

of the war. Through it all, the Ukrainian people have demonstrated extraordinary courage and resilience.

But one thing is clear: It is time for the war in Ukraine to end. President Trump is right. But the more difficult question is, How?

Years ago, I recall GEN David Petraeus, the leader of our military and Central Command, heading up our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, was asked the question: How does the war end?

He said: You tell me how the war ends. Wars are easy to start and hard to conclude.

This is the most difficult question of all—how does it end?

We should all be grateful to President Trump for taking on the difficult but essential task of brokering a peace agreement to end this devastating war. During the contentious meeting at the Oval Office last week, President Trump commented that he hoped to “be known and recognized as a peacemaker.” Well, this would be no small feat, but it is the right position to take.

It is not hard to look at this incredible devastation—the massive casualties, the human misery and suffering of the last 3 years—and understand that it is time for the bloodshed to end. But it will take both sides, Ukraine and Russia, to accomplish this goal. Ukraine cannot do it on its own.

President Trump was correct to point out to President Zelenskyy last week during this high-intensity meeting in the Oval Office—he said: I have to align myself with both of you in order to make a deal.

President Trump’s skill at making deals is famous, but this would be the crowning achievement of his life if he is able to make this happen.

But the point is, in order to achieve a lasting peace, both sides of the conflict must be willing to sit down and negotiate and make concessions no matter how hard that is.

I am glad to see that President Zelenskyy has indicated a willingness for Ukraine to do so in part through a critical minerals arrangement with the U.S. Government. Such a deal would compensate the United States and its taxpayers for our many years of military and economic support for Ukraine. It would actually be a vested interest that the United States would have every reason to want to protect in the future. Some have called that an implicit security arrangement.

Perhaps most importantly, though, in order to ensure a lasting peace, there must be some real and tangible and enforceable security assurances for Ukraine. To put this in the proper context, we have to consider history, the events that led us up to this point.

In 1994, the United States, Russia, and Britain signed something called the Budapest Memorandum. This was shortly after the fall of the Soviet Union. As the Soviet Union broke up, it turned out that Ukraine, which was

formerly part of the Soviet Union, had the third largest nuclear weapons stockpile in the world.

The Budapest Memorandum was an agreement between the United States, the United Kingdom, and Russia that if Ukraine would give up its nuclear weapons, its territorial integrity and independence would be preserved and respected.

This was a historic point in world history. It was an important step toward nuclear nonproliferation and prevented the rise of a major third nuclear power in Eastern Europe. But, unfortunately, Russia proceeded to violate that same agreement in 2014 with the annexation of the Crimean Peninsula, and then, as we know, the Russian Government, led by Mr. Putin, violated that agreement a second time in February of 2022 with its invasion of Ukraine.

If Russia was unwilling to honor the commitments it made in the Budapest Memorandum in 1994 by its invasion of Crimea in 2014 and its invasion of Ukraine as a nation in 2022, how can Ukraine be assured that Russia will honor a peace agreement brokered in 2025? That, perhaps, is the single most important question that we need to ask.

Given the history and pattern of behavior by Russia, if Zelenskyy does not receive adequate security assurances, will this incentivize him to do other things to protect and preserve his nation—for example, to reacquire a nuclear weapons program against an existential threat? We know that President Zelenskyy himself has floated this as a possibility, and more recently, the newly elected Chancellor of Germany had suggested that both Germany and the United Kingdom would share, perhaps, their nuclear weapons capabilities with Ukraine, which would be a dramatic and dangerous development.

But that is not all. We have to keep in mind that both President Zelenskyy and President Putin are not fighting this war in some sort of vacuum. Allies of the United States and adversaries alike around the world are watching.

Will our actions in Ukraine suggest to allies in South Korea, for example, that they should pursue their own nuclear weapon capability, especially in light of the North Korean nuclear program, which receives Russian assistance?

Will more citizens of Taiwan cast their vote for representatives pushing closer alignment with the People’s Republic of China as the most prudent way for their people to maintain a guarantee against a catastrophic war in the Indo-Pacific?

Seeing that unanswered aggression is awarded, would President Xi be emboldened to seize Taiwan, as he has made clear he intends to do one way or the other?

These are just a few of the unintended consequences that could play out depending on how these peace negotiations transpire and how they develop.

We, the duly-elected representatives of the American people, must ask ourselves: Will a world of unreliable security assurances, of greater prospects of nuclear proliferation, of insufficient deterrence in the face of unprovoked aggression, result in a safer world for our children and grandchildren?

Well, given these difficult but necessary questions, I would once again applaud President Trump for taking the initiative of embracing peace through strength. His approach is the correct one, and he is right that an important piece of this is that our NATO allies—who, in fact, live in Europe, where Ukraine is located—need to increase their contribution to our collective security under the North Atlantic Treaty alliance. It is through strength we can guarantee peace both in Europe and around the world.

The suffering resulting from the Russian invasion of Ukraine on two occasions—2014 and 2022—has been devastating not only for Ukrainians but also for Russians as well, who have lost hundreds of thousands of casualties in the process.

President Trump pointed out during the meeting with President Zelenskyy that both sides are losing “1,000, 2,000” soldiers a week. “As we sit here and talk, people are being shot and dying on the battlefield.”

What President Trump is doing to secure peace in this dangerous world is an act of moral leadership and I believe divinely inspired.

Jesus said in the Beatitudes:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God.

If President Trump is successful in securing a lasting peace, I, for one, think he will have earned the Nobel Peace Prize.

As President Zelenskyy himself said in the Oval Office—he said:

If President Trump [can] bring peace to our country, I think he will be on this wall.

He was, of course, referring to the walls of the Oval Office. They have pictures of historic American Presidents who have done great and important things.

It is my sincere hope that President Zelenskyy and President Putin will both accept the olive branch offered by President Trump by coming to the table and by making the necessary, enforceable concessions to ensure a lasting peace.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. CORNYN assumed the Chair.)

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

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

HALT FENTANYL ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, I led my colleagues in reporting

a bill that is entitled the “HALT Fentanyl Act.” This bill was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

This is a battle-tested bipartisan bill that passed the House of Representatives with a supermajority of votes, including 98 Democrats voting in favor of the bill. If you have been involved with this issue over the last 3 or 4 or 5 years, you would know that bipartisan fentanyl legislation has been hard to come by. But I am pleased to see that this bill has seven Democratic cosponsors here in the Senate and had nearly half the Democrats in my committee vote in favor of it.

I want to thank all my Democratic colleagues for working with us on such a vital piece of legislation. I think you all know the statistics: About 70,000 of the 100,000 people that die of drug overdose are dying because of fentanyl.

The HALT Fentanyl Act does three things. First, it makes permanent the class scheduling of fentanyl-related substances. This is the same classwide scheduling that occurred during the first Trump administration and has been continued nine times by Congress on a short-term basis. This legislation would eliminate that from time-to-time scheduling of fentanyl analogs, and that is why permanent legislation is so important.

Second, the bill confirms the sentencing penalties the Federal courts have long applied to fentanyl-related substances. And thirdly, the bill creates a streamline registration process for studying schedule I controlled substances.

Classwide scheduling has been a successful policy. It has been a success in stopping the creation of fentanyl-related substances that would have otherwise killed countless Americans.

If you don't believe me, I would like to have you listen to Dr. Tim Westlake. Dr. Westlake is the inventor of the classwide scheduling system the DEA adopted. He came before my committee and testified:

[T]hese efforts have resulted in shutting down the creation and flow and very existence of new fentanyl related substances into the [United States]. It's why Congress must act to finally make permanent this temporary policy.

I began by saying that bipartisan fentanyl legislation has been very hard to come by. I am proud to lead the HALT Fentanyl Act with Senators HEINRICH and CASSIDY. That is one Democrat and one Republican.

Our bill has the support of the leading law enforcement organizations. These 12 organizations have called on us here in the Congress to “advance this critical legislation without delay or modification.”

Our bill also has the support of an organization called Facing Fentanyl. That is a coalition supported by over 200 family groups impacted by fentanyl. They “stand in full support of the HALT Fentanyl Act as it is currently written, without amendments.”

I have also received over 100 individual letters from parents who have lost their children to fentanyl poisoning.

Our bill also has the support of the medical community.

The HALT Fentanyl Act is truly a bipartisan compromise, bringing together stakeholders and Members from across the spectrum.

During the last 4 years, Senate Democrats couldn't be bothered to bring this bill or any other permanent legislation to schedule fentanyl to the floor for a vote, and that was the situation even after HALT passed the House with 74 Democrats voting in favor and even with the Biden administration's coming out in support of the bill—all taking place in the last Congress.

So the time has surely come. This is long overdue legislation, and I urge my colleagues to move to and support this bill. If we can't come together to pass this battle-tested bipartisan legislation, then we will have failed the American people and made the environment for even more people to die of drug overdoses and fentanyl poisoning. We owe it to the hundreds of thousands of families who have lost loved ones to this very poison. We owe it to our constituents. It is time that we found the will to act, and now is that time to act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture votes on the Chavez-DeRemer nomination and the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 18, S. 331, be waived.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we move to begin the vote right now.

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

#### VOTE ON EDGAR NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Edgar nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA),

and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Ex.]

#### YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Mullin
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Peters
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Marshall	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Curtis	McCormick	Tuberville
Daines	Moody	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Moreno	

#### NAYS—43

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Schatz
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schiff
Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Kaine	Shaheen
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Slotkin
Booker	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Coons	Lujan	Warner
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warnock
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Welch
Fetterman	Murray	Whitehouse
Galleo	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Hassan	Rosen	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Kelly	Padilla
Lummis	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 29, Lori Chavez-DeRemer, of Oregon, to be Secretary of Labor.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Barrasso, Mike Lee, Katie Britt, Mike Crapo, Bill Hagerty, Steve Daines, Jim Banks, Eric Schmitt, Tommy Tuberville, Chuck Grassley, Ashley B. Moody, Roger Marshall, John R. Curtis, Bernie Moreno.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lori Chavez-DeRemer, of Oregon, to be Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.