VAN HOLLEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, at this moment of danger and peril around the world, we, the United States of America, must support our friends and democracies that are under attack from brutal adversaries. That means supporting Israel's right to defend itself in

the aftermath of the brutal Hamas attacks of October 7.

It also means ensuring that the people of Ukraine can defend themselves against Putin's rank aggression. Make no mistake about it, this proposal on the floor today is tantamount to saying the Ukrainian people should surrender to Vladimir Putin. It is waving the white flag. If we don't support Ukraine, not only will the Ukrainians lose, democracy will lose around the world. And I have to say that Ronald Reagan would be rolling in his grave today to see the Republican Party abandoning Ukraine in the fight for democracy and freedom.

You know, most of us gathered recently in the Old Senate Chamber with President Zelenskyy, and he was very clear that the Ukrainians will fight on to defend their democracy and their sovereignty, but if the United States doesn't stand by the people of Ukraine, Putin will have the upper hand.

So for goodness' sake, our Ukrainian friends are spilling blood; they are giving lives. The very least we can do is step up and continue to provide military assistance so that they can defend themselves.

And this is not only about Ukraine; it is about making sure that our allies—our NATO allies—understand that the United States will continue to stand up against aggression. If the United States walks away, the NATO alliance will begin to collapse.

It also sends a terrible signal to others around the world—other autocrats—who are watching very carefully what the United States and our allies do with respect to Ukraine. I have heard my colleagues say it is only speculation as to what our allies in the Indo-Pacific would think if we walked away.

Well, let me tell you. They have told us very clearly. Leaders in Japan and South Korea, friends in Taiwan are watching closely what the United States does with respect to Ukraine, just as President Xi is keeping one eye on Taiwan as he keeps the other eye on what is happening in Ukraine.

Now, President Biden is scheduled to meet with President Xi tomorrow in San Francisco at the APEC conference. And I can tell my colleagues don't pretend on the Senate floor or otherwise that you are going to be really tough on China; that you are going to support Taiwan if you cut loose and run when it comes to Ukraine because they are intricately connected. Just ask the people in Taiwan, ask the people in the Indo-Pacific region.

Finally, I keep hearing my Republican colleagues talk about their so-called pay-for, as if the \$14 billion dollar cut to the IRS pays for the \$14 billion in support for Israel. This debate has been going on for a couple of weeks so it can't be that our colleagues aren't paying attention to what both the IRS and the Congressional Budget Office have said. They have said, far from paying for it, it will actually increase

the deficit. That was the testimony of all the witnesses, Democrats and Republicans, in the Budget Committee last week. Why would it increase the deficit? Because you are taking away funds that the IRS is using to go after very wealthy tax deadbeats, people who are not paying the taxes that are already due and owing.

You are saying to the IRS: We are going to deny you the funds to go after those very wealthy deadbeats. And because you can't collect the revenue from those tax deadbeats, the United States deficit is going to go up, not down. So that doesn't pay for it. Don't call it a pay-for. That is simply a fraud. It is not true.

And what is really astounding—I have heard my colleagues use the word “leverage” a couple of times. It is a new cynicism to use our efforts to support Israel to provide what amounts to a don't-have-to-pay-your-taxes message to very wealthy Americans. It is like nobody ever seems to miss an opportunity to give another tax break to very wealthy folks on the Republican side. In this case, it is not a tax break; it is actually just requiring that people pay the taxes already due and owing. So stop calling it a pay-for.

Let's stand up for Ukraine and democracy in Ukraine; yes, let's continue to support Israel's right to defend itself; and let's stand up as the United States of America to ensure that we send a message to our allies around the world that are with them and our adversaries around the world that we will stand by our friends.

With that, I yield to the Senator from Colorado, Senator BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, reserving the right to be object, I am glad to be here today. I think it is important for us to have this debate. This is a debate. People on the other side of the aisle say it is not one.

I heard my colleague from Ohio talking earlier about slogans, slogans, slogans. This is all about slogans.

I cannot believe the degree to which the accomplishments by the Ukrainian people are being diminished on this floor or being diminished in this debate. It is absolutely disgraceful.

They are this close to winning this war. There is a freeze today on the battlefield, on the frontline, in part, because Putin knows exactly what is going on here. He knows about the debate that is going on here. He knows, my colleagues, that he is losing on the battlefield. He understands that. NATO understands that. Xi Jinping understands that. He knows that.

He is losing on the battlefield. He is counting on winning on Capitol Hill. He is counting on winning on this battlefield. Let me tell you something. This isn't about slogans.

Let's talk about what Ukraine has done over the last 2 years. I haven't heard anybody talk about that in this discussion or this debate. I hope my

colleagues on the other side are listening because you will not hear, in your lifetime, a list of greater courage or sacrifice than what you will hear from Ukrainians, and it is not slogans.

They defeated and reversed the Russian attack on Kyiv—which, by the way, Kyiv was supposed to fall in 72 hours. They reversed that. They forced Russia to retreat from Chernihiv and Sumy. They won the battle of Kharkiv. They took back Kherson. They took back Snake Island.

Ukraine has taken back more than half—more than half—of the land that Russia took from them in this invasion, colleagues, more than half. Nobody 2 years ago would have predicted that. Everybody would have said Putin would never relinquish that land.

They almost singlehandedly restarted commercial grain trade with Asia and Africa. Why does that matter? That matters so that the whole rest of the world can be fed, so they will stay in the fight that we have led that no other country can lead but the United States of America, even though my colleagues on the other side have gotten tired.

Last month—read it. Look it up. I will put it in the RECORD. There was an amazing article over the weekend about this in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 2023]
HOW UKRAINE, WITH NO WARSHIPS, IS
THWARTING RUSSIA'S NAVY

In a small, hidden office in the port city of Odesa, the commander of the Ukrainian Navy keeps two trophies representing successes in the Black Sea.

One is the lid from the missile tube used in April 2022 to sink the flagship of the Russian Black Sea Fleet, the Moskva, a devastating blow that helped chase Russian warships from the Ukrainian coast. On the lid is a painting of a Ukrainian soldier raising his middle finger to the ship as it bursts into flames.

The other is a key used to arm a British-made Storm Shadow missile that slammed into the headquarters of the Russian fleet in Sevastopol on the Crimean Peninsula.

We dreamed of making a beautiful recreation park for children in this place, to take away the center of evil that is there now,” said Vice Adm. Oleksiy Neizhpapa, the Ukrainian naval commander.

He held the key in his hand, and although his eyes were tired, he said there was nothing to do but fight.

“Sevastopol is my hometown,” he said. “For me, it is my small homeland, where I was born, where my children were born. So, of course, I dream that the time will come, hopefully soon, that we will return to our naval base in Sevastopol.”

Despite having no warships of its own, Ukraine has over the course of the war shifted the balance of power in the naval conflict. Its use of unmanned maritime drones and growing arsenal of long-range anti-ship missiles—along with critical surveillance provided by Western allies and targeted assaults by Ukraine's Air Force and special operations forces—have allowed Ukraine to blunt the advantages of the vastly more powerful Russian Navy.

“At this point, the Russian Black Sea Fleet is primarily what naval strategists term ‘a fleet in being’: It represents a potential threat that needs to be vigilantly guarded against, but one that remains in check for now,” said Scott Savitz, a senior engineer at the RAND Corporation, a federally financed center that conducts research for the United States military. “Remarkably, Ukraine has achieved all this without a substantial fleet of its own.”

Admiral Neizhpapa cautioned that Ukraine remains vastly outgunned on the Black Sea. It lacks the battlecruisers, destroyers, frigates and submarines that populate the Russian fleet. Russian planes still dominate the skies above the sea, and Russia still uses its fleet to launch long-range missiles at Ukrainian towns and cities, threatening armed forces and civilians alike.

On Wednesday, a missile struck a commercial ship pulling into the port of Odesa, killing the pilot and wounding three crew members. It was the first civilian vessel hit since shipping to Odesa resumed in late August.

The Russia Navy also dominates the Sea of Azov, a body of water connected to the Black Sea by the narrow Strait of Kerch, and is increasingly using Azov ports in the occupied cities of Mariupol and Berdiansk to help alleviate logistical challenges on land.

Ukraine has nevertheless managed to negate some of those advantages and lately has gone on the offensive. Over the last two months, it has launched both stealthy nighttime operations by small units on jet skis and powerful missile strikes. Those strikes have hit not just the Sevastopol headquarters but also a Kilo-class submarine and a shipbuilding plant in eastern Crimea, an attack that damaged a new missile-carrying Russian warship.

The latter strike “will likely cause Russia to consider relocating farther from the front line,” the British military intelligence agency reported on Wednesday.

Ukrainian officials also said that the Russian strike on a civilian ship as it pulled into port in Odesa would not stop the shipping. About 100 cargo vessels carrying more than 3.3 million tons of agricultural and metal products have made the journey in a little over two months, according to Western and Ukrainian officials.

Even as forward movement on the ground has largely shuddered to a halt, with neither Russian nor Ukrainian forces able to break through heavily fortified lines, Ukraine has effectively turned around 10,000 square miles in the western Black Sea off its southern coast into what the military calls a “gray zone” where neither side can sail without the threat of attack.

And Admiral Neizhpapa stressed that Ukraine's combined armed forces and its security services were all playing integral roles in the battle of the Black Sea.

James Heapey, Britain's armed forces minister, told a recent security conference in Warsaw that Russia's Black Sea fleet had suffered a “functional defeat” and contended that the liberation of Ukraine's coastal waters in the Black Sea was “every bit as important” as the successful counteroffensives on land in Kherson and Kharkiv last year.

The war at sea has also demonstrated the impact of emerging technologies, transforming long-held theories about naval warfare in ways that are being studied around the world, perhaps nowhere more closely than in China and Taiwan.

The classical approach that we studied at military maritime academies does not work now,” Admiral Neizhpapa said. Therefore, we have to be as flexible as possible and change approaches to planning and implementing work as much as possible.”

For example, he said, it takes years to develop and build warships and more time to update them to meet new challenges. Yet maritime drones are evolving every month.

Admiral Neizhpapa acknowledged that Russian air superiority over the Black Sea is a problem and has stressed the value that F-16 fighter jets would bring to Ukraine's naval war. The United States has pledged F-16s, but Ukrainian officials have said they are unlikely to be seen in Ukrainian skies before next summer.

Russia's main response to setbacks at sea has been a relentless bombing campaign aimed at crippling Ukrainian port infrastructure and punishing the people of Odesa. In recent weeks, its naval aircraft have been dropping "mine-like objects" in the shipping lanes from Odesa, the admiral said, but shipping has not stopped.

"Of course, they want to stop our initiative by all means," he said. "But we believe that they will not succeed."

While much attention over the past 20 months has focused on the land war, Europe's largest since World War II, a desire to control the Black Sea was a key factor in President Vladimir V. Putin's decision to invade Ukraine. In 2014, when Russia illegally annexed Crimea, Ukraine lost nearly all of its ships; about 5,000 of its sailors defected, cutting the size of its navy by two-thirds.

Despite Ukraine's recent intensified assaults, Crimea still functions like a huge aircraft carrier parked off Ukraine's southern coast. It is a critical logistics hub for Russian occupation forces in the south, a base for Russian fighter jets and attack helicopters, and a platform to launch missile and drone strikes across Ukraine.

Admiral Neizhpapa is fond of citing an adage of Alfred Thayer Mahan, the famed American naval officer and historian: "A nation must defend its own coast starting from the coast of the enemy."

For the admiral, who left the peninsula in 2014 with other sailors who remained loyal to Ukraine that means taking the war to Crimea.

Russia, however, is also adapting and bolstering its defenses.

What we did a year ago is no longer working or is not working as effectively," Admiral Neizhpapa said. "We have to be flexible and change our tactics."

Ukraine must not only innovate, he said, but also deploy new weapons quickly. Ukraine has unveiled several iterations of uncrewed surface vessels, and officials recently offered a glimpse of what they said was Ukraine's first unmanned underwater vehicle.

Christened Marichka and measuring about 20 feet from bow to stern, the vessel can travel beneath the surface of the waves for more than 600 miles, although the size of its payload has not been made public and there is no evidence that it has been used in combat.

About two dozen Russian ships and one submarine have been damaged or destroyed since Russia launched its full-scale invasion, Admiral Neizhpapa said. Oryx, a military analysis site that counts only losses that it has visually confirmed, has documented at least 16 damaged or destroyed ships.

Standing in front of a classified chart that lists damage done to Russian vessels, Admiral Neizhpapa said he had no time for what he called "wishful sinking"—any exaggeration of what Ukraine has achieved.

There are still scores of powerful Russian warships that Ukraine wants to take off the board. On Friday, Ukraine's intelligence agency released a video of a naval drone attack on two ships that it said played an important role in the layered air defenses that protect Russia's fleet. The extent of the damage was not clear.

"The enemy also learns very quickly, and he also makes his own conclusions, counteracting our actions," Admiral Neizhpapa said. "The war at sea can only be won with new solutions that must be implemented as quickly as possible."

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, they largely neutralized the Black Sea Fleet. They don't even have a real navy. They don't have a navy. Through their dedication and through their imagination and their willingness to sacrifice, they have managed to neutralize the Black Sea Fleet.

There is nobody who thought they could do this. This is all while Russians outnumber Ukrainians 3 to 1 on the battlefield.

I heard from my colleagues, how much more American lives, how much more American treasure? There is not an American losing their life. The Ukrainians are losing their lives in the name of democracy.

In total, Ukrainians have killed 300,000 Russian fighters. Thank you, Ukraine, for doing the work that NATO has not been asked to do, that the United States has not been asked to do.

Putin knows he is losing this war in Ukraine. The only question that he has is, is he going to win the war here in the U.S. Congress? Who is going to lose Ukraine?

And the people who are here today saying this is not a lesson from World War II; this is a lesson from World War I, these are the people who are going to lose Ukraine.

Do we have any right to be fatigued, colleagues, when we haven't lost 100,000 people, when all we are being asked to do is manufacture the weapons that Ukraine is using on this battlefield, putting American people to work to support Ukraine and democracy? That is what we are being asked to do. Can we possibly be fatigued at this moment?

I suppose we could be having a very different debate if Ukraine hadn't been as successful as they have been, but they have been successful. What we know is, if we roll over now for Vladimir Putin, if we stop providing Ukraine with their weapons—and they are out of bullets. They are out of bullets as we stand here today. They have \$1 billion left. If we stop providing them with resources, if we stop providing them with the intelligence that we provided them, they are going to lose this war. President Zelenskyy came here and told you that we will win this war if you stick with us; we will lose this war if you abandon us.

We cannot abandon Ukraine at this moment.

I know I have other colleagues on the floor who need to speak today. I am glad this has been recorded for history. I am glad today's debate has been recorded for history because when they ask who lost this war to Vladimir Putin, it is not going to be a question of rhetoric or debate points; it is going to be a question of a war that we were actually on the verge of winning and a

war that we walked away from and lost with repercussions to every single corner of this world, including where Xi Jinping is sitting right now in Beijing. And don't forget about it. Don't forget about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I want to thank Senator MURRAY and Senator REED for leading us in this time.

I want to make two relatively brief points to add to the discussion, and I will turn it over to others of my colleagues.

First, I understand that my Republican colleagues want to avoid the question of Republican priorities. The fact of the matter is, an Israel-only funding bill passed through the House of Representatives, and attached to it was a massive giveaway for the richest Americans: millionaires and billionaires who don't pay their taxes. So as we chart the path forward for a bill that only funds Israel, we know, in the House of Representatives, it has to be matched with a massive—massive—giveaway for millionaires and billionaires.

I don't think you can ignore that fact that a large swath of the Republican Party is using this crisis in Israel in order to deliver yet another gift to the very small slice of Americans who don't need any more gifts. There are 700 billionaires in this country who have more net worth than 50 percent of all Americans. The rules are already rigged in favor of the superwealthy. So the idea that we would facilitate a plan in the House of Representatives to use Israel aid as a means to continue to rig the rules in favor of those ultrarich Americans, it is just incredibly distasteful, and it is a signal about where the Republican Party priorities are today.

Second, I do want to talk about what Senator VANCE and others talked about, about the lazy precedent, referencing the sloganeering that they accuse Democrats of engaging in.

So it is correct that what is happening today in Ukraine does not have a modern precedent because never before in our lifetime, in the post-World War II order, has a large nuclear nation like Russia invaded another large neighboring nation with the purpose of annexation.

What Russia is trying to do is to fundamentally change the rules; to fundamentally shift international norms that have been in place since World War II. At the foundation of it is that big countries don't change their borders through force, through aggression. It is important to understand that these are the rules that have undergirded the last 70 years of U.S. growth and U.S. national security.

So we don't believe that we should support Ukraine because we just believe that Vladimir Putin is Adolf Hitler. We don't believe we should support

Ukraine to perpetuate some slogan about American greatness. No. We believe that we have an interest—as the most powerful nation in the world, as the nation that has benefited most from the post-World War II order—to defend those rules because, if we don't, no one else will.

And it just strikes me that my Republican colleagues who have this fatalistic view of what is going to happen in Ukraine just really view America as weak, as impotent, and as powerless in the face of this unprecedented aggression from Vladimir Putin. America's greatness is connected to our willingness to stand up and lead at moments of crisis, and this is a unique moment of crisis without precedent, which is why it requires the United States to stand against Russia's aggression.

Listen, for thousands of years—and we know this because you read about it in your history books while growing up—for thousands of years, prior to the establishment of the post-World War II order, this world was defined by state-on-state, civilization-on-civilization violence and conflict. People labored under the constant threat that their entire world would be ended by another one of these civilization-on-civilization conflicts. But this was back at the time when weapons were crude—they were swords; they were bows and arrows; then they were simple firearms. Millions died, but millions also survived.

We live in a very different era today where we, frankly, have to be more worried—not less worried, not permissive and fatalistic—about the consequences of reentering a world and a paradigm in which states enter into conflict against other states. Why? Because we now live in a world filled with weapons of mass destruction, not just nuclear weapons but other highly sophisticated weapons.

So now this kind of conflict that Russia and Ukraine are engaged in is the kind of conflict that can wipe out millions in a day. That is why the United States of America has stood up for the post-World War II order. That is why we have fought and sometimes died to maintain it. And this is the most significant affront to that order—an order that has protected this country; an order that has protected our economy; an order that has saved millions of lives in our lifetimes.

It is hard. Ukraine's mission is difficult. In a short-term “satisfy me now” culture, I understand that many of my Republicans get phone calls from their constituents saying: If Ukraine hasn't won this war tomorrow, I am not interested any longer. But this conflict matters, and it matters that we stick with Ukraine, because if we lose—if we lose—we are living in an entirely new world: The cap is off state-on-state violence. Pretty soon, America will be in one of those conflicts with another nuclear nation, and we won't be talking about thousands of Ukrainians dying; we will be talking about millions of Americans dying.

So I appreciate my colleagues for being here today. I think this is as important as it gets. I think we really are deciding the future of this world and the rules that govern it, and I join my colleagues in objecting to this motion.

I yield the floor to Senator SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object—and I will be pretty quick here—I have rarely seen such a cynical piece of legislation on the Senate floor. I have rarely seen it.

The point that CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and CHRIS MURPHY made, I think, is the first point, which is, when all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. So whenever there is an opportunity to legislate—even in the foreign policy space, even when we are in a global fight against fascism—the first thing that comes to the mind of many people on the other side of the aisle is, How can we make life easier for the wealthiest among us? Like it has literally got nothing to do with Israel aid or Ukraine aid or Indo Asia-Pacific security matters. Just, whenever you get a chance, throw in an opportunity to enrich the wealthiest among us who are already not paying their fair share of taxes.

So that is the frame, right?

This is where we start, which is, I have got an idea: We should cut taxes again. I have got an idea: Let's gut the IRS so that they don't have the ability to audit these billionaires, many of whom don't pay taxes in the first place.

So that is how you should understand this from the jump.

The second thing you should understand is, we really are in a global fight against fascism and authoritarianism. And if there is one thing that I think the last 2 or 3 years—frankly, the last 7 years—has taught us is: Believe what the authoritarians say they want to do. Believe Hamas when they say they want to wipe Israel off the map and that they are not done. Believe Putin when he says that the biggest mistake that the Soviet Union ever made was perestroika and glasnost and all of that. Believe him when he says that after he takes Ukraine, he will turn his eye to the Baltics. Believe all of these people. They do exactly what they have been saying they would do. And here we are hoping—hoping against hope—that maybe they don't mean it; that maybe their ambitions aren't so murderous. They do it every time.

And the idea that we would separate these two fights even though these people are aligned—these Fascists are aligned, this authoritarian movement is increasingly aligning itself perhaps because of the internet, perhaps because of globalization—but, whatever it is, there is an actual global Fascist, authoritarian movement, and they are on the march. And the idea that we would fund Israel's security needs and leave Ukraine behind because—what?—

Ukraine is in Europe? because Donald Trump doesn't like Ukraine aid? because it is getting hard? because it is getting tiring? because it is getting expensive? Listen to those arguments. My God. This man wants to take Europe and has a plan to do so.

As Senator BENNET said—and this is a key point—God bless these Ukrainian fighters. They are the ones fighting and dying. They are the ones spilling blood to keep Europe peaceful, to establish that nobody can change the boundaries of a country using violence only. God bless them for doing this. God bless them for their sacrifice, for their ingenuity, for, frankly, exceeding everybody's reasonable expectations. God bless them for their sacrifice.

All they need from us are resources. We are the wealthiest country in the history of humankind, and we are saying: It is a little too long. We haven't won yet. Trump doesn't like it. This is kind of getting expensive.

What a bunch of terrible arguments in the scheme of things. What a bunch of terrible arguments. When we look back 20, 30, 50 years from now at this debate, no one is going to ask whether this was emergency spending or in a supplemental or in the regular appropriations process or in a CR or in a CR and omnibus. They are just going to ask: Did we stand with the free world like Americans always do?

So this has gotten me a little angry. This has gotten me a little frustrated because I just thought—I really did think—and I am not naive—but I really did think that on an issue like this, we could put our partisanship aside; we could put our fealty to either our current President or to the former President aside and just say: Look, this is good for the free world; we are just going to do it together.

I now, with the Presiding Officer's permission, through the Chair, defer to the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I call for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mrs. MURRAY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas still has the floor.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, thank you to my colleagues for their comments today and for their arguments. Many were good arguments. Some of the facts, the American people disagree with. Some of the conclusions, the American people disagree with.

What I heard today was once again from my colleagues spending 80 percent of their time focusing on Ukraine funding; but I didn't hear one person say why we shouldn't go ahead and fund Israel today, why we shouldn't send a bill to the President's desk today.

Look, we have debated Ukraine at lengths. Put a bill on the floor. Let's

vote on Ukraine funding. My friends across the aisle have said that Ukraine is winning this war, and many of the same reasons they give us to continue to support Ukraine are the same words I heard in grade school as to why we should support the cause in Vietnam. They are the same arguments.

If Ukraine is winning, then why have Poland, Slovakia, and Hungary abandoned Ukraine? Why is the frontline not moving?

Some of my friends brought up aid. Look, if you want aid to the hospitals in Gaza, if you want aid to Gaza itself, then tell Iran to stand down. Tell Hamas to release the hostages. I don't hear anyone talking about that. Tell Hamas to surrender. Let's send a message from the Senate that we unequivocally stand beside Israel.

And I will close with this: One of my friends across the aisle talked about President Reagan. What I will remember about President Reagan and, before him, Eisenhower is that they stressed peace through strength. But this White House is giving us war through weakness.

Time is of the essence. We need to get Israel the funding. Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, my colleagues from Kansas, Ohio, and Missouri have raised a raft of questions to which I will offer a few timely and simple answers: Look up. Look back. Look ahead.

To my colleague from Kansas, his predecessor Bob Dole, a Senator who was a great leader in this Chamber, was a champion for the power of humanitarian aid around the world. And I will not yield without speaking to a piece of this supplemental that has been largely ignored: the critical role of humanitarian aid in sustaining our partners and allies, in averting humanitarian catastrophe, and, yes, in sustaining both Ukraine and Israeli national security.

But, first, if I might, let's look back for a moment to history. My colleague from Ohio complained that we somehow had not thoroughly debated Ukraine. I believe we have, but I am happy to have us engage for hours more because there are critical lessons from the past that inform the strong, broad, and bipartisan support for aid to Ukraine.

The last time I went to Kyiv, I traveled with his predecessor, Senator Rob Portman—a cochair of the Ukraine Caucus in this body and a determined and committed supporter of Ukraine's. Why? Let's look back for a moment.

In the runup to the Second World War, a famous American aviator, Charles Lindbergh—a man who was decorated for his exploits and his exploration—joined a nationwide movement whose slogan was “America First.” “America First” seemed to say that we should stay out of the roiling conflicts in the Pacific and in Europe; that we should step back and allow the

armies of the Nazis to advance across Western Europe and allow the armies of imperial Japan to advance across Asia because those were not our concerns. In fact, he gave a publicized speech in favor of neutrality just on the eve of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

History proved that “America First” almost risked “America Alone” in a world overcome by authoritarians.

I will tell you, that mistake is a mistake my colleagues risk making now. If they want to make America weak again, they can go back to the arguments of the isolationist Republicans on the verge of the Second World War.

But to my colleague from Kansas, I will say you don't really have a debate with us. You have a debate with your own leadership. I have heard on this floor clear, forceful, focused speeches in defense of Ukraine—the critical role of our support for Ukraine—not from Democrats alone but from some of the most seasoned and capable and leading Members of the Republican caucus, including my colleagues from Texas and from Kentucky.

There is broad support for Ukraine. I, frankly, think, to answer the question of my colleague from Ohio: How are these possibly connected, the attack of Hamas on Israeli civilians, the attack of Russia on Ukrainian civilians?

I say, you would need only look up. What is that sound? It is Iranian drones and missiles raining death on innocent civilians in Israel and Ukraine. These conflicts are profoundly connected.

My colleague from Ohio suggested that President Biden has thrown the world into chaos. I do not have the time to fully rebut this ill-informed point, but I will suggest that Vladimir Putin's aggression in Ukraine and, in particular, the terrorism of Hamas in Israel is not the cause—of that, President Biden is not the cause but, in fact, has been a forceful, timely, and responsive leader. His response to the attack on Israel, I hope, has earned broad bipartisan support because it was personal, forceful, and timely.

All of us here are standing, calling for the release of hostages by Hamas, standing in strong support of Israel, and insisting that we advance at the same time the aid that is desperately needed by our close allies.

My colleague from Kansas asked a critical question: Will we show the United States is a fair-weather friend? To my colleague I will say: Sir, that is exactly why I join my colleagues in objecting to this narrow, Israel-only aid package, because we cannot show that we will fail to aid Ukraine.

Last, it was asked by several of my colleagues: Why would we send humanitarian aid into Gaza? It will inevitably all fall into the hands of Hamas, who support this.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, if I might, a letter from the Israeli Embassy to the Congress of the United States.

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING— HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE COMPONENT

Please find below an overview of Israel's position, regarding the humanitarian assistance component of the Presidential request for emergency supplemental funding.

It is in Israel's view that humanitarian assistance to Gaza could and should play a significant role in helping Israel achieve its long-term strategic goals to remove the Hamas threat in Gaza, and enabling a post-Hamas Gaza that is demilitarized and does not pose a threat to Israel.

Israel's position is that this assistance should be designed in a way that ensures that it does not fall into the wrong hands, Palestinian or international.

In light of this, we support appropriating significant funding as part of the supplemental, for the following purposes and under the following terms:

a) Funding for short-term emergency humanitarian assistance, so long as it will be allocated and delivered in coordination with Israel, inspected and monitored by Israel and which is consistent with Israel's objectives in Gaza.

b) Designated funding for a post-Hamas Gaza. Significant humanitarian assistance under the supplemental is required in order to rebuild a demilitarized and profoundly changed Gaza following the uprooting of Hamas.

c) Egypt-Gaza border: As part of the supplemental, we seek funding for the Egypt-Gaza border, including the upgrading of the Rafah crossing—all designed to ensure that Gaza will not be able to remilitarize. As such, this part of the supplemental will be vital for Israel's security. We stand ready to share our thinking on how to achieve the above mentioned goal.

The bottom line is that the supplemental, properly allocated, would contribute to humanitarian solutions on the ground, while bolstering Israel's national security. We believe that US funding in this matter will draw contributions from additional actors and stakeholders from the region and from the international community. We are more than willing to answer any questions you may have and look forward to continuing our dialogue on this and other matters.

Mr. COONS. Who supports humanitarian aid into Gaza with appropriate measures of inspection? The Israeli Government. They say it is critical to bolstering their national security.

Look up. Look back. Look forward. Look up; you will see the missiles and drones of Iran raining down on innocent civilians. Look back; you will see the mistakes of isolationism. Look forward, and you will see there is a bipartisan path to supporting humanitarian relief globally, to supporting aid to Israel against Hamas, to investing in border security, and to taking up and passing a robust supplemental, as we can and as we should.

For that reason, I join my colleagues in opposing the motion made by my colleague from Kansas.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Minnesota.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today, alongside my colleagues, including Senator COONS and Senator MURRAY, to implore my colleagues to hold firm in their support of Ukraine.

I have sat here for the last hour and listened to these speeches and listened

to some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—which, I know, does not reflect all of them—and this is what I came away with: the focus on “Oh, you just want to go backward,” the analogies to talking about past decisions in Munich and Vietnam. We all are students of history. I am focused on now. I am focused on what is happening now.

Like my colleagues here, I have strongly condemned the massacre, the terrorist attack by Hamas—and the democracy of Israel. We stand with Israel and the right to defend, but we also stand with the idea that we should continue to provide humanitarian relief in Gaza and around the world.

I think one of the ironies of the statement of our colleague from Ohio—and some of our other colleagues—was that he failed to mention that, actually, Israel has come out this week also supporting the humanitarian aid. So that is one thing that I think needs to get corrected.

The second, as we look at where we are now, he mentioned Vladimir Putin, called him “a bad guy.” Those were his words, “a bad guy.” I think it is a lot more than that. This is a tyrant. This is a ruler who has committed war crimes, who has downed passenger planes, who has invaded a democracy. Let’s get the facts straight about Vladimir Putin.

The other thing is that, now, to not see this as connected is just plain wrong. What kind of drones was Russia using? Iranian drones. Who took the meeting with some of their senior officials from Russia? Who went there? Hamas. Hamas went to Russia after this terrorist attack.

When we stand for democracies in one place, we stand for democracies in other places.

Our colleague from Ohio referred to some of the President’s requests as a “hodgepodge”—a “hodgepodge.” I was thinking of that word and what is in this request and this budget: protection of a nuclear plant, the largest nuclear plant not just in Ukraine but in Europe. When his predecessor, Senator Portman, and I were in Ukraine, when we met with President Zelenskyy—where we actually talked about the strong support and the strong Ukrainian community in Ohio and in Minnesota—when we met with him, a major focus of ours was the nuclear plant because we didn’t know how long the Ukrainians were able to hold the line to protect that plant from not just contamination in Ukraine but contamination all over Europe. That is what is in what our colleague has called a “hodgepodge” of a budget.

What else? Supporting NATO. I was just with the leader of Estonia—a small country, yes, but they have given over 1 percent of their military budget—of the budget of their country—to Ukraine.

Are we just going to turn away on NATO because we think it is a “hodgepodge” to support our allies in coun-

tries like Great Britain, our allies in countries like France and Germany and Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania and Georgia and, yes, Ukraine? We are just going to say it is a “hodgepodge”?

What else is in that “hodgepodge”? Well, what else is in the “hodgepodge” are things like air defense, things like munitions, things like small arms. That is what we are talking about here when we talk about the help that we give to Ukraine.

Then I looked at some of the percentages, as I sat here, of other small nations that have given much more than the United States, where it is something like 0.3 percent—right? These countries are at over 1 percent in the help that they have given Ukraine. They have taken in 4 million—count that, 4 million—refugees in Europe. So when we help Ukraine, we are not doing it alone, colleagues. We are standing with our allies. We are standing with our best trading partners. We are standing with the world for democracy.

This is not in a vacuum. This is, as the President once said, a big effing deal.

What about Vladimir Putin? Senator BENNET got at this. He is failing. He tried to capture Kyiv, but he failed. He tried to wipe Ukraine off the map, but he failed. He tried to break the Ukrainian spirit, but he has made it stronger. He tried to break NATO, but NATO has grown.

Ukraine has persevered against all odds. To abandon our partners now would be a dereliction of our duty to defend a democracy and an embarrassment to this Nation, and, yes, it would create a much bigger national security risk not just for our allies but for our country.

I have had the privilege of visiting Ukraine not just with Senator Portman but on another visit, as well, with a number of our Republican colleagues. Each time, I was struck by the strength of the people who put their lives on the line: the ballerina who has to don camo and go to the frontline, the cafe owner donating food to people in need, the deejay at the national call center using her platform to find missing loved ones.

We must not forget President Zelenskyy’s words in September:

There is not a soul in Ukraine that does not feel gratitude to you, America.

That is what we have to remember. They are watching in Ukraine. The democracies are watching. And, as Leader MCCONNELL has said, “think of it as an axis of evil: China, Russia, and Iran.”

This is not just a test for Ukraine. It is a test for the United States and for the free world, and the path toward greater security for all of us is simple: Help Ukraine win the war.

I yield the floor.

The Senator from Oregon is with us today to speak.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I once again join my colleagues in com-

ing to the floor in opposition to this short-sighted proposal and in support of a comprehensive supplemental funding bill that responds to the full range of immediate global challenges facing our country. This includes arming and equipping Ukraine and Israel, aiding our partners in the Indo-Pacific, and providing the necessary assistance to adequately address dire humanitarian needs around the world.

To only provide urgently needed support to Israel, as my colleague’s proposal would do, would miss the bigger picture. And that is precisely what Putin and Hamas are hoping for. This proposal ignores the reality that these conflicts are part of a shared fight to preserve democracy, confront autocracy and defend the values of the free world.

Over the past 75 years, these shared values and the advancement of democracy across the world have benefited the American people by making the world more predictable, increasing our national security, lowering the cost of goods, and providing opportunities for American businesses. Europe is a critical trading partner for the U.S., and in my home state of New Hampshire, we export about \$3 billion worth of goods and services to Europe annually.

So it is in our collective interest to continue supporting our partners to further the democratic advancement in countries across the world, provide an alternative to China and Russia, and increase America’s security and prosperity.

We know that our allies need weapons now, but bullets and bombs alone will not solve these challenges in their entirety. Humanitarian assistance, which provides for the basic needs of those who find themselves in the crosshairs of the world’s conflicts and crises, supports our security objectives in Israel, Ukraine, and across the globe. In Gaza, the United States has long worked with our Israeli and Egyptian allies to ensure that humanitarian aid is properly and efficiently vetted and delivered. The U.S. has a rigorous system in place to screen and certify implementers on the ground who make sure that food, water, and fuel go to the places and people that need them—not to Hamas. And in Ukraine, the United States has stood by men, women, and children as they fight off a brutal invading force. A failure to continue to support assistance for Ukraine could mean that 12 million fewer people will get the humanitarian assistance they need right now—aid that has gone to emergency food and shelter, basic healthcare, access to safe drinking water, and basic hygiene kits. This funding is simple. It will save lives. We must deliver.

Now, make no mistake; our adversaries are watching what the United States does. It is no coincidence that Iran backs Hamas’s campaign in Israel while also supplying Russia with lethal drones to use in Ukraine. China’s coercive behavior toward Taiwan and the

broader Indo-Pacific region may very well depend on if the U.S. is willing to stand on the side of democracy in Europe and the Middle East. Dictators like to stick together. And while they stick together, they seek to divide us from our allies and divert our attention and our resources. We cannot pick and choose when to stand up to autocrats—or there will be no free world left to defend.

I will keep coming back here and keep objecting as long as there are short-sighted and partisan proposals that do not adequately address the breadth of our national security challenges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled recess: Senator MERKLEY, Senator LEE, and Senator CORNYN.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, our colleague from Kansas has come to the floor and asked for unanimous consent for a bill of some major significance.

We have heard a lot of my colleagues explain why this Israel-only bill would be a disaster, because it throws Ukraine overboard.

And then I heard his rebuttal. His rebuttal was, “Well, why not do Israel alone?” as if we hadn’t had this conversation for the last hour and a half. We know the answer: because the House has said it will pass an Israel-alone bill, leaving Ukraine abandoned.

So this UC is about abandoning Ukraine. That has powerful international consequences. Allow Ukraine to be torn apart by Putin’s brutal invasion—that is what this UC does. It makes a group of American Senators Putin’s best friends. This bill—this UC, this unanimous consent for this bill—will shatter the Atlantic alliance, deeply, deeply damaging the power of democracies working together. This bill will fracture NATO because if we don’t stand with Ukraine, how many doubts creep in about any enduring effort to defend a smaller country assaulted by a dictator next door?

This bill will destroy American leadership in defending democracies. This bill will empower dictators around the world. They will conclude that they can outlast the attention span of a coalition of democratic republics as long as they stay the course.

Some of my colleagues in support of this bill say it is costing a lot of money. The budget that Russia is dedicating to this battle is, some estimate, 30 percent—30 percent—of their defense expenditures. Our GDP here is 1½ percent—1½ percent versus 30 percent. If we can’t stay the course when the question is \$1.50 out of every \$100, when would we ever stay the course?

The last time this globe saw such complicity blockading a vicious con-

queror was when Chamberlain went to Munich.

In Munich, Chamberlain told Hitler: You can take that massive slice of Czechoslovakia, and England will look the other way. We will simply declare peace in our time.

But that appeasement by Chamberlain didn’t produce peace in our time. Instead, that appeasement of Hitler stoked Hitler’s appetite for conquering adjacent lands. That appeasement of Hitler set the stage for the Second World War, with massive loss of life and treasure for the United States of America and nations around the world.

Appeasing Putin today is as wrong as appeasing Hitler 85 years ago. We must instead stand with the freedom-loving, fierce-fighting, democracy-defending people of the Republic of Ukraine.

If you come to this Chamber and you have followed former President Trump’s lead in loving Putin, then say yes to this unanimous consent request and throw Ukraine under the bus. If you love China, love their authoritarian conquests, love their desire to invade Taiwan, then come to this floor and support this unanimous consent request for this bill and throw Ukraine under the bus. But if you care about freedom; if you are a champion of democracy; if you believe that democracies must stand together against tyranny, against autocracy, against imperialist invaders; if you respect the courage and fortitude of the people of Ukraine, then absolutely say that you object to this UC request, that you object to this bill.

We here in the U.S. Senate must not countenance Putin appeasement. We must not countenance complicity and another Munich moment. So I join my colleagues today in preparing to object to this bill.

I yield to my colleague from Washington State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is to be recognized next.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this is a moment in history where we have the chance to stand up and provide assistance to an ally, an important ally, in a tough part of the world that has a lot of enemies in common with the United States.

Israel was savagely attacked without provocation on the morning of October 7 of this year, just over a month ago. The most unspeakably savage human attacks were carried out on men and women of Israel whose offense was simple: living in Israel. The people of Hamas wanted them dead because of the fact that they are Jewish and they live in Israel. Their humanity, their religion, their ancestry, and their geography all qualified them to be deemed unworthy of living by the savages of Hamas. These savages will continue in their butchery and, in so doing, degrade humanity for as long as they can get away with it.

Longstanding relationships between the United States and Israel have set

us on a course in which we can reasonably be expected to provide reasonable assistance to Israel.

Now, to be clear, what Israel is asking of us is not grand. They are not asking us to go there and fight their war for them, nor are they asking us to provide hundreds of billions of dollars over many years in order to help them achieve that effort—no. It is a relatively modest request that they are making of us. Compared to other requests that we are considering from other parts of the world, including and especially from Ukraine, this is a modest one.

This is, moreover, an effort that they believe they can carry out successfully in a matter of weeks or months, not something spanning out over the better part of a decade.

Finally, there is overwhelming bipartisan, bicameral support for aid to Israel. It has already passed the House of Representatives. It is done. We could bring it up right now, we could pass it today, and it could be on the desk of the President of the United States at the Oval Office, just a few blocks from here, by tonight.

To my knowledge, there is not a single Member of this body who would object to collapsing, consolidating the otherwise burdensome and time-consuming process that it takes to bring a bill to the floor at the U.S. Senate. We could have this done today, and I predict that the vote would be overwhelming—if not unanimous, then very nearly so—with the number of dissenting votes probably in the single digits, probably in the low single digits, if, in fact, there were any “no” votes at all.

So the point here is that you have two proposals, two ideas to offer support in two different conflicts. One is overwhelmingly popular and bipartisan and could easily pass both Houses. The other is troubling and fraught with questions and also happens to be the proposal—the one for Ukraine—that is a lot more expensive and that involves a conflict that is now, we are being told, a conflict that is likely to stretch out for the better part of a decade with no end in sight. And that is a conflict wherein—since the beginning of last year, we have spent \$113 billion on the conflict in Ukraine. They are, moreover, analytically distinct, just as they are geographically distinct. They involve different considerations. We opt to consider them together.

This is one of the real maladies of Washington today, is the fact that, in many instances, Congress can’t seem to resist the impulse to consolidate support for one thing and use that as leverage to bring about support for something else for which there is no comparably large, bipartisan, broad-based support. That is unfortunate.

The people of Israel need this aid now. Let’s get this done now. We will consider Ukraine on its own merits. There is no reason to delay. We should bring this up today, get it passed

today, and get it signed into law this very evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CHINA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow, President Biden is scheduled to meet with Chinese President Xi Jinping, and it is safe to say their meeting comes at an especially fraught time. There is a war in the Middle East, a war in Europe, and growing tensions in the Indo-Pacific.

In each case, the United States and China have aligned with opposing powers. China is financing the Russian war while America is supporting Ukraine. China is propping up the Iranian regime and terrorist proxies while the United States is backing Israel's righteous defense. China is threatening its own invasion of Taiwan while the United States stands firmly in support of Taiwan's defense.

In addition to these conflicts on the world stage, the United States is facing more direct threats from the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party. Economic relations have deteriorated due to China's subversive trade practices.

The Chinese Communist Party is holding three American hostages, including Houston native Mark Swidan, who has been imprisoned and tortured for more than a decade.

More than 70,000 Americans a year are being killed by a synthetic opioid, fentanyl, which is manufactured using precursor chemicals that come from—you guessed it—China.

Earlier this year, a Chinese surveillance balloon traveled across the United States, marking a new level of bravado for the Chinese Communist Party.

So suffice it to say this is an especially fraught time for U.S.-China relations, but President Biden should not give the Chinese Communist Party or President Xi a free pass. I hope the President will deliver a clear message to President Xi that China's aggressive and hostile actions will not be met with kid gloves. We have a responsibility to the American people and to our allies to deal with threats from China straightforwardly and head-on.

Strong leadership from the President is important, but Congress has an important role to play too. For example, we have a major piece of unfinished business that is a key to our efforts to counter threats from China, and that is the National Defense Authorization Act. This year's National Defense Authorization Act—or NDAA, as we call it—includes a range of provisions related to long-term strategic competition with China, and it is time to finish that bill and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

The Senate passed the NDAA at the end of July, and here we are in November. I hope this week, after more than 3½ months of waiting, we can finally

begin to vote on the formal conference process. This will be key to ironing out the differences between the House and the Senate so we can deliver a bill to the President's desk that is truly tough on China and deals with the threat in a realistic and clear-eyed fashion.

The Biden administration has moved away from the idea of decoupling from China and now focuses on derisking. Frankly, that makes a lot of sense to me because it is hard to ignore a population of 1.4 billion people on the other side of the planet. But we do need to derisk, and that requires some very specific tasks.

We want to reduce America's reliance on China for key national security interests, but we don't necessarily want to completely decouple. I couldn't care less how many businesses want to invest in Starbucks or Burger Kings in China, but I care a lot about American investment in artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and advanced semiconductors.

We know that derisking is harder than it sounds because China does not play by the rules, as we know. The Chinese Communist Party has become increasingly aggressive in its efforts to gain power and influence, embracing illicit tactics like intellectual property theft, for which it is infamous, forced technology transfers, and predatory lending.

It is important to understand that this strategy by the Chinese Communist Party doesn't just benefit China's economy but also its military. In China, there is no bright line separating the military and civilian sectors. This is part of a very intentional strategy known as military-civil fusion, which promotes development of dual-use technologies. In short, the Chinese Communist Party is focused on shoring up technologies that bolster its military strength and its economic power at the same time.

Unfortunately, American investors are fueling the success of Chinese military-civil fusion, possibly unwittingly, without even knowing exactly what is happening. I am not talking about covert theft of intellectual property; I am talking about direct investments in Chinese companies. American investors are funneling money into companies that are developing artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and next-generation semiconductors, all of which benefit the People's Liberation Army. Intentionally or not, these American investors are fueling China's military strength and funding capabilities that could eventually be used against the United States and our allies.

Joseph Stalin reportedly said:

We will hang the capitalists with the rope they sell us.

Metaphorically, the United States has provided the Chinese Communist Party with a lot of metaphorical rope.

At the end of 2020, U.S. investments in Chinese companies totaled \$2.3 trillion in market value. That includes \$21

billion in semiconductors, \$54 billion in military companies, and a whopping \$221 billion in artificial intelligence. That is American investors in China, in those sectors.

We now know China as the single largest national security threat of our time, and it is clear that the United States entities are helping bankroll its rise. While we have some information—anecdotal really—that illustrates the scope of the problem, we need more information. We need more visibility. We need a better understanding of how certain U.S. investments benefit the Chinese Communist Party and its military buildup and its belligerent and aggressive actions.

Thankfully, this is a bipartisan priority, and I am glad the Senate took action over the summer. The Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, and I introduced an outbound transparency provision that was adopted as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, and it passed by a vote of 91 to 6. You don't get that kind of bipartisan vote around here very often. So I think it sends a very strong message.

This measure simply requires companies to notify Treasury of investments in specific sectors, including advanced semiconductors, artificial intelligence, and hypersonics. This is not a broad bill that prohibits investments in the People's Republic of China. This is designed to provide information to Congress's policymakers about where that money is going in particular sectors where we are in the greatest level of competition with China.

This is all about visibility, about transparency. It will help us understand where the money is going and allow us to take appropriate action, if required.

Our colleagues in the House are overwhelmingly supportive of outbound investment transparency, though there isn't the same level of consensus that there is here in the Senate. Members of the House have suggested everything from notification requirements to sanctions, to outright prohibitions on some investments.

We work very diligently with stakeholders here in the Senate to try to build consensus. And I think we have achieved that on our outbound transparency provision. But I do expect our colleagues in the House will have a thorough debate about various options. And I have to say, we are fortunate that we have two experts on this topic in the conference committee of the House.

Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL leads the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is a powerful and trusted voice on matters related to China. He recently introduced his own outbound investment legislation and is committed to including a strong outbound provision in the NDAA.

The conference committee for the Defense authorization bill also includes Chairman MIKE GALLAGHER, who leads