

From 2002 to 2012, she served in the Office of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Oregon in Portland. She handled both trials and appeals in that role, representing her clients in Federal district court and before the Ninth Circuit. In 2012, Judge Baggio opened a solo practice in Portland, where she worked until 2019. During her time as a litigator, she tried 12 cases to verdict, including 8 jury trials.

In 2019, Judge Baggio was appointed to the Oregon State Circuit Court in Multnomah County by then-Governor Kate Brown. Judge Baggio was subsequently elected to the position in 2020. Over the past 5 years, she has handled civil, criminal, and family law matters, and she has presided over more than 40 trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Baggio “well qualified” to serve on the District of Oregon. She has deep ties to Oregon and enjoys the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Mr. WYDEN and Mr. MERKLEY. Her extensive litigation background and experience as a State court judge will serve her well on the Federal bench.

When Senator WYDEN introduced Judge Baggio at her confirmation hearing, he noted that she has never had a party before her file a request for a different judge, a testament to her fairness. I strongly support this nominee, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to move now to my brief remarks with respect to our judge from Oregon. I come to the floor today to reiterate my strong support for Judge Amy Baggio’s nomination to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

Judge Baggio has a proven track record as both a jurist and a litigator. She spent a decade as a public defender; and in her career on the bench, she has presided over hundreds of civil and criminal matters and handled 42 trials, half of which were jury trials.

And I note, because Members have been asking with respect to her values in terms of prosecuting and dealing with cases and her attitude towards criminals, in one case the judge sentenced a man to many more years for first-degree sexual abuse than anyone had thought was even being discussed, certainly longer than was sought by defense counsel. So it is a testament to Judge Baggio’s fairness and professionalism that during her career as a judge, she has never once had a party file a request for a different judge.

In addition to being fair, she has consistently demonstrated an ability to make thoughtful decisions that protect communities and their values.

I urge my colleagues—and I gather that we will be going to the vote now—to support a very dedicated public servant—and I emphasize that—a public servant who has got a real track record as a public defender and in her career on the bench.

I urge my colleagues to support Judge Amy Baggio.

VOTE ON BAGGIO NOMINATION

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

Mr. WYDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—44

Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—2

Barrasso	Lummis
----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be notified immediately of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in December, President Zelenskyy came here to Congress. He came to us because he is fighting for his country’s future and for his citizens’ lives. This supplemental spending bill, the portion for Ukraine, will fulfill our commitments to our allies, defend democracy, and save innocent lives.

Let’s be absolutely clear about that. Ukrainian civilians will live or die based on what we decide to do here in the Senate, in this Chamber. Are we

going to ignore the requests, the pleas, the cries for help from our fellow champions of democracy in Ukraine?

President Zelenskyy has told us that Ukrainians will continue to fight with or without us. By that, he did not mean that they don’t need us. No, they need us more than ever. With our help, they have pushed back against the Russian invaders. Without our help, they will run out of ammunition to hold back the Russians.

Our White House has conveyed this message:

We are out of money—and nearly out of time.

That is our government speaking. Our White House has warned us that “while our allies around the world have stepped up to do more, U.S. support is critical and cannot be replicated by others.”

Putin himself told us the deadly stakes. He said:

[Ukraine] will only have a week to live when the ammunition runs out.

And Ukrainians are running out of ammunition.

Now, the United States could choose to stop funding, but the Ukrainians can’t choose to stop fighting—nor would any of us if war came to our hometowns. If you had to defend your home, if you had to defend your family knowing that, if you stopped fighting, that death would fall from the sky as bombs and rockets obliterated your communities; that as Russian soldiers marched down your quiet street, your neighbors would be tortured, raped, your children stolen, your family executed, would you stop fighting even if you ran out of ammunition?

And those actions are what Russia has already done in the cities and towns they ran over in Ukraine. We know it will continue to happen if they run over other cities.

So the Ukrainian people really are fighting for their lives, and we are here debating whether we are going to abandon them. This is a conversation I can’t believe we are having. I can’t believe, with all of the foreign engagements we have been involved in, that when a fellow Republic which has repeatedly pushed hard to be out from under Russia’s thumb, which had the Orange Revolution, which threw a President out of their country who wanted to betray them, who are now fighting in the streets against this Russian invasion—I can’t believe we are having this conversation here in the Senate with so many colleagues ready to abandon Ukraine.

But this is certainly a critical debate. Ukraine is not some regional conflict on a faraway map. Putin himself put it this way in October. He said:

This is not a territorial conflict or even the establishment of a regional geopolitical balance.

He continued, and he said:

The question is much broader and more fundamental: We are talking about the principles on which the new world order will be based.

That is Putin. And what are the principles that Putin champions in that new world order? Well, we know what they are: the end of freedom of speech; the end of freedom of assembly; the end of freedom of religion; the end of citizens, through the integrity of democratic elections, choosing their own leaders and their own futures.

And there is another principle that is very much embedded with Putin, and that is the continuation of vile crimes against humanity—of rape, torture, and execution.

And Putin is not the only authoritarian in the world with this set of principles. We have got the Ayatollah in Iran to Xi Jinping in China who share his vision, who have closed ranks behind him in this fight, this fight in which they evade sanctions, legitimize tyranny, undermine the precious values of human rights, freedom, and democracy.

They are watching the United States very closely. They are watching to see if Senators in this Chamber are going to vote to abandon Ukraine. They are going to see if Senators in this Chamber are going to abandon our partnership and alliance with NATO in support of the people and the republic in Ukraine. They are watching to see if they can outlast our fickle political attention span. They are watching to see if they can invade their neighboring countries, execute the citizens in that country, and take over those adjacent nations, all for more power and more profit.

It is so important that democracy stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight. We know that is what we need to do. That is how we won the Cold War. And before that, it is how we won World War II when we defeated another axis of authoritarians bent on repression and conquest.

It was in 1940. Germany and Italy signed a pact to support each other. Back then, many Americans believed that we could stay out of war in Eastern Europe by hiding behind the slogan of “America First.” And then the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor.

The war in Europe then, like the war in Europe today, isn’t some regional conflict that we can ignore, not some regional conflict that doesn’t affect us. It is a universal struggle about whether people in Ukraine and here in the United States have the right to live in freedom and peace or whether repressive authoritarians can conquer democracies.

And the authoritarians in Europe and Asia then, like the authoritarians in Europe and Asia today, were dictators who viewed democracy as a threat—a threat to their power, a threat that must be destroyed. Dictators do not stop. Dictators must be stopped.

Putin has ruled Russia for a quarter of a century, and he wants even more time to continue his establishment of those principles against freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, the principles of crushing

dissent. Putin has ruled with total and merciless control and power, and he wants even more power. What makes us think that ceding some of Ukraine will be enough to placate him?

We have seen this story before. The last time the world naively tried to placate a murderous madman was when British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain went to Munich in 1938. In Munich, Chamberlain told Hitler, like some colleagues in this Chamber today want to say to Putin, that he could have a slice of an adjacent country—in that case, Czechoslovakia—and England would look the other way and declare “peace in our time.” But that appeasement of Hitler didn’t produce “peace in our time.” Instead, that appeasement encouraged his appetite, made him stronger, set the stage for the unimaginable horrors of World War II.

Appeasing Putin today is as wrong strategically and morally as appeasing Hitler was 86 years ago. Think of the lives we could have saved and the incalculable destruction we could have prevented had we stopped Hitler in 1938.

Well, we have that same question before us right now. Every student of history, every student of politics, if they could go back in time, would tell Chamberlain: Do not appease Hitler. That will not work.

For the same reason, every student of history and politics today is telling us: Don’t appease Putin.

Appeasing Putin would be a mistake of the same magnitude, one that future historians will condemn as the megamistake of the 21st century.

We must say here in this Chamber—we must say no to another Munich moment. We must say no to appeasement. We must say no to the Neville Chamberlains of our time.

Some of my colleagues asked the question: Can we afford to defend democracy?

Munich and Pearl Harbor teach us we cannot afford not to defend democracy. A threat to democracy anywhere is a threat to democracy everywhere.

Experts estimate that Putin is spending some 30 percent, and possibly quite more, of his government budget to fight this war. We here in the United States, we are spending 1.5 percent of our government budget to support Ukraine. That is pennies on the dollar. A penny and a half of our Federal budget, that is all we are asking.

The Ukrainians are fighting and giving with their lives and their injuries to save their democracy. All they are asking of us: 1.5 percent of our Federal budget.

We are not putting Americans in harm’s way in the process. We are just being asked for 1.5 percent of our government budget. But that 1.5 percent, that is so important. It is that 1.5 percent combined with the European partnership that is supporting the people in Ukraine. It is those pennies, that 1.5 percent, that is ensuring that Ukrain-

ian soldiers don’t run out of artillery shells. It is those pennies, that 1.5 percent, so that Ukrainian soldiers won’t run out of air defenses. It is those pennies that will ensure Ukrainian soldiers will not run out of ammunition.

If Putin conquers Ukraine like Hitler conquered Czechoslovakia, if he sees the United States will not stand with this democratic ally, where will his attention turn next? Where will his attention turn to his next project? He is a frustrated KGB agent who saw the dissolution of the USSR, the Soviet Union, as the biggest calamity of his life, and he wants to do everything in his power to take back as much as he possibly can in his lifetime. That is his mission.

So anyone who thinks you can appease Putin the way Chamberlain tried to appease Hitler, you are just wrong. Imagine the costs when Russian tanks roll up to the border of Poland or Estonia or Latvia or Finland. All NATO members are sworn by a treaty to defend each other, and that includes not just our money but our soldiers.

It makes so much sense to stand with Ukraine today and stop Putin in Ukraine rather than to hand over Ukraine and then defend the rest of Europe from his aggression that will surely follow.

And think about the message that we are sending to China regarding Taiwan. China is watching this very closely. China says: If Putin can outlast the United States and Europe in Ukraine, well, we can certainly outlast them when we attack Taiwan.

So standing with Ukraine today is the right stance if you want to deter China from attacking Taiwan tomorrow. We could have stopped Hitler in 1938, just like we can stop Putin today.

This is a war between democracy and authoritarianism, and this Senate floor, the battlefield, is right here, right now, this week. The decisions that we make this week about funding Ukraine may be the most consequential of our careers. The United States, in this fight, is the only truly indispensable nation.

If we are leaders of the free world, if we are the last best hope for democracy, then we have to actually be that hope for democracy. We have to heed the lessons of history. We have to stop dictators like Putin in their tracks, and we need to do it now.

When President Zelenskyy was here before Congress in 2022, he said:

This struggle will define in what world our children and grandchildren will live, and then their children and grandchildren. It will define whether it will be a democracy of Ukrainians and for Americans—for all.

He continued:

This battle cannot be frozen or postponed. It cannot be ignored.

My friends, defending Ukraine is not some charitable operation where we can decide to give a little more or a little less and feel good about it. Defending Ukraine is global and national security.

Putin and his authoritarian allies want to show the world that democracies don't work. We here in the U.S. Senate, need to show the world that democracies do work. The Senate should debate the supplemental security spending for Ukraine this week in this Chamber; the Senate should vote on this supplemental security for Ukraine this week in this Chamber; and this Senate should pass this emergency funding supplemental for Ukraine here in this Chamber this week for Ukraine's democracy and for our own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 480, Nicole Shampaine, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicole Shampaine, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the Shampaine nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING JEAN CARNAHAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn last week of the passing of a trailblazing former member of our Senate family. Senator Jean Carnahan was the first woman ever to represent Missouri in the U.S. Senate.

She was appointed to the Senate in December 2000, after her husband, then-Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan, lost

his life in an airplane crash in the closing weeks of his Senate campaign. The Carnahans' eldest son Randy and Chris Sifford, a longtime political aide to the Governor, also perished in the plane crash.

It was too late to remove Governor Carnahan's name from the ballot so 1 week before the election. Missouri's acting Governor announced that he would appoint Jean Carnahan to serve in her late husband's place should the people of Missouri elect Governor Carnahan posthumously.

In her first remarks in the Senate, Senator Carnahan told her new colleagues, "I know I did not come to the U.S. Senate in the same way you did. I did not have a long-term, personal commitment to a campaign. My name has never been on a ballot. On election night there was no victory celebration. You are here because of your win; I am here because of my loss. But we are all here to do the work of this great nation."

The first Senator to greet her after she took her oath of office was someone who also knew the searing pain of losing a spouse and child. As Senator Carnahan later recalled, then-Senator Joe Biden assured Missouri's new Senator that she could endure her crushing loss. He also shared with her the same advice that had been given to him when he was elected to the Senate shortly after his wife Neilia and baby daughter Naomi were killed in a car crash.

His advice was, "Lose yourself in the work." In fact, as President Biden remarked last week after Senator Carnahan died, "she found herself" serving the people of her State in this Senate.

She was elected as a Member of the first 50/50, evenly divided Senate. The 2 years she served were some of the most tragic and turbulent in our Nation's history. They included the 9/11 terrorist attacks on America, the start of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the anthrax attack on the Senate.

In a time of growing political division and acrimony, Senator Carnahan was a quiet but determined consensus seeker and a practical politician. She joined the Centrist Coalition, a bipartisan group of Senators. She focused on national security, conditions for members of the military, and military families. And she was part of the first congressional delegation to Afghanistan after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

While she had never held public office before, Jean Carnahan was not new to politics and public service; she had been serving the people of Missouri her entire adult life. She was born Jean Carpenter and grew up in a working-class section of Washington, DC. Her father was a plumber, and her mother was a hairdresser. She met her future husband, the son of a Missouri Congressman, when they were both 15 years old. They met first at church and a few days later at Anacostia High School, where they were seated next to each other.

On their second date, he told her that he was going to marry her, and he was going to move back to Missouri to run for Congress. They married 5 years later. The following year, Jean Carnahan graduated from George Washington University with a degree in business and public administration, the first member of her family to graduate from high school or college.

True to his word, Mel Carnahan returned to Missouri and was elected to Congress, representing the Bootheel area of southeastern Missouri. He would go on to serve two terms as a popular Missouri Governor.

In their early campaigns, Jean Carnahan was her husband's speechwriter and press secretary, and she was always his best and closest political confidante. She made the position of first lady of Missouri a full-time job and developed her own slate of child- and family-centered causes. She advocated successfully for establishing daycare centers at workplaces. Her focus on childhood immunizations helped boost Missouri's childhood immunization rate from 49th in the Nation to tenth. She also led a successful effort to renovate Missouri's Governor's mansion. She also was a gifted writer, author of seven books.

Weeks before the end of her time in the Senate, in another cruel twist of fate, a different plane crash claimed the lives of another beloved member of this Senate, Senator Paul Wellstone, along with his wife Sheila, their daughter Marcia, three campaign staffers, and the plane's two pilots. In the dark days that followed, no one was a greater support to the devastated Wellstone staff than Senator Carnahan and her staff.

In 2002, Senator Carnahan ran in a special election to serve the remainder of what would have been her husband's 6-year term. She lost in a razor-thin vote.

In her final remarks on this floor, she thanked the people of Missouri for allowing three generations of Carnahans to serve their State. She also had some wise words of advice to the Senators that served with her and those who would follow her. I think her parting words are even more important today. Senator Carnahan implored us "[W]hen my colleagues think on the role of government, seek a balance. Seek a balance between one that does everything and one that does nothing. And where there is talk of war, let there be the free and open debate that becomes our great Nation. And when there are judges to be appointed, let them be selected for their temperament and jurisprudence and not for political ideology that satisfies a special interest group."

She continued "When we lay out our energy and environment policy, let it not be for short-term gain but for the well-being of our grandchildren and the survival of our planet. And when my colleagues speak of leaving no child behind, let that not be a mantra but a