



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2024

No. 71

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord, our Redeemer, abide with our Senators through the passing hours of another day. Strengthen them to stand firm for those good and eternal values that keep a nation strong. Lord, give them the courage to do the right even when others are doing wrong. Remind them that You are the pilot of their lives who can guide them to a desired destination. Let discretion preserve them, understanding keep them, and faith fortify them. Lead them not into temptation, but deliver them from the forces of evil. Save them from pride that mistakes their abilities for possessions, and keep them humble enough to see their need of You.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SECURING GROWTH AND ROBUST LEADERSHIP IN AMERICAN AVIATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 3935, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT, 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate has received a message from the House of

Representatives to accompany H.R. 815.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 815.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 815) entitled "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes.", with a House amendment to the Senate amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 815, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 815, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2943

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Chris Van Hollen, Mark Kelly, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Michael F. Bennet, Gary C. Peters, Jon Tester, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jeanne Shaheen, Angus S. King, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Benjamin L. Cardin.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1842

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to concur in the House amendment to H.R. 815, with an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment, with an amendment numbered 1842.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1843 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1842

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1843 to amendment No. 1842.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1844

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to refer H.R. 815 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to refer the House message to accompany H.R. 815 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1844.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1845

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1845 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1846 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1845

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1846 to amendment No. 1845.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 1, strike "4 days" and insert "5 days".

H.R. 815

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate convenes at a moment nearly 6 months in the making.

A few days ago, the House of Representatives, at long last, approved essential national security funding for

Ukraine, for Israel, for the Indo-Pacific, and for humanitarian assistance. Today is the Senate's turn to act.

For the information of Senators, at 1 p.m. this afternoon, the Senate will hold two rollcall votes related to the supplemental: one on a procedural motion and then a vote to invoke cloture.

The time has come to finish the job to help our friends abroad once and for all. I ask my colleagues to join together to pass the supplemental today as expeditiously as possible and send our friends abroad the aid they have long been waiting for. Let us not delay this. Let us not prolong this. Let us not keep our friends around the world waiting for a moment longer.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, to provide for the common defense is one of Congress's primary responsibilities.

I have been at this business for quite a while, and I have found that making and explaining sensible decisions about advancing our Nation's interests is easier when you start from the right set of assumptions.

Here is what I know to be true: American prosperity and security are the products of decades of American leadership. Our global interests come with global responsibilities. Healthy alliances lighten the burden of these responsibilities. And at the end of the day, the primary language of strategic competition is strength.

These are the facts that led me to urge Presidents of both parties not to abandon Afghanistan to terrorists, to fight efforts from both sides of the aisle to tie America's hands in critical parts of the world, to push consecutive administrations to equip Ukraine with lethal weapons before—before—Russia escalated, and to continue fighting for the sort of sustained investments in our military and defense industrial base necessary to meet the challenges that we face.

The responsibilities of leadership, the value of alliances, the currency of hard power—these are foundational principles. They are not driven by the fickle politics of any one moment. They are tested and proven by the workings of a dangerous world.

Today, the Senate sits for a test on behalf of the entire Nation. It is a test of American resolve, our readiness, and our willingness to lead. And the stakes of failure are abundantly clear.

Failure to help Ukraine stand against Russian aggression now means inviting escalation against our closest

treaty allies and trading partners. It means greater risk that American forces would become involved in conflict. It means more costly deployments of our military and steeper military requirements to defend against aggression.

Failure to reestablish deterrence against Iran means encouraging unchecked terrorist violence against American personnel, our ally Israel, and the international commerce that underpins our prosperity.

And failure to match the pacing threat—the People's Republic of China—means jeopardizing the entire system of alliances that preserve American interests and reinforce American leadership.

Colleagues on both sides of the aisle who dismiss the values of our allies and partners ignore what history teaches about times when we lacked such friendships. Our adversaries understand the stakes, and they are responding with a coordinated full-court press.

Iran and North Korea are literally arming Russia's war in Ukraine. China is helping Iran skirt international sanctions. A "friendship without limits" has blossomed between Moscow and Beijing.

The authoritarians of the world may have caught the West flatfooted. They may be betting big that American influence is in decline. But, increasingly, our friends understand the stakes too.

In Asia, nations with every excuse to be preoccupied by Chinese aggression understand that, in fact, defeating authoritarian conquest halfway around the world is actually in their interests. They know China will benefit from Russian advances, and they know Beijing is waiting for us to waver.

In Europe, allies that had long neglected the responsibilities of collective security are making historic new investments in their own defense.

Finland and Sweden, two high-tech nations, responded to Russian escalation by bringing real military capabilities to the most successful military alliance in world history. And when the House passed the supplemental last week, the Prime Minister of Sweden reiterated that our allies have even more work to do.

The holiday from history is over.

And in the Middle East, our close ally is locked in a fight for its right to literally exist. The people of Israel require no reminders of the stakes of hard-power competition or deterrence.

The remaining question is whether America does. Do our colleagues share the view of the Japanese Prime Minister that "the leadership of the United States is indispensable"? Or would we rather abdicate both the responsibilities and the benefits of global leadership?

Will the Senate indulge the fantasy of pulling up a drawbridge? Will we persist in the 21st century with an approach that failed in the 20th? Or will we dispense with the myth of isolationism and embrace reality?

For those who insist that America cannot do what the moment requires, the facts are inconveniently clear:

First, supplemental investment in the capabilities America and our friends need to defeat Russian aggression are not a distraction from China. Without the investments we have made over the past 2 years, America's defense industrial base would be even further behind the clear requirements of long-term competition with the PRC.

You don't believe me? Just ask the former chairman of the House Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party, who stayed in Congress long enough to support the legislation now before us.

Second, supplemental investments have expanded our capacity to produce critical munitions. This supplemental contains additional investments aimed at expanding production capacity of critical munitions and weapons systems needed in the Indo-Pacific. Higher production rates and lower unit costs of critical munitions are a no-brainer for colleagues who are actually interested in strategic competition with the PRC.

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say they are concerned over the defense industrial base today would have done well to have joined me—months before Russian escalation in Ukraine—in supporting a massive proposed investment under reconciliation led by our former colleagues Senator Shelby and Senator Inhofe. If some of our Republican colleagues hadn't joined the Democratic leader in opposition, we would have begun to rebuild our capacity even sooner.

And, finally, investment in American hard power and leadership isn't coddling our allies. By every objective measure, they have helped drive our allies to make historic—historic—investments of their own in collective defense.

Across Europe, the acceleration of defense spending is outpacing our own. And, right now, allies and partners from Europe to the Indo-Pacific have contracted more than \$100 billion worth of cutting-edge American weapons and capabilities. That is right. Our allies across the world are buying expensive, sophisticated American weapons produced in American factories by American workers.

Do my colleagues really think that will continue if America decides that global leadership is too heavy a burden?

So much of the hesitation and shortsightedness that has delayed this moment is premised on sheer fiction, and I take no pleasure in rebutting misguided fantasies.

I wish sincerely that recognizing the responsibilities of American leadership was the price of admission for serious conversations about the future of our national security.

Make no mistake, delay in providing Ukraine the weapons to defend itself has strained the prospects of defeating

Russian aggression. Dithering and hesitation have compounded the challenges we face.

Today's action is overdue, but our work does not end here. Trust in American resolve is not revealed overnight. Expanding and restocking the arsenal of democracy doesn't just happen by magic.

And even as our allies take on a greater share of the burden of collective security, our obligation to invest in our own defense is as serious as ever.

So I will continue to hold the Commander in Chief to account for allowing America's adversaries to deter us, for hesitating in the face of escalation, and for providing anything less than full support for allies like Israel as they fight to restore their security and their sovereignty. At the same time, I will not mince words when Members of my own party take the responsibilities of American leadership lightly.

Today, the Senate faces a test, and we must not fail it.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a recent article by Peter Pomerantsev in *TIME* Magazine starts this way. It is about a Ukrainian held prisoner by the Russians. I quote:

After they beat Azat Azatyan so bad blood came out of his ears; after they sent electric shocks up his genitals; after they wacked him with pipes and truncheons, the Russians began to interrogate him about his faith. "When did you become a Baptist? When did you become an American spy?" Azat tried to explain that in Ukraine there was freedom of religion, you could just choose your faith. But his torturers saw the world the same way as their predecessors at the KGB did: An American church is just a front for the American state.

Since Soviet times, the Russian Orthodox Church has been used as a tool of the state, so Russians assume Protestants in Ukraine are American agents.

The world was horrified after the Kyiv suburb of Bucha was liberated, revealing that civilians had been massacred simply for being loyal Ukrainians. But Bucha is not an exception. In every part of Ukraine that Russia has occupied, civilians have been murdered, women systematically raped, and Christians not loyal to Moscow have been persecuted, tortured, and killed. Every day, the Russian military fires rockets, drones, and shells at civilian areas to demoralize the population in hopes of taking more Ukrainian land. Yet, with every Russian missile attack, every Ukrainian town destroyed, and every report of murdered pastors, the Ukrainian people become

more determined to prevent any more territory falling under Russian occupation.

You can understand why calls by some American politicians to negotiate with Russia seem so absurd to Ukrainians under daily attack. Ukraine knows that if it allows any more territory to fall under Russian control, it will mean more Ukrainians tortured and killed. Likewise, for most Ukrainians, giving up on their fellow countrymen currently suffering under Russian occupation is unthinkable.

There is also zero indication from Russia that Russia is looking to negotiate. The lack of any new U.S. military assistance from Congress for over a year has actually bolstered Putin's belief that he can outlast the West despite being outnumbered and outmatched in economic and military power.

Now, we all know that Russia is in violation of multiple treaties recognizing Ukraine's borders and promising to respect its sovereignty. Start out with the United Nations Charter that guarantees the sovereignty of individual countries. But beyond that, the United States and Russia, plus the United Kingdom, all signed the Budapest Memorandum in 1993 in which Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons inherited from the Soviet Union in return for a guarantee of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. If you believe in the rule of law, that Budapest Memorandum ought to mean something.

Just like in 2014, if Russia gets away with any territory it took by force, it will send the message that force pays off. Before long, Russia will be back for more territory. And who is to say they would stop with Ukraine? Anyone claiming that there is no threat to the rest of Europe is choosing to ignore comments by people in Putin's inner circle threatening NATO allies like Poland and the Baltic countries.

I think Putin made it very clear back in 2005 when he said that "the demise of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century." We all hear Putin talking a lot about Peter the Great and restoring the Russian Empire. The Russian Empire grew and grew throughout history, irrespective of national, ethnic, religious, or cultural borders. That provides the context when Putin repeats the phrase "Russia's borders do not end anywhere."

I believe in the lesson we took from World War II for the Cold War that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. When we see the flame of aggression, we ought to stamp it out before the whole world is engulfed.

Neville Chamberlain bet everything on the hope that letting Hitler take Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia would satisfy him and there would be, according to his own words, "peace in our time." It is not 1938, but it could be, and hopefully no world war confronts us like it did in 1938 when Prime

Minister Neville Chamberlain made that trip to Germany and had that meeting that ended with the words "peace in our time."

We all know that Hitler took the rest of Czechoslovakia and then, in a short period of time, invaded Poland. We stayed out of that war until we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, and then World War II was raging both in the Pacific and in Europe.

So can we learn from history? Today, we have to decide again whether to respond to aggression with strength while the threat is manageable or opt for appeasement and hope, against experience, that it will not lead to a wider war as it did in the late 1930s.

Think about how much was lost in World War II, not just in dollars but in American lives. Now think about how much it would cost in American blood and treasure if Russia is emboldened to attack a NATO ally and article 5 of the NATO treaty would kick in and all 31 countries would be involved in that effort—and the United States would likewise be involved.

The United States has been spending about 5 percent of our annual military budget to arm Ukraine, and U.S. intelligence believes the war has severely degraded Russia's military power and its ability to threaten NATO allies. Ukraine has taken back about half the territory Russia occupied in 2022. But without American aid, Ukraine is almost out of ammunition, and Russia sees an opportunity.

Europe has spent more than twice as much as the United States on aid to Ukraine in total dollars. Think of the humanitarian aid that Europe lends to all those millions of Ukrainians who have sought refuge in other countries. Compared to Europe, when you look at it as a share of the economy, the United States ranks No. 32. No. 1 ranking Estonia has provided more than 12 times as much assistance as a share of its economy because Estonia knows what it was like to be occupied by the Soviet Union from 1940 to 1991.

Europe has stepped up big-time and keeps finding ways to do more. You read daily in the newspapers about European leaders wondering whether the U.S. Congress is going to step up, and they have tried to fill in the vacuum while we dither here, waiting to make a decision on more help for Ukraine.

The Czechs and the Estonians have led two efforts to pool Europe's funds to purchase shells from other countries to patch the gap left by the United States while Congress dithers on this issue, but the Czechs and Estonians do not have the military industrial base that we do, so they cannot do it all.

Opponents of Ukraine aid have started talking down our industrial base's ability to produce everything needed to stop Russian aggression while also preparing for China, which may just follow Russia's example against Taiwan if Russia is successful in Ukraine. These people argue that Ukraine can't win so we should cut our losses and worry

about China. I disagree. The fact is, Russia has lost much of its experienced military and advanced equipment. Russia does have a vast population and has put its economy on full war footing, so it has been able to reconstitute; however, Russian soldiers are poorly trained, and the morale of these Russian soldiers is in the toilet.

Russia has resorted to its old tactic of "meat assaults," where hundreds of poorly trained infantry try to overwhelm Ukrainian defenses with sheer numbers and great deaths.

Russia has only been able to make incremental advances while taking huge casualties in the face of superior Ukrainian morale and equipment.

Russia's economy is feeling the strain. Word has gotten out about how freely Russian commanders sacrifice the lives of their soldiers. It will only get a lot harder to replace the tens of thousands of Russian soldiers sent to their death in Ukraine.

Russia is pinning its hopes on U.S. military aid not coming and Ukraine running out of ammunition. I, for one, am happy to help dash Putin's hopes. The good news is that our defense industrial base is ramping up. That includes the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, which has more than doubled production using its current facilities. It is also undergoing a major modernization program, accelerated by previous Ukraine supplemental bills.

In the near future, it will have a brandnew facility that will be able to produce many more 155mm shells and do it much faster.

Those arguing that the United States is no longer up to the task of producing the necessary military equipment are underestimating our economy.

I am reminded of President Carter's famous 1979 malaise speech where he identified a crisis of confidence among the American people. That was 1979.

In 1980, Ronald Reagan came along with his signature optimism that America's best days are ahead. And he worked to overcome the challenges that we faced, including the lagging economy and an underresourced military.

Just recently, the Japanese Prime Minister spoke to our Congress and delivered a message as a very good friend. He said he detected an undercurrent of self-doubt about Americans. The Japanese Prime Minister spoke movingly about the role of American leadership in championing freedoms and fostering the stability and prosperity of nations like Japan. That Japanese Prime Minister explained that while American leadership is indispensable, Americans are not alone in this world.

With allies like Japan and many countries in Europe stepping up, the free world has never been stronger or more united. So this is hardly a time for a crisis of confidence.

In fact, I am shocked to hear some people in my own party—the Republican Party—accepting American decline and advocating a return to the

Obama head-in-the-sand policy toward Russia.

Remember, back then, Obama was so afraid of escalation that he tried to appease Putin after Russia's 2014 invasion of Ukraine. Look at that mistake we made. Do we want to overdo it again?

Obama refused to provide any lethal aid—not one bullet for Ukraine under Obama. He pushed Ukraine to negotiate with a gun to its head.

President Trump came in, reversed the Obama policy, and provided equipment and training to the Ukrainian military. Thank God Trump did that. The Javelins provided by the United States played a major role in stopping the Russian advance towards Kyiv.

Take it from this Senator, elected to this body alongside President Reagan: The conservative position is to believe in America, to invest in our military, and to support freedom.

Like the Senate-passed bill, most of the money in this package goes straight to our military to replenish stockpiles—spent in the United States, using American labor. It will allow for more drawdowns to send vital military aid to Ukraine. This includes Patriot interceptors that can take down Russia's most advanced missiles and save lives at the same time.

Ukraine will get more Iowa-made howitzer shells that are far more accurate and reliable than those that Russia has begged from North Korea.

And an improvement added by Reagan Republicans in the House is a requirement for the Biden administration to provide the long-range ATACM missiles needed to take out Russia's supply lines.

I have been calling for these ATACMS to be provided for a long time. I think the reason they have not been provided by the Biden administration is due to the holdover of the Obama fear of escalation. That fear has proven to be misguided.

The only way to lasting peace is strength. That is what Ronald Reagan showed Americans. Strength is what we need now in the face of aggression from Russia and Iran and threats from China.

I don't buy this notion that it is a conservative or Republican position to abandon the American leadership that has kept the peace since World War II, meaning no World War III. I certainly do not think it is conservative to advocate a return to a weak and failed Obama policy.

I make no apologies for supporting Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan in the face of threats from the axis of anti-American dictatorships. And, now, instead of the axis of the 1940s—Germany, Italy, and Japan—it is now the axis of the 21st century—Russia, Iran, China, North Korea. They have their sights set upon replacing the United States as leaders of this Earth. It is an investment worth making to prevent the United States getting sucked into World War III. It is also the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, like my good friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, I am going to come down to the Senate floor to talk about the national security supplemental we are voting on today. I commend the senior Senator from Iowa. He is a great U.S. Senator. It was a really good speech. I am going to reinforce some of what he just said on the importance of this bill, but, importantly, the broader context of how we actually got here and where we need to be going in terms of our Nation's defense.

In my view, the current occupant of the White House, President Biden, has gotten a free pass on his numerous huge national security missteps that have been undermining our Nation's security and have forced the Congress of the United States to actually take action.

That is the whole point. We are taking action. I am a supporter of this legislation, but we are doing it because of the failures of the current occupant of the White House. I am going to encourage my colleagues, particularly my Republican Senate colleagues, to vote in favor of this bill.

But I think it is important to put it in the broader context of what is going on in the world. I made a couple of speeches on this before. I am just going to reiterate some and add to some of the challenges we are facing because of the Biden administration.

First, I think it is pretty obvious to everybody—to anyone who is watching—that we are in a new era of authoritarian aggression led by this dictator, Xi Jinping. Look at him. He gets in his “cammies” every now and then, threatening his neighbors.

By the way, China is going through the largest peacetime military buildup in the history of the world. If that doesn't make you a little nervous about what is going on around the world, it should. This guy is a brutal dictator. But it is led by him, Putin, the ayatollahs in Iran, the terrorists in Iran—the largest state sponsor of terrorism—and the “Mini-Me” North Korean dictator. They are all working together. They want to undermine our interest. They want to undermine the interest of our allies. They are driven by historical grievances. They are paranoid about their democratic neighbors. They are more than willing to invade them, as we are seeing across the world—whether Israel, whether Ukraine.

Again, they are working together, and they are spending boatloads of money on national security issues, military buildups. This is actually led by this guy. He is the big one that we have to keep a close eye on. That is No. 1.

We are in a real, real dangerous era. This is one thing I do agree with the Biden administration on.

We have had the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs

come and say: Hey, we are in the most dangerous time since probably the end of World War II.

Dictators are on the march. They are invading their neighbors. They are massively building up their military, and they are all working together. It sounds a little bit like the 1930s to me.

The second reason we need a defense industrial base supplemental is our own industrial base—our ability to produce weapons for us, for America—has completely atrophied. I could give a speech for hours. This, again, is part of the Biden administration's fault.

But we can't build Navy ships. We can't build Navy subs. Every component of our industrial base is shrinking. It is brittle. It has atrophied. Yet we are in this dangerous period. So that is pretty alarming.

By the way, it is our responsibility, in article I of the U.S. Constitution, for the Senate and the House to raise an army, to provide and maintain a navy. My view is it is the No. 1 constitutional duty we have—securing this Nation. Yet we are behind.

The Navy just put out, 3 weeks ago, this alarming report saying the U.S. Navy is behind on every ship platform that they are building—3 to 5 years behind—carriers, subs. Almost 40 percent of our attack sub fleet is in maintenance, not even out to sea.

He is scared to death of U.S. subs. What is this guy doing? He is cranking out 10 to 12 ships—high-end navy ships—a year. The Chinese Communist Party's navy is now bigger than the U.S. Navy. The danger is our industrial base can't produce weapons the way it could.

And then the third reason I think we need a national security supplemental is given how weak the Biden administration has been on national security. The current budget of this President shrinks the Army, shrinks the Navy, shrinks the Marine Corps. Do you think Xi Jinping is impressed by that? He is not—neither is Putin, neither are the ayatollahs. That is what they are doing.

By the way, this President, in every budget he submits to Congress for the military during these really dangerous times, what does he do? He cuts it. He cuts the military. I am going to get more into that.

These are the big three reasons that I have been supportive of this bill. But here is the thing. When you read the bill and look at it and dig into the details, it is less of a foreign aid bill and much more of a bill to enhance our industrial capacity. It is not a perfect bill, and I am going to get into that in a minute. There is no such thing as a perfect bill, by the way, but almost 60 percent of this national security supplemental bill that we are going to be voting on goes directly into our industrial base, directly into our ability to build submarines—like \$6 billion for submarines, \$6 billion with the AUKUS agreement, \$5 billion for 150mm artillery shells, over half a billion for

counter-UAS systems—Patriots, Javelins, Harpoons, Tomahawks, HARM missiles, TOW missiles—built by Americans for our own defense. That is in this bill. It is in the bill. That is a really important component. Almost 60 percent of this bill goes into that.

And it has other things in it: \$3 billion for our troops in the CENTCOM area of responsibility, right now—who are in combat right now, taking incoming missiles from the Houthis. The USS *Carney* almost took 100 different missiles and drones. With sailors in combat, this replenishes their weapons systems and helps our troops in combat.

By the way, in my view, just that element alone is enough to support this bill. You have American troops in combat in the Middle East.

And, of course, this bill does go to help our allies and partners—Israel, Taiwan, Ukraine—who are facing existential threats, literally, from their very aggressive neighbors.

But, again, a lot of this is going to stay home. We are not sending subs to any of those countries. We are building submarines to be ready, if we have to, in a conflict with China. Xi Jinping—that dictator I was just showing you there—is scared to death of the nuclear sub capability of the United States.

This is mostly about us protecting our country and our industrial base to produce weapons for America. I think it is going to put a lot of workers to work. But this bill, primarily, if you read it, is about protecting our Nation.

As I said, it is not a perfect bill. There are a number of things—there are some amendments we were debating a couple months ago here on the Senate floor. For example, I think the direct budget support, the economic aid—that should go to our European allies to help the Ukrainians with that, that should go to the Gulf Arab allies who want to support Gaza in terms of economic aid. We should be providing the lethal aid.

But, I will say, Speaker JOHNSON definitely improved the bill from what the Senate sent over a couple of months ago. I applaud him for his impressive leadership.

There are a number of improvements, like the direct budget support and economic aid are now in the form of forgivable loans. That was a President Trump idea. That was a good idea.

On the REPO Act, Senator RISCH has been pushing on that hard. He has done a great job on that. That would enable us to seize Russian assets and use them to help pay for the Ukraine war.

There is a requirement that makes the Biden administration lay out a much more detailed strategy on Ukraine and forces them to provide Ukrainians ATACMS weapon systems.

It focuses on fentanyl. It focuses on TikTok and the improvements there, breaking the tie between the Chinese Communist Party and control of this popular app.

The House did try to take up some border security issues. I certainly wish

those would have passed. I am not sure my Senate Democratic colleagues would have voted on it. That would have made it better.

But there are many improvements. The Speaker did a good job on it.

Mr. President, we had some critics on the left and on the right of this bill. I want to just address a few of those as we are getting ready to vote on this. Some are quite serious.

Some of my Republican colleagues have said: Hey, the Europeans need to do more, particularly when it comes to Ukraine.

I actually agree with that. No one in this Chamber has worked harder on the issue of making sure our NATO allies meet their 2-percent obligation in terms of defense spending.

I had an amendment to the Sweden and Finland accession treaties that we voted on here that said it is the sense of the Senate that all of these countries have to meet their 2-percent-of-GDP obligation on defense as a NATO member. That passed 98 to 0 here in the Senate.

I had an NDAA provision that is now law that says the Secretary of Defense shall prioritize training and troop deployments for countries in NATO with U.S. forces that meet their 2 percent obligation.

So I agree with those critiques, but some of the critiques from some of my colleagues—let's just say they weren't serious.

You might remember one—that this national security supplemental is some kind of secret trap for a future impeachment of President Trump. I am pretty sure that is not what Speaker JOHNSON was working on the last 2 months.

That this national security bill will “strain our industrial base.” Actually, it will do the opposite. I think that is clear. It is going to make generational investments in our industrial base that hopefully will continue for years. They will continue for years.

That the national security supplemental sends the “wrong signal” to what the warfighter in America needs for actual threats we face. Well, I find that really curious. Let me give one example. I worked directly with the INDOPACOM Commander, Admiral Aquilino, on exactly what he thought he needed to help American forces defend Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait. That is in the bill. The original bill from the Biden administration had very little on that. We made it a lot better, a lot stronger. But working directly with INDOPACOM and the admiral—there is no better expert in the world on what they need to fight in the Taiwan Strait. So, again, that criticism seems really off base and not a serious critique if you actually are one of the Senators doing the homework on what our warfighters need.

But the biggest issue I have with some of the arguments and critiques of this national security supplemental that are actually coming from the left

and the right in the House and in the Senate is their claim that deterrence is divisible—deterrence is divisible. Now, what do I mean by that? Their argument, and I have heard it a lot, is that you can cut off aid to Ukraine, let Putin roll over them, roll over that country, move up to the borders of the Baltics and Poland—NATO allies, by the way—but somehow we can still be strong in the Taiwan Strait with regard to Xi Jinping and the ayatollahs in Iran.

So deterrence is divisible. You can kind of show weakness with regard to Putin but strength with regard to Xi Jinping and the ayatollahs. Well, that is not how the world works. Deterrence is not divisible. How do we know that? Well, I think we know that because of this debacle.

Joe Biden's failed approach to national security has shown us that deterrence is not divisible. What am I talking about? When this happened, the botched Afghanistan withdrawal—“Biden's debacle,” as *The Economist* put it on their front cover—many in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans, by the way, myself included—predicted that, given this botched Afghanistan withdrawal, dictators around the world are going to be emboldened to press us other places. Stand by. Putin and Xi are going to invade somewhere else because of this. I didn't only hear that from people here; I have talked to world leaders who have said there was no way Putin would have invaded Ukraine if it hadn't been for this Biden debacle.

So deterrence is not divisible, and that is exhibit A, which brings me to my final point here.

The press, our friends in the media, as usual are missing the bigger story on what is going on on this national security supplemental. All the focus has been on the House and how Republicans in the House have delayed the Senate bill for 2 months, that we Republicans in the Congress are not taking foreign policy seriously, and that this bill's passage is some kind of victory for President Biden's foreign policy leadership. But here is what I think is going on: This national security supplemental bill actually exposes even further the weakness of the Biden administration's approach to Ukraine on foreign policy that has only brought the world chaos.

I was at a Sunday talk show the other day and made the point—a very simple question: Is the world a safer place for America and its allies today relative to 4 years ago? I think everybody knows the answer is no, it is not even close. There is chaos all over the world.

I think what is really important is to focus on how we actually got to this point, why we need this defense supplemental in the first place. The reason we do is the failure of the current occupant of the White House's policies with regard to foreign policy and national security. That is the entire reason we

have to bring this bill, this national security bill, to the floor and why it is so urgently needed now. This bill is not some kind of exhibit of Joe Biden's foreign policy triumph; it is a needed correction of Joe Biden's foreign policy failure.

First, as I noted, the Afghan debacle certainly emboldened Putin to invade Ukraine. I think that is a view that is commonly held.

Secondly, our own border debacle has been something that has made it so Republicans who would normally support strong national security were, with a lot of good reasons, saying: Hey, let's take care of our own open borders and national security at the southern border first. The President has not done that. We have an open border that is a humanitarian and national security fiasco in America.

Third, this President, with regard to Ukraine, has not been in it to win it. What do I mean by that? Every major weapons system that the Ukrainians have said they need, they have delayed and delayed and delayed because they were fearful of Putin. Let's just call it like it is. The list is long: HIMARS, Stingers, Javelins, tanks, Abrams tanks, F16s, even the ATACMS that are in the House bill, forcing the President to say that we are going to get these really important, long-range, accurate artilleries to the Ukrainians. This is the No. 1 issue we heard from President Zelenskyy a couple months ago when we were in Munich—that they are just not getting weapons they need.

Imagine if the Biden administration had gotten all the weapons systems I just mentioned to Ukrainians a year and a half ago. And what has happened every time? This body—Democrats and Republicans—has gone to the President, saying: Mr. President, give them these weapons.

Well, we are going to delay. We don't want to escalate with Putin.

Escalate with Putin? He invaded a country.

They are not in it to win it.

The President called an LNG pause on our allies. Our allies in Europe are apoplectic about that.

Not in it to win it.

Finally, this President has never explained the stakes of why this is so important. He has given two speeches on Ukraine. Two. Two major speeches. And do you know what he does? He attacks Republicans in his speeches. That is not leadership. That is not leadership. Especially on a big national security issue, you want to bring people together and explain the stakes. Speaker Johnson has done more to explain the stakes in a calm, reassuring manner in the last 2 weeks than President Biden has done in 3 years.

Finally, again, in terms of lack of seriousness on national security issues, I think the most damning issue is the lack of seriousness with regard to our national defense. As I mentioned, the President puts forward budgets to cut defense spending every year.

I have asked the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs—three hearings in a row in the Armed Services Committee—if this is the most dangerous time since World War II, why are you cutting defense spending? Why are you going to bring defense spending in America next year to below 3 percent of GDP? We have only been there four times since World War II. Why are you dramatically undermining readiness?

They don't want to do that. The Secretary of Defense doesn't want to do that. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs doesn't want to do that. So why are they doing it? The answer to that is, this is where our Democratic colleagues always are. Since Vietnam, just look at what every President who is a Democrat who has occupied the White House has done—Carter, Clinton, Obama, and now Biden. They come in, and they cut defense spending, and they cut readiness. This is in the DNA of the national party.

Republicans have a different tradition. It is this tradition: Peace through strength. Peace through strength—that is our tradition.

To my Republican colleagues and friends in the Senate, our tradition is much more serious, it is prouder, and I will tell you this: It is much more supported by the American people. Peace through strength, not American retreat.

As I am encouraging my Republican Senate colleagues to vote on this national security supplemental, this is in line with the peace through strength tradition we have in this party. Think about it—Teddy Roosevelt; Eisenhower; Reagan, of course; the Bush Presidencies; and, very much in the tradition of peace through strength, the Trump Presidency. I was here. Heck, I ran for the U.S. Senate in 2014 primarily because the second term of the Obama administration cut defense spending by 25 percent. Readiness plummeted—plummeted. Shocking how badly ready our troops were. When the Trump administration came in, working with Senate Republicans when we were in the majority, we reversed it. Peace through strength.

So through arguments, facts, understanding history, a serious view of the world, peace through strength—my Republican colleagues, we need to keep this tradition going, especially during these dangerous times. We certainly can't rely on our Democratic colleagues to support that. We certainly can't rely on this White House. President Biden cuts defense spending every year to support that. That is a really important reason why I encourage my colleagues to support this national security supplemental—imperfect bill, yes, but needed during these very dangerous times.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on a \$95 billion

supplemental spending package, and \$95 billion—that is a lot of money, especially at a time when many Americans are unable to afford their rent or pay their mortgages, pay their bills, afford healthcare, struggling with student debt, and many other needs. Mr. President, \$95 billion is a lot of money.

All told, this package includes tens of billions of dollars in additional military spending and major policy changes, many of which are controversial, many of which are disagreed with by the American people. Yet, unlike the House of Representatives, the Senate will not have the opportunity to hold separate votes on the various components of this bill.

I have heard from many of my Democratic colleagues—and I agree—who talk about the dysfunctionality taking place in the House of Representatives. In fact, I don't know if we are quite sure who the Speaker of the House will be in a couple of weeks or whether the extreme-right wing is going to get rid of Mr. JOHNSON. But what we can say about the House is that they at least gave their Members the opportunity to vote yes or no on funding for Ukraine, yes or no on aid to Israel, yes or no on TikTok, and yes or no on aid to Asian countries. That is more than can be said for the U.S. Senate right now.

I remind my colleagues that this is supposedly the greatest deliberative body in the world—except we don't have very many deliberations around here. You have one bill, up or down.

We need to have a serious debate on these issues. I think the American people want us to have a serious debate on these issues, and that is why I am trying my best to secure amendment votes, which, in my view, will significantly improve this bill.

As it happens, I strongly support the humanitarian aid included in this bill, which will save many thousands of lives in Gaza, Sudan, Ukraine, and many other places. Strongly support it. I strongly support getting Ukraine the military aid it needs to defend itself against Putin's Imperialist war. I support the Iron Dome to protect Israeli civilians from missile and drone attacks.

But let me be very clear: I strongly support ending the provision which will give \$8.9 billion in unfettered offensive military aid to the extremist Israeli government, a government led by Prime Minister Netanyahu, who is continuing his unprecedented assault against the Palestinian people.

I also strongly oppose language in this legislation that would prohibit funding for UNRWA, the U.N. organization that is the backbone of the humanitarian relief operation in Gaza and the only organization that experts say has the capability to provide the humanitarian aid that is desperately needed there.

And I have filed two amendments to address these issues. These amendments would not touch funding for the Iron Dome and other purely defensive

systems to protect Israel against incoming missiles.

As we all know, Hamas, a terrorist organization, began this war with a horrific attack on Israel that killed 1,200 innocent men, women, and children and took more than 230 captives, some of whom remain today in captivity.

As I have said many times, Israel has and had the absolute right to defend itself against this terrorist attack, but Israel did not and does not have the right to go to war against the entire Palestinian people, which is exactly what it is doing.

Regarding offensive military aid to Israel, what we will be voting on is pretty simple: First, has Netanyahu and his government violated U.S. and international law in Gaza? Which, if he has, should automatically result in the cessation of all U.S. military aid to Israel. That is a pretty simple question.

Second—maybe even more importantly—as U.S. taxpayers, do we want to be complicit in Netanyahu's unprecedented and savage military campaign against the Palestinian people? Do we want to continue providing the weapons and the military aid that is causing this massive destruction? Do we want that war in Gaza to be not only Israel's war, but America's war?

On the first question, the legal issue, the answer is very clear. Netanyahu and his extremist government are clearly in violation of U.S. and international law and, because of that, should no longer receive U.S. military aid.

International law requires that warring parties facilitate rapid and unimpeded passage of humanitarian relief for civilians in need. That is international law. Israel has clearly not done that. Only in the last several weeks, after pressure from President Biden, has aid access begun to improve somewhat; though, it is still grossly insufficient given the scale of the humanitarian catastrophe.

Maybe more importantly is that U.S. law on this subject is extremely clear. There is no ambiguity. The foreign assistance act says that no U.S. security assistance may be provided to any country that "prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, the transport or delivery of United States humanitarian assistance." That is the law. Israel is clearly in violation of this law. For 6 months, it has severely limited the amount of humanitarian aid entering Gaza. The result has been a catastrophic humanitarian disaster with hundreds of thousands of children facing malnutrition and starvation. Israel's violation of this law is not in debate. It is a reality repeatedly confirmed every day by numerous humanitarian organizations. Israeli leaders themselves admit it.

At the start of this war, the Israeli Defense Minister declared a total siege on Gaza, saying—this is the Israeli defense minister:

We are fighting human animals and we [are acting] accordingly.

There will be no electricity, no food . . . no fuel . . . Everything [is] closed.

And they kept their word on that. In January, Netanyahu himself said that Israel is only allowing in the absolute minimum amount of aid. For months, thousands of trucks carrying lifesaving supplies have sat just miles away from starving children—trucks with food miles away from children who are starving. And Israel has kept these trucks from reaching people in desperate need.

Israel's blockade pushed the United States—this is rather incredible—to extreme measures, including airdropping supplies and the construction of an emergency pier in order to get food to starving people. In other words, the President and the United States did the right thing. Children are starving. We are trying to do airdrops, build a pier. In other words, we are now in the absurd situation where Israel is using U.S. military assistance to block the delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to Palestinians. If that is not crazy, I don't know what is; but it is also a clear violation of U.S. law.

Given that reality, we should not today even be having this debate. It is illegal to continue current military aid to Israel, let alone send another \$9 billion with no strings attached.

Let me take a moment to describe what is happening in Gaza right now to further explain why these amendments are absolutely necessary and why we must end U.S. complicity in Netanyahu's war in Gaza.

More than 34,000 Palestinians have been killed and 77,000 wounded since this war began; 70 percent of whom are women and children—70 percent of whom are women and children. That means some 5 percent of the 2.2 million residents of Gaza have been killed or wounded in 6½ months—5 percent of the entire population in 6½ months have been killed or wounded. That is a staggering, rather unbelievable number.

Mr. President, 19,000 children in Gaza are now orphans—19,000 children are orphans—having lost their parents in this war. And I might add, for the children of Gaza, the psychic damage that has been done to them will never cease in their lives. They have witnessed—little kids; Gaza is a young community, a lot of children—they have witnessed unbelievable carnage, destruction of houses. They have experienced hunger, thirst. They have been thrown out of their homes. What is being done to these many hundreds of thousands of children is unforgivable.

And the killing has not stopped. Over the weekend, 139 Palestinians were killed and 251 were injured. Of these, 29 were killed in and around Rafah, including 20 children and 6 women, 1 of whom was pregnant.

Roughly 1.7 million people, over 75 percent of the population, have been driven from their homes in Gaza. Sat-

ellite data shows that 62 percent of homes in Gaza have been either damaged or destroyed, including 221,000 housing units that have been completely destroyed—221,000 housing units completely destroyed. That is more than 1 million people made homeless by Israeli bombing.

Not only housing, it is Gaza's entire civilian infrastructure that has been devastated. In Gaza today, there is no electricity, apart from generators or solar power, and most roads are badly damaged. More than half of the water and sanitation systems are out of commission. Clean drinking water is severely limited, and sewage is running through the streets spreading disease.

Israel has not only destroyed the housing stock in Gaza, not only destroyed the infrastructure, they have systemically destroyed the healthcare system in Gaza. Mr. President, 26 out of 37 hospitals are completely out of service in a country which now has tens and tens of thousands of people who are sick and wounded. Only 11 hospitals are partially functioning, but they are overwhelmed by the many, many people who are sick and injured, and they are all short of medical supplies. Doctors have had to perform countless surgeries without anesthesia or antibiotics, only three hospitals are now providing maternal care in Gaza, where 180 women are giving birth every day. Overall, 84 percent of health facilities have been damaged or destroyed in Gaza, and more than 400 healthcare workers have been killed.

But it is not only the housing that has been destroyed, not only the infrastructure, not only the healthcare system, the education system in Gaza has collapsed, with 56 schools destroyed and 219 damaged. The last of Gaza's universities was demolished in January. Some 625,000 students now have no access to education. I really do not understand what the military utility of destroying a university is. Mr. President, above and beyond the destruction of homes, the destruction of the infrastructure, the destruction of the healthcare system, the destruction of schools, universities, and the educational system, unbelievably, there is something even worse now taking place in Gaza, and that is that more than 1 million Palestinians, including hundreds of thousands of children, face starvation.

People in Gaza are foraging for leaves. They are eating animal feed or surviving off the occasional aid package. At least 28 children have already died of malnutrition and dehydration. The real number is likely much, much higher. But without sustained humanitarian access throughout Gaza, it is impossible to know. Recently, USAID Administrator Samantha Power said that famine was already present in northern Gaza.

Without food, clean water, sanitation or sufficient healthcare, hundreds of thousands of people are at severe risk from dehydration, infection, and easily preventable diseases.

I keep hearing discussion from the pundits and the experts about the “day after in Gaza,” when the war is over. But what kind of “day after” can there be amidst this incredible destruction? Gaza today can barely sustain human life.

Hamas started this war. That is true. But this war stopped being about defending Israel a long time ago. What is going on now is the destruction of the very fabric of Palestinian life. It is impossible to look at these facts and not conclude that the Israeli Government's policy has been quite deliberately to make Gaza uninhabitable for Palestinians. And, clearly, there are powerful voices in Israel's extreme-rightwing government who have been quite open about their desire to drive the Palestinian people out of both Gaza and the West Bank.

This is not the Israel of Golda Meir. Netanyahu's government is beholden to outright racists and religious fanatics who believe that they have exclusive right to dominate the land.

That is why we must end our complicity in this terrible war. That is why we should support the amendment I am offering to end unfettered military aid to Netanyahu's war machine.

Let's be clear: Cutting military aid to Netanyahu's government is not just my view. It is what the American people believe and are demanding. The American people, in fact, are fed up with Netanyahu and his war. They do not want to see their taxpayer dollars support the slaughter of innocent civilians and the starvation of children.

A recent Gallup poll showed that just 36 percent of Americans approve of Israel's military action, with 55 percent disapproving. A Quinnipiac poll showed that U.S. voters oppose sending more military aid to Israel by 52 percent to 39 percent. An earlier YouGov poll also showed that 52 percent of Americans said the United States should stop sending weapons to Israel until it stops attacks in Gaza.

Maybe—and here is a very radical idea—maybe it is time for Congress to listen to the American people. I would urge strong support for my amendment.

Mr. President, my second amendment would remove the ban on funding for UNRWA, a U.N. organization with 30,000 employees that is delivering essential humanitarian aid in Gaza and supporting basic services in other neighboring countries, including Jordan. Millions of people rely on those services.

Israel has said that 12 UNRWA employees were involved in the October 7 terrorist attack. These are serious charges and, obviously, any involvement with Hamas by UNRWA employees is unacceptable. That is why every year UNRWA provides Israel with a list of its staff and goes to great lengths to cooperate with Israeli authorities. UNRWA learned about Israel's accusations from the media, and immediately fired the accused employees while the U.N. launched an investigation.

Thus far, Israel has refused to cooperate with the U.N. investigation. I should add, importantly, that most major donors have now restored funding to UNRWA and are satisfied by the agency's protocols to ensure independence from Hamas.

The U.S. National Intelligence Council, meanwhile, said that Israel's claims were plausible but could not be confirmed, and noted that Israel has tried to undermine UNRWA for years. In the last 6 months, Israel has harassed UNRWA employees, blocked shipments of supplies including medicines, frozen its bank accounts, and killed 181 U.N. staff.

UNRWA plays a critical role both in Gaza and across the region. Whatever the investigation shows in the end, it is my view that you do not deny humanitarian aid to millions of people because of the alleged actions of 12 UNRWA employees out of a workforce of 30,000.

And, by the way, when we talk about investigations, maybe—just maybe—we should not just be talking about investigating UNRWA. Maybe we should also investigate what is going on in the West Bank. Last weekend, after an Israeli teenager was killed, large groups of armed Israeli settlers—vigilantes—rampaged through 17 villages, shooting dozens of people and burning homes. Israeli soldiers watched the attacks unfold, doing nothing to stop them. No arrests have been announced. Maybe we need an investigation there as well.

This past weekend, the Israeli military killed 14 more Palestinians in the West Bank. An ambulance driver was shot and killed as he tried to recover people wounded in another violent attack by Israeli settlers.

Since October 7, Israeli soldiers and settlers have killed more than 470 Palestinians in the West Bank, including more than 100 children. But for some reason, I don't know why, I just don't hear any of my colleagues calling for an investigation of that.

We are in a critical moment, not just in terms of what is happening in Gaza but, in many ways, what is happening right here in America and what is happening here in the U.S. Senate. Given the fact that a majority of the American people now want to stop funding for Netanyahu's war machine, I find it incomprehensible that we are not going to be able to vote on that issue.

I find it outrageous that, at a time when Netanyahu's government has clearly broken the law, Members of this Congress, Members of the Senate, are not going to be able to vote as to whether or not they want to continue providing billions more of unfettered military aid to Netanyahu's war machine.

So I would hope that we will have the decency to allow a little bit of democracy here in the U.S. Senate. I would hope that we will allow the Members to vote on some of these very, very important issues, and I certainly hope that we will pass these amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, my colleagues, we live in a dangerous world. Fellow Americans and Kansans, we live in dangerous times, and the world is a real challenge.

The national security crises abroad and here at home are increasing. They are ever increasing. Iran launched a full-scale attack on Israel. Hamas has stated its intent to wipe Israel off the map. Russia continues its brutal aggression in Ukraine. And China is rapidly modernizing its military and using companies to spy and track Americans.

Each of these conflicts is interconnected, and it would be naive to send aid to Israel but take a pass on supporting Ukraine, Taiwan or our other allies. It is vital the United States be a steadfast and reliable partner in the midst of so many dangers that threaten the world and our own nation's peace and prosperity.

In a joint FOX News op-ed with former Secretary Mike Pompeo, we stated:

The preservation of freedom requires enormous effort; indeed, liberty demands the marshaling of every resource necessary in its defense against those who would see it destroyed.

Vladimir Putin has chosen to pursue the reconstitution of the Russian Empire according to his own vision of Russian history. He has made clear that his aspirations go beyond Ukraine and that he views NATO as Russia's enemy. Under Putin's leadership, Russia is increasingly collaborating with other nations that oppose us—Iran and our most powerful adversary, communist China.

Allowing the war in Ukraine to fester will only prolong and deepen the instability already wrought, and it puts at greater risk the 100,000 U.S. service-members defending NATO's borders, including those from Fort Riley in Kansas.

I have said, from the beginning, the world is a better and safer place if Ukraine wins and Russia loses. Ending the war on terms favorable to Kyiv will leave Ukraine and the NATO front in a stronger and better position to deter further Russian aggression.

Just a week ago, Iran launched a full-scale attack on Israel from its own soil. Through an impressive and coordinated effort with the United States and other countries, Israel successfully defended itself from the barrage of missiles fired at it. It was a victory for Israel, but Iran has demonstrated that it is capable and willing to act on its desire to eliminate the State of Israel.

Standing with Israel and Ukraine also means standing with our Indo-Pacific partners. We cannot be tough on China and weak on defending Ukraine and Israel.

The Pentagon describes China as the most “comprehensive and serious challenge” to U.S. security. The Japanese Prime Minister stood before Congress,

just a few days ago, and reaffirmed that “Japan is already standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States.” The United States must send the message that we are committed and that we are standing shoulder to shoulder with our allies in the Indo-Pacific.

The bill that we are about to debate, discuss, and presumably vote on allows the United States to respond to immediate needs as China increases its military provocation of Taiwan, while also modernizing our own U.S. fleet to compete in the Pacific.

It is in America’s—it is in America’s—vital national interest to assist Ukraine in repelling Russian invasion, assist Israel in driving out terrorism, and assist our Indo-Pacific partners in standing up to China’s threats. We must project strength. Failure to do otherwise undermines our credibility, and that undermining of credibility, unfortunately, resonates around the globe. That credibility was already damaged after the administration’s disastrous and chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Additionally, in this funding package, a majority of those funds provided to Ukraine—and those provided in previous packages—will be directly injected back into the U.S. economy.

There has been a significant amount of misinformation on this bill, and that is important to clarify: 70 percent of funding in the Ukraine bill—\$42 billion of the \$60.8 billion—will be used to replenish U.S. stockpiles and develop, produce, and purchase U.S.-made weapons, including weapons from production facilities in Kansas and the Kansas City area.

This package also requires the administration to develop a strategy to support Ukrainian victory.

The American people deserve to know the objectives of supporting Ukraine, our interests as they relate to this war, the cost of not satisfying those interests, and an estimate of the resources that are needed. The supplemental will deliver on all of these aspects.

There is no path forward for Ukraine; there is no path forward for Israel or for Taiwan if the United States of America disengages in the world. The price tag is significant. But in the absence of taking a stand now, we have to take a stand tomorrow. Do what we need to do today or pay a price later, and later will be even more costly, but these costs must be shared with our NATO allies and our partners elsewhere in the world.

I commend NATO and the European nations that have, up to now, pledged more support to Ukraine’s cause even than our own country has. Europe has pledged more money than the United States; yet it is critical to rapidly fulfill these commitments, such as through the delivery of necessary equipment like air defense systems, to help Ukraine better withstand Russia’s onslaught.

I am reluctant—and so are many Kansans—to spend more money or to be engaged further in the world, especially with a crisis at our own southern border. I share my colleagues’ frustrations that we were unsuccessful. We came close, but we were unsuccessful in including border policies in this package. The crisis at the southern border is a grave national security threat. There are lots of reasons to be concerned about people coming across our borders, but I would highlight, in this conversation, it is a security threat. The administration’s continued inaction at the border is particularly frustrating when the administration has many of the tools that it needs to improve the situation.

I will continue working to pass legislation to protect the border, but at the same time, we must work to bolster our national security in the areas that we can agree upon. We can’t wait for a new administration or a new Congress to try and pass perfect border legislation, if such a thing exists. Some of the national security challenges we face are not strictly military in nature and reflect the changing nature of what conflict is. What does “conflict” mean today?

Our adversaries use technology companies to collect vast amounts of personal data from Americans. This information can be used to control or influence each of us, often without our even realizing it is happening. This bill takes the first step to protect U.S. data, but significant work is left to ensure America’s data is secured by a Federal comprehensive data privacy and security law.

The challenges we face, unfortunately, will not just go away. They will not resolve themselves on their own, and the preservation of freedom requires enormous effort. I have always believed that our greatest responsibility as American citizens is to make sure that those who follow us live with the freedom and liberties that were guaranteed by our Constitution and that were fought to protect and defend by those who sacrificed, many of them who sacrificed their own lives. This week, we have an opportunity to deliver on that effort—to do, to live up to our responsibilities as Americans to be a steadfast and reliable partner.

I am grateful to my colleagues in the House for their work in getting the National Security Supplemental passed and sent back to the Senate.

I underscore to my colleagues in the Senate the importance of doing the work we were elected to do. Americans who will be directly impacted, they are paying attention—but so are our adversaries and allies. I hope we are successful in fighting for and defending the liberties and freedoms of America and Americans and in protecting and helping to secure the remainder of the world. It is in our benefit—in America’s benefit—to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I feel fortunate, of course, to serve in the Senate and equally fortunate to represent the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago. What an amazing gathering place for America Chicago has been over the years—and still is to this day.

When we talk about issues here in Washington, many times I can relate them not just to neighborhoods but to people in Chicago who feel so intensely about the land of their birth or causes of other countries. I have gone through that same experience myself—my mother an immigrant from Lithuania. I was fortunate to witness the freedom struggle in Lithuania when they finally broke from the Soviet Union. If you go down Chicago Avenue west of Michigan Avenue, you go into an area known as Ukrainian Village. That nomenclature speaks for itself. There are churches and gathering places, schools, and families who are watching the war in Ukraine with personal intensity. To them, it is a land where their mothers and fathers were born and where many of them were born, and they have prayers and pleas to the politicians not to forget.

You can also step right outside of this Chamber, a few steps away, and find a group of Ukrainian Americans who have been demonstrating on behalf of the cause of Ukraine for as long as this war has gone on. I saw them this morning, and as we go by, the typical greeting in the Ukrainian Village is “Slava Ukraini”—“Long Live Ukraine”—to which they reply that they agree with me. It is a great feeling to see these demonstrators peacefully demonstrating for a cause that means so much to them and to realize that, as a Senator, I am going to have a vote today or tomorrow that can make a real difference in whether Ukraine prevails against Vladimir Putin or whether it doesn’t.

Last week, my Ukrainian Caucus co-chair, Senator ROGER WICKER—the Republican of Mississippi—and I hosted the Ukrainian Prime Minister. The Presiding Officer was there, and we were joined by several colleagues from both sides of the aisle. It was truly a bipartisan turnout.

The Prime Minister’s point was simple: With continued U.S. and allied support, Ukraine can defeat Russia’s brutal war and, in doing so, help defend greater security in Europe.

I agree. That is why the weekend vote in the House and the vote here this week in the Senate are so important.

We always have had an isolationist sentiment in the United States. If you are a student of history, you know that we had to overcome that sentiment in both World Wars; but in both cases and here today with Ukraine, in the larger national security supplemental bill which we are considering, it was not only in our interest to stop wars of aggression but also to help maintain the international world order that reflects our values and benefits here at home.

Russia's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine and its earlier seizure of land in Georgia and Moldova threaten decades of hard-won peace and stability in Europe. Make no mistake, China, Iran, and North Korea are watching to see if the United States and our allies allow Russia's aggression to stand. Doing so not only would embolden Putin to try for more European land, including from NATO allies like the Baltics and Poland, but it would also raise the risks faced by allies in the Indo-Pacific and the Middle East. That is why I am so pleased that this supplemental includes security assistance for our key allies in those regions of the world as well.

It also includes considerable humanitarian aid to help with the number of growing needs, including in Gaza, Sudan, and in drought-stricken areas of the world that are facing food insecurity.

Quite simply, what we do today has consequences—global historic consequences. NATO Secretary General Stoltenberg recently issued his blanket warning to us all.

He said:

If Vladimir Putin wins in Ukraine, there is a real risk that his aggression will not end there.

Putin will continue to wage his war beyond Ukraine, with grave consequences.

Stoltenberg went further to remind us:

Our support is not charity; it is an investment in our own security.

I want to remind my Republican colleagues that President Ronald Reagan understood this 37 years ago when he said at the Brandenburg Gate dividing East and West Berlin: "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." I was lucky enough to be in Berlin when the wall was coming down. The euphoria felt by the people of Berlin was palpable. I remember groups coming to the Brandenburg Gate, bringing little hammers with them to try to chip off a piece of the wall and save it for their children and grandchildren. It meant that much to them.

Only a few years after his historic speech, the Soviet Union collapsed, ushering in decades of freedom and prosperity in Eastern Europe and a welcomed end to the Cold War. Vladimir Putin called this historic wave of liberation from the shackles of Communism "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century"—a wave of freedom he clearly wants to reverse that continues to this day.

And my friend and former colleague John McCain, with whom I will never forget walking through the makeshift shrines to those killed fighting for democracy in Ukraine's Maidan Square, saw this battle of ideas and freedom so clearly.

Recently, House Foreign Affairs Committee chair MIKE MCCAUL happily noted:

The eyes of the world are watching, and our adversaries are watching, and history is watching—and that's what I kept telling my

colleagues: Do you want to be a Chamberlain or a Churchill?

So I urge a strong bipartisan vote this week to send a clear message to Putin that he cannot prevail in Ukraine; to ensure that other key allies and humanitarian crises will receive much needed aid; and to uphold basic international norms.

The Washington Post called the House's approval of the supplemental "the vote heard around the world." Let's make sure our actions in the Senate this week are also heard around the world.

This package contains many elements beyond aid to Ukraine. The Indo-Pacific section provides \$2 billion in weapons for Taiwan and \$3.3 billion for a submarine base, and provisions relating to humanitarian aid to Gaza, Sudan, and other vulnerable populations around the world will make a difference between life and death.

We want to crack down on the fentanyl trafficking. I recently had Anne Milgram, who is the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, back to my office to give me a briefing on the fentanyl crisis in this country. It bears repeating what she said over and over again:

One pill can kill.

That message has to be communicated to our children and families all across the United States. We lost over 100,000 Americans last year to fentanyl. Some of them had no idea what they were ingesting. What they did, of course, was to take a fatal dose of fentanyl, which can be very small.

Yesterday, I was at O'Hare Airport in Chicago and was taken on a tour to show the efforts to intercept precursor drugs and pill pressers, tablet pressers, that are coming into this country and killing so many people. So many innocent people have no idea of the danger. A young person, a teenager in Chicago, felt that he was ordering a Percocet pill—a harmless Percocet pill—over the internet. It was laced with fentanyl, and he died on the spot. One pill can kill.

We take significant steps forward in the enforcement of laws against fentanyl and drug trafficking, as we should.

We also have new sanctions on Iran, Russia, and China. And, of course, there was a controversial issue, the sale of TikTok, which is included in this.

My greatest fear is that Netanyahu and his rightwing coalition, once they receive these American funds, will act irresponsibly. I am afraid that they will revert to their devastating tactics in Gaza. In the name of stopping Hamas, they will, unfortunately, revert to their devastating tactics, which kill many innocent people, mainly women and children—Palestinian women and children—who have no place to turn, no place to escape. These innocent people living in Gaza should not be victims of this war.

There are requirements for all civilized nations in wartime when it

comes to protecting individuals and civilians, and they certainly should apply in this situation. There is no question—and it bears repeating every time we talk about this topic—that Israel has the right to exist; it has the right to defend itself; and it had the right to strike back at Hamas after the atrocities of October 7, but the humanitarian crisis which was unleashed in Gaza is unspeakable, indefensible, and we cannot be a party to it.

There are provisions in the law for those who receive aid from the United States, and that would include all of the countries that I have mentioned here—provisions in the law which require them to adhere to international standards when it comes to protecting the innocent and when it comes to facilitating the delivery of humanitarian aid. We must hold Israel and all recipients of U.S. aid to those standards to make certain that they are doing everything in their power to protect the innocent.

This is an important vote, and as usual, in the Senate, we find that it is not a single issue that we will be voting on but, in fact, perhaps, a dozen key issues, any one of which could be a major bill debated at length on the floor of the Senate. But time is wasting. We passed this defense supplemental for the first time in February of this year, and here we are in April. It is time to get this done for the relief and the support of the people in Ukraine and for the good of American values all around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, less than 2 weeks ago, Iran attacked Israel with a barrage of more than 300 missiles and drones. The attack was a notable escalation on Iran's part since the weapons were fired not just by Iranian proxies but also directly from Iran.

It was a reminder of two things:

First and foremost, the attack was a reminder of the need for the United States and the free world to make it clear to Iran that we are not going to stand idly by while Iran attacks Israel and continues to foment terror in the Middle East.

Iran's malign activities have been allowed to go on for far too long, and it is past time not just for the United States but for nations in Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere to call a halt to Iran's activities.

On a larger scale, Iran's attack on Israel was a reminder that bad actors and hostile powers are going to fill any space that they think they can fill. And if the United States and other free countries abdicate leadership or telegraph weakness on the global stage, bad actors are going to be happy to step in to fill the vacuum.

I would not be surprised if the Biden administration's all-too-frequent posture of appeasement toward Iran—and the lack of clarity the administration

has telegraphed about U.S. support for Israel—has emboldened Iran to reach further and engage in the kind of escalation that we saw this month.

Bad actors around the world are flexing their power right now: Iran in the Middle East, Russia in Europe, China in the Indo-Pacific and beyond. And these powers are forging alliances with each other to advance their activities.

Iran has provided Russia with weapons to use in its war on Ukraine and is working with Russia to produce drones at a Russian facility. Meanwhile, Russia has committed to supplying Iran with fighter jets and air defense technology—assets which, as a recent Washington Post article noted, “could help Tehran harden its defenses against any future airstrike by Israel or the United States.”

When it comes to China, the Secretary of State recently reported:

We see China sharing machine tools, semiconductors, other dual-use items that have helped Russia rebuild the defense industrial base that sanctions and export controls had done so much to degrade.

In the face of increased aggression from these powers, the United States’ response needs to be one of strength. That includes not just having a strong military and a strong economy but engaging on the global stage.

As I said, bad actors will fill any space they think they can fill. And when the United States and other free countries abdicate leadership on the global stage, bad actors will step in to fill the vacuum.

The foreign aid contained in this bill is an important part of telegraphing America’s refusal to cede the global stage to hostile powers.

It will help demonstrate to Iran our support for Israel and help our ally rid itself of the threat of Hamas on its border.

It will help make it clear to Russia that the United States is not going to give Russia free rein in Eastern Europe.

It will help make a credible investment in our own industrial base and replenish interceptors that we have used in the Red Sea.

And it will let China know that while Taiwan may be small, its backing is not.

Sending these messages is important. It is in our Nation’s interest to ensure that a newly victorious and emboldened Putin isn’t sitting on the doorstep of four NATO states that we are bound by treaty to protect.

It is in our Nation’s interest to ensure that a China inspired by a Russian victory in Ukraine doesn’t decide it is time to invade Taiwan.

And it is in our Nation’s interest to ensure that Israel is equipped to defend itself from Iran and its terrorist proxies.

I am pleased that in addition to the funding for Israel, Taiwan, and Ukraine we considered before, the bill before us today includes some new measures. No-

table among them is legislation to ban TikTok if the company is not purchased by an entity unaffiliated with the Chinese Communist Party.

Currently, the Chinese Communist Party is able to gain unlimited access to the account information of TikTok users if it so chooses. And the news that emerged last week that the Chinese Embassy has actually lobbied congressional staff against legislation to force the sale of TikTok was a stunning confirmation of the value the Chinese Government places on its ability to access Americans’ information and shape their TikTok experience. So I am very pleased that the bill before us today would ban TikTok if it is not sold to a company without ties to the Chinese Communist Party.

I am also pleased that this legislation includes the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act—or the REPO Act—which would direct frozen Russian assets to rebuilding efforts in Ukraine. Russia has caused a horrifying amount of destruction in Ukraine, and it is right that Russian assets should go toward its rebuilding.

This bill also contains additional accountability measures for our support for Ukraine, including a provision that would turn some of the funding into loans to be repaid by Ukraine when it is back on its feet.

Does this bill cover everything we should be doing on the national security front either at home or abroad? No, it doesn’t. But it will provide essential support to our allies that will not only help them preserve their freedom but will advance U.S. interests around the globe.

So I look forward to the Senate’s passing this legislation this week and sending a clear message about American resolve and about American strength.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk about the pending business, the supplemental appropriations bill that came over to us from the House of Representatives.

In February of this year, I was in Munich for the security conference, and the question that was asked of me the most by just about every world leader is whether the Congress would pass the Ukraine supplemental appropriations bill. Our colleagues around the world understood how important the supplemental appropriation passage was to the security of Ukraine and its ability to defend itself.

I want to tell you, when I was asked that question by the world leaders, I

said, yes, we would pass it. I don’t know if they were so convinced that we would get it done, and I am not so sure how convinced I was at that time that we would be able to reach a point where we would be able to keep the supplemental intact and be able to pass it. For, you see, the aid in that supplemental is so critical to the defense in Ukraine. Ukraine is literally running out of ammunition. The U.S. leadership is absolutely indispensable.

It also, of course, includes the humanitarian assistance and so many other important issues. But it also represents U.S. leadership, the ability for us to keep the coalition of the democratic states and the West together in our campaign to make sure that Mr. Putin does not succeed in taking over Ukraine and then moving to other countries in Europe.

Now we can definitely answer the question. By our actions in this body, we can tell our friends around the world that, yes, the supplemental appropriation will pass, will be signed by President Biden, and the aid will be flowing to Ukraine to defend itself.

So much depends on the passage of this supplemental. First and foremost, it is the defense of Ukraine—incredibly brave people in Ukraine who are holding up the defense against a great, mighty Russian army. They have been very, very successful, but they need to have the ability to defend themselves. That is what they are asking the United States to do: not to provide the soldiers but to provide the wherewithal so we will not have to send our soldiers to Europe.

It is the frontline for defense of democratic states, where we all know that Russia will not stop with Ukraine if they are successful; that Moldova and Georgia, the Baltic States, and Poland are all very much in the view of what Mr. Putin wants to take over.

But there is more to the supplemental than just Ukraine. There is the financing for the Middle East. Israel is defending unprecedented Iranian drone attacks. We saw that last week. They need our assistance to make sure that they can protect against these missiles and drones.

We know the leaders of Taiwan are looking to passage of this supplemental because they have to look across the Taiwan Strait at the People’s Republic of China and their aggressive language and their concerns about whether China will use force against Taiwan. The passage of this supplemental gives great hope to Taiwan that the United States is with them.

Then, as I mentioned earlier, the humanitarian workers who are desperate to help in the Sudan need our resources in order to meet that crisis that is going on every day. The passage of this supplemental will help the humanitarian workers deal with the humanitarian crisis that we have in the Sudan, that we have in Gaza, and that we have in Ukraine and so many other areas around the world.

So, yes, it has been difficult to understand the delay in getting this done, and it has affected Ukraine's ability to defend itself, the delay in getting the supplemental to the finish line. So it is absolutely essential, as Senator SCHUMER said, that we complete our work as quickly as possible and to remove any doubt about America's support of Ukraine. If there was any doubt, the vote in the House of Representatives on the Ukraine package passed by a strong bipartisan vote of 311 to 112.

Now, the entire package enjoys strong bipartisan support, and that is critically important for the success of our foreign policy—\$60 billion for Ukraine, \$26 billion for Israel, \$8 billion for Taiwan and our Indo-Pacific partners, and \$9 billion for global humanitarian assistance. But in addition to the appropriations that were in the bill when we passed it in the Senate months ago, the House added some additional provisions which, quite frankly, I think all strengthen the bill.

It provides a way to hold Russia accountable for its own actions, the damage it has caused. That is a positive addition to the package. It strengthens our sanctions against some of our most extreme adversaries. That also strengthens the bill.

I was pleased that there was a reauthorization of the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act, a bill that I authored that deals with trying to avoid conflicts from turning into genocide or atrocities so we can prevent having to deal with the challenges we see in so many parts of the world. We need to invest in prevention, and the Elie Wiesel Act gives us the tool to do that.

I want to recognize President Biden for his leadership on these issues, his leadership globally in keeping the coalition together in support of Ukraine and our foreign policy objectives in the free world, and also for what he did here in the United States: staying true to the principles, connecting the dots for the American people, and dealing with the strategy so we can finally get this bill to the finish line. I congratulate the Biden administration for staying with this and helping us reach this moment where we are on the verge of passing the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

It reinforces our foreign policy that is rooted in our values that promote human rights and defend democracy—a foreign policy drawn by basic human decency. That is what the U.S. foreign policy is about, and this supplemental reinforces our objectives in each one of those categories.

This gives the world a credible vision of the future—a future that discourages dictators and autocrats, a future for a Europe whole and free, a future for a thriving Indo-Pacific, a future for a peaceful and prosperous Middle East, and a future that prioritizes civil society movements and human rights around the world.

I know that the challenges we face today on the global stage seem im-

mense because they are. Anyone can see that. Russia is relentlessly bombing Ukraine's oil and gas sector. Ukraine is running out of ammunition. But, shortly, we will take a historic vote—a vote that, as President Zelenskyy says, gives Ukraine “a chance at victory.”

So I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the supplemental that passed the House of Representatives. I urge them to vote yes to funding America's foreign policy and national security priorities, yes to supporting the war-stricken people of the world who will not give up hope for democracy, yes to standing up with our allies and partners across the globe, and yes to a future American leadership on the global stage that is based on our values.

EARTH DAY

Madam President, on Monday, April 22, we celebrate Earth Day. Since April 22, 1970, millions have come together worldwide to highlight the urgent action needed to save our planet.

In 1970, the American environmental movement began in earnest as concerned individuals mobilized en masse to protect the planet.

The status quo was unacceptable—rivers so polluted they caught fire, children getting sick just from playing outside, and wildlife showing clear signs of distress.

In Congress, Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin championed the Earth Day movement, with the hope of bringing environmental awareness to the political and national stage.

Back then, the exact causes of our planet and people's ailments were not totally understood. The American people were not aware the extent to which the reliance on fossil fuels, fertilizers, and pesticides were causing irreparable harm.

We know a lot more now. However, we are still learning about how harmful everyday products are. Items that we accept as part of our daily life—plastic products, for example—are ubiquitous.

This year's Earth Day theme, planet vs. plastics, reminds us that the threat of plastic pollution continues to grow. Plastics are actively causing harm to human life, animal life and our Earth.

It is estimated that the average American ingests more than 70,000 microplastics in their drinking water supply. The origins of these plastics range from littering to stormwater runoff, to poor wastewater management in treatment facilities.

Plastic pollution is one of the most pressing environmental issues we currently face. Microplastics and microfibers are smaller than 5 millimeters in size. An estimated 50 to 75 trillion pieces of microplastics are in the ocean. Because these microplastics are so small, many animals mistake them for food. These microplastics have been found to attract and carry pollutants that are present in the water, making them carriers of various harmful chemicals.

Evidence such as this prompted then-President Barack Obama to pass the Microbead-Free Waters Act. The Microbead-Free Waters Act helped to ban plastic microbeads in certain products from being sold in the United States.

However, this same regulation does not apply to the limiting of microplastics in bottled water or microfibers in clothing.

When synthetic clothes are washed in the washing machine, an estimated 3.5 quadrillion microfibers are released—a process known as microfiber shedding. This particle is the most prevalent type of microplastic found in the Chesapeake Bay. With over 3,000 miles of coastline, Maryland is extremely vulnerable to plastic marine debris and its environmental consequences.

A study by NOAA took samples of various locations of the Chesapeake Bay watershed and found that 98 percent of the samples contained microplastics.

A modeling exercise conducted by researchers from Pennsylvania State University and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science found that the majority of plastic pollution in the Chesapeake Bay stays within the local waters and is not exported to the ocean.

The study suggests that the bay acts as a catchall for plastics, with about 94 percent of microplastics staying in the system, most likely on or along the shores. Only 5 percent of the particles were carried from the bay to the ocean, and 1 percent remained suspended in the water column.

In 2020, Maryland produced nearly 12 million tons of solid waste, with 13 percent attributed from plastics, including plastic bags.

Research concluded that the COVID-19 pandemic led to a rise in carryout services and grocery store visits, resulting in a 30 percent increase in plastic waste in 2020.

My home state of Maryland has taken many steps to combat plastic pollution. In September 2020, Maryland made history by becoming the first State to enact a ban on expanded polystyrene foodware, the single-use plastic foam that is often used for takeout cups and containers.

In October 2021, Baltimore effectively banned the use of plastic bags used for grocery and restaurant services, while also imposing a 5-cent bag tax on alternative bag use. The Salisbury City Council unanimously approved a ban on certain types of plastic bags that took effect on July 1, 2023. These are all significant steps my home State has taken to address plastic waste.

Plastics not only threaten the marine life, like oysters and crabs, that call the Chesapeake Bay home, but they can also negatively impact the economy and health of Maryland and the region at large.

In light of the threat of microplastics and the broader environmental challenges we face, I am proud of the accomplishments we have made to address the plastic pollution crisis.

The Save Our Seas 2.0 Act was signed into law in December 2020. One of the crucial components to this Act was the authorization of the NOAA Marine Debris Program. The NOAA Marine Debris Program serves as a model for finding ways to track marine debris, including plastics, around the world.

Congress must continue to take action to support legislation that seek to reduce the use and production of plastic and improve recycling facilities.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Plastic Pellet Free Waters Act, introduced by my colleague Senator DICK DURBIN.

Last year, I was privileged to lead a bipartisan delegation to Dubai for COP28. During this summit, we emphasized that the United States is concerned about the impacts of climate change and is ready to continue taking action to combat it.

At the summit, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations and Executive Director of the U.N. Environment Programme warned of the climate implications of plastics to our coastal ecosystems and oceans. He urged the plastic industry to find non-plastic alternatives for products to help the environment.

When Earth Day was first celebrated, the topic of environmental protection was not as partisan as it is today. Our focus should be on passing legislation that works to protect and preserve our Earth. We see the evidence before us. The longevity of our Earth is at stake.

While Earth Day only comes around once a year, it should be celebrated every day. We must not forget the responsibility we have to protect our planet. On this Earth Day, I celebrate the progress we have made so far and ask that we reaffirm our commitment to environmental stewardship and sustainable development.

With that, I would yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.R. 815

Mr. KELLY. Madam President, these are dangerous times for our national security, and the actions we take here this week will shape the world that our kids and our grandkids grow up in.

Putin continues to wage a brutal war to annex Ukraine and has been making gains as Ukraine runs low on ammunition. Israel is under threat from not just Iran's proxy terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah but Iran itself. Just 10 days ago, we saw them launch hundreds of ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and drones against Israel. China continues its aggression toward its neighbors in Asia as it renews its threats to take Taiwan by force.

Our partners and allies and the democratic values we hold dear are in real

danger. That should be enough to compel us to act, but it is bigger than that. Iran, China, and even North Korea are helping to supply Russia's desperate war machine. China's President Xi is watching to see if we can hold together the coalition supporting Ukraine. He is judging what the cost would be if he were to invade Taiwan.

Our adversaries are testing us, and they see instability and dysfunction as an opportunity. That creates a real risk that one or more of these threats could boil over into a wider conflict that would be much more costly for the United States and potentially put more Americans in harm's way.

I spent yesterday at the Naval Air Station in Patuxent River, MD, with U.S. Naval Academy midshipmen. They shouldn't have to go to war years from now in Europe, the Middle East, or the Pacific because of a failure of leadership in Washington, DC, this week. That must be avoided at all costs.

So what do we do? We get our allies and partners—Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan—the weapons and ammunition to help them defend themselves; we modernize our own forces so our adversaries know they will lose any fight they pick with us; and we provide humanitarian support to those harmed by these conflicts, including innocent Palestinians in Gaza.

The Senate is once again preparing to vote on a national security bill that will accomplish these goals and meet the dangerous moment we find ourselves in, but let's get something straight here. We should have gotten this done shortly after the President proposed it in October. The Senate spent months negotiating before we ultimately passed it with 70 votes. And then the House—well, they let it sit for more than 2 months before sending it back to us with 311 votes.

It should disappoint all of us that partisanship and obstruction meant it took 6 months—6 months—for Congress to pass something that clearly the vast majority of us—in fact, 71 percent of us—in the Congress agreed on. Ultimately, bipartisanship will win the day. It will win the day in the House and in the Senate. But the delays have come at a real cost, especially on the battlefield in Ukraine.

There are a lot of factors that go into winning a war. Russia is a massive country, and even with its heavy losses, it can throw a lot of manpower at the problem to overcome and cover up its incompetent leadership, its culture of corruption, and its underperforming weapons systems.

At the same time, I have seen in my two trips to Ukraine since the war broke out that the Ukrainians have a remarkable spirit that can only come from a unified country fighting for its own existence. They are literally fighting for their own lives. But because of delays in getting this bill passed, Ukraine's fighters are desperately low on artillery shells, on missiles, and even on small arms ammunition. That

is tying the hands of their commanders at the same time that Russia is revitalizing its war effort with increased domestic military production and a lot of help from China and Iran.

With the right equipment and enough of it, Ukraine can win this war. Passing this bill will allow us to transfer them more of the weapons, armored vehicles, and ammunition from our stockpiles that Ukraine needs to turn the tide, and then we will be able to replenish our own stockpiles with modern equipment to deter our adversaries from testing us any further. This is a win-win for us.

At a very dangerous time, this is what we must do to prevent further destabilization and conflict that will cost us more in the end. I know that a majority of my colleagues agree with me.

Let's not wait any longer. Let's not wait a day longer. Let's get this done right now and show the world that the United States continues to lead, continues to stand by our allies, and continues to be the strongest force for peace and stability in the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to urge my colleagues to strongly support the national security supplemental appropriations package before us. This important legislation, which was approved overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, reflects, in many ways, the bipartisan bill that Chair MURRAY and I negotiated and the Senate passed in February by a vote of 70 to 29.

This bill will strengthen our military's readiness, rebuild our defense industrial base, and assist our partners and allies at a volatile and dangerous time in world history.

The national security package before us totals \$95 billion. Now, 71 percent of that funding—\$67 billion—is defense funding. It will be used to continue vital U.S. military support to Europe and the Middle East, where our partners and allies are under attack by authoritarian regimes, rogue states, terrorists, and other extremists. It will expand and modernize U.S. defense production capacity. It will replenish our own stockpiles with updated, more capable weapons and equipment. And it will strengthen the U.S. submarine industrial base.

In the past few months, I have received briefings from two combatant Commanders—General Kurilla of the U.S. Central Command and Admiral Aquilino of the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command. Each of them has told me that this is the most dangerous global environment that they have seen. One said in 40 years; the other said in 50 years.

The point is, the threats that the United States faces from an aggressive Iran and its proxies, an imperialistic Russia, and a hegemonic China are interconnected. How we respond to one affects how the other will operate. They require a strong response.

The package before us provides the resources to address each of those threats. Let me take just a few moments to highlight some of the bill's key components.

With regard to Iran and its proxies, earlier this month, as we are all painfully aware, Iran attacked Israel with more than 300 drones and missiles. Thanks to the U.S. Navy's heroic response in assisting Israel, as well as the great coordination and response from our allies and partners, fewer than 1 percent of Iran's weapons reached their targets in Israel.

In all, more than 80 incoming drones and at least 6 missiles were intercepted by American forces, including the crews of two destroyers. I am proud to say, that were built in Bath, ME—the USS *Carney* and the USS *Arleigh Burke*.

But let us make no mistake about what was going on with this attack. Iran fully intended to kill as many Israelis as possible and to cause horrific damage. It was only the skill, the bravery, and the precision of Israel, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia that prevented that from happening.

This national security package includes \$2.4 billion to support the ongoing U.S. Central Command operations in the Middle East, such as those that I have just mentioned, but, also, to keep open vital shipping lanes and to protect commercial ships from all over the world from attack as they are transiting.

It also includes \$4 billion to replenish Iron Dome and David's Sling air defense systems, which have proven to be so critical to Israel's self-defense, as well as \$1.2 billion for Iron Beam, a promising new air defense capability.

This legislation would also provide vital assistance to Ukrainians battling a brutal, unprovoked Russian invasion. And I know how strongly the Presiding Officer feels about this issue, as do I.

It includes \$15.4 billion to help Ukraine purchase American-made weapons to use in its defense and \$11.3 billion to support our servicemembers in Poland and Germany who are helping our allies equip and train Ukrainian forces.

But let me underscore an important point. It is not our troops who are dying on the Ukrainian battlefield. It is the Ukrainians who are bravely defending their country. If, however, Putin is allowed to succeed in Ukraine, he will continue to pursue his goal of re-creating the former Soviet Union. He has made no bones about that. He has said that repeatedly.

In my judgment, he would likely seize Moldova next; again, invade Georgia, as he did in 2008; continue to menace the Baltic nations; and threaten Poland. And then, our troops would be involved in a much wider European war because Putin would be ultimately attacking our native NATO allies.

The funding in this package aims to prevent such an outcome by supporting Ukraine as it defends itself against Putin's aggression.

And let me debunk a myth that I keep hearing over and over again, and that is that the Europeans somehow are not doing their part in helping to equip Ukraine. That is just inaccurate.

I have a chart that I used a few months ago, when the supplemental was on the floor, that ranked our European allies. Well, today, the United States would be even further down on this list, which measures security assistance to Ukraine as a percentage of GDP of that nation.

Today, we rank 16th on that list. In other words, 15 other countries—Estonia, Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Poland, Sweden, North Macedonia, Albania, Romania, Netherlands, Germany, the Czech Republic, and the United Kingdom—are all spending more of their GDP to help Ukraine than we are.

I think that is such an important point, and yet we hear, over and over again, by those who are opposed to assistance that the Europeans are not doing their part. They are clearly doing their part.

With regard to the Indo-Pacific, this package would help deter a menacing China, whose navy now exceeds the size of ours. And in the budget that the President just sent up, that would only grow worse, since the President is requesting the lowest number of new ships in 15 years. And we cannot allow that to happen.

This legislative package also includes \$1.9 billion to replenish U.S. military inventories transferred under Taiwan Presidential drawdown authority, as authorized by last year's National Defense Authorization Act. This is the fastest way for DoD to get Taiwan the weapons it needs to strengthen its own defense.

The bill also includes \$2 billion to provide Indo-Pacific allies and partners with American defense equipment and training, as well as \$542 million for the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command's top unfunded requirements.

The package includes humanitarian assistance to address global needs, such as in Sudan and Gaza. It prohibits, however, funding from being provided to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency, known as UNRWA, which employed several terrorists who participated in the October 7 attack on Israel.

Finally, I want to note that this bill includes the FEND Off Fentanyl Act, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of. This bill would help disrupt the flow of fentanyl into the United States, including by requiring the President to sanction criminal organizations and drug cartels involved in trafficking fentanyl and its precursors.

We are losing too many of our family friends, coworkers, and neighbors to this scourge, and we must be more aggressive in combating it. And I thank my colleague Senator TIM SCOTT for his leadership on this piece of the package.

I once again call on my colleagues to recognize the perilous times in which

we are living and to vote for this essential national security legislation. We must pass it without further delay.

Our adversaries are watching. With our vote on this package, let us send them a strong message. Terrorists will not succeed in wiping Israel off the map. Authoritarian states will not be allowed to invade their free, independent, and democratic neighbors without consequences. And this Congress, despite its divisions, will come together to ensure that the United States and its military have what they need to stand tall, firm, and beside our allies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 10 minutes, Senator SCHMITT be recognized for up to 5 minutes, Senator LEE be recognized for up to 10 minutes, and Senator SANDERS be recognized for up to 2 minutes prior to the scheduled vote.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I have been warning for months about the need to meet this moment of global uncertainty and chaos with a robust, national security supplemental—not delay, not half steps, but investments that show the world we are serious about standing by all of our allies, providing humanitarian aid, and maintaining America's leadership on the world stage, which is why I am glad the House sent us legislation that includes every pillar of the package we passed overwhelmingly here in the Senate.

And I hope now we can all come together to pass these policies once again. We cannot send the message that division has won out against action, that isolationism has won out against leadership, because the challenges that we face and that our allies face are immense, urgent, and interconnected.

Putin is waging a brutal invasion of Ukraine, which is running low on supplies.

The war between Israel and Hamas threatens to escalate into a far more dangerous regional conflict. Civilians caught in conflict desperately need food, water, medical care, and other humanitarian aid. And the Chinese Government is making aggressive moves to grow its influence in the Indo-Pacific.

Those are the stakes of this moment, as I have reminded my colleagues time and time and time again. Inaction cannot be an option. We need to meet this moment, address all the challenges before us, and show the world American leadership is still strong.

I believe that strongly, and I know, when push comes to shove, a clear majority of Members on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of Congress, feel the same way.

That is why I have come to the floor so many times over the past several months to lay out in painstaking detail

how much is at stake, how crucial it is that we meet this moment with a robust package that addresses the many interconnected challenges before us. It is why here in the Senate we took action over 2 months ago now and overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan national security supplemental. I and many others—Vice Chair COLLINS, Leader SCHUMER, Leader MCCONNELL—all worked very hard over months to craft legislation that could pass both the Senate and the House, that both Democrats and Republicans could get behind.

So I am glad we are now working to pass the national security supplemental the House sent over, particularly since it is materially identical to the Senate package we cleared with such great support.

I have to say I am relieved to see Speaker JOHNSON finally do the right thing, ignore the far right, and send us what is essentially the bill we wrote and passed months ago. But let's be clear about a few things. This delay has not been harmless. Putin's forces have been on the march. His missiles and Iranian-made drones have been striking critical Ukrainian infrastructure. We measure time in hours; Ukrainians are measuring it in how many bullets they have left, how many more missiles fall on their cities, and how much closer Putin's tanks are getting. That was clear even before I said that 2 months ago.

The path forward, the path we are finally now on, was painfully clear because unfortunately we have seen this movie before in debt limit negotiations and in funding the government.

I believe Congress can actually work together. We can actually hammer out a compromise.

This is not the bill either party would have written on their own but one that gets the job done. Let's be clear. The package before us gets the job done. It gets aid to soldiers in Ukraine, who are counting their bullets and wondering how long they can hold out. It gets support to Israel, which faces serious threats on all fronts. It gets support to our allies in the Indo-Pacific, where the Chinese Government has been posturing aggressively. It gets critical humanitarian aid to civilians in Ukraine, Sudan, and Gaza, including kids who are caught in the crossfire who are in desperate need of food and water and medical care.

That was a redline for me. I pushed hard at every stage of this to make sure we provide humanitarian aid. At every stage of these negotiations, I made clear Congress will not advance a supplemental that fails civilians. I will not let us turn our backs on women and children who are suffering and who are often hit hardest by the fallout of chaos and conflict.

Madam President, at a time when the world is watching and wondering if the United States is still capable of meeting the challenges before us, if we are still united enough to meet them, this

package won't just send aid, it will send a message. It will show our allies that our word is still good and that we will stand by them in times of need. It will show dictators that our warnings are serious and that we will not let their flagrant attacks go unchecked. And it will show the world that American leadership is still alive and well and that we are still a strong protector of democracy and provider of humanitarian aid. That is a message that is well worth sending now more than ever.

I wish we were able to wrap this up much sooner. I am glad we are at this final threshold now. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the final package.

Before I wrap up, I absolutely have to recognize some of the people who have worked incredibly hard to get us here today. It starts with my vice chair on the Appropriations Committee, Senator COLLINS, and our House colleagues, former Chairwoman GRANGER, Ranking Member DELAUNO, and Chairman COLE, and their staffs for help getting this package through the House. It includes Leader SCHUMER and Leader MCCONNELL, as well, and in the House, Leader JEFFRIES and Speaker JOHNSON.

We also would not have gotten here without Members on both sides of the aisle coming together and understanding that this is a moment we cannot leave our allies behind and then all pulling in the same direction so we can deliver support to our allies in Ukraine, Israel, and the Indo-Pacific, humanitarian aid to civilians, and that message to the world.

Most importantly, we wouldn't have gotten here without the tireless work of our dedicated staff. The stakes have been high, the nights have been very long, and the men and women working to get this package together and get it across the finish line have absolutely risen to the challenge.

Madam President, from Vice Chair COLLINS' team, I want to recognize Betsy McDonnell, Matt Giroux, Ryan Kaldahl, Paul Grove, Viraj Mirani, Lindsay Garcia, Patrick Magnuson, and Lindsey Seidman for their hard work.

I owe a huge thanks to many members of my excellent team. Excuse me for one moment. It is a list, but every one of them deserves recognition and for us to all hear who they are. From my team, I want to thank Evan Schatz, John Richter, Carly Rush, Kate Kaufer, Mike Clementi, Robert Leonard, Ryan Pettit, Abigail Grace, Brigid Kolish, Gabriella Armonda, Katy Hagan, Kimberly Segura, Laura Forrest, Alex Carnes, Drew Platt, Kali Farahmand, Sarita Vanka, Doug Clapp, Jennifer Becker-Pollet, Aaron Goldner, Kami White, Elizabeth Lapham, Jim Daumit, Michelle Dominguez, Jason McMahon, Mike Gentile, Ben Hammond, Valerie Hutton, and Dylan Stafford.

I know there are many others as well, including House staffers who have worked tirelessly on this. I want to

personally thank each and every one of them.

Madam President, we hammer out a lot of meaningful bills here. Just about every bill we pass touches the lives of the American people directly—every one. But, as I said before, in this moment of global uncertainty, the balance of world power and the strength of American leadership are at stake. So I am deeply grateful to every Member, every staffer, and every person who came together to make sure we pass this test by passing the resources that are so clearly needed.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I will speak for just a moment. I know that as the day goes on, I am sure we will have a mutual admiration society of the Wilsonian view that permanent Washington has about foreign policy in this country, so I do not wish to speak about that at this time. I do believe that view is on a collision course with history and the will of the American people. But I rise to speak about sort of the process of the Senate—where we are, how we got here—and to quote a famous St. Louisan, Yogi Berra, "It's like déjà vu all over again."

Here we are debating. Senator LEE, my friend from Utah, has a motion to table, essentially, Senator SCHUMER's effort to fill the tree. To the American people who are watching or listening or being reported upon, that means that the majority leader of this Chamber is boxing out everyone. That is right. The 99 other people who were elected by an entire State to advocate for their interests don't get a say. They don't get to offer an amendment. They don't get to say: I would like to build a unique coalition with either somebody from my own party or somebody on the other side of the aisle on something we might agree upon.

I think the world's most deliberative body has been reduced to Kabuki theater. There is no uncertainty ever. The only time—and this is the cold, hard truth to my friends in the Gallery—the only time you get to offer an amendment in this place is if it is sure to fail. Think about that. Senator SCHUMER won't allow U.S. Senators to offer ideas unless he knows they will fail.

So, to my Republican and Democrat colleagues, colleagues who may be watching on TV, or their staff, it doesn't need to be that way. This is perhaps one of the most obstructive measures that the majority leader employs, and I don't pretend it is just him. I think one of the things that all of us have to look in the mirror about is whether or not that is what we want this place to be.

Mr. President, if we think we have come together on an issue that affects both of our States, we should be allowed to offer those things up. We don't get a chance to do that.

Appropriations bills—I know the Senate appropriators have worked hard on

individual bills. CHUCK SCHUMER didn't allow those bills to be debated on the floor. It never happened. We ended up with a few minibuses.

That would be a great reform. How about, instead of every hour maybe you show up, what if we sat in our seats and actually voted on this stuff for 4 or 5 hours? We could get through a lot. But the Senator from New York is allergic to work unless he can control the outcome; or, say, if you object now, everyone has to change their plans last minute; or if you don't support this without an opportunity to affect it, you are against—pick the poison—you want to shut down the government or you are for Putin. All these ridiculous things get thrown out here.

Open it up. I will tell you why it won't happen—because it is a real threat. It is a threat to him because the idea that other Senators who aren't part of the two who get to make all the calls—that we would find a different way. That is a threat to his power because right now he gets to say: Come to me with everything. I will put it in some omnibus. There won't be any time to debate it. They probably won't be able to read it. But if they don't vote for it, you want to shut down the government.

So to all the Senators, I would like to work with you to dislodge this concentration of power that no doubt our Founders would be rolling in their graves over. This diffusion of power that is defined by our separation of powers and federalism was meant to spread it out to protect individual liberty. It certainly was never intended for one person in the Senate who can always be recognized and, like last week, did something that had never happened in the history of our Republic, which was to dismiss Articles of Impeachment even though we are supposed to have a trial. Granted, he had accomplices in that. Every single Democrat voted with him. But he is recognized first. He can fill the tree. There are no amendments. We have to beg to be heard, which is why I objected to that farce last week. I don't think it is becoming of a U.S. Senator to say: Oh, thank you, Senator SCHUMER, for giving me 2 minutes to speak.

Anyway, there is a better way.

It is playing out again here today because we are essentially taking what the House gives us. The upper Chamber is capitulating to the House to say that we can't actually affect this thing, we can't change anything, and if you do it—pick the poison—you are threatening the security of another country or something ridiculous.

I would just hope that this is a clarification call for reform. The Senate is broken.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. I echo and endorse the wise comments just uttered by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Missouri. What we are wit-

nessing here is the destruction of the legislative process in the Senate.

The Senate is here today preparing to vote on one of the most significant pieces of legislation this entire Congress—that is, a bill to send nearly \$100 billion overseas—and Senators are unable even to offer an amendment to that bill.

By filling the amendment tree this afternoon, the majority leader has prevented every single Member of this body from offering amendments to the legislation, any efforts to improve it. If we want to have any amendment considered, we have to beg the majority leader to let it come before the full Senate for a vote.

You may remember that just a couple of months ago, we were in a very similar position on a very, very similar bill.

Senator SCHUMER promised a “fair and open” amendment process on the national security supplemental in February of this year, but not one amendment—not a single amendment—was considered on the Senate floor.

Republicans filed over 150 proposed amendments to improve the bill, but not one vote on a single one of those amendments or any other was allowed. Why? Why?

Well, Senator SCHUMER blocked every amendment from even being considered by filling the amendment tree. That blocked all of the other 99 Senators from participating meaningfully in that process.

Now, why wouldn't he want amendments? That is, after all, the hallmark characteristic of what defines us as a body. It is why we call ourselves the world's greatest deliberative legislative body. So why wouldn't he want those?

Well, I think it has a lot to do with the fact that an amendment might point to some of the weaknesses in the bill, some of the defects of the bill. It might prompt Members to—I don't know—slow down and ask whether this is a prudent idea—to send a lot of humanitarian aid to Gaza, up to \$9 billion, \$9.5 billion that could go there with minimal guardrails, where Hamas will, with certainty, seize it to wage war against Israel; or if the U.S. taxpayer should be footing the bill for “gender advisors” in Ukraine's military. Should they really vote for a bill that does this? That is what an amendment forces all of us to ask ourselves and decide on one particular question or another.

But leadership in the Senate wants to avoid these thorny questions that might rock the boat. Leadership wants to ram this bill through the Senate with minimal debate and perhaps no amendments because they know that aspects of it, especially the \$60 billion for Ukraine, are massively controversial with the American people, those who elected us, those who pay taxes to fund these efforts.

Now, my colleagues and I are working in good faith to reach a unanimous

consent agreement to bring forward a handful of amendments and set up a stand-alone vote in exchange for expediting the passage of the bill.

We nearly had that agreement locked in late Friday night—an agreement to vote on just two amendments and one stand-alone bill—but a couple of Senators on the other side of the aisle panicked and started objecting to any and all agreements.

They panicked because they knew that one of those items set up as part of a UC—the stand-alone legislation to redesignate the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization, as has been offered by my friend and colleague the Senator from Texas—might actually pass. Remember, this is the same entity that has been firing on U.S. forces in the region and those of our allies, and yet they couldn't let that happen. Democrats will agree only to amendments that they find politically palatable or know will not pass.

Now, it has not always been this way in the Senate. When I first joined this body in 2011 as a new Member, individual Members could call up our amendments freely and then make them pending, and the Senate would then have to dispose of them as it does with pending amendments, either by voting them in; voting them out, up or down; or by a motion to table or reject them.

But Members had to vote. They had to take ownership for their opinions in public. They had to let their constituents know where they stood.

Today, the majority leader hides the ball from the public by filling the amendment tree, ensuring that the amendments that he and his party dislike will never see the light of day.

This is a circus. It is a madhouse. Filling the amendment tree isn't about creating an orderly process. It is about limiting real debate.

When we had an open process, when Members could call up their amendments and make them pending on most bills, it actually sped up consideration of a bill. Members knew that they would have a fair shot in the debate and debate eventually. So they would be more cooperative, would be more willing to collapse time, and wait until the next bill to offer their amendment or take a motion to table as a proxy for their amendment vote.

But in today's Senate, we do nothing on the floor for hours while Members and the staff hide in the cloakroom and argue about what we can and cannot vote for. They twist arms, pressure Members in private, and make assurances they can't and don't intend to keep, saying: Oh, you will get the amendment in the base text of the next bill or you will get it as a free-standing measure another time.

And then they shrug their shoulders when it just doesn't work out.

Why not have these debates in public? Why not allow our Senators and their constituents to know what is

going on? Well, it is because the majority leader doesn't want to give up control.

Sadly, while the Democrats pioneered this change in the amendment process, Republican leadership chose to tolerate the practice and even continue it while we were in the majority by filling the amendment tree so that no one could offer an amendment without the leadership's blessing. For both sides, it is about control. It is about protecting Members from voting, the very thing we all came to this body to do.

On the Republican side of the aisle, our aspiring leaders need to ask if they want to perpetuate this awful trend. Will they tolerate blocking out Members, including Members of their own party from offering amendments? Will they continue to lock down the floor? Will they continue to disenfranchise Members and, more importantly, those they represent, by preemptively blocking them from exercising their procedural rights? Or will they finally stop this barbaric practice of filling the amendment tree? Will they let Members make their amendments pending so that Senators must actually debate and vote?

Republicans need to ask these questions of anyone desiring to lead our conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I rise finding myself in the unusual position of supporting Senator LEE's effort of opening this bill up to amendment votes. I don't often agree with Senator LEE. I know that it is a radical idea. But, maybe, in the greatest deliberative body in the world, we might, on rare occasion, actually have debate and votes on major issues.

To that end, I plan on offering two very important amendments to this legislation. Members can agree with me on these issues or disagree, but they should be voted upon.

My first amendment would ensure that we are not providing any more offensive military aid to Netanyahu's war machine while he continues to violate U.S. and international law.

This amendment would not touch funding for the Iron Dome or other purely defensive systems, but it would end aid to a war machine which has already killed 34,000 Palestinians and wounded 77,000, 70 percent of whom are women and children. And, right now, as we speak, hundreds of thousands of children face starvation as a result of that war machine.

Poll after poll shows that the American people are sick and tired of seeing their taxpayer dollars support the slaughter of innocent civilians and the starvation of children.

And while there is strong Republican support for ending aid to Netanyahu's war machine, the support, I should tell my Democratic colleagues, is overwhelming.

The second amendment that I am offering would remove the prohibition on

funding for UNRWA, the backbone of the humanitarian relief operation in Gaza and the only organization that experts say has the capability to provide the humanitarian aid that is desperately needed.

Israel has alleged that 12 UNRWA employees out of 30,000 were involved in the Hamas terrorist attack on October 7. That is being investigated.

I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. SANDERS. That is being investigated, and it should be. But you don't allow thousands of children to starve because of the alleged violations and actions of 12 people.

The bottom line: We are debating one of the most serious issues we have faced in a long time. The American people want us to vote and debate these issues, and we should be able to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. A bipartisan majority has been working for months to get this aid across the finish line and, after so long, we are at the threshold. Any further delay will waste time we do not have, that our allies do not have. That is exactly what this motion is. We need to get this bill passed ASAP.

Let's remember: This bill is essentially the same bill we already passed overwhelmingly 2 months ago. There is no reason, no excuse for delay, not when bombs are falling on our allies, not when civilians, including kids, are suffering and starving, not when the world is watching to see if America is still united enough to lead.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the table motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we just heard the astounding claim that it would be a waste of time to allow individual Senators to come here and do what they were elected to do, which is to offer improvements to pending legislation.

We are not a rubberstamp for the House. We are not a rubberstamp for either party's leadership in either Chamber. We are U.S. Senators, and we should be able to vote as such.

And so I am asking for the support of my colleagues in tabling the amendment tree so we can have the "fair and open" process that Senator SCHUMER promised the last time we addressed the national security supplemental.

If we table the tree, Members can actually, finally, be able to call up their amendments on the floor, instead of begging Senator SCHUMER to give his blessing for their consideration.

If you support a fair and open amendment process, if you want to improve the bill, you should support my motion to table.

This will not create the post-apocalyptic hellscape that those in leadership would have us believe will ensue.

There will not be dogs and cats living together in the streets, nothing out of the Book of Revelations. We will just find ourselves in the position of being able to do our job.

MOTION TO TABLE

To that end, I move to table the motion to refer.

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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 151 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—2

Hawley

Paul

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on the House message to accompany H.R. 815 be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to

the Senate amendment to H.R. 815, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Chris Van Hollen, Mark Kelly, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Michael F. Bennet, Gary C. Peters, Jon Tester, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jeanne Shaheen, Angus S. King, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 815, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements relating to the eligibility of veterans to receive reimbursement for emergency treatment furnished through the Veterans Community Care program, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Ricketts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Britt	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeben	Schatz
Butler	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	Kennedy	Sinema
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Collins	Lujan	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Moran	Warnock
Crapo	Mullin	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Welch
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Fischer	Padilla	Young
Gillibrand	Peters	

NAYS—19

Barrasso	Hawley	Sanders
Blackburn	Johnson	Schmitt
Braun	Lee	Scott (FL)
Budd	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	Merkley	
Hagerty	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—1

Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 19.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer and the amendments pending thereto fall.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today, the Senate sends a unified message to the entire world: America will always defend democracy in its hour of need.

We tell our allies: We will stand with you.

We tell our adversaries: Don't mess with us.

We tell the world: We will do everything to defend democracy and our way of life.

In a resounding bipartisan vote, the relentless work of 6 long months has paid off. Congress is sending the supplemental to President Biden's desk.

Getting this done was one of the greatest achievements the Senate has faced in years, perhaps decades. A lot of people inside and outside Congress wanted this package to fail. But, today, those in Congress who stand on the side of democracy are winning the day.

To our friends in Ukraine, to our allies in NATO, to our allies in Israel, and to civilians around the world in need of help: Help is on the way.

To our friends in Ukraine: America will deliver more ammo and air defenses and basic supplies that you need to resist Putin on the battlefield.

To our friends in Israel: America will soon deliver aid to help you fight the scourge of Hamas and stand up to Iran.

To innocent civilians in the midst of war, from Gaza to Sudan: America will deliver food and medicine and clothing.

To our friends in the Indo-Pacific: We will stand with you to resist the Chinese Communist Party.

And to the whole world: Make no mistake, America will deliver on its promise to act like a leader on the world stage, to hold the line against autocratic thugs like Vladimir Putin.

A few months ago, Putin made a bet that American aid would sooner or later come to an end. We are showing Putin that betting against America is always—always—a grave mistake.

Over the past few months, I have spoken repeatedly and at length about the supreme importance of getting this supplemental package done. Starting in October and through Thanksgiving and Christmas and New Year's and into the spring, I said again and again that we had to work in a bipartisan way, Democrats and Republicans alike, if we wanted to pass this bill.

When we succeeded in getting the supplemental through the Senate the first time in February, it was for two reasons above all: persistence and bipartisanship. At certain points, it might have seemed hard to see how we would reach our goal, but we never lost hope that if we persisted, we could finish the job.

Today, thank God, our persistence has been validated, and the bill sent to us by the House is largely the same as the bill in substance as what the Senate has championed all along.

It wasn't easy to reach this point, but today's outcome yet again confirms another thing we have stressed from the beginning of this Congress: In divided government, the only way to ever get things done is bipartisanship. I am very pleased that in this moment, when it mattered most, both parties found a way to work together even when it wasn't easy.

Again, persistence and bipartisanship are what saved the day. Leader McCONNELL and I, who don't always agree, worked hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder to get this bill done. Together, we were bipartisan and persisted.

Now, it is troubling that a very small minority within the hard right tried desperately for months to prevent Congress from doing the right thing. These isolationists have now secured their ignominious place in history as the ones who would see America stick its head in the sand as our enemies sought to undermine us. Had they won, they would have presided over a declining America. I am glad that today we will see that effort fail.

This is an inflection point in history. Western democracy faces perhaps its greatest test since the end of the Cold War. The conflicts we see right now in Europe, in the Middle East, and the tensions of the Indo-Pacific will go a long way in shaping the balance of power between democracy and autocracy in the decades to come, and the consequences for America's long-term security will be profound.

If Putin is allowed to seize the territory of a neighboring sovereign nation, if the Chinese Communist Party is allowed to consume the Indo-Pacific, if Iran is allowed to dominate the Middle East, and if America were to stand by and do nothing, it is the United States that would suffer the consequences most of all in the long run.

Failure to act now could not only undermine the legitimacy of our democratic values, it would have impacts across American life. It would hurt us politically, economically, militarily, and socially. It would harm the competitiveness of U.S. businesses, endanger the safety of our troops, cripple America's innovative potential, and make the world a more hostile place for our civic values—individual liberty, freedom of expression, equal justice under law, and opportunity for all. We always try to live up to these ideals, but they will not survive if autocratic powers like Putin and the Chinese Communist Party overtake America in this century.

That is what is at stake in the war in Ukraine, where we face Putin. That is what is at stake in the Indo-Pacific, where we face Xi. That is what is at stake in conflicts in the Middle East, where we face Iran. Nothing less—nothing less—than the future of American security and the future of the democratic order that has survived since the end of the Second World War.

So we have a choice. We can either make a downpayment on defending our

security or find ourselves on the back foot, facing much graver threats in years and decades to come. The only answer is the right one: We must act now.

We have learned in recent years that democracy is a fragile and precious thing. It will not survive the threats of this century—the new threats—if we aren't willing to do what it takes to defend it. And if America will not lead the way to protect democracy in this age, no other nation will. That is the burden, that is the duty of a nation as great as ours.

There are so many people on both sides of the aisle who deserve credit for this immense accomplishment.

I thank President Biden for his stalwart leadership. He never flinched or winced. He knew how important this was and was always working with us and importuning us to move forward.

I thank Leader MCCONNELL, as I have mentioned before, for working hand in hand with us, not letting partisanship get in the way.

I thank Speaker JOHNSON, who rose to the occasion. In his own words, he said he had to do the right thing despite the enormous political pressure on him.

I thank Leader JEFFRIES, who worked so well together in his bipartisan way with Speaker JOHNSON.

Let me say this once again about my friend the Republican leader: We were of one mind to get this bill done. It was our bipartisanship, our linking of arms together, that got this large and difficult bill through the Congress despite many political ideologues who wanted to bring it down. Bipartisanship once again prevailed, and I thank him for his leadership.

I want to thank my Senate colleagues, particularly in my caucus. The dedication and unity and strength you have shown have made this possible. I was able, as leader, to work with the Republican leader in the House, the Speaker, the minority leader in the House, and the President because I knew I had our full caucus behind us—strongly, fervently.

The speeches that we heard at our Tuesday lunches, made by many who are sitting here, would make every American proud, and I thank you, thank you, thank you for that.

For the past 6 months, our friends and allies across the world have been watching what has been going on in Congress and asking themselves the same thing: Will America stand by her friends to face down the forces of autocracy? Will America follow through on its commitment to be a leader on the world stage and safeguard the cause of democracy? Will America summon the strength to come together, overcome the centrifugal pull of partisanship, and rise once again to meet the magnitude of the moment? Today, with both parties working together, the Senate answers these questions with a thunderous and resounding yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). The Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation, and I want to thank Leader SCHUMER for his tremendous leadership on this entire package. It is amazing. His dedication and support to getting this done. He really, really held steadfast as well as our caucus, as he just described, and so many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I also want to thank Senator MURRAY for her continued leadership on appropriations bills.

This supplemental will supply Ukraine with desperately needed equipment, weapons, training, and logistics.

For over 2 years, the Ukrainian people have shown courage and resilience, enabling them to resist Russian aggression. As just described by our leader, it would be disastrous for our national security and democracy and human rights if we had not supported them.

This bill also continues to support American taxpayers by authorizing the President to use an estimated \$5 billion in frozen Russian assets. These assets will help pay for Ukraine's reconstruction. And it designates the U.S. economic assistance, which Ukrainians will have to pay back once they have repelled the Russians.

The supplemental also includes support for our Middle East ally Israel, including support to make sure, just like these past few days, of shooting down 99 percent of missiles and drone attacks by Iran.

It also includes \$9 billion of humanitarian aid for Gaza, Ukraine, and for people caught in conflicts around the world. These conflicts have taken an immeasurable toll on the Palestinian and Ukrainian people.

The supplemental also contains a range of sanctions that will make it harder for each of Israel's adversaries—Iran and Hamas—to finance their operations.

It contains the SHIP Act, which requires the President to post sanctions against individuals and companies that knowingly help evade oil sanctions. Illegal revenues funnel tens of billions to designated organizations and terrorist groups. And it builds on legislation Senator MURKOWSKI and I enacted over a decade ago that helped expose the middlemen who were enabling Iran to evade these sanctions.

This package also includes over \$8 billion to support Taiwan and other Indo-Pacific allies in this critical part of the world where we stand shoulder to shoulder with these democracies.

It also contains legislation, the FEND Off Fentanyl Act, of which I was proud to be a cosponsor—It is critically important legislation that does a couple of things. One, it declares that fentanyl is a national emergency. This enables the President to impose sanctions on fentanyl traffickers, enabling the U.S. Treasury to better fight

fentanyl-related money laundering. Those fentanyl traffickers and money launderings have ties to organized crime and to drug cartels.

These issues have been clearly outlined in my State by communities, health providers, law enforcement, and others who want help in stopping the traffickers.

Part of the solution is stemming the flow of fentanyl. This supplemental would allow the proceeds from those seized assets of those narco-traffickers to be used by law enforcement in our local communities to fight this fentanyl scourge.

We must give our communities all the tools they need to stop this product from flooding across our borders, and this legislation will do just that.

I also want to address that technology should be a tool to help solve our greatest challenges, to improve the human condition, and to drive innovation and support economic opportunity. But foreign adversaries use technology for social and political control.

There is no individual right to privacy or freedom of speech in these autocracies. U.S. social media companies are not allowed to operate in China. In fact, China leads the world in using surveillance and censorship to keep tabs on its own population and to repress dissent.

Governments that respect freedom of speech do not build backdoors into hardware or software, into apps on phones, or into laptops. Backdoors allow foreign adversaries to target vulnerable Americans based on their user name or sensitive data. Backdoors allow foreign adversaries to use proxy bots to bombard—bombard—vulnerable populations—Americans—with harmful content or even to blackmail people.

The U.S. Department of Justice has stated: "Hostile foreign powers are weaponizing bulk data and the power of artificial intelligence to target Americans."

I do not want technology in the United States used this way. I want the United States to work with our most sophisticated technologically advanced countries, like-minded democracies—places like Japan, South Korea, our European allies—and set the global standards for technology and data protection. I want to see a technology NATO, one in which our allies come together and say there cannot be a government backdoor to any hardware or software if it wants to see global adoption.

We should have a trusted framework for cross-border data flows, as has been discussed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the G7. And criteria for trusted data flow should include commitments to democratic governance, the rule of law, and the protection of property rights and free speech.

I believe in trade, and I want trade. And I believe that business should be about business. But business is not

about business when foreign adversaries weaponize data, weaponize technology, and weaponize business approaches that hurt Americans.

I want to yield to my colleague, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, for his perspective on why this legislation before us is so important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first of all, I want to agree with my friend, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, on issues she already outlined, whether it be the need for aid for Ukraine, support for Israel, humanitarian aid for Gaza, or the necessary funding that has taken place for the Indo-Pacific, and, obviously, legislation that we all supported on fending off fentanyl.

But I want to particularly commend her for comments she has made on these technology issues. Over the last 7 years, as vice chair and now chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I spent an awful lot of time looking at what I think is one of the most significant intelligence failures of the last half century, and that was the failure we had to anticipate and disrupt Russian efforts to meddle in our elections. Since that time, though, we have seen a wide spectrum of foreign adversaries who tried to copy the Russian playbook.

But don't just take it from me. A succession of now-declassified intelligence assessments has described the ways in which foreign adversaries like Iran, like the People's Republic of China, and others are seeking to stoke social, racial, and political tensions in the United States. They are seeking to undermine confidence in our institutions and our elections systems and even to sow violence amongst Americans. The extent to which our adversaries have exploited American social media platforms is a matter of public record.

The committee I chair has held many hearings—open hearings—on the failure of U.S. social media platforms to identify the exploitation of their products by foreign intelligence services. As a Senator, along with the Senator from Washington, I have been among the leading critics of these platforms for their repeated failures to protect consumers.

While the exploitation of U.S. communication platforms by adversaries continues to be a serious issue, at the end of the day, our platforms are at least independent businesses. They do not have a vested interest in undermining our basic democratic system.

The truth is, though, I can't say the same for TikTok, the fastest growing social media platform in the United States, whose parent company ByteDance is based in the PRC. Even as U.S. social media platforms have fumbled in their response to foreign influence operations, there was never any concern that these platforms would operate at the direction of a foreign adversary. Again, I cannot say the same for TikTok.

I yield back to Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank Senator WARNER for his perspective as chairman of the Intelligence Committee and his hard work. He and I both drafted legislation more than a year ago trying to give our government the tools to deal with this issue.

In 2020, India concluded that TikTok and other Chinese-controlled apps were national security threats and prohibited them. As a result, India TikTok users migrated to other platforms, including Google's YouTube, and Indian small businesses found other ways to operate on other platforms.

This supplemental contains the Protecting Americans from Foreign Adversary Controlled Applications Act. Congress has a nonpunitive policy purpose in passing this legislation. Congress is not acting to punish ByteDance, TikTok, or any other individual company. Congress is acting to prevent foreign adversaries from conducting espionage, surveillance, and malign operations harming vulnerable Americans, our servicemen and women, and our U.S. Government personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to expound a little bit on what Senator CANTWELL just said. It has been made absolutely clear that a number of Chinese laws require Chinese companies and their subsidiaries to assist PRC security agencies and abide by the secret and unchallengeable government directives. The truth is, these Chinese companies, at the end of the day, don't owe their obligation to their customers or their shareholders, but they owe it to the PRC Government.

In the context of social media platforms used by nearly half of Americans, it is not hard to imagine how a platform that facilitates so much commerce, political discourse, and social debate could be covertly manipulated to serve the goals of an authoritarian regime, one with a long track record of censorship, transnational oppression, and promotion of disinformation.

In recent weeks, we have seen direct lobbying by the Chinese Government, indicating, perhaps, more than anything we will say on the floor here, how dearly Xi Jinping is invested in this product—a product, by the way, that is not even allowed to operate in the Chinese domestic market, itself.

Story after story, over the last 18 months, have exposed the extent to which TikTok had grossly misrepresented its data security and corporate governance practice, as well as its relationship with its parent company. Countless stories have refuted the claims made by TikTok executives and lobbyists that it operates independently from its controlling company ByteDance.

We have also seen documented examples of this company surveilling journalists. We have seen corresponding

guidance from leading news organizations, not just here in America but across the world, advising their investigative journalists not to use TikTok. These public reports, based on revelations of current and former employees, also reveal that TikTok has allowed employees to covertly amplify content.

Unfortunately, those who suggest that the United States can address the data security and foreign influence risk of TikTok through traditional mitigation have not been following TikTok's long track record of deceit and lack of transparency.

I yield back to Senator CANTWELL.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank Senator WARNER for his comments.

I find it most disturbing that they used TikTok to repeatedly access U.S. user data and track multiple journalists covering the company. Researchers have found that TikTok restricts the information that Americans and others receive on a global basis.

As of December 2023, an analysis by Rutgers University found that TikTok posts mentioning topics that are sensitive to the Chinese Government, including Tiananmen Square, Uighurs, and the Dalai Lama were significantly less prevalent on TikTok than on Instagram, the most comparable social media.

Foreign policy issues disfavored by China and Russian Governments also had fewer hashtags on TikTok, such as pro-Ukraine or pro-Israel hashtags. Here are some of those hashtags on TikTok:

The example of Tiananmen Square, which we all know was an example of students standing up to the military, and yet for Tiananmen Square, there are 8,000 percent more hashtags on Instagram than on TikTok.

The Uighur genocide protecting a Muslim population, there are 1,970 percent more hashtags about that on Instagram than on TikTok.

And my personal favorite, just because I had the privilege of meeting the Dalai Lama here in the Capitol, 5,520 percent more hashtags where the Dalai Lama is mentioned on Instagram than on TikTok.

And pro-Ukraine, 750 percent more hashtags on Instagram than on TikTok about Ukraine and support for Ukraine.

I think that says it all in this debate today. Are we going to continue to allow people to control the information by using an export-controlled algorithm and China-based source code?

My colleagues and I are urging for this deweaponization by saying that TikTok should be sold. Now, I know that the Chinese have an export control on that algorithm. Congress believes that you have to have adequate time to sufficiently address this issue posed by our foreign adversaries. That is why the legislation before us is for ByteDance to sell its stake in TikTok.

We think a year is ample time to allow potential investors to come forward, for due diligence to be completed, and for lawyers to draw up and

finalize contracts. This is not a new concept to require Chinese divestment from U.S. companies.

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States requires Chinese divestment from hotel management platforms—StayNTouch, from a healthcare app called PatientsLikeMe, from the popular LGBTQI dating app Grindr, among other companies. And even after the Chinese owner divested from Grindr in 2020, Americans had continuity of service on this platform.

So I turn it back to my colleague, but we are giving people a choice here to improve this platform and have the opportunity for Americans to make sure that they are not being manipulated by our foreign adversaries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H. Res. 1051, the House resolution originally on this legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

H. RES. 1051

Whereas TikTok collects vast amounts of data on Americans, though the total extent of its collection is unknown:

(1) On August 6, 2020, the President concluded that TikTok “automatically captures vast swaths of information from its users” and that TikTok’s ownership by ByteDance Ltd. enables the People’s Republic of China (referred to in this resolution as the “PRC”) and Communist Party of China (referred to in this resolution as the “CCP”) to gain access to “Americans’ personal and proprietary information,” potentially allowing the CCP “to track the locations of Federal employees and contractors, build dossiers of personal information for blackmail, and conduct corporate espionage”.

(2) Outside reporting has confirmed the breadth of TikTok’s reach, concluding that its data collection practices extend to age, phone number, precise location, internet address, device used, phone contacts, social network connections, content of private messages sent through the application, and videos watched.

(3) On November 11, 2022, Federal Communications Commissioner Brendan Carr explained that “underneath [TikTok], it operates as a very sophisticated surveillance app.” He characterized it as “a big risk” for multiple reasons, including espionage. The risk posed by TikTok is exacerbated by the difficulty in assessing precisely which categories of data it collects. For example, outside researchers have found embedded vulnerabilities that allow the company to collect more data than the application’s privacy policy indicates.

Whereas PRC law requires obligatory, secret disclosure of data controlled by Chinese companies at the PRC’s unilateral request:

(1) Pursuant to PRC law, the PRC can require a company headquartered in the PRC to surrender all its data to the PRC, making it an espionage tool of the CCP.

(2) The National Intelligence Law, passed in China in 2017, states that “any organization” must assist or cooperate with CCP intelligence work. Such assistance or cooperation must also remain secret at the PRC’s request.

(3) The PRC’s 2014 Counter-Espionage Law states that “relevant organizations . . . may not refuse” to collect evidence for an investigation.

(4) The PRC’s Data Security Law of 2021 states that the PRC has the power to access and control private data.

(5) The PRC’s Counter-Espionage Law grants PRC security agencies nearly unfettered discretion, if acting under an effectively limitless capacious understanding of national security, to access data from companies.

(6) On September 17, 2020, the Department of Commerce concluded that the PRC, to advance “its intelligence-gathering and to understand more about who to target for espionage, whether electronically or via human recruitment,” is constructing “massive databases of Americans’ personal information” and that ByteDance has close ties to the CCP, including a cooperation agreement with a security agency and over 130 CCP members in management positions.

(7) On December 2, 2022, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Christopher Wray, stated that TikTok’s data repositories on Americans “are in the hands of a government that doesn’t share our values and that has a mission that’s very much at odds with what’s in the best interests of the United States. . . . The [CCP] has shown a willingness to steal Americans data on a scale that dwarfs any other”.

(8) On December 5, 2022, the Director of National Intelligence, Avril Haines, stated, when asked about TikTok and PRC ownership, “It is extraordinary the degree to which [the PRC] . . . [is] developing frameworks for collecting foreign data and pulling it in, and their capacity to then turn that around and use it to target audiences for information campaigns and other things, but also to have it for the future so that they can use it for a variety of means”.

(9) On December 16, 2022, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, William Burns, explained that “because the parent company of TikTok is a [PRC] company, the [CCP] is able to insist upon extracting the private data of a lot of TikTok users in this country, and also to shape the content of what goes on to TikTok as well to suit the interests of the Chinese leadership”.

(10) On August 2, 2020, then-Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, stated that PRC-based companies “are feeding data directly to the Chinese Communist Party, their national security apparatus”.

(11) Public reporting has repeatedly confirmed statements made by the Executive Branch regarding the tight interlinkages between ByteDance, TikTok, and the CCP.

(A) The Secretary of ByteDance’s CCP committee, Zhang Fuping, also serves as ByteDance’s Editor-in-Chief and Vice President and has vowed that the CCP committee would “take the lead” across “all product lines and business lines”, which include TikTok.

(B) On May 30, 2023, public reporting revealed that TikTok has stored sensitive financial information, including the Social Security numbers and tax identifications of TikTok influencers and United States small businesses, on servers in China accessible by ByteDance employees.

(C) On December 22, 2022, public reporting revealed that ByteDance employees accessed TikTok user data and IP addresses to monitor the physical locations of specific United States citizens.

(D) On June 17, 2022, public reporting revealed that, according to leaked audio from more than 80 internal TikTok meetings, China-based employees of ByteDance repeatedly accessed nonpublic data about United States TikTok users, including the physical locations of specific United States citizens.

(E) On January 20, 2023, public reporting revealed that TikTok and ByteDance employees regularly engage in practice called “heating,” which is a manual push to ensure specific videos “achieve a certain number of video views”.

(F) In a court filing in June 2023, a former employee of ByteDance alleged that the CCP spied on pro-democracy protestors in Hong Kong in 2018 by using backdoor access to TikTok to identify and monitor activists’ locations and communications.

(G) On November 1, 2023, public reporting revealed that TikTok’s internal platform, which houses its most sensitive information, was inspected in person by CCP cybersecurity agents in the lead-up to the CCP’s 20th National Congress.

Whereas the PRC’s access to American users’ data poses unacceptable risks to United States national security:

(1) As a general matter, foreign adversary controlled social media applications present a clear threat to the national security of the United States.

(2) The Department of Homeland Security has warned that the PRC’s data collection activities in particular have resulted in “numerous risks to U.S. businesses and customers, including: the theft of trade secrets, of intellectual property, and of other confidential business information; violations of U.S. export control laws; violations of U.S. privacy laws; breaches of contractual provisions and terms of service; security and privacy risks to customers and employees; risk of PRC surveillance and tracking of regime critics; and reputational harm to U.S. businesses”. These risks are imminent and other, unforeseen risks may also exist.

(3) On September 28, 2023, the Department of State’s Global Engagement Center issued a report that found that “TikTok creates opportunities for PRC global censorship”. The report stated that United States Government information as of late 2020 showed that “ByteDance maintained a regularly updated internal list identifying people who were likely blocked or restricted from all ByteDance platforms, including TikTok, for reasons such as advocating for Uyghur independence”.

(4) On November 15, 2022, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Christopher Wray, testified before the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that TikTok’s national security concerns “include the possibility that the [CCP] could use it to control data collection on millions of users or control the recommendation algorithm, which could be used for influence operations if they so choose, or to control software on millions of devices, which gives it an opportunity to potentially technically compromise personal devices”.

(5) On March 8, 2023, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Christopher Wray, testified before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate that the CCP, through its ownership of ByteDance, could use TikTok to collect and control users’ data and drive divisive narratives internationally.

Whereas Congress has extensively investigated whether TikTok poses a national security threat because it is owned by ByteDance:

(1) On October 26, 2021, during the testimony of Michael Beckerman, TikTok head of public policy for the Americas, before a hearing of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, lawmakers expressed concerns that TikTok’s audio and user location data could be used by the CCP.

(2) On September 14, 2022, lawmakers expressed concerns over TikTok’s algorithm and content recommendations posing a national security threat during a hearing before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate with Vanessa Pappas, Chief Operating Officer of TikTok.

(3) On March 23, 2023, during the testimony of TikTok CEO, Shou Chew, before the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, lawmakers expressed concerns about the safety and security of the application, including TikTok's relationship with the CCP.

(4) On February 28, 2023, former Deputy National Security Advisor, Matthew Pottinger, emphasized that it has already been confirmed that TikTok's parent company ByteDance has used the application to surveil United States journalists as a means to identify and retaliate against potential sources. The PRC has also shown a willingness to harass individuals abroad who take stances that contradict the Communist Party lines. The application can further be employed to help manipulate social discourse and amplify false information to tens of millions of Americans.

(5) On March 23, 2023, Nury Turkel, the Chair of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, raised the alarm that TikTok's parent company, ByteDance, has a strategic partnership with China's Ministry of Public Security, and China's domestic version of the application, Douyin, has been used to collect data and sensitive information from Uyghurs and other oppressed ethnic minority groups.

(6) On July 26, 2023, William Evanina, the former Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, pointed to TikTok as just one of many areas of concern that combine to paint a concerning picture of the CCP's capabilities and intent as an adversarial, malign competitor.

(7) On November 30, 2023, John Garnaut of the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) remarked that TikTok has sophisticated capabilities that create the risk that TikTok can clandestinely shape narratives and elevate favorable opinions while suppressing statements and news that the PRC deems negative.

(8) On January 18, 2024, the Select Committee on Strategic Competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party of the House of Representatives was briefed by a set of senior interagency officials to discuss these matters.

(9) On March 22, 2023, elements of the intelligence community provided a classified briefing on the threat to members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and leadership for the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(10) On April 26, 2023, the Executive Branch provided a classified briefing on the threat to members of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(11) On June 5, 2023, the Executive Branch provided a classified briefing on the threat to staff of the Committee on Banking of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(12) In June 2023, at the request of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the intelligence community provided a classified threat briefing open to all Members of the House of Representatives.

(13) On November 15, 2023, elements of the intelligence community provided a classified briefing to the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on, inter alia, the Peoples Republic of China's conduct of global foreign malign influence operations, including through platforms such as TikTok.

Whereas Congress and the Executive Branch are of one mind on the risks presented by TikTok's data collection practices:

(1) On May 15, 2019, the President issued an Executive Order on Securing the Information

and Communications Technology and Services Supply Chain, which stated that "unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries . . . constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States".

(2) On June 9, 2021, the President issued an Executive Order on Protecting Americans' Sensitive Data from Foreign Adversaries, which stated that "[f]oreign adversary access to large repositories of United States persons' data also presents a significant risk." The EO stated that "the United States must act to protect against the risks associated with connected software applications that are designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned or controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of, a foreign adversary".

(3) In May 2019, in connection with a review by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), a company based in the PRC agreed to divest its interest in a popular software application reportedly due to concerns relating to potential access by the PRC to American user data from the application.

(4) On July 8, 2020, then-National Security Advisor, Robert O'Brien, stated that the CCP uses TikTok and other PRC-owned applications to collect personal, private, and intimate data on Americans to use "for malign purposes".

(5) On August 14, 2020, the President found "there is credible evidence . . . that ByteDance, Ltd. . . . might take action that threatens to impair the national security of the United States".

(6) In February 2023, the Deputy Attorney General, Lisa Monaco, stated, "Our intelligence community has been very clear about [the CCP's] efforts and intention to mold the use of [TikTok] using data in a worldview that is completely inconsistent with our own." Deputy Attorney General Monaco also stated, "I don't use TikTok and I would not advise anybody to do so because of [national security] concerns".

(7) On July 13, 2022, Federal Communications Commission Commissioner, Brendan Carr, testified before the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives that "there is a unique set of national security concerns when it comes to [TikTok]".

(8) On March 23, 2023, the Secretary of State, Antony Blinken, testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that TikTok is a threat to national security that should be "ended one way or another".

Whereas the Executive Branch has sought to address the risks identified above through requiring ByteDance to divest its ownership of TikTok:

(1) On August 14, 2020, the President issued an Executive Order directing ByteDance to divest any assets or property used to enable or support ByteDance's operation of the TikTok application in the United States and any data obtained or derived from TikTok application or Musically application users in the United States. The Order, however, remains the subject of litigation.

(2) On August 6, 2020, the President issued an Executive Order (E.O. 13942) that directed the Secretary of Commerce to take actions that would have prohibited certain transactions related to TikTok in 45 days if ByteDance failed to divest its ownership of TikTok. The companies and content creators using the TikTok mobile application filed

lawsuits challenging those prohibitions, as a result of which two district courts issued preliminary injunctions enjoining the prohibitions.

(3) Following the multiple judicial rulings that enjoined the Executive Branch from enforcing the regulations contemplated in E.O. 13942, on June 9, 2021, the President issued a new Executive Order that rescinded E.O. 13942, and directed the Secretary of Commerce to more broadly assess and take action, where possible, against connected software applications that pose a threat to national security.

Whereas Congress has passed, and the Executive Branch has implemented, a ban on ByteDance-controlled applications like TikTok from government devices because of the national security threat such applications pose; even so, the application's widespread popularity limits the effectiveness of this step:

(1) Prior to 2022, several Federal agencies, including the Departments of Defense, State, and Homeland Security, had issued orders banning TikTok on devices for which those specific agencies are responsible.

(2) On December 29, 2022, following its adoption by Congress, the President signed into law a bill banning the use of TikTok on government devices due to the national security threat posed by the application under its current ownership.

(3) A majority of States in the United States have also banned TikTok on State government devices due to the national security threat posed by the application under its current ownership.

(4) To date, as long as TikTok is subject to the ownership or control of ByteDance, no alternative to preventing or prohibiting TikTok's operation of the application in the United States has been identified that would be sufficient to address the above-identified risks.

(5) The national security risks arise from and are related to the ownership or control of TikTok by a foreign adversary controlled company. Severing ties to such foreign adversary controlled company, for example by a full divestment, would mitigate such risks.

(6) As has been widely reported, TikTok, Inc. has proposed an alternative, a proposal referred to as "Project Texas," which is an initiative to try and satisfy concerns relating to TikTok's handling of United States user data.

(A) Under the proposal, United States user data would be stored in the United States, using the infrastructure of a trusted third party.

(B) That initiative would have allowed the application algorithm, source code, and development activities to remain in China under ByteDance's control and subject to PRC laws, albeit subject to proposed safeguards relating to cloud infrastructure and other data security concerns. Project Texas would also have allowed ByteDance to continue to have a role in certain aspects of TikTok's United States operations.

(C) Project Texas would have allowed TikTok to continue to rely on the engineers and back-end support in China to update its algorithms and the source code needed to run the TikTok application in the United States.

(D) Allowing code development in and access to United States user data from China potentially exposes United States users to malicious code, backdoor vulnerabilities, surreptitious surveillance, and other problematic activities tied to source code development.

(E) Allowing back-end support, code development, and operational activities to remain in China would also require TikTok to

continue to send United States user data to China to update the machine learning algorithms and source code for the application, and to conduct related back-end services, like managing users' accounts.

(7) On January 31, 2024, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Christopher Wray, testified before the Select Committee on Strategic Competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party of the House of Representatives that TikTok gives the PRC "the ability to control data collection on millions of users, which can be used for all sorts of intelligence operations or influence operations," and "the ability, should they so choose, to control the software on millions of devices, which means the opportunity to technically compromise millions of devices".

(8) The risks posed by TikTok's data collection would be addressed by the Protecting Americans from Foreign Adversary Controlled Applications Act, despite the potential that the PRC might purchase similar types of data from private data brokers.

(9) The degree of risk posed by TikTok has increased alongside the application's immense popularity in the United States.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has determined that ByteDance and TikTok pose an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States.

Ms. CANTWELL. I turn it back to my colleague Senator WARNER and again thank him for his leadership.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Washington for her leadership going through the disparate effects of TikTok versus other social media platforms.

And let's acknowledge, TikTok, I think, realized they had a problem over a year ago. So they tried to develop a response—it was something called Project Texas—to allegedly address concerns related to TikTok's handling of America's data.

However, Project Texas would still allow TikTok's algorithm, source code, and development activities to remain in China. They would remain so under ByteDance control and subject to Chinese Government exploitation.

Project Texas allows TikTok to continue to rely on engineers and back-end support from China to update its algorithm and source code needed to run TikTok in the United States.

How can they say there is not the possibility of interference? This reliance on resources based in China, again, makes it vulnerable to Chinese Government exploitation.

That is why Project Texas does not resolve the United States' national security concern about ByteDance's ownership of TikTok.

Now, let me acknowledge—and I think Senator CANTWELL and I worked on a more, frankly, comprehensive approach that, in a perfect world, we might have been debating today, but we work in the world of getting things right.

So I stand firmly in support, as Senator CANTWELL has, of taking action now to prevent the kind of intelligence failure we first saw back in 2016.

And, again, the chair of the Commerce Committee has indicated this is not some draconian or novel approach.

For decades, we have had systems in place to examine foreign ownership of U.S. industry. We have seen even more scrutiny in instances where foreign buyers have sought to control U.S. telecom and broadcast media platforms.

Frankly, this country should have adopted a similar regulatory approach for social media—again, something that Senator CANTWELL and I worked on—which has considerably more scale and barriers to entry than broadcast media had a decade ago.

But this bill is an important step in fixing that glaring gap. It goes a long way toward safeguarding our democratic systems from covert foreign influence, both in its application to TikTok and forward-looking treatment of other foreign adversary control over future online platforms.

Before I yield back, I want to make clear to all Americans: This is not an effort to take your voice away. For several months now, we have heard from constituents how much they value TikTok as a creative platform. And yesterday was the 4-year anniversary of my once-viral tuna melt video on another social media platform. I can kind of understand why TikTok has become such a cultural touchstone.

To those Americans, I would emphasize: This is not a ban of a service you appreciate.

Many Americans, particularly young Americans, are rightfully skeptical. At the end of the day, they have not seen what Congress has seen. They have not been in the classified briefings that Congress has held, which have delved more deeply into some of the threat posed by foreign-controlled TikTok. But what they have seen, beyond even this bill, is Congress's failure to enact meaningful consumer protections on Big Tech and may cynically view this as a diversion or, worse, a concession to U.S. social media platforms.

To those young Americans, I want to say: We hear your concern, and we hope that TikTok will continue under new ownership, American or otherwise.

It could be bought by a group from Britain, Canada, Brazil, France. It just needs to be no longer controlled by an adversary that is defined as an adversary in U.S. law.

And with that, I urge that we take action on this item, and, again, appreciate the great leadership of the chairman of the Commerce Committee on working with our friends in the House to bring this important legislation to the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I cannot believe we are here again. Americans cannot believe what we are witnessing here today.

Less than a week ago, House Republican leadership sold out Americans and passed a bill that sends \$95 billion to other countries. With the Speaker's blessing, the House Rules Committee approved a package of foreign aid bills that undermines America's interest abroad and paves our Nation's path to bankruptcy.

The Speaker relied on Democrats to force this \$95 billion package through committee, over the objection of three conservative Members.

Unfortunately, our leadership here in the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, are complicit.

The Senate is about to follow the House's lead, further violating the trust of those who sent us here. We are about to vote on another \$60 billion for Ukraine; this, on top of the \$120 billion American taxpayers have already sent to this black hole, with no accountability.

We are a country that is \$35 trillion in debt. We are a country whose southern border is wide open thanks to the Biden administration. Illegal immigrants are invading our country. Drugs, including fentanyl, are flooding across, killing hundreds—hundreds—of Americans a day.

We are printing money for other countries while inflation continues to crush the American citizen. Not one dollar of this bill is paid for or offset. Not one. We will have to print more money or borrow it from China, all to fund foreign wars while we are losing the fight at our own southern border.

What we are doing is a slap in the face to the Americans who sent us here to represent them. Instead of debating legislation to close the border and fix the economy, we are about to send billions of dollars to one of the most corrupt countries in the world.

The war in Ukraine is a stalemate. It has been for a while. Pouring more money into Ukraine's coffers will only prolong the conflict and lead to more loss of life. No one at the White House, Pentagon, or the State Department can articulate what victory looks like in this fight.

They couldn't when we sent the first tranche of aid over 2 years ago and they still can't do it over 2 years later. We should be working with Ukraine and Russia to negotiate an end to this madness. That is called diplomacy, by the way, a tactic this administration has been completely unwilling to use.

Instead, Congress is rushing to further bankroll the waging of a war that has zero chance of a positive outcome.

The Speaker claims he is privy to special, classified information that justifies support for this massive package. If this critical information exists, all elected representatives who are being asked to vote on this massive spending package should have access to it.

Republican leaders in the Senate argue that Russia will roll through

Ukraine and into NATO if we don't immediately send another \$60 billion we don't have.

I wouldn't be surprised if we get a letter signed by fifty or so "high ranking, former intelligence officials" confirming this and the dire consequences of delay. Don't fall for it.

I had a classified briefing from the Department of Defense just this morning. I can tell you there is no justification to prioritize Ukraine's security before our own. None.

To add insult to injury, we are financing this conflict on the backs of the American taxpayer. As I said earlier, this country is \$35 trillion in debt. Today we are borrowing \$80,000 a second—you heard that right—\$80,000 a second, \$4.6 million a minute. And I want this body to explain that to the American people next election. This is irresponsible and unsustainable.

On top of that, we are now considering adding another \$95 billion to that mountain of debt with this foreign aid package. This funding will be financed by deficit spending the American people will eventually have to pay back.

This group doesn't have to pay it; the American people do. It is easy to spend somebody else's money.

Unlike the so-called loan to Ukraine—loan, we are hearing, which will never be repaid—don't be fooled—unfortunately, some of my colleagues will vote yes on this bill claiming that, hey, this money for Ukraine is a loan. This was a concept originally floated by President Trump.

However, this bill not only allows the President to set the terms of loan repayment, it lets him cancel the payment any time and the interest on it. Sounds a little fishy to me.

I and the majority of Americans are highly skeptical that we will ever see a cent paid back to the American taxpayer. The chickens are going to come home to roost, and when they do, it is going to get really, really ugly. Every Member of this body should be laser-focused on getting our own house in order, not bankrolling foreign wars.

Mr. President, \$46 billion of this foreign aid package is supposedly for Israel. Sadly, that is not reality.

If you read the fine print, \$9 billion of that funding would go to the Palestinians for what is being billed as humanitarian aid for Gaza. Of course, sending any money to Gaza will immediately be used to line the pockets of Hamas terrorists. They will provide zero relief to the civilians suffering under their control.

There is no requirement that any hostages—also in this bill—be released for any exchange of this money. Why is that not happening? We have American citizens and we have Israeli citizens who have been captive for 5, 6 months. We are giving \$20-something billion—\$9 billion to the people who are holding hostages—and we are not getting any relief for the people who have been suffering as hostages going on 6 months.

Why in the world would America agree to funding both sides of this war?

Israel is our greatest ally in the Middle East. We should be standing firm in support of our friends in their battle against Hamas. Sadly, the White House is more focused on playing politics and appeasing their radical, pro-Palestinian base. Why else would we send billions of dollars to Hamas? Is this a political payoff in an election year? Sounds like it to me. What a sad state of affairs this country is in.

While Congress rushes—rushes—today to bankroll Ukraine and the Palestinians, our leadership is avoiding the key crisis facing our Nation: our southern border. Wake up.

According to a recent Gallop poll, immigration is the top concern of people in this country who pay our bills, but the American people were just sold out. It is that simple.

You are witnessing the swamp at its worst—a swamp more concerned about maintaining power and being smarter than everybody else and lining the pockets of their friends than representing the interests of the American people.

Colleagues, wake up. The clock is ticking. How many Americans must die before we take on our own security as seriously as we are taking on other people's borders, including Ukraine's?

We lose 100,000 people to fentanyl. Does anybody care in this body? I haven't heard it. This is a direct result of the border policy under President Biden. Fentanyl is manufactured in China and ran by the cartel in Mexico. At what point does that horrific reality become important enough for us to come in here and vote and shut this dang border down? The left loves to tell you about threats. What kills more Americans than the Biden border policy? Nothing. It is the biggest disaster in history since I have been alive and a citizen of this country. Ukraine is losing soldiers by far fewer than the number of Americans who are dying from fentanyl. We have to take care of our own people before we take care of the rest of the world.

The Biden administration is failing this country. We know what the problem is. We know the solution. But nobody wants to solve it. That is an ineffective government.

President Trump proved that we can get operational control of our border. He had control. The problem is, no one in this administration or this body actually wants to solve this problem, which means we are also failing this country.

Americans are counting on this body to stand up and correct the course. I hope we don't let them down.

For these reasons, I will be voting against this massive supplement of taxpayer money that we don't have today going to Ukraine.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, you know, we meet this week at a critical time. The threats we face on the world stage

are demanding our attention in a way that we have not seen in decades.

From the Middle East, to Europe, to the Indo-Pacific, weakness from President Biden has allowed chaos to spread across this globe. In Israel, they are in a fight for survival against genocidal Hamas terrorists. In the Indo-Pacific, China is saber-rattling and making provocative moves towards Taiwan and the Philippines. In Ukraine, Russia continues its brutal war of aggression by committing war crimes against innocent civilians. But right here at home, we are facing a crisis of our own—most notably, the worst border crisis in American history.

The truth is that the consequences of our border crisis affect our citizens the most. For example, in my home State of North Carolina, we have seen a 22-percent increase in drug overdose deaths—the highest level ever recorded. This is primarily due to deadly fentanyl that was transported into our country through an open southern border on President Biden's watch.

Police departments from Charlotte to Raleigh have uncovered tens of thousands of pounds of fentanyl—enough to kill every man, woman, and child not just in North Carolina but in the whole country. Right now, we have an administration ignoring that crisis, and the only attempt the Senate made to address it—it fell far short of what is needed.

So as we again debate foreign aid and foreign spending, I will repeat what I have said throughout the process. We must secure our own border before we help other countries protect theirs. In order to be a strong nation, we first have to have a strong border here at home.

During one of my recent telephone townhalls a few months ago, I asked a poll question to the thousands of people who had joined me that evening on the phone. I asked: If you could be assured that the southern border was secure, would you then support sending aid to allies and partners? Roughly two-thirds of the respondents said yes. You see, most people aren't opposed to helping our friends; they just think we need to take care of our own country first.

For me, "America First" does not mean "America Only," so when I oppose this package, it won't be because I oppose helping our friends and our allies. We should send Israel the weapons they need to eliminate Hamas and free the remaining hostages—one, by the way, who is a North Carolinian. We should counter the Chinese Communist Party's military aggression in the Indo-Pacific and its social media subversion inside our country. We should counter Russia's brutality and force Putin to the negotiating table on terms most favorable to Ukraine. We should rebuild the arsenal of democracy and make significant investments in our national defense. We should do all of those things but not before we fix what affects our own citizens first.

Too many Americans are suffering. Too many Americans are dying. This is an order of priorities, and my first priority as a U.S. Senator will always be to make life better for us here in the United States and back home in North Carolina.

I will oppose this foreign aid package because we must put America first—not alone, not alone, but first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today not in defense of TikTok but in defense of TikTok's users, especially the 170 million American users. Congress is rapidly heading towards passing legislation that will likely result in the blocking of the most popular application among young people in this country—an app whose fundamental purpose is to facilitate and promote speech; an app that has revolutionized how people connect, share, do business, and communicate online; an app that is bringing competition to the heavily concentrated social media market.

It should be a serious flag that a bill with such significant implications for freedom of speech and online competition has gone from being an idea in the House of Representatives to all of a sudden being passed on the floor of the Senate in a matter of weeks, just weeks.

So when political elites who otherwise fiercely disagree with each other come together to pass legislation that may result in significant censorship—yes, censorship—often in the name of national security, we should be hypervigilant about the true intentions of this legislation.

Episodes in history of using national security as a pretext to crack down on dissenting or unpopular speech loom as warnings about the ease of compromising our values when national security is supposedly at stake.

I want to be clear. I rise today on this greatest of debate floors not to defend TikTok. I don't deny that TikTok poses some national security risks. Instead, I come here today with a plea to my colleagues to think carefully about the impact of this bill, the consequences of its implementation, and the tradeoff between supposed national security threats and freedom of expression and basic rights to free speech.

This legislation may address or at least mitigate a national security risk, but it could and likely will result in widespread censorship. This censorship would predominantly impact young people in our country, many of whom are just gaining their political consciousness and obtaining the right to vote. We should be clear-eyed about these stakes.

Censorship is not who we are as a people. We should not downplay or deny this tradeoff. Some say the legislation merely forces ByteDance to sell TikTok within a year. That is a sale that won't affect its users at all. The ownership will change, so bill sup-

porters say, but the app will stay the same.

Realistically, the actual chances of divestment in a year, if ever, are very small. A TikTok sale would be one of the most complicated and expensive transactions in history, requiring months, if not years, of due diligence by both government and business actors.

We should be very clear about the likely outcome of this law: It is really just a TikTok ban. And once we properly acknowledge that this bill is a TikTok ban, we can better see its impact on free expression: 170 million users—170 million Americans use TikTok to watch videos, learn about the news, run a business, and keep up with the latest pop culture trends. They connect with friends and family, sell new products and build community. The culture and expression on TikTok are unique and unavailable anywhere else on the internet.

In fact, TikTok is a threat to business, a threat to Facebook and Instagram and other American companies precisely because of its unique style and community which cannot be replicated anywhere else.

And while many of my colleagues are sincere in their fears for U.S. national security, others appear to support this legislation for a far more dangerous reason: They want to ban TikTok because of its users' content, because of TikTok's viewpoints. They don't like that many TikTok users support progressive or liberal politics or perspectives that they simply don't agree with.

The bill's supporters dress up this censorship by arguing that the Chinese Government is manipulating TikTok's algorithm to promote certain viewpoints. In this view, a TikTok ban is about combating Chinese propaganda, not penalizing TikTok's content.

TikTok, from their perspective, is "poison[ing] the minds of young Americans with pro-Communist China propaganda." This isn't just some hypothetical risk, critics say, but an actual ongoing operation by the Chinese Communist Party.

Don't be fooled by these arguments. Although the Chinese Government certainly censors online speech in China, there is no credible evidence that the CCP has done so in the United States through TikTok. In fact, when U.S. national security officials talk about the risk of China manipulating TikTok's algorithm, they refer to it as a "hypothetical" risk—a hypothetical risk. This is the real objection, an objection to the political content, the most valuable and protected speech in a democracy.

We should be very clear about the impact and intent of this legislation. This bill is, for all intents and purposes, a ban on TikTok, and it is intended to suppress disfavored speech on the platform, plain and simple. We could see that in the cross-examination—the questioning in the House of

Representatives hearing—on this subject.

For my colleagues who are awake to this reality, they may, nevertheless, believe that such speech suppression is a small cost to pay to keep Americans safe. To them, I urge a strong note of caution. The defense that a little speech suppression is necessary when our national security is at stake is ultimately un-American. This reasoning may seem convincing, but American history has too many examples of controversial laws that ultimately infringe on civil liberties in the name of national security. In the United States, we often look back on these episodes with regret. We should not add TikTok to that history.

Don't get me wrong. TikTok has its problems. No. 1, TikTok poses a serious risk to the privacy and mental health of our young people. In fact, TikTok paid a fine for violating my Children's Online Privacy Protection Act just 5 years ago. But that problem isn't unique to TikTok, and it certainly doesn't justify a TikTok ban, which is what we heard over and over again in the House of Representatives in their hearing on this issue. The reason is that YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat are making our children sick, as well, and exploiting our children and teenagers and their information for profit. American companies are doing the same thing, too, to children and teenagers in our country, as is TikTok.

So why aren't we thinking of this as a common goal that we are going to have in order to protect those teenagers and children?

If the bill's supporters truly wanted to protect the well-being of our young people, they would broaden their lens and address the youth mental health crisis plaguing our children and teenagers that has, in part, been caused by Big Tech in the United States—in the United States—along with TikTok.

I want you to hear the statistics. To my colleagues, it is powerful. One in three high school girls in the United States just 2 years ago considered suicide. At least 1 in 10 American high school teenage girls attempted suicide that year—attempted suicide. Amongst LGBTQ youth, the number is more like 1 in 5 attempted suicides just 2 years ago.

Now, it is not exclusively because of social media, what TikTok, Instagram, Facebook, Discord—all of them are doing it, but it plays a big role according to our own Centers for Disease Control. It plays a big role according to our own Surgeon General. It plays a big role, and we should be talking about that out here. That is a clear and present danger. That is not a hypothetical danger. That is not a hypothetical threat that may occur sometime in the long, distant future. It is happening right now. If we are talking about TikTok, we should be talking about all the other companies at the same time.

Instead of suppressing speech on a single application, we should be addressing the root causes of the mental health crisis by targeting Big Tech's pernicious privacy invasion business model of teenagers and children in our country. We could be passing our bipartisan Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act and banning targeted ads to kids and teens on TikTok and everywhere else.

My legislation with Senator BILL CASSIDY has been intensely vetted, passed through Senate committee, and is supported by the chair and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee. And unlike a TikTok ban, it addresses the problem that is universally recognized, the compromised health and well-being of all of our children and teenagers.

Today, if you hear out on the floor Senators talking about the impact TikTok is having upon young people in our country, it is a good question, and we should be dealing with it, but you can't deal with it just by talking about TikTok. You have to talk about every American company that actually created the model that has led to this mental health crisis, and we are not doing that today. That is something that is a clear and present danger right now, not a hypothetical threat in the future, which is what we are actually doing by passing this legislation.

Instead of protecting young people online, we are censoring their speech, and this is a grave mistake. We should be having a much bigger discussion about what the implications of this legislation are for the future. I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the opportunity to come out here on the Senate floor to talk about this very important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. In a few hours here, the press headlines are going to read that the Senate just passed the Ukraine funding bill. That is what they will call it. This bill is about a lot more than just Ukraine. There is a lot in this bill, and I want to go through some of it.

First of all, it provides something I have strongly supported, which is providing, in this case, \$26 billion to the State of Israel to defeat Hamas, to defend itself against its enemies. This is actually something we tried to pass on its own or could have passed on its own months ago. It was blocked. It was held hostage for Ukraine funding, but it is something we should have done months ago.

It is interesting. I think Israel, in and of itself, is a miracle country. On the first day of its existence, it was invaded, I believe, by 12 separate armies. The whole world thought they would be overrun and defeated very quickly, and they survived. And they have throughout their entire existence had to deal with the fact that everywhere they turn, they have enemies all around them.

It also happens to be the only pro-American democracy in the Middle East. Today, it is engaged in a battle to not just defeat these vicious criminals and terrorists who committed a slaughter on the 7th of October of last year, but they also have to deal with rockets being launched against them from Lebanon. You have 90-something thousand, potentially, Israelis permanently displaced in their own country. They can't go back to where they live in the northern part of their country. And then there is the threat from Iran and the threat from all the terror groups—Hezbollah and the like—that are constantly targeting Israel and then having to face all the things that are happening around the world, as well, in this effort to delegitimize their right to be a Jewish State.

I am a strong supporter of Israel's defense. We should have done this weeks and months ago, and it could have been done as its own bill, but it was held hostage.

This bill provides, as well, \$8 billion to help nations in the Indo-Pacific, particularly Taiwan, and the purpose of that is to build up the military capacity of our partners in the region, frankly, to dissuade and prevent the Chinese Communist Party from starting a war in the Indo-Pacific that would make the one going on in Europe look like child's play—far more dangerous.

By the way, that is something I have been trying to do since 2019. I believe I was the first Member of Congress to call for a banning—not a banning of TikTok, a banning of ByteDance, which is the company that owns TikTok. If ByteDance sells TikTok, TikTok could continue to operate. But we should not have a company operating in the United States with the algorithm that it has and the access to the data that it has that powers the algorithm. We should not have a company like that operating in the United States that happens to do whatever the Chinese Communist Party tells them to do.

But the reason why the headlines are going to be about Ukraine funding is because that is the part of this bill that, frankly, has been controversial and has people who oppose it.

I, personally, believe it is in the national interest of the United States to help Ukraine. Ukraine was invaded, not once but twice, by Vladimir Putin. I supported Ukraine in helping Ukraine back in 2014 when they were first invaded by Putin; and President Obama would only supply them with blankets and meals, ready-to-eat. And I support continuing to help them now to defend themselves. They didn't start this war. I support helping them defend themselves to the extent we can afford it and to the extent we can sustain it.

But while this invasion of Ukraine most certainly poses a national security risk to the United States and a risk to our country, the invasion of America across our southern border is even more important. It is even more a severe threat.

Today, and every single day for the last 3 years, thousands of people—many if not most of whom we know very little about—are pouring into the United States across our southern border.

I made it clear months ago that while I support helping Ukraine, I would only vote to do so if the President issued Executive orders that would help stop this. It was his Executive orders ordering us not to enforce immigration laws that created the incentive and the driver that has led to this crisis and only that. Only Executive orders to begin to enforce our immigration laws will allow us to stop what is happening now.

But the President continues to refuse to issue those Executive orders. He continues to refuse to enforce our immigration laws, and so the crisis continues. And sadly, just a few moments ago, we took a vote here that basically says that we here in the Senate will not be allowed to vote on amendments to make changes to this bill.

So we are left with the choice. I am left with this choice. If I want to help Israel, if I want to help Taiwan, if I want to ban ByteDance from operating TikTok in the United States, then I have to drop my demand that the President enforce our immigration laws, and, by the way, I have to vote for billions of dollars to be spent on all kinds of programs around the world that I will describe in a moment, including for people who are illegally entering this country. This is moral extortion.

First of all, 9 million people over 3 years—that is how many have entered our country. This is not immigration. We should always be a country that welcomes immigration. It enriches our country. Controlled immigration, in which we control how many people come, who comes, knowing enough about them—that is immigration. But 9 million people and counting in 3 years? That is mass migration, and mass migration is never good. There is never such a thing as positive mass migration, particularly of 9 million people in 3 years. At a time when our country, from the inside and the outside, is being infiltrated by people and by movements that seek to destroy America, mass migration is catastrophically dangerous.

Last week, in a coordinated effort—and it was a coordinated effort; they admitted it—to cause the most economic impact possible in the United States, at least until our leaders abandoned Israel—that was their demand—we had pro-terrorist mobs, which is what they are—these are not protesters; these are pro-terrorist mobs—shut down traffic on an interstate highway in Oregon. They blocked passengers from getting to the airport in Chicago and Seattle. They closed down the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco.

At this very moment—right now, as I speak on the Senate floor—at some of

our most prestigious universities, their campuses are closed because they have been taken over by pro-terrorist mobs, chanting things and harassing Jewish students to go back to Poland, they say. Others are chanting: "Go Hamas. We love you. We support your rockets too." Others—I have heard these chants—here it goes: "We say justice. You say how. Burn Tel Aviv to the ground."

The situation has gotten so intolerable that, just 2 days ago, a rabbi advised Jewish students to leave Columbia University and go home for their safety.

This morning, I got a text message from a friend—a Jewish friend—and I read something I never thought I would ever have to read. Here is what he wrote me:

I have to tell you, for the first time in my life, I see Jewish people scared for their safety and considering exit strategies from the USA, including buying homes in foreign countries and looking to liquidate USA assets.

I never thought I would ever read that from anybody in America.

These mobs, by the way, don't just want to destroy Israel. They want to destroy America. Some of these mobs are out there chanting "death to America" in the streets of American cities.

As for one of the mob leaders at one of these riots, this is what he said into a microphone:

It is not just "Genocide Joe" that has to go; it is the entire system that has to go. Any system that would allow such atrocities and devility to happen and would support it—such a system does not deserve to exist on God's Earth.

Do you know what system he is talking about? This system—our system, our system of government—that is what he was talking about.

Where did all of this come from? How did all of this happen from one day to the next? How can things that we once only saw happening in the streets of Tehran, manufactured by the evil regime—how are those things now being chanted in our streets in our country? Where did this come from? The clues are everywhere.

Hamas and Hezbollah have been very, very public about how these violent, anti-Israel, anti-Semitic mobs are part of their strategy to intimidate American leaders to support policies that will help destroy Israel.

Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terror groups have repeatedly called on their supporters around the world to protest "in cities everywhere," and they boast about how their friends—or who they call their "friends on the global left"—were actually now responding to their calls.

By the way, they openly brag. This is all coming from interviews that they do on television programs that can be monitored. They openly brag that this is "because of the introduction of colonialism, racism, and slavery studies into history curricula."

They go on to say that many young Americans have been—this is my term,

a term I read today in the Wall Street Journal—have been groomed to "support armed resistance," to support intifada in the United States.

By the way, it is not just the mobs that we are seeing. Beyond that, as the Director of the FBI has acknowledged, ISIS generates income—they generate revenue—by running a human smuggling ring that brings migrants to the United States.

Just the bare minimum common sense would lead you to conclude that, if ISIS has a business to smuggle migrants into the United States, why wouldn't they use that to smuggle a few terrorists here to do in America what they did in Moscow a few weeks ago?

So we have Hamas, and we have Hezbollah, and we have all of these terror groups encouraging and supporting violent mobs calling for intifada inside America. We already have people here, on student visas, calling for "Death to America," and ISIS controls a migrant smuggling ring that they can use to bring people into the United States to conduct attacks.

But if I want to help Israel, if I want to help Taiwan, if I want to help Ukraine, if I want to ban TikTok, I have to agree; I have to vote to do nothing to stop thousands of people a day whom we know literally nothing about—just allow them to come across our border and be released into our country.

As far as some of the money that is being spent all over the world, I have always supported the United States being engaged in the world, and I continue to be, but I ask you this: I have senior citizens, and I have veterans, and they call my office, and they call our offices, and they say: I have nowhere to live. Housing is too expensive.

I met a senior, a couple of days ago, in his eighties. He still has to work nights as a security guard, and he literally lives in a mobile home—not even a mobile home, in like a trailer parked in someone's backyard.

These people call. They have lived in this country their whole lives. They have served our country. They call for help, and the most we can often do is help get them on a waiting list for section 8 housing. This is a problem that exists in America right now.

But if I want to help Israel, if I want to help Taiwan, if I want to help Ukraine, if I want to ban TikTok, I have to vote for spending billions of dollars to give to charity groups so they can fly people around the country here and put them up in hotel rooms or so they can help for resettlement in another country.

We have rich countries in the Middle East, allies of ours. Their leaders own some of the largest yachts in the world. Some of their leaders own some of the most expensive horses you could possibly buy in the world. They have built some of the most extravagant and luxurious resorts on the planet in some of these countries. These are rich coun-

tries and strong supporters of the Palestinian cause, as they call it.

But if I want to help Israel, if I want to help Taiwan, if I want to help Ukraine, if I want to ban TikTok, I have to vote to send American taxpayer money to deal with the catastrophe that has been created by Hamas in Gaza—100 percent by Hamas. There was no war. There was a ceasefire before Hamas crossed over and slaughtered and raped and kidnapped. But now the American taxpayer is on the hook.

Look, I understand that, in our Republic, in our system of government, compromise is necessary. We have to do it all the time. I have passed a lot of bills—I am very proud of that—and every one of them involved my finding someone from a different ideological perspective, from the other side of the aisle. You have to compromise, meaning you are not going to get everything you want. You are going to have to give them something they want in exchange for something you want or you may have to change the way you wrote what you want. That is what you have to do in order to pass laws.

I do understand compromise—I do—but this bill is not that. This bill is not a compromise. This bill is basically saying that, if I don't agree to drop my demands that the President secure our border, if I don't agree to spend billions of taxpayer dollars all over the world to resettle people here and in other places in the midst of our own migratory crisis—if I don't agree to all of that, then Israel and Taiwan and Ukraine do not get the help they need and that I support, and TikTok does not get banned. This is not compromise. This is legislative blackmail, and I will not vote for blackmail.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, does anybody believe that hashtag "StandwithKashmir" is organically more popular than hashtag "TaylorSwift"? No, of course not, but right now, on TikTok, hashtag "StandwithKashmir" has 20 times more posts than hashtag "TaylorSwift."

This is a direct example of the Chinese Communist Party using their control of TikTok to skew public opinion on foreign events in their favor. China is our chief foreign adversary in the world. They are a threat to our national security, our values, our economy, and the CCP works tirelessly every day to undermine our entire way of life. TikTok is one of the ways they are doing that.

I understood that as Governor. That is why I was the first Governor in the country to ban the use of TikTok on State devices back in 2020, and that is why I will be voting for this bill today. Today, we are taking action to end the Chinese Communist Party's ability to own and operate TikTok in the United States.

TikTok's active users include over 150 million Americans. That is almost half of our country's entire population. It has become the most influential news platform in the country. The percentage of TikTok users who regularly get their news from this app has doubled since 2020. The problem, however, is that what that news is, what slant that news has, is being entirely controlled by the Chinese Communist Party. We don't allow this for TV stations or radio stations. You have to be a U.S. citizen to own a TV station or a radio station in this country. Why are we letting our greatest adversary in the world own a news platform?

TikTok, under CCP ownership, promotes or demotes content based on whether it aligns with the CCP's interests and its agenda. This has major, real-world implications here at home and around the world.

Look at what is happening on our college campuses right now in this country. Pro-Hamas activists are taking over public spaces and making it impossible for campuses to operate. Jewish students are being told to leave campus because their universities can't guarantee their safety. There are a lot of other things wrong with this, including the failure to prioritize student safety over appeasement of terrorist sympathizers.

But why is this happening?

Well, let's look at where young people are getting their news. Nearly a third of adults 18 to 29 years old—these young people in the United States—are regularly getting their news exclusively from TikTok. Pro-Palestinian and pro-Hamas hashtags are generating 50 times the views on TikTok right now despite the fact that polling shows Americans overwhelmingly support Israel over Hamas. These videos have more reach than the top 10 news websites combined.

This is not a coincidence. The Chinese Communist Party is doing this on purpose. They are pushing this racist agenda with the intention of undermining our democratic values, and if you look at what is happening at Columbia University and other campuses across the country right now, they are winning.

I want to talk about another example that means a lot to folks back home whom I represent in Nebraska.

We know that the COVID-19 pandemic originated in China. Instagram and TikTok currently have about the same number of users in the United States; However, if you look at the content, there is a 400-to-1 ratio for content that blames China for this pandemic on Instagram compared to TikTok. Again, Instagram has 400 times the number of posts blaming China for COVID than on TikTok.

On TikTok, the Chinese Communist Party has quashed dissent or criticism. They have done this for Tiananmen Square—which, again, on Instagram, there are 80 times the posts around Tiananmen Square than there are on

TikTok, and on Hong Kong, there are 180 times the posts on Hong Kong being censored or being repressed versus on TikTok.

The Federal Government's job is to protect Americans against foreign and domestic threats. TikTok is a major foreign threat. The bill we are passing today puts an end to that. This bill ensures that our citizens are not improperly targeted, surveilled, or influenced by any foreign adversary.

Right now, the major threat is TikTok, but China can make another TikTok. That is why, instead of going after any specific app, this bill simply prohibits marketplaces, like the App Store or Google Play, from hosting applications controlled by foreign adversaries. This is just common sense.

It also establishes a narrow framework to protect against future apps. It allows the Federal Government to require divestment of applications controlled by a foreign adversary or face a prohibition on app stores and be denied access to web-hosting services in the United States. That power has very strict guidelines. The authority can only be exercised if an application is under the control of an adversarial foreign entity, presents a national security threat, and has over 1 million active users annually.

It also protects individual users. No enforcement action can be taken against individual users of banned applications. Civil enforcement actions may only be initiated against companies that violate the act.

The bill incentivizes China to divest from TikTok or TikTok will face a ban. If TikTok is divested from the CCP, it can continue to operate in the United States. If the restrictions are already in effect and TikTok is divested later, the restrictions will be lifted.

I believe the Chinese Communist Party is the greatest threat we face in this Nation. They are fighting smart, trying to undermine us from within, and using technology like TikTok to do it. Together, by passing this bill, it is my hope that we will send a loud message and a clear message that America is not open to the CCP for influence.

We are taking a stand to protect our own, protect our values, and end a major Communist Chinese Party tool to attack us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, long before I ever thought of running for office, I was a little kid born in a West Virginia coal mining town called Beckley. My sister and I ended up going to the same grade school not too far from our house.

As a kid, I was pretty well behaved and didn't get into much trouble, but in the first grade, I got in a fight. I got in a fight because some kid was picking on my sister, who was a year older, in the second grade. He was a much bigger

guy, and it was not a fair fight. I got involved in it and took him out with one swing. That was the last punch that I think I had thrown in anger. But I didn't like the idea of a big guy, a bully, trying to push around somebody, whether it was my sister or not. I have never cared for that in other situations growing up and watching the behavior of people in all kinds of different situations.

Our country, if you go back to our founding, if you recall, we took on the biggest nation on Earth, the strongest nation on Earth, Great Britain. It was not a fair fight. They had us badly outgunned, outnumbered. And somebody came to our rescue. The persons who came to our rescue were the French. If it weren't for the French, we would still be, maybe, a colony of Great Britain. But the French stood up and said: We are here to help.

There is a time for people to stand—countries to stand by and allow things to happen, and there is a time to stand up and be heard. We were helped as a nation over 200 years ago by the French. We have, I think, a moral obligation to help make sure that Ukraine has an opportunity to continue to go forward and to be a democratic nation. They are a democratic nation. They actually choose—they elect their own leaders. Vladimir Putin doesn't care very much for that. He thinks they shouldn't be allowed to do so and has decided to use force to be able to take away the opportunity to be a free nation.

We have a couple of opportunities. We can criticize Putin, the Russians, for what they are doing or we can actually do something about it.

I think I may be the last Vietnam veteran serving here in the U.S. Senate. When we go out from here, I like to run. Many, many mornings when I have gone for a run near the Capitol, I have run out to the Lincoln Memorial. On my way back, I run right by the Vietnam Memorial. It is black granite. There are names of I want to say maybe 59,000 people who died in that war I served in.

We got involved in that war. It was not a popular war. It wasn't popular with my generation. But we got involved in that war. The communists in North Vietnam were coming in and trying to take over the south. We ended up, for better or for worse, aligning with the south. We know what the outcome turned out to be. A lot of people died. A lot of people died in that war. I know a number of them, and my guess is my colleagues do as well.

I tell that story because we have a situation here that is not altogether different in which the Ukrainian people, who want to defend themselves—they want to preserve their democracy, and they are willing to make the tough fight if we will help them and the rest of the free world will help them.

God bless our President and leaders of a bunch of other countries who said: We are not going to walk away and let

Putin have his way and take away the democracy of the people of Ukraine. We are going to help them. We are going to help them not by sending—as we did in the Vietnam war—our own young soldiers, sailors, and airmen. We are not going to send them to Ukraine to defend Ukraine. We are going to send them munitions. We are going to send them drones. We are going to send them missiles. We are going to send them ships and aircraft. We will do that.

That is really all the Ukrainians are asking for. That is all they are asking for. They are asking for that kind of help. We ought to provide it. We ought to provide it.

I used to fly missions. I was a naval flight officer, P-3 aircraft mission commander. We used to fly a lot of surveillance missions around the world, track Soviet submarines everywhere across the planet. We also flew a lot of missions off the coast of Vietnam and a lot of missions in the South China Sea.

Even decades ago when I was flying missions with my squad in the South China Sea, we were concerned about the militarization of the South China Sea by China and China taking over islands that were not theirs, that maybe had been claimed by the Philippines and other nations. The Chinese were taking them over with the idea of militarizing them and ultimately making maritime trafficking—the moving of ships and aircraft through the South China Sea—more difficult.

We used to fly missions in the Vietnam war. We used to fly missions out of Vietnam. I was commissioned in 1968. By that time, we pulled a lot of land-based aircraft—B-52s, P-3s, just land-based aircraft with the Navy—we pulled them out of Vietnam, and we flew our missions out of Thailand, a big Air Force base.

We flew missions out of Taiwan, places in the southern part of the island, Tainan, which is an Air Force base in Taiwan. I had a chance to be deployed there from time to time. I got to know some of the people who lived in Taiwan—wonderful people, lovely people. Do you know what they were concerned about all those years ago? They were concerned about China coming in and taking them over, trying to take away their independence—not just militarize the South China Sea and transfer a bunch of islands into bases, if you will, for the Chinese military but actually take over a democratic country that has never been a part of China and make them do the bidding of China.

Mark my words. If Vladimir Putin is successful in prevailing in Ukraine, if he is successful, Taiwan will be next. As sure as I am standing here today, President Xi, the leader of China who says Taiwan is theirs, will hunt right into the fight. That would trigger a real-world conflict between them and us. It wouldn't be good for either of us, but we would, I think, be beholden to defend Taiwan.

Why don't we bring a halt to that idea of China getting involved and trying to come after Taiwan and having to commit our own troops? Why don't we just take care of it by making sure the people of Ukraine have the ships, the aircraft, the tanks, the missiles, and the armament they need to prevail on their own against Russia?

We wouldn't have to commit our own troops. We wouldn't have to worry about the kind of body bags that came back from Vietnam when I was serving in the Vietnam war. We would end up with a free Ukraine, and I think we would have a much better chance of making sure that the folks in Taiwan would continue to enjoy their independence as well.

I am wearing a lapel pin here that people ask me about from time to time—even today. They say: What kind of lapel pin is that? It is an American flag, and it is a Ukrainian flag as well.

A couple of days after Russia invaded Ukraine, I sent somebody over from my staff to the Ukrainian Embassy to get this lapel pin. I have worn it every day since, every day since.

And I get a lot of people—I go back and forth on the train, as my colleagues know. I live in Delaware and go back and forth on the train almost every day. It is amazing how many people I run into on the train, at the train stations, or traveling around the country. They will say: What is that that you are wearing? And when I explain it, I don't recall one person ever saying: You shouldn't wear that, or, That is a bad idea. People say: Good for you. Good for you. We ought to help them.

The Presiding Officer may recall a couple of months ago when—in fact, this year and maybe even last year—President Zelenskyy came here. Not to this Chamber, but he came into the Old Senate Chamber just down the hall. And he spoke in a closed room to Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, in very emotional, very compelling language where he laid out the situation that they faced, laid out how important our support was and how grateful that they were for us being willing to stand by them, stand up for them.

And his speech was interrupted any number of times by standing ovations by Democrats and by Republicans. I happened to be sitting right in front of his podium when he was speaking, about as far away as our stenographer is standing from me today. And during the course of his speech, a couple of times he made eye contact, and I tried to give him encouragement in a sort of way. And I think I did.

But when it was over, he walked away from the podium, and I walked up to him and I shook his hand and I hugged him. I don't get to hug international leaders every day, but I hugged him and he hugged me. And I said to him, "You are a hero." I said to him, "You are a hero." And he reached over and touched my lapel pin, and he said to me, "No, no. You are our heroes." He said, "You are our heroes."

Now, I just want to say, in the months that have passed since then when we have floundered, kind of waffling around and trying to figure out how we are going to continue to provide aid and support for Ukraine, and I thought—he was back a couple of months later, and I had a chance to talk to him again. And again he said, "You are our heroes; you are our heroes," talking about us in this body and the House of Representatives.

And I said to my staff later that day and my colleagues later in the day: You know what—it is funny—I don't feel much like a hero.

This was a couple of months ago when he was here because we were on the verge of pulling the plug on the aid and the assistance we were going to provide for Ukraine. There was a very real chance that we could pull the plug, take away the help, and Putin and the Russians would just move in and take over. And I didn't feel like a hero with that sort of staring us in the face.

When we leave this week and go back to our districts, our States, and our homes across the country and reflect back on what we have done, what we have decided, I want to feel like a hero. I want all of us to feel like a hero and a heroine and deserve to be feeling that way.

I am a great student of World War II, and some of my colleagues are as well. I remember a time when Churchill was leading the allied world and rising and standing up and warning against the threat that Germany provided for the rest of us, urging us to be brave and be strong, be vigilant, come to the aid of Europe.

There was another guy named Chamberlain whose name is sort of thought of in terms of appeasement. Churchill: engage, defend, be strong. Chamberlain: appease. We have a chance here to be more like Churchill and less like Chamberlain. And I hope and pray, when we vote here today—maybe even tomorrow—that is exactly what we will do.

I want us to make not just the folks in Ukraine, Taiwan, and—I don't want them just to be grateful. I want the people who we serve, who elect us and sent us here—I want them to be proud of what we have done and the work that we have done on their behalf and on behalf of these other countries who need our help.

We are the beacon for democracy for the world. Our Constitution is the longest living constitution in the history of the world. It lays out how the democracy should operate; and for all these years, we have. We need to hold that to our heart, and we need to do the right thing.

The last point I would say is this: My mom was a deeply religious woman. I have shared this with some of my colleagues before. She would drag my sister and me, in the West Virginia coal-mining town in West Virginia—she would drag us to church every Sunday morning, every Sunday night, every

Wednesday night, and even on Thursday night. And then we would go home, and she would turn on the TV and we would watch Billy Graham on television. She wanted us to have a deep faith, but she really wanted us to hold dear the Golden Rule, the idea that we should treat other people the way we want to be treated.

How would we want to be treated if we were the Ukrainian people today? How would we want to be treated if we were Taiwanese people today, facing the kind of threats that they face? We would want the rest of the free world to come to their aid—not to send troops, not to send fighter pilots and all, but give them the tools that they need to take on this fight and to win it. When we do that, if we do that—and I am encouraged that we will—we will deserve the words of President Zelenskyy when he said, “You are our hero. You are our hero.” Let’s be that hero.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, with respect to my colleagues who voted in the other direction on this particular piece of legislation, let me offer some serious concerns about the direction we are headed as a country and about what this vote represents in terms of American readiness; American capacity to defend itself and its allies in the future; and, most importantly, the American leadership’s ability to acknowledge where we really are as a country: our strengths, our weaknesses, what can be built upon, and what must be rebuilt entirely.

I am extraordinarily aware of a couple of historical analogies that should inform this debate, one that seems to always inform debate and another that seems to never come up. Now, opponents of further aid in Ukraine—and I count myself among them—say that this is a Chamberlain vs. Churchill kind of moment. You just heard my distinguished colleague from Delaware make this observation.

With no disrespect to my friend from Delaware, we need to come up with some different analogies in this Chamber. We need to be able to understand history as not just World War II replaying itself over and over and over again. Vladimir Putin is not Adolf Hitler. It doesn’t mean he is a good guy, but he has significantly less capability than the German leader did in the late 1930s. America is not the America of the late 1930s or the early 1940s. We possess substantially less manufacturing might, in relative terms, than we did almost 100 years ago. And most importantly, there are many ways in which the analogy falls apart even if you ignore America’s capacity, Russia’s capacity, and the like.

There are ways in which we should be looking at other historical analogies, and I would like to point to just a couple of those right now. The Second World War, of course, was the most

devastating war, arguably, in the history of the world. Close behind it is the First World War. And what is the lesson of the First World War? It is not that there are always people appeasing the bad guys or fighting against the bad guys. The lesson of World War I is that, if you are not careful, you can blunder yourself into a broader regional conflict that kills tens of millions of people, many of them innocent. In 1914, alliances, politics, and the failure of statesmanship dragged two rival blocs of militaries into a catastrophic conflict.

In the past week alone, the Council on Foreign Relations has published an essay calling for European troops to sustain Ukraine’s lines as Ukraine struggles to raise troops. Some European leaders have said they might send troops to support Ukraine in a conflict.

Perhaps the history lesson we should be teaching ourselves isn’t Chamberlain vs. Churchill. Perhaps we should be asking ourselves how an entire continent, how an entire world’s set of leaders allowed itself to blunder into world conflict.

Is there possibly a diplomatic solution to the conflict in Ukraine? Yes, I believe that there is. Indeed, as multiple people—both critics of Vladimir Putin and supporters of Ukraine—have pointed out, there was, in fact, a peace deal on the table approximately 18 months ago. What happened to it? The Biden administration pushed Zelenskyy to set aside the peace agreement and to engage in a disastrous counteroffensive, a counteroffensive that killed tens of thousands of Ukrainians, that depleted an entire decade’s worth of military stocks, and that has left us in the place that we are now, where every single objective observer of the Ukraine war acknowledges today that the war is going worse for Ukraine than it was 18 months ago.

Could we have avoided it? Yes, we could, and we should have avoided it. We would have saved a lot of lives, we would have saved a lot of American weapons, and we would have had this country in a much, much more stable and much better place if we had.

Now, there is another historical analogy that I think is worth pointing out, and that is the historical analogy of the early 2000s. Now, in 2003, I was a high school senior, and I had a political position back then. I believed the propaganda of the George W. Bush administration that we needed to invade Iraq, that it was a war for freedom and democracy, that those who were appeasing Saddam Hussein were inviting a broader regional conflict.

Does that sound familiar to anything that we are hearing today? It is the same exact talking points, 20 years later, with different names. But have we learned anything over the last 20 years? No, I don’t think that we have. We have learned that if we beat our chest instead of engage in diplomacy, that it will somehow produce good outcomes. That is not true. We learned

that if we talk incessantly about World War II, we can bully people and cause them to ignore their basic moral impulses and lead the country straight into catastrophic conflict.

Now, as one of the great ironies of my time in the U.S. Senate for the last 18 months, I have been accused by multiple people of being a stooge of Vladimir Putin. Well, I take issue to that because in 2003, yes, I made the mistake of supporting the Iraq war. I also, a couple months later, enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps, one of two kids from my small block on McKinley Street in Middletown, OH, to enlist in the marines just that year. I served my country honorably, and I saw when I went to Iraq that I had been lied to, that the promises of the foreign policy establishment of this country were a complete joke.

Just a few days ago, we saw our friends in the House waving Ukrainian flags on the floor of the U.S. House—which, I would love to see them waving the American flag with such gusto. And I won’t complain about the fact that it was a violation of the rules of decorum, though it certainly was. But it reminded me—it reminded me—and I believe, 2005, maybe it was 2006—when that same exact Chamber, the Members were raising their fingers, stained with purple ink, to commemorate the incredible Iraqi elections that had happened in 2005.

I was in Iraq for both the constitutional referendum of October of 2005 and the parliamentary elections of December of 2005. And I remember the people in Iraq, happily voting, raising their fingers in the air.

What I am saying is, not that the people of Iraq were bad or that they were bad for voting in their elections, what I am saying is the obsessive focus on moralism—democracy is good, Saddam Hussein is bad; America, good; tyranny, bad—that is no way to run a foreign policy, because then you end up with people waving their fingers on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, even though they have walked their country into a disaster.

And I say this as a proud Republican. I say this as somebody who supports Republican colleagues who agree with me and disagree with me on this issue. It is, perhaps, the most shameful period in the Republican Party’s history of the last 40 years that we supported George W. Bush in the prosecution at military conflict.

Now, my excuse is that I was a high school senior. What is the excuse of many people who were in this Chamber or in the House of Representatives at the time and are now singing the exact same song when it comes to Ukraine?

Have we learned nothing? Have we updated nothing about our mental thinking, about the standard that we apply for when we should get involved in military conflicts? Have we learned nothing about how precarious and precious U.S. life is and other life around the world and that we should be a little bit more careful about protecting it?

Back then, in 2003, we actually had an anti-war left in this country. Now, nobody, really, is anti-war. Nobody is worried about prosecuting military conflicts overseas. Nobody seems to worry about unintended consequences. But Iraq had a lot of unintended consequences—a lot of consequences that were, maybe, foreseen by a few smart people; a lot of them that weren't foreseen by anybody—one of which is that we gave Iran a regional ally instead of a regional competitor.

Did George W. Bush stand before the American people and say: We are going to invade this country and give one of our strongest enemies in the region a massive regional ally? Did we think that 20 years later, Iraq would become a base to attack American troops in the Middle East? Did we think it would empower one of the most dangerous regimes in that area of the world?

We are now funding Israel, as I think that we should, to defend itself against attacks that are originating in Iran when the same people who are calling for more war all over the world were the same people who caused us to start a war that empowered Iran.

There is a certain irony in this, a certain sadness that I have that we never seem to learn the lessons of the past. We never seem to ask ourselves why it is that we keep on screwing up American foreign policy, why it is that we keep on making our country weaker, even though we say we intend to make it stronger.

Here is another thing that we should learn from the Iraq war, something that I as a Christian care a lot about and I think that even many of my colleagues who are not Christians, many of my fellow Americans who are not Christians, should care about. The United States remains, to this day, the world's largest majority Christian nation. We are the largest Christian nation by population in the entire world. And yet what are the fruits—"By your fruits ye shall know them," the Bible tells us. What are the fruits of American foreign policy when it comes to Christian populations all over the world over the last few decades?

Well, in Iraq, before we invaded, there were 1.5 million Christians in Iraq. Many of them were ancient communities—Chaldeans, people who trace their lineage and their ancestors to people who knew the literal Apostles of Jesus Christ.

Now, nearly every single one of those historical Christian communities is gone. That is the fruits of American labor in Iraq—a regional ally of Iran and the eradication and decimation of one of the oldest Christian communities in the world.

Is that what we were told was going to happen? Did the American people—the world's largest majority Christian nation in the world—did they think that is what they were getting themselves into? I certainly didn't. And I am ashamed that I didn't, but we did. We did all of those things because we

weren't thinking about how war and conflict lead to unexpected places.

Now, it sounds farfetched, I am sure, when we apply these lessons to the Ukraine conflict. Certainly—certainly—this has no risk of spilling over into a broader regional or even world conflict. Well, certainly not, in fact. I was being sarcastic. It obviously does. As European allies propose sending troops to fight Vladimir Putin, drawing NATO further into this conflict, yes, the Ukraine war threatens to become a broader regional conflict.

What about the assault on traditional Christian communities? Just today, the Ukrainian parliament is considering enacting a law that would dispossess large numbers of Christian churches and Christian communities in the country of Ukraine.

Now, they say it is because these churches are too close to Russia. That is what they say. And maybe some of the churches are too close to Russia. But you don't deprive an entire religious community of their religious freedom because some of its adherents don't agree with you about the relevant conflict of the day.

I believe, standing here, that this war will eventually lead to the displacement of a massive Christian community in Ukraine. And that will be our shame—our shame in this Chamber for not seeing it coming; our shame in this Chamber for doing nothing to stop it; our shame for refusing to use the hundreds of billions of dollars that we send to Ukraine as leverage to ensure and guarantee real religious freedom.

The other thing—one final point on this historical contingency point. It was true then, and it was true today, there is this weird way where the debate in this country has gotten warped, where people can't engage in good-faith disagreement with our Ukraine policy. You will immediately be attacked for being on the wrong team, for being on the wrong side.

I remember, as a young conservative high schooler, how opponents from the conservative side of the Iraq War: Well, you are just all for Saddam Hussein, and you believe that Saddam Hussein should be allowed to continue to brutalize the Iraqi people; you have no love for these innocent Iraqi people; you don't believe in America. And the same exact arguments are being applied today, that you are a fan of Vladimir Putin if you don't like our Ukraine policy, or you are a fan of some terrible tyrannical idea because you think maybe America should be more focused on the border of its own country than on someone else's.

This war fever, this inability for us to actually process what is going on in our world to make rational decisions is the scariest part of this entire debate.

You see people who served their country, who have been advocating for good public policies—agree or disagree with them—for their entire careers smeared as agents of a foreign government simply because they don't like

what we are doing in Ukraine. That is not good-faith debate; that is slander. And it is the type of slander that is going to lead us to make worse and worse decisions.

It should make us all feel pretty weird when you see your fellow Americans making an argument, and the response to that argument is not: Well, no, no, here is why you are wrong, or, Here is substantively why I disagree with you. But they fling their finger in your face and say: You are a Putin puppet; you are an asset of a foreign regime.

This way of making decisions democratically is how we bankrupt this country and start a third world war. We should stop doing it.

So let me make some arguments for why our Ukraine policy doesn't make any sense. The first, we do not have the manufacturing base to support a land war in Europe. This must be appreciated. And it is interesting, when I was making this argument that we didn't have the manufacturing base to support a military conflict in Eastern Europe, to support a military conflict in East Asia, and then also to actually support our own national defense, that America was spread too thin, I was commonly met 18 months ago with a very common rejoinder. I was told that the Ukraine war represented a fraction of a fraction of American GDP, that we could do everything all at once and it would not stress America's capabilities.

Now, everyone seems to agree with me. Now, everyone seems to acknowledge that we are severely limited, not in the number of dollars that we can send to Ukraine—because there are limits there—but in the number of weapons, of artillery shells and missiles, that we don't make enough of the critical weapons of war to send them to all four corners of the world and also keep ourselves safe.

But people will say: Well, J.D. is right, we need to rebuild the defense industrial base; we need to rebuild our capacity to manufacture weapons. But now the desire and the need to manufacture more weapons is an argument for the Ukraine conflict instead of an argument against it.

It is interesting how advocates of this conflict always find a new justification when the justification of a few months ago falls apart.

So let's deal with some very cold, hard facts. Ukrainians have argued publicly—their defense minister has said this—that they require thousands of air defense interceptor missiles every single year in order to keep themselves safe from Russian attack. Do we make thousands? No.

If this supplemental passes, as I expect it will in a few hours, we will go from making about 550 PAC-3 interceptor missiles to about 650. And there are a few other weapons systems that could provide protection in terms of air defense. But Ukraine's air defenses are being overwhelmed right now because

we don't make enough air defenses. Europe doesn't make enough air defenses. And, by the way, we are being stretched in multiple different directions.

The Israelis need them to push back against Iranian attacks. The Ukrainians need them to push back against Russian attacks. We may, God forbid, need them. And the Taiwanese would need them if China ever invaded. We don't make enough air defense weapons and neither do the Europeans. And so rather than stretching ourselves too thin, America should be focused on the task of diplomacy and making it possible for our friends and our allies to do as much as they can but to recognize the limitations and to ensure that we—most of all, our own people in our own country—can look after our own defense.

It is not just air defense missiles. Martin 155mm artillery shells—these are one of the most critical weapons for the land war in Europe, maybe the single most critical weapon for the land war in Europe. The United States makes a fraction of what the Ukrainians need. And if you combine what the United States provides with what the Europeans are able to provide and what other figures are able to provide, we are massively limited in whether we can help Ukraine close the gap it currently has with Russia.

Now, you have heard senior figures in our defense administration say that unless this bill passes—unless this bill passes—the Ukrainians will face a 10-to-1 disadvantage when it comes to critical munitions like artillery—10 to 1.

What gets less headlines is that currently the Ukrainians have a 5-to-1 disadvantage, and there is no credible pathway to give them anything close to parity. And I am not even talking about this year; I am talking about next year too. During a conversation with the senior national security official of the Biden administration, I was told that if the United States radically ramps up production and if the Europeans radically ramp up production, the Ukrainians will have a 4-to-1 disadvantage in artillery by the end of 2025. And that was treated as good news.

You cannot win a land war in Europe with a 4-to-1 disadvantage in artillery, especially when the country that you are going up against has four times the population that you do.

And, of course, the most important resource in war, even in modern war, is not just air defense missiles and is not just artillery shells; the most important resource is human beings. Human beings still fight our wars, as tragic as that is and as much as we wish that it wasn't true, and Ukraine has a terrible manpower problem too.

The New York Times recently wrote a story about how they had conscripted—perhaps accidentally; I certainly hope so—they conscripted a mentally handicapped person into serv-

ice in their conflict. They have now dropped the conscription age. And, still, they are engaged in draconian measures to conscript people into this conflict. That says nothing about the fact, by the way, that approximately 600,000 military-age men fled the country.

This war is often compared, as I said earlier, to the UK's fight against Nazi Germany. In the height of World War II, did a million Brits—over a million Brits leave Britain to avoid being conscripted by the Germans? I highly doubt it. So there is a deep reserve problem—a reserve of weapons, there aren't enough of them; a reserve of manpower, there aren't enough men.

This is the problem that Ukraine confronts. I say this not to attack the Ukrainians who have fought admirably—many of them have died defending their country. But if we want to respect the sacrifice of the people who have died in this conflict, we have to deal with reality. And the reality is that the longer that this goes on, the more people will needlessly die, the fewer people will actually be left to rebuild the country of Ukraine, and the less capable Ukraine will be of actually functioning as a country in the future.

But I am not just worried about that; I am not just worried about whether Ukraine can win. I also worry about, as I said earlier, unintended consequences. And now we should spend a little bit of time discussing some more of those.

A few things come from our obsessive focus on Ukraine. No. 1, we have, at multiple levels in this Congress, passed pieces of legislation that deal with Ukraine that attempt to explicitly curtail the diplomacy powers of the next Presidential administration. I know we don't often talk so directly about politics, and I am sure I disagree with my friends on the other side of the aisle about who the next President should be, but we want to empower the next President, whoever that is, to actually engage in diplomacy, not make it harder to engage in diplomacy.

Multiple provisions of this legislation—but also other legislation this Chamber has passed and I opposed—try explicitly to tie the next President's hands. Let's just say that the next President, whoever that might be, decides that he wants to stop the killing and engage in diplomacy. This Chamber will be giving a predicate to impeach that next President for engaging in basic diplomacy. Hard to imagine a more ridiculous judgment on the priorities of American leadership that we are already trying to make it impossible for the next President to engage in any measure of diplomacy. That is not leadership, and that is not toughness; that is a blind adherence to a broken foreign policy consensus, which is unfortunately exactly what we have.

The Ukraine supplemental that is, again, likely to be passed in the next few hours, funds Ukraine's border while turning a blind eye to the United

States own border crisis. The bill includes hundreds of millions that could be used to strengthen Ukrainian border security and support the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine. Good for them. I am glad that they care about their own border security.

The supplemental extends benefits for Ukrainian parolees in the United States. It includes \$481 million for refugees and interim assistance, which could be used, in part, for the Office of Refugee Resettlement to provide resettlement assistance to Ukrainians arriving in the United States and also to other organizations that also, because money is fungible, could resettle other migrants from other countries into our country.

So the very same moment that we are supporting the Ukrainians to secure their own border, we are not just ignoring our own border, we are funding NGOs that will worsen Joe Biden's migration crisis. It is completely senseless. Yet that is what we are doing.

Let's talk about something else. This bill includes a provision that is wildly popular called the REPO Act. In short, the REPO Act does something very simple. The REPO Act allows the Treasury Department to seize Russian assets to help them pay for the war. That sounds great. Of course, Russia shouldn't have invaded Ukraine and, of course, they should have to pay for some of the consequences—all of the consequences—that they have created. But ask yourself, are there unintended consequences that come from seizing tens of billions of dollars from foreign assets? In fact, there are.

A number of economists from across the political spectrum have argued that the REPO Act could potentially make it harder to sell U.S. Treasuries. This is something a lot of Americans don't care about. I am sure their eyes might glaze over a little bit. But this country is running almost \$2 trillion deficits every single year. You ask: Where do those \$2 trillion come from? They come from selling Treasury bonds on the open market. That is how we pay for the deficit spending in this country. And what happens when people start to worry that U.S. Treasuries are not a good investment? Well, we have already seen the consequences over the last couple of years. Interest rates go up. Inflation goes up. Home mortgages become more expensive. Are we at least a little bit worried that the bond markets could react negatively to us seizing tens of billions or hundreds of billions of dollars from assets? We should certainly be worried about it because we already can't afford the deficit spending in this country to begin with. Treasury yield rates are already extraordinarily high. Thanks to the Biden spending programs, they have actually shown a remarkable stubbornness over the last few months.

Here is another unintended consequence. Germany is an important American ally, and it has, by some

standards, the fourth or fifth largest economy in the entire world. It is a very, very important country, a very important ally. By the way, it is a beautiful country with beautiful people. But Germany, under the influence of a series of so-called green energy policies, is rapidly deindustrialized.

Germany, by the way, was one of the few countries in the wake of World War II—especially in the seventies, eighties, and nineties—that actually kept its industrial might largely intact. Think about German cars and all the other manufacturing things that come from the country of Germany. Well, Germany is much less powerful in terms of manufacturing today than it was 10 years ago. Why? Because it takes cheap energy to manufacture things. You need cheap energy if you want to manufacture steel. You need cheap energy if you want to manufacture cars. That is one of the reasons, by the way, the manufacturing economy has done so poorly under the Biden administration—because their energy policies don't make any sense.

But Germany should be told that the United States will not subsidize its ridiculous energy policies and its policies that weaken German manufacturing. We should send a message to the Germans that they have to manufacture their own weapons; they have to field their own army; and they have the priority and they have the responsibility to defend Europe from Vladimir Putin or anyone else.

I ask the question: How many mechanized brigades could the German army field today? By some estimates, the answer is zero; by other estimates, the answer is one. So the fourth most powerful economy in the world is unable to field sufficient mechanized brigades to defend itself from Vladimir Putin. Now, this isn't 5 years ago or 10 years ago; this is yesterday. So for 3 years, the Europeans have told us that Vladimir Putin is an existential threat to Europe, and for 3 years they have failed to respond as if that were actually true.

Donald Trump famously told European nations they have to spend more on their own defense. He was chastised by Members of this Chamber for having the audacity to suggest Germany should step up and pay for its own defense. Even today, Germany, by some estimates, fails to hit its 2-percent-of-GDP threshold where it is supposed to spend 2 percent of its economy on military. And even if it hits that 2-percent threshold in 2024, it will have hit it barely after, literally, decades of being chastised. Is it fair that the Americans are forced to front this burden? I don't think that it is.

But I am actually less worried about the fairness and more worried about the signal this sends to Europe. If we keep on carrying a substantial share of the military burden, if we keep on giving the Europeans everything that they want, they are never going to become self-sufficient, and they are never

going to produce sufficient weapons so they can defend their own country.

You hear all the time from folks who support endless funding to Ukraine that unless—that unless—we send resources to Ukraine, Vladimir Putin will march all the way to Berlin or Paris. Well, first of all, this don't make any sense. Vladimir Putin can't get to western Ukraine; how is he going to get all the way to Paris? Second of all, if Vladimir Putin is a threat to Germany and France, if he is a threat to Berlin and Paris, then they should spend more money on military equipment.

Some of my fellow Americans have been lucky enough to travel to Europe. It is a beautiful place. But one of the things that Europeans often say about Americans is that we have way too many guns and way too little healthcare. One of the reasons why we have less healthcare access than the Europeans do is because we subsidize their military and their defense. If the Europeans were forced to step up and provide for their own security, we could actually take care of some more domestic problems at home. No, too many in this Chamber have decided that we should police the entire world. The American taxpayer be damned.

Let me make one final point here, cognizant I have colleagues who wish to speak.

May I ask, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. VANCE. I see my colleague from Florida, so I will be relatively brief here.

For 40 years, this country has made, largely, I would say, a bipartisan mistake. It has allowed our manufacturing might to get offshored and to get outsourced, while simultaneously increasing the commitments that we have all over the world. We basically outsourced our ability to manufacture critical weapons while stepping up our responsibilities to police the world. And, of course, if we are going to police the world, then it is American troops who need those weapons.

With one hand, we have weakened our own country; with the other, we have overextended. There is a certain irony that if you look at the voting records and the commitments of this Chamber, the people who have been most aggressive—my colleagues, some of them my friends—who have been most aggressive sending our good manufacturing jobs to China are now the ones who are most aggressive to assert we can police the world.

What are we supposed to police the world with? Our artillery manufacturing, our weapons, our air defense manufacturing, our basic military industrial complex has become incredibly weakened. And this bill, you will hear people say, fixes it. It doesn't fix it at all. This bill, while it does invest some—and this is a good thing, by the way, it is not all bad—while it does in-

vest some in critical manufacturing of American weapons, it sends those weapons overseas faster than it even replenishes them. This is not a bill to rebuild the defense industrial base; this is a bill to further extend this country.

I will yield the floor, recognizing my friend from Florida wants to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for his hard work and his commitment to making sure he protects our country.

President Biden has shown the American people that he will pander to his anti-Semitic base over supporting Israel. Israel, one of America's greatest allies and the only democracy in the Middle East—the only democracy in the Middle East.

One of President Biden's first actions was to resurrect the failed Iran deal. Since then, he has green-lit billions of dollars in sanctions relief to Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

His pandering can be seen in our cities and on college campuses where radical extremists rally violently in support of Hamas and the extermination of the Jewish people. This cancer has taken over the Democratic Party and caused violence against our Jewish communities.

President Biden has made clear with his decisions that the American people cannot trust his administration. I certainly do not, which is why I am highly concerned that without proper safeguards, the Biden administration will use this aid package as leverage against our great ally, Israel.

On October 7, Iran-backed Hamas terrorists burned people alive in their homes, beheaded babies, raped women and young girls, and murdered parents in front of their children. They brutally murdered 1,200 innocent people in Israel, including Americans. And 200 days since the attacks, they are still holding 8 Americans and more than 100 other innocent people hostage in Gaza.

I was in Israel last month, my sixth visit to the Jewish State in my years as Florida's Governor and now a U.S. Senator, and I have helped lead the charge in the Senate to support our great ally Israel. I have voted for the Israel aid in this bill only to see it fail the Senate with all the Democrats—all Democrats—voting against it.

For years, I have voted for significant funding for the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and other key military assets to help Israel defend itself from Iran-backed terrorism.

I am leading the Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act to condition aid to Gaza on the release of hostages and ensure we don't send a single dollar—not a single dollar—of American taxpayer money to Gaza unless the President certifies that it won't end up in the hands of a Hamas terrorist—a pretty simple ask.

Unfortunately, the Democrats have blocked this bill from consideration or

passage in the Senate three separate times, including when I tried to include it in the Senate-passed foreign aid supplemental in February. It should not be difficult to say that we won't risk even one dollar of American taxpayer money going to Hamas and pass commonsense legislation to stop that from happening. That shouldn't be hard.

Here is what makes me so angry and worried about our country: We have a President who is a fool who is stuck in a war that is raging—not overseas but within the Democratic Party right here in America. Joe Biden has ignited a civil war in the Democratic Party because he is allowing and in some cases actively encouraging the takeover of his party by Hamas-loving, terrorist sympathizers.

Thankfully, there are still some Democrats who oppose this takeover and continue to stand with Israel, but they are very few, and their voices are being drowned out by the scream of anti-Semitic hate from the radical Hamas lovers in Michigan and New York.

We cannot avoid the hard truth here. Joe Biden is destroying U.S. foreign policy in an attempt to pacify Democrats who support terrorism.

They have chanted "Death to America" in Iran for years, but now Democrat activists are chanting it in New York and Michigan. Look at what is happening at Columbia University. How is this happening in the United States of America? But Democrats are letting this happen because Michigan is crucial for Biden to win. He knows he is losing there, so he is bending over backwards to support the small minority of people in Michigan who support terrorism, and he is doing it hoping it will help him win reelection.

I want to stress this because it shows the American people exactly what is wrong with the platform of my colleagues across the aisle.

Every single day, we hear Democrats scream about protecting democracy and how democracy is under attack. While they love to point fingers at Republicans as being responsible for this, the truth is that it is them.

Between Israel and Hamas, which do you think is a stronger example of democracy? Pretty simple answer. Hamas hates everything that Americans support, especially democracy. If you are a woman, if you are gay, if you like equality, democracy, freedom of speech, none of these things is supported by Hamas—none of them—and some of them will get you killed by Hamas. All of them are supported by Israel.

But Democrats are so obsessed with winning an election, they have taken the fringe radicals in their party and put them front and center—center stage. Think about that. Democrats are so terrified of the Hamas-loving lunatics in New York City and in Michigan, they are tearing down the only true democracy in the Middle East and propping up a terror organization that,

if given power again, will create one of the most oppressive regimes in the world.

Democrats are giving power and voices to people who support terrorism. It is so bad that over the weekend, Jewish students at Columbia University in New York City were told to go home and not return to campus because it is not safe for them. They were told to go home and not return to campus because it is not safe for them. Jewish students at Columbia University in New York City, of all places, are not safe because the campus is being overrun by dangerous, pro-Hamas extremists. Is anyone paying attention?

Look at what is happening in our country. We have a President of the United States who is leading a Democratic Party that is cowering to the radical left of their party in a disgusting and dangerous attempt to get votes from Hamas sympathizers. His cowering means that all over our country, even in New York City, Jewish Americans aren't safe. No one, not one Member of the U.S. Senate should be OK with what is happening in our country today.

I know that terrorists are being glorified at Columbia University right now, but let me remind my Democratic colleagues who Hamas is as we consider a bill that could provide billions of dollars in aid to these monsters.

When I was in Israel, I saw the absolute evil of Israel's enemies—Hamas, Hezbollah—all backed by Iran, and their brutality. Hamas stormed into Israel on October 7 and murdered Jewish people who were killed for one reason: just for being Jewish.

I stood in places where it happened, where the blood of these innocent Jewish people still stains the floors and the walls of their homes and the streets where they once lived and played.

When Hamas stormed in, they raped women, murdered families, and butchered and beheaded babies. You cannot imagine. Hamas burned parents alive in front of their children. They dragged people out of their homes and are now holding them hostage.

What happened on October 7 horrified the world and struck me personally. One of the places where I saw the devastation of Hamas's terror was Kfar Aza. It wasn't the first time I had visited that small kibbutz. In 2019, my wife Ann and I visited Kfar Aza for the first time.

As early reports were coming out, I was really worried about the kibbutz because of its proximity to Gaza, about half a mile away. You can see Gaza right there. It is right there, half a mile away. Open fields. When I heard the news that it was the site of some of the most horrific and barbaric activities, my heart just sank. I wanted to vomit.

In 2019, my wife and I had spent an afternoon there, and it was the most peaceful place. I keep thinking about the moms and kids who were playing outside, enjoying the warm summer

weather. It is gut-wrenching to think of the fate of the families we met that day.

I spoke with Chen, the woman who led our tour of the kibbutz. She was traveling outside of Israel that day and fortunately survived.

When I was in Israel a few weeks ago, I talked with Chen and other people who experienced the attack firsthand and thankfully survived, and they told me what happened to them, their families, and friends. I saw parents setting up memorials at the Nova music festival site for their children who have been taken hostage or murdered. I stood in a destroyed home and listened to the last words of a young Israeli woman via audio recording as she talked to her father before Hamas gunned her down. I met with the families of American hostages, whose devastation and grief are overwhelming. I saw firsthand what Israel faces from Iran and its proxies and what they would do to us, too, if they could. They would absolutely do it to us.

I have placed a poster outside my office that features the faces of the hostages being held by Hamas, and I am not going to take it down until they all come home.

I have been clear that we cannot see a cease-fire until every Hamas terrorist is dead. I want every single one of them dead.

I know I said this before, but I won't stop saying what Hamas did. These monsters beheaded children and babies, raped girls, burned innocent civilians alive, and shot people at point-blank just because they were Jewish. They dragged innocent people through the streets and are now holding them as hostages in Gaza, which these terrorists absolutely control.

It is unimaginable that the United States would ever consider sending money to a place where we know—we absolutely know—that it will be used to help terrorists who are holding American hostages. That is exactly what this bill does today.

I want to make sure everyone understands what I am saying here, which is a fact: Every dollar that goes to Gaza directly benefits Hamas.

I have spent every day since October 7 telling the stories of those being held hostage in Gaza by Iran-backed Hamas terrorists. As I said, I have a poster outside my office that features the faces of the hostages being held by Hamas, and I am not going to take it down until they are all released.

It has been 200 days since the attacks, and some parents are still waiting for their children to come home. Can you imagine? A parent waiting for their child to come home.

Little baby Kfir Bibas's first birthday was spent as a hostage in Gaza. His 4-year-old brother, Ariel, a beautiful little boy, is still being held hostage. I have a milk carton in my office that has Ariel's picture on it. I see it every day, and it makes me think of my own grandkids.

Kfir and Ariel's parents have been waiting for 200 days to hold their babies again. Can you imagine? Sadly, we have heard horrible reports that these innocent children may no longer be alive. It just makes you sick to think about it, and you think about your own family.

While Israel is dealing with the recovery from these attacks in its own country, it is still fighting the terrorists who want to destroy it. It is still fighting with these terrorists who want to destroy every Jew and destroy Israel.

So here is the other takeaway from my recent trip to Israel. In meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu and Israeli leaders, I saw that while Israel is still dealing with the recovery of its own people, they are also overseeing incredible and unprecedented work to preserve civilian life and get aid into Gaza.

War is hell. Tragedies happen, and we wish we could prevent all of them. We wish there could be zero civilian impact of war, but that is simply not possible.

When tragic incidents occur, we are right to expect accountability. Israel has shown full accountability for every misstep taken as it fights for its existence against brutal Iran-backed terrorism.

Israel is doing more to prevent civilian deaths than any warfighting nation has been expected to do in history and taking responsibility when tragic incidents happen. But it seems that accountability from Israel is not enough for President Biden; it is not enough for the Democrats.

It is insane to me that the same President who has never held anyone accountable for the deaths of 13 American warriors at Abbey Gate in Afghanistan and never held anyone accountable for the deaths of the innocent Afghan family killed in a U.S. drone strike during his botched Afghanistan withdrawal is openly attacking Israel for mistakes that it is taking full responsibility for.

When President Biden and Democrats again and again attack Israel and talk about sanctions on the IDF, they do the bidding of Iran and Hamas. Let us all remember who the enemy is. Let us all remember who the enemy is and has always been—the evil terror-supporting regime in Iran.

Since its first days, the Biden administration has emboldened Iran with appeasement, freeing billions and billions and billions of dollars to fuel Iran's support of terrorism and turning its back on Israel.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and one of America's strongest allies, but it took President Biden months to meet or speak with Prime Minister Netanyahu after he took office, and the world took notice.

Since October 7, President Biden and Democrats in Washington have continued to undermine Israel's fight against Iran-backed Hamas terrorists, further

isolating our ally in its greatest time of need.

America and the freedom-loving nations of the world are less safe and secure because of President Biden's weakness and appeasement of evil regimes and the terror each supports.

Now the Senate wants to again pass legislation that gives billions of dollars to Gaza, which is 100 percent run by Hamas—100 percent run by Hamas. I am not opposed to humanitarian aid to people in war-torn places like Gaza, but I am not OK with giving aid that has even the slightest possibility of going to terrorists who want to destroy Israel and the United States.

I am especially disturbed by the idea of giving aid that could go to terrorists who want to destroy Israel and the United States and who are also at this point holding American hostages.

Can you imagine giving aid to a country that wants to—anybody who wants to hold American hostages? Why would we do that? How is that a minority opinion in the U.S. Senate? How has the Democratic Party fallen so far to the radical pro-Hamas lunatics in its base that saying “No, we won't provide humanitarian aid unless we can certify it won't go to terrorists who are holding American hostages” is not an OK position to take, an OK position to even vote on?

The eight Americans who are being held hostage in Hamas have been held in captivity for 200 days. We believe five are still alive and three are dead, and Hamas is holding their bodies and robbing their families of the ability to bury their loved ones. Even when we know they are dead, Hamas holds their bodies.

Do we see President Biden or senior members of his administration and Democrats in Washington talking about that every day? Absolutely not. What we do see from Democrats is they continue to attack Israel, call for the ousting of its democratically elected government—they call for the ousting of its democratically elected government—and allow the abandonment of our ally at the United Nations. They abandoned our ally Israel at the United Nations and on the world stage.

And it is disgusting that, while they launch these attack on our ally, Democrats say little or nothing about the fact that American citizens—American citizens—are being held hostage by a brutal terrorist organization that we know is committing horrific sexual abuse against these innocent people.

Why has Biden given money to Gazans who are holding American hostages? Why would he do that? Why would we allow Biden to give more money to Gazans who are holding American hostages?

When will this stop? Why the heck are we allowing Biden to send more money to Gaza in this bill when we know that every dollar—every dollar—that goes to Gaza funds the terrorism of Hamas?

What are we doing to get American hostages released? What has happened?

Have we sent the troops in? Have we done anything? Have you heard anything? Have you watched Biden in the Situation Room do anything? Absolutely nothing.

I won't stop stating this fact: Every dollar that goes into Gaza directly benefits Hamas. That is the undeniable truth, and it is why I have been fighting for years to pass—for years—to pass a simple bill, the Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, which simply prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from going to Gaza unless the Biden administration can certify that not a single cent will go to Hamas—pretty simple. This isn't a solution in search of a problem. It addresses a very real threat of taxpayer money funding Iran-backed terrorism that seeks to destroy Israel and is holding hostages.

How can it be fair to allow an American family with a family member being held hostage in Gaza to see their tax dollars go to the same people who are holding their family member hostage.

We have seen reports that the Palestinian Authority has been paying over \$300 million a year in monthly salaries to terrorist prisoners, in monthly allowances to families of dead terrorists. The Palestinian Authority that pays terrorists and their families should not receive U.S. tax dollars, and this bill is going to allow more of that.

In 2021, President Biden's State Department said:

We're going to be working in partnership with the United Nations and the Palestinian Authority to “kind of”—

“Kind of”—

channel aid there in a manner that does its best to go to the people of Gaza.

The official went on to say:

As we've seen in life, as we all know in life, there are no guarantees, but we're going to do everything that we can to ensure that this assistance reaches the people who need it the most.

The Biden administration thinks the risk of resources going to Hamas terrorists is OK because “in life, there are no guarantees.”

I reject that. I do not believe we should leave anything to chance when it comes to preventing U.S. taxpayer dollars from being sent to the brutal terrorists that slaughtered so many Israelis and Americans and are holding American hostages.

Senate Democrats have made clear that they are so terrified of losing the votes of radical, Hamas-loving leftists that they cannot bring themselves to support something that simply makes sure we aren't sending money to the thugs who brutally murdered 1,200 innocent people, including more than 30 Americans, on October 7 and are still holding American hostages. They won't even allow us to have a vote on it.

It is hard to imagine that this is where we are today, and this bill that is before us does nothing to address this, while approving billions in aid for Gaza that we know will go straight to Hamas. Nothing—absolutely nothing—

in this bill says that money will not go to Hamas, because there is nothing in this bill that prevents it. Again, there is nothing in this bill that prevents your taxpayer money from going to Gaza, where it will directly benefit Hamas.

I have heard about my colleagues on the left talking about needing to support the children of Gaza. No child should suffer, but the children of Gaza suffer every day not because of Israel, not because of America but because of Hamas. They suffer every day because Hamas takes aid dollars that come into Gaza to fund its terror against Israel and the United States.

If my Democrat colleagues wanted to make sure any U.S. tax dollars only go to help the children of Gaza, they would fully support my Stop Taxpayer Funding of Hamas Act, but they won't even let me have a vote on it. It would make certain that no aid goes to Hamas. It would not stop all aid from going to the children of Gaza. It would just make sure that that is the only place it goes and not to Hamas terrorists. But, again and again, Democrats have blocked the Senate from even voting on this. It makes no sense to me.

We should aid our ally Israel now. I have been trying to get that done for months, and Senate Democrats have blocked it five times. While it is extremely important to continue to fund Israel's defense efforts—as I have fought to do for years—I fear that President Biden will use this as the leverage he needs to advance his radical, anti-Israel foreign policy to appease the anti-Semites in his own party.

I was just in Israel and clearly understood the urgency in delivering aid to Israel. But without safeguards in place to ensure that no money goes to Hamas or that Biden cannot say “strings attached,” this aid doesn't protect Israel from being forced into an unacceptable compromise by the Biden administration while it is at war. What Prime Minister Netanyahu said is: Give us time and space to destroy Hamas, and we will.

Too often in Washington, compromise means that everyone gets what they want so nobody has to make a tough choice. The bill before the Senate today is a perfect example of this broken way of doing business that has become the norm in Washington.

If given the opportunity to vote on these issues independently, as the House did, I would vote to support aid to Israel in a heartbeat, with strong safeguards, as I have in the Senate multiple times—all of which have been blocked by Democrats prior to this vote. I would vote to ban TikTok, unless we see a total divestment from it by entities controlled by communist China. I would vote to sanction the evil regime in Iran. I would vote to support aid for Taiwan so it can fend off threats of invasion by communist China. And I would vote for the REPO Act, which allows for the confiscation of Russian assets, and of which I am a

proud cosponsor, while opposing the fact that this bill allows President Biden to send billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars in unaccountable aid to Ukraine—unaccountable aid to Ukraine—including billions to pay the salaries of Ukrainian politicians.

Why are we borrowing our money to pay for the salaries of Ukrainian politicians? It makes no sense for the United States to borrow dollar after dollar after dollar so we can pay the salaries of politicians in the Ukraine while our border—our border—is wide open.

I have had a redline in the debate about the future of any aid to Ukraine. First, it must be lethal only; and, second, any action taken by the United States to secure the borders of Ukraine must be tied to forcing—it is the only way it is going to happen. You have to force the Biden administration to secure the U.S. southern border.

In some of his first actions as President, Joe Biden took multiple Executive actions to dismantle the border security policies enacted by President Trump, which created the most secure U.S. southern border in recent history. The catastrophic results of Biden's open border policies are being felt by nearly every American family.

Since Biden took office, more than 10 million—10 million—illegal aliens, unvetted, have unlawfully crossed our border, and more than 6 million have been released into the United States. We have no idea who these people are.

Deadly fentanyl, the precursors of which are supplied by communist China and manufactured by the savage Mexican drug cartels, are killing more than 70,000 Americans every year. Why don't the Democrats care about that?

Terrorists and dangerous criminals are coming across the border in droves. Why don't Democrats care about this?

The FBI Director admitted to me, under oath, that we now have terror cells in the United States because of the open southern border. And we have all seen the horror brought to our communities by violent illegal aliens murdering innocent Americans like Laken Riley.

But the Senate won't have the chance to vote on each bill which passed the House individually. No, we won't have a chance to do that individually, the way it was done in the House, and we are not going to have a chance to change this bill. It is up or down. If you don't like a provision, tough luck. You don't get an amendment vote. It is a sad day for our body to be shut out of the process like this.

While some politicians will claim that the bill before the Senate today is some magic bullet that will restore order and protect democracy around the world, we know that is a lie. Most bills have some good policy. This one is no different. However, I cannot bring myself to look the other way and vote for policies that will, in many ways, prolong the suffering that Biden's weaknesses and appeasement have caused for Americans and our friends

and allies around the world each and every day.

I yield to my colleague and I now retain the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, thank you very much. I would like to be recognized. Can you let me know when it is 40 minutes?

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You will be notified.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, so our colleagues are talking today about how they are going to vote, why they are going to vote. I think the support of history will judge what we do here today.

Let me say one thing up front: There is no border security in this package. I regret that. I wish there were. There should be.

On the bill from the Senate, I voted no regarding the border security provisions. I thought it was sort of inadequate tabs on parole and on a few other things. My hope was it would get over to the House, and we could negotiate a stronger border security package. That did not happen, and I regret that.

So to everybody who comes on this floor and says our border is broken, we should do something about it. You are absolutely right. And, unfortunately, we didn't get there. President Trump opposed the Senate bill. We couldn't find a better way forward that would get 60 votes. I hate that, but now we have to deal with what is left for us to take care of in the world.

So the fact that we did not get provisions for our border, in my view, doesn't mean we can't deal with the other problems the world faces. We actually have to because, if we don't get Ukraine right and we don't get Taiwan right and we don't get Israel right, then our broken border is going to be a bigger problem.

So the first thing I want to say is: To those who want border security, you are right. Don't give up. But this is not just about border security.

This is a statement from the Minister of Defense in Israel:

The supplemental package submitted to the U.S. Senate today is critical and urgent in supporting Israel's capabilities to face threats posed by Iran and its proxies. We thank our friends in Congress, and urge our partners to stand with Israel in the face of Iranian terrorism.

Now what is he talking about? This was issued earlier today. This is the Minister of Defense in Israel. I know him very well. He is a very accomplished man, and he is urging us to vote for this package because Israel needs it because they have been threatened by Iran.

Now, since we took up this debate in the Senate, a lot has happened. The Iranians attacked Israel from Iran. Over 300 drones and missiles were launched at Israel from Iran and successfully engaged. Nobody lost their

life, but it wasn't because the Iranians weren't trying.

We are voting today on a package to help our friends in Israel replenish Iron Dome. This is Passover. It is so ironic, right? We are having this debate on Passover. Here is my Passover gift to the Israeli people: More weapons—replenish the Iron Dome so that you can defend yourself and have another Passover, so that this won't be the last one. If you left it up to Iran, it would be.

So to those who are wondering what we should do: We failed on the border; you are right about that. We should vote yes to help our friends in Israel. I can't think of a time since I have been here that they need more help than right now. They don't need any speeches. They don't need us to attend events. They need us to send them military aid that they are desperate to have.

They have diminished their Iron Dome stockpile. They need it replenished. They are dealing with Hamas on one front, Hezbollah on the other, and now they have been attacked by the Iranian Ayatollah from Iranian soil.

So the Defense Minister of Israel is asking us for a "yes" vote because it is urgent to help our friends in Israel. So if you are pro-Israel—which most people in this body are—they need you, and they need you now. The 20-something billion dollars of aid in this package is absolutely imperative to help the Jewish State survive against Iran and its proxies, as the Defense Minister said. So from an Israeli point of view, this is the most critical time maybe since its founding because the efforts to destroy the Jewish State are real.

Here is what I worry about. If we don't help Israel now, we will be encouraging more attacks by the Iranians, and this war will get really out of hand. It is already out of hand.

There are about 100,000-plus rockets in the hands of Hezbollah in Lebanon. If they were all unleashed at the same time, that would be a nightmare for Israel. They have about 300 drones and missiles, but that is a fraction of what is available. I want to deter Iran from going to the next step. Now, how do you do that? Let Iran know that we have Israel's back, that we are going to help them with their military needs in perpetuity so they can defend themselves, that we are not going to abandon Israel at this critical time.

What does Israel have to do? Not only do they have to knock down the rockets that have come their way—they need weapons to do that—they have to create deterrence. The best way for Israel to deter the enemies of the Jewish State is to let the world and the enemies know that America has Israel's back.

Now, I want to say something about Speaker Johnson and Democratic Leader Jeffries: Well done. Speaker JOHNSON and Hakim Jeffries worked together to pass a package we have before us. We need more of this, not less, in a time of great peril for our allies and the United States.

So this was a moment where the people in the House rose to the occasion. They set aside their party differences. They focused on giving us a package that I think is stronger but needed now more than ever.

Since we last had this debate in the Senate, what has happened? A direct attack on the State of Israel by Iran. They need the money, and they need it now. Vote yes. A great Passover gift to the Israeli people would be this aid package.

Now, I want to put this debate in a greater context. I have had a lot of my friends come to the floor talking about whether or not Ukraine is in our vital national interest. I think it is. Here is what is happening in Europe as I speak: You have Russia who has launched an effort to destroy Ukraine—not just the Crimea, but to take Kyiv and turn it into a part of Russia. Ukraine, a sovereign nation that gave up 1,700 nuclear weapons they had in their possession after the end of the Cold War in the Budapest Memorandum in the mid-nineties. Ukrainians gave up 1,700 nuclear weapons with the assurance their sovereignty would be protected. The map used had Crimea as part of Ukraine.

So what do we have then? We have a situation where, for the second time, Russia has invaded Ukraine. They did it in 2014. We had some kind of a peace agreement. It didn't hold. Why? Because Putin wants all of Ukraine. I will talk about that in a moment.

He wants more than just Ukraine. He wants to reconstruct the Russian empire, the old Soviet Union. Listen to him, not me. I will talk about that in a moment.

Go back in time to the thirties. If you could go back in time and you could talk to the leaders in the thirties, knowing what you know now, what would you tell them? "You should stop Hitler as soon as you can." You have got opportunity after opportunity to hold him to account before he got too strong. You had plenty of chances to lay down the gauntlet.

But every time there was a chance to stop him, people blinked. People believed that he wanted German-speaking territory and that was all. They did not believe he wanted to kill all the Jews. That was a big mistake, because he did. He wanted a master race.

He wrote a book. The biggest miscalculation of the 20th century was not to understand what Adolf Hitler actually wanted. He didn't want German-language countries. He wanted everybody to speak German. He wanted a master race where there is no place for the Jewish people and others. And 50 million people died because we got it wrong.

In 1941, in this body, Senator Nye—I don't know him:

Getting into this return engagement of war to Europe is only as inevitable as we the people of America will permit it to be. Staying out of this war is inevitable if only the people will continue and multiply their

forceful demands upon the Government at Washington to keep its promise to the people to keep our country out of this mess, which seems destined to wreck every civilization that lends its hand to it.

He is on the floor of the Senate in June of 1941, telling his colleagues: This war in Europe, stay out of it.

Well, how well did that age? Because in December of 1941, we were attacked by the Japanese.

Here is a rule that has stood the test of time: When forces rear their ugly heads anywhere in the world wanting to dominate other people, destroy their religion, put them under the yoke of tyranny, it will eventually come back to us.

When the Taliban blew up statues of Buddha, even though I am not a Buddhist, it came back to me. Evil unchecked and appeased, we always pay a heavier price than if we confront it.

Charles Lindbergh—an American hero in many ways, a very brave guy—this is what he said on April 24, 1941:

When history is written, the responsibility for the downfall of the democracies of Europe will rest squarely upon the shoulders of interventionists who led their nations into war uninformed and unprepared.

When history is written, the responsibility for the downfall of the democracies of Europe will rest squarely upon the shoulders of the interventionists who led their nations into war uninformed and unprepared.

How well did this age? The democracies in Europe failed because we allowed Hitler to get strong. Every time he would go into the Sudetenland, you named the early intervention. We wrote it off. We appeased him.

No, Mr. Lindbergh, you were wrong. The reason democracies in Europe were at risk and failed is because we did not stand up to Adolf Hitler while it really mattered. The reason that 50 million people died is because you didn't get it.

Father Coughlin—the demagoguery from this guy is being used today: demonizing people, trying to convince the American people "those people over there don't matter to you."

Let me tell you what matters to the American people. When forces like Putin rear their ugly head to take Ukraine, they are not going to stop; they are going to keep going. And we have NATO commitments to countries around Ukraine. Vote yes for this package to help the Ukrainians continue to fight the Russians before Americans are fighting the Russians. And how does America get into this conflict? If a NATO nation is attacked.

This is my favorite: September 11, 1941. Now, when I say "September the 11th," most Americans kind of listen, because that day does live in infamy.

So Charles Lindbergh made a speech on September 11, 1941, in Des Moines, IA. And here is what he said:

When this war started in Europe, it was clear that the American people were solidly opposed to entering it. Why shouldn't we be? We had the best defensive position in the world; we had a tradition of independence from Europe; and the one time we did take part in a European war left European problems unsolved, and debts to America unpaid.

It is obvious and perfectly understandable that Great Britain wants the United States in the war on her side. England is now in a desperate position. Her population is not large enough and her armies are not strong enough to invade the continent of Europe and win the war she declared against Germany.

If England can draw this country into the war, she can shift to our shoulders a large portion of the responsibility for waging it and paying its cost.

He is arguing that the Lend-Lease Program that President Roosevelt came up with to help the island nation withstand invasion by the Germans was a foolish endeavor, that this small group of people in England cannot possibly win and we are betting on a loser.

The loser is Lindbergh. The winner is Churchill and the British people.

This attitude exists today. People in this body, right before I spoke, talk about "we can't help Ukraine because we have too many problems in other places. They can't win."

They were supposed to fall in 4 days.

Look what has happened: 200-something days later, they have destroyed half of the Russian army, taken back half the territory Russia seized, and now they need our weapons in a desperate fashion. They are trying to defend their homeland, and they are asking from us not troops, but weapons that can matter. And I will say to everybody in this body: You sell the Ukrainians short at your own peril. You are in the camp of Lindbergh trying to convince the American people: Pull the plug on England. They are in a fight they can't possibly win. What Lindbergh and others didn't realize was that their fight was our fight.

Let me tell you why Ukraine's fight matters to us. If we don't stop Putin now, he will keep going. And let's talk about what he says.

Just as people in the thirties—Lindbergh and Father Coughlin and Chamberlain, let's bring them back to light here:

How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing.

This is when Hitler annexed the Sudetenland in violation of all the agreements they signed in World War I. He was telling the British people: This is sort of a German thing. I know he is violating the agreements we had to end World War I; but, you know, it really doesn't matter.

Boy, were you wrong. He didn't want the Sudetenland. He wanted the world. He wanted a master race. And guess what? Mr. Chamberlain's analysis of Hitler is not aging too well in history.

To the people of this body who are going to vote today: You are miscalculating Putin if you think it is just about some dispute with Ukraine or he is threatened by NATO. No. Yes, I am sure he is threatened by NATO, but he has an ambition here.

Putin in 2016:

The borders of Russia never end.

Putin in 2022:

[When Peter the Great] was at war with Sweden taking something away from it. . . . He was not taking away anything, he was returning.

When he founded the new capital, none of the European countries recognized this territory as part of Russia; everyone recognized it as part of Sweden.

He is telling you, in Russian history, because you claim it, he wants it, the Russians are going to take it.

This is Medvedev:

One of Ukraine's former leaders once said Ukraine is not Russia. That concept needs to disappear forever. Ukraine is definitely Russia.

This is the former President of Russia. He is telling you—and you are not listening—that they want more than Ukraine. Ukraine is part of Russia. The Ukrainians don't believe that. They are fighting like tigers. I don't believe that. If you give him Ukraine, he will want Moldova and then the Baltic nations. He will make claims to them because they used to be part of the Russian Empire.

Hitler wrote a book, and nobody believed him. Putin and Medvedev, to their credit, are telling you exactly what their ambitions are, and you are not getting it. You are making the same miscalculations that they made in the thirties. You are making the same arguments: They can't win. It is not our problem. Stay out of it. Don't help people fighting for their freedom.

That gets you more war, not less. Fifty million people died in World War II because they got it wrong in the thirties when they could have gotten it right.

We haven't lost one American soldier, but if you don't help Ukraine now, that will change unless you want to completely abandon NATO. I am saying it as loudly as I can say it—that if we don't help Ukraine now, this war will spread, and Americans who are not involved will be involved. You think this war costs a lot now? Wait until you are in a war with Russia and NATO, and see what that costs. I am not telling you things that I made up. I am quoting people who are in charge of Russia. Nobody believed Hitler. You should have. You should believe these people. They have a mission.

Isolationism leads to more war, not less. Isolationism takes off the table confronting evil at a time it is the weakest. Isolationists, in the name of peace, create more war than they ever avoid because the bad guy won't stop.

Here is what you have got to understand: The Ayatollah, what does he want? He tells us he wants to destroy the Jewish State. I believe it. He tells us he wants to purify Islam in his own image—the image of Shiism. I believe it. He tells us that we are the Great Satan, and he is coming after us. I believe him. So the Ayatollah has an agenda that Israel can't accommodate. You cannot accommodate somebody who wants to kill you.

Hamas doesn't want to advocate for the Palestinian people a better life;

they want to kill all the Jews. The agenda of Hamas is not to make the Palestinian people more prosperous; it is to destroy the Jewish State—"from the river to the sea." These people are religious Nazis. What do you expect Israel to do? October 7 was an attack not to restore the dignity of the Palestinian people but literally to rape and murder and kill the Jews.

Isolationism allows that to go unchecked. "America First" says: Let's help Israel. Let's help Ukraine. Let's turn it into a loan rather than a grant. Let's get Europe to do more and pay more. That is a big difference to me.

To the people in this body, if you don't help Israel now, you are sending the worst possible signal to the Ayatollah. If you believe as I do, that he wishes to destroy the Jewish State, how can you vote no?

I know our border is broken, but voting no to Israel doesn't make our border more secure. It makes us less safe.

If you believe Hamas wants to destroy every Jewish person they can get their hands on and destroy the Jewish State, how can you vote no?

If you believe, as I do, that Putin won't stop in Ukraine, how do you vote no? You have to believe that Putin won't go any further when he says he will.

To vote no to Israel, you are taking off the table money they desperately need because they are under attack from forces they haven't been under attack from before. Hamas and Hezbollah have attacked Israel, and they are proxies of Iran, but the Iranians launched an attack toward the Jewish State from Iran. Don't vote no. Israel needs you now.

Nothing we can do will fix the border, but we can help Israel, and we can help Ukraine. Helping Ukraine means we are less likely to get in a war with the Russians. Helping Israel means we are helping an ally, and the same people who want to kill Israel want to kill you too. So there is 20-something billion dollars to help Israel replenish the Iron Dome. There is \$60 billion—some of it is in the form of a loan—to help replenish our stockpile. Most of this money is for us, but some of it goes to Ukraine to stay in the fight; they need an air defense capability.

So to the isolationists—and I know you don't want to be called an isolationist, but you are. When you don't support your allies from threats because you don't want to get involved and you think it doesn't matter, I think you really are an isolationist. You would have to believe that Putin does not mean what he says. I believe him when he wants to take over the old Russian Empire and reconstruct the Soviet Union. I believe it. I want to stand up to it. I believe the Ayatollah wants to kill all the Jews. I want to help the Jewish people. This is Passover for God's sake—we are taking this vote on Passover—and not one of the people we are talking about here of the countries wants one American soldier.

Have we learned nothing? We withdrew from Iraq in 2011. Senator McCain, Senator Lieberman, and myself—we all spoke up. Well, those two are gone, and I miss them desperately at times like this, but we told the Obama administration: If you pull all the troops out of Iraq, you are going to regret it and that ISIS was not the JV team. They came back in full force, and they established a caliphate. Al-Qaida and ISIS didn't even exist. This idea of leaving radical Islam unchecked and thinking it won't hurt you is insane. These people are not going to stop fighting us or our allies. You may be tired of fighting them. They are not tired of fighting you. I would rather fight them over there before they get here. Every one of these terrorists whom Israel kills is one less terrorist who will attack us. Containing Putin and Ukraine means it is less likely for us to get in a war.

Here is what I said: I feel all we have worked for and fought for and sacrificed for is very much in jeopardy by today's announcements. I hope I am wrong and the President is right, but I fear the decision has set in motion events that will come back to haunt our country.

Well, I was right, and I didn't want to be. Al-Qaida came back, and Iraq fell apart. We had to go back in. The Yazidi people were pretty much wiped out. Thousands of people were slaughtered. ISIS, you know, attacked the French, and they killed people all over the world because we let them come back.

So here is what I would say to the people who vote no: Not one country we are helping wants any of our soldiers to come in and fight; they just want the weapons to do the fighting. If you don't give them these weapons at a time of critical need, you are setting in motion America being deeper involved in conflict, not less. If they take Israel down, I promise you, you are next, and if you don't help Israel replenish their conventional weapons, there will be a day when Israel, if they have to, will play the nuclear card. I promise you this: The Jewish people are not going down, this time, without a fight. The State of Israel will do whatever it takes to survive.

I want to let the Ayatollah know America has Israel's back, which I think will create deterrence, but if the Ayatollah ever thought we pulled the plug on Israel, then I think it would be more emboldened, and you have got 100,000 rockets—precision-guided—to be fired at Israel en masse. That is a nightmare for the Iron Dome. So Israel has to tell the region, when it comes to defending the Jewish State, all bets are off. This thing could escalate big time.

So, when you vote no today, you are making it more likely the Ayatollah does more, not less. When you vote no today, you incentivize Putin to do more, not less. When you vote no today, you make China wonder if we really are serious about helping Taiwan.

I understand that the American people have needs here at home. I get it. Our border is broken, and you are right to want to fix it, but we are not right to abandon our allies in great need. If history has taught us anything—for those who are willing to learn from history—it is that, when evil rears its head, stand up; be firm; be unequivocal. It will save a lot of lives and a lot of heartache.

I am going to end where I started: What does China want? They want to turn world order upside down. They don't believe in the rule of law. They steal our intellectual property; they intimidate their neighbors; and they will go after Taiwan if they believe we are weak and not helping Taiwan. If you want to avoid a war between Taiwan and China, give Taiwan the capability that would deter China. Eighty percent of the semiconductors in the world are made in Taiwan, and the digital economy would be dominated by China. We have a chance here to harden the defenses of Taiwan to deter China.

We have a \$24 billion package to replenish the weapons that Israel desperately needs to stand up in the face of multiple threats from Iran and its proxies. They need the money. They need it now. This is Passover. Help our friends in Israel.

We have a chance to replenish the stockpile of the Ukrainians, who fought like tigers—but not just give them 155 rounds; give them the ATACMS that can reach out and knock the bridge down between Crimea and Russia.

The bill before us allows us to go after Russian sovereign wealth funds that are frozen all over the world—about \$300 billion. It allows us to take money from the Russian invader to pay for the reconstruction of Ukraine. This is a package worth your support. It makes Russia pay more. There is a loan component in this: Pay us back if you can because we are in debt. I get that part of it.

This package coming back from the House was not only bipartisan, I thought it was smart. The component in this package to allow us to seize Russian assets I think will have a deterrent effect all of its own. The oligarchs around Putin are now in more jeopardy, not less, and it is proper to go after Russian sovereign wealth assets when Russia has brutally invaded Ukraine in violation of every agreement they made with Ukraine and the world at large.

The bottom line for me is that this package doesn't address the border, and I am sorry it doesn't. This package addresses threats that exist to our allies, and it is in our national security interest to meet the needs of those allies before it gets worse. Whether you want Iran to stop or not, they will not. Israel needs the weapons, and they need them now. Our friends in Ukraine, with the right set of weapons, can go back on the offensive, and if you don't stop Putin now, you will regret it later.

This is one of the moments in history that really matters. I always wondered, How could the people in the thirties not get it about Hitler? Now I know. It is complicated. I have very good friends who are going to vote no. I have very good friends who do not see Putin in the same way I see him. I see him as a guy with ambitions that won't end in Ukraine and that he will get us into a bigger war if we don't stand up now. I believe him when he says the thing he says about taking more territory. I have friends who are strongly supportive of Israel but who are going to vote no.

The bottom line is, Israel needs you now more than ever. The Ayatollah upped the ante by attacking Israel directly from Iranian soil. For God's sake, let's help Israel and help them now.

There is a chance here to seize Russian assets to pay for the war to take the burden off the taxpayer. Let's vote yes.

As for Taiwan, there is almost universal acknowledgment in this body that China will keep going until somebody stops them and that we want to deter war between Taiwan and China. In this package, we have vital military assistance to Taiwan to make it harder for the Chinese to attack and take it over by military force.

Do you think the Chinese are watching what we do with Ukraine? If you don't think they are watching, you don't know much about China. They are sizing us up, and if we pull the plug on Ukraine, you are inviting more aggression from China to Taiwan. If we send a signal that we are not—if you vote no and we are not giving the package to Israel to replenish their defenses, it will make the Iranians more emboldened to keep going.

This vote you are about to take is probably one of the most important votes we have had since I have been here. This is the defining moment in world history. The world is on fire. It all started with Afghanistan. Once we pulled out of Afghanistan, people thought we were weak, and they took advantage.

Here is what I would say: If you agree with me, don't vote no; vote yes because a "no" vote, I think, continues that theme that America is unreliable. A "no" vote will make Russia believe that there is a growing sentiment in America that, if we just outlast Ukraine, we will not only get Ukraine, we will get more. A "no" vote emboldens the Ayatollah to think support for Israel is being diminished. A "no" vote to help Taiwan would encourage China, in my view, to be more aggressive.

Now, how does this all end? Here is my fear: These are the Twin Towers. This is what happens when something over there gets out of hand, and we don't deal with it. This is what happens when you ignore the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan, and you sit on the sidelines and think it doesn't matter to

you. This is what happens when a group of people take women in a soccer stadium and kill them for sport, thinking it won't bother us. The 18 to 19 hijackers who were able to do this were able to do it because they had a safe haven in Afghanistan.

We didn't get involved. We looked the other way, thinking it doesn't matter to us. We missed all the warning signs.

Remember when they said the lights were blinking red before September 11, 2001? Let me tell you what the FBI Director says: I have never seen so many blinking lights as I do now. Wherever I turn, I see threats. I have never seen a time in American history that I have been involved as FBI Director with this many threats all at once. Everywhere I look, I see blinking lights.

The response to that is to help our allies, not turn away. How can you say we are under great threat, and we are not willing to provide aid to people who are on the tip of the spear?

So this aid package coming back from the House is better than it was when it left the Senate. It has more for Israel. It has the ability to get Russian assets to help the American taxpayer and reconstruct Ukraine with Russian money, not American money or other money. It has a component in here to let the Ayatollah know we are not going to bend in Israel, and it reinforces Taiwan's military defense at a time when they are very vulnerable.

This is a good package. It has a loan component, recognizing that we are in debt. It is not a perfect package. I wish it had border security. I was hoping it would, but it doesn't.

Since we last had this discussion about what to do, Iran launched an attack on Israel—300 drones—and everything is really getting out of hand here.

The Ukrainians are down to their last artillery shells. That can all change when we vote yes. They will get not only more artillery shells, they are going to get more advanced weapons. And we are going to go after Russian money. We are going to put Putin on his back foot.

If you vote yes, it is a bad day for Putin; it is a bad day for the Ayatollah; and it is a wake-up call to China. If you vote no, you are going to encourage everybody I just talked about to do more.

We are friends. I respect everybody in here, no matter how you vote. I just see this as clear as a bell.

There were people in the 1930s, like Churchill and others, who saw Hitler for who he really was. And a lot of people didn't want to confront that because they were weary of the war they just fought called World War I. They wanted to believe that Hitler was just all talk. They didn't want to get in another war because millions of people had died. The last thing they wanted was another war. What they didn't realize is that Hitler wanted things they couldn't give them.

We have been at war since September 11, 2001. We are in debt. We are all tired. The last thing we want is to keep it going.

Well, let me tell you about our adversaries. They are not going to stop. It is wise for us to help people do the fighting so we don't have to, to have their backs at a time of great need because if we abandon them and say this doesn't matter to us, everything you saw happen in the 1930s is going to happen again.

If Russia believes we can't stick with Ukraine, they are going to keep going. If the Ayatollah believed that American support for the Jewish State was deteriorating, he is going to up the ante.

These college campus protests make me sick to my stomach. You have people on college campuses in this country supporting the terrorists, supporting Hamas. They are not supporting a better life for the Palestinian people; they are supporting the destruction of the Jewish people.

Hamas doesn't want a better life for the Palestinians; they want to kill all the Jews.

My good friend from Connecticut just walked in. His grandparents were involved in the Holocaust. I know where he is going to be.

So what is going on in America is very similar to the 1930s but in many ways worse.

To those who are out there protesting to stop aid to Israel: You are fools. You are progressive. Do you think Hamas is progressive? Do you think Hamas will tolerate a society that you have come accustomed to, where women can do whatever they want, people can live their lives? You are empowering people who are despicable. They are religious Nazis.

You are dumb as dirt if you think abandoning Israel makes us safer and that Hamas gives a damn about the Palestinian people. They don't.

I am urging a "yes" vote.

I understand this is not a perfect package, but this is a really good package at an important time in world and American history. So I would urge a "yes" vote. And a "no" vote, in my view, makes it more likely we spend more money and Americans die who are not dying now.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I have such respect for the remarks of the gentleman who just completed his remarks. I know he feels very passionately. And I agree with him about what he said, especially about Israel and what they are going through.

The attacks on October 7 were unspeakable horrors imposed on the people of Israel, and I want to come to their defense. I want to come to their defense so badly that I have joined my colleagues repeatedly to pass stand-alone \$14 billion funding for Israel multiple times since October 7.

By unanimous consent, we came to the floor multiple times and said: Let's send money to Israel. And who stopped it? The Democrats. The Democrats stopped money going to Israel.

Now we are here with a package of bundled things so we can roll enough stuff together so that we can get passage of a piece of legislation that is highly imperfect.

One of the main things that my constituents object to is that we are spending money for every country in this bill except our own. We will not defend our southern border. We will not spend money to protect our country from the invasion of terrorists and people whom we don't know, and we don't know why they are here.

The number of people who are coming into this country whom we don't know, we don't know why they are here, we are not identifying them, and we are turning them loose in this country is a crazy way to then turn around and say: We are not going to protect our borders. Y'all come, but we are going to send \$95 billion to other countries to protect their borders.

That doesn't fly with my constituents.

But, interestingly, that is not even my biggest concern about this bill. Regarding this bill, I filed an amendment to ensure the \$95 billion pricetag of this package is fully paid for by reducing the Fiscal Responsibility Act spending caps for fiscal year 2025 in both nondefense and defense areas.

In other words, this is yet another thing we are doing that is not paid for. If we are that passionate about helping our friends in Ukraine, in Taiwan, in Israel, then let's pay for it.

The American people are living paycheck to paycheck right now. They are going to the grocery store and paying twice as much for food, in some cases, than they were in 2020.

The price of gas is up. The price of food is up. The price of rent is up. More people right now are living paycheck to paycheck in this country than were in 2020. They can't afford health insurance, and they are cutting back on important things in their diets and for their families.

So we are going to let our people endure these kinds of insults that are brought on by us, and yet we want to send \$95 billion to other countries that we are going to pay for with borrowed money?

We are \$34 trillion in debt. In 22 months during COVID, the U.S. Government printed 80 percent of all the money that has ever been printed in the entire history of the United States. In 22 months during COVID, we printed 80 percent of all the money that the United States has ever printed in its history.

Now, when you print that much money and you put it in an economy, you get inflation. Why? Because you have too much money facing too few goods. That is kind of the definition of inflation.

We got ourselves into this. Between the Federal Reserve and Treasury, that printed money, with nothing behind it except the full faith and credit of the United States—which is not nothing—but when they did, they put us in a position where this year, we are going to owe more interest on the national debt than our entire defense budget and our entire budget for Medicare. And last year, we already passed legislation spending more on interest than the entire budget for Medicaid. We are spending money on interest because we refuse to pay for the things we think are critical.

I agree with the last gentleman who spoke. The world is in crisis, and I agree that we should help them. But we should pay for helping them, not run up debt, not put this burden on people in this country in the future.

This is wrong, and I am voting no. If we vote no, this bill is not the end of it. How many bills have we dealt with since October 7 dealing with funding for Ukraine or Taiwan or Israel or some combination of them?

Both parties have people who want to help Ukraine, Israel, and Taiwan. We understand the world risks that are posed by China if we sit on our hands, the risks that are posed by Russia if we sit on our hands and Iran and North Korea, and we are not going to sit on our hands. We are going to pass a bill. We are going to fund these things. But since we know we are going to do it, why don't we do it right? Why don't we pay for it?

You know, if we had only passed a budget a few weeks ago that was at fiscal year 2019 levels—we actually collect enough revenue in this country to pay for that—we could have had a year where we balanced our budget.

Now harken back to 2019. Is there anything the government is doing now that they weren't doing in 2019 that is a total game changer in your life? I will bet the answer is no. So if we only would have gone back to the spending levels of 2019, I don't think it would have made a difference in anybody's lives, the way that they live their personal lives, and we would have balanced the budget. But we keep spending more and more money that is not paid for. Our national debt per citizen now exceeds \$103,000. Debt per taxpayer is nearly \$267,000.

Since I became a Senator in 2021, our national debt has increased \$7.8 trillion. When I first entered Congress in 2008, our national debt was just over \$10 trillion—\$10 trillion. Now we are at \$34 trillion. This is not sustainable. In just 15 years, our national debt has more than tripled. Our debt is the greatest threat our country faces today—not China, not Russia.

The American people will continue to shoulder the burden of our unhinged spending. When we have changing priorities, we should be doing what we do in our own personal lives. If something is more important to me than something else, I don't do this; I do the thing that is more important to me.

We never have those discussions here. In fact, the way our committees work, they never talk to each other. The people on the committee that crafts the budget don't talk to the people who are spending the money. They don't talk to the committee that is collecting the taxes. Once the budget is set, the appropriators go to work. Are they talking to the committee that collects the taxes and oversees our Tax Code? No. They don't talk to each other. In fact, they are completely divorced of each other.

If you look at the charts around here that are spread around the Senate, it will show you how much we are spending on discretionary spending and mandatory spending and defense and non-defense, but where does it ever compare it to the revenues we are taking in? We don't talk to each other about it. We are \$34 trillion in debt, and, by golly, we ought to start talking about it.

Now, in the last few weeks, we turned the Constitution on its head. The U.S. House sent over impeachment articles that they had worked hard on. Now, whether or not you thought that Alejandro Mayorkas was guilty of the crimes that were asserted and whether or not you felt that you would vote to impeach him doesn't matter. The Constitution set up a process where the House impeaches and the Senate sits as the jury.

For the first time in our history, we didn't have a trial. We didn't get a chance to say he is guilty or he is not guilty. And given the partisan politics of the day, we would have found him not guilty—you know. But people in this body didn't want to hear the evidence against him. People in this body don't want to know how many terrorists are coming across our border, how many people are coming across the border and we don't know whether they came from a Venezuelan prison. So the motion was tabled, and then we dismissed it. We pushed it under the rug.

Now, the same week, we had a bill come over from the House on section 702 of FISA. We were told that it was just an extension of the expiring provisions of section 702. It wasn't. It expanded 702. It expanded the opportunity for the government to tell communications providers: You will give us this information without a warrant. They expanded the warrantless searches in that bill. The Fourth Amendment was under attack, and there again, we just swept it under the rug.

Now we are passing a bill to spend \$95 billion that is unpaid for.

You know, we have good reasons for making the decisions we do around here. My colleague Senator GRAHAM just voiced very articulately why we should help Ukraine, why we should help Israel, why we should help Taiwan, that our enemies are watching. Well, let's fix this bill and make it better and then pass it. But we are not allowed to do that. We are not allowed to have a debate. We are not allowed to

have amendments. We are not allowed to make it better. We have one choice: yes or no.

If you vote no, by golly, you must be an isolationist. Well, I am voting no. I am not an isolationist. I have previously voted many times to help Israel. I have helped bring motions to fund Israel specifically to the floor of this Senate as a stand-alone bill, and the Democrats shot us down. And the Democrats shot us down from having a trial that was required by the Constitution.

Further, we didn't get to amend the bill that came to us regarding section 702 of FISA. Now, that debate was bipartisan. There were a lot of Democrats and Republicans who wanted to join together and fix that bill, and the people who encouraged us to vote for that bill knew it was faulty. They knew it was faulty. They knew that language was too broad. They knew we should fix it.

They said: You know what, let's pass it now because the time is about to expire. It is 11:30 p.m. FISA 702 expires in half an hour, and we don't have time to fix it.

Yet we sat on our hands and fiddled around the whole day. We could have fixed that, but the proponents—on both sides of the aisle, by the way—said: No, no. Let's fix it later. We need to get this passed now. It is important to get it done before the clock expires, but we will work on it maybe when we get to the NDAA.

We put off the big decisions. We are trying to get things done, but we don't care if they are right. Let's just sweep this one under the rug. Let's let this one pass today and deal with it another time.

That is what we are doing with this bill. We are saying: Yeah, let's help Ukraine and Israel and Taiwan. We are not going to pay for it. Let's worry about that later.

But the American people expect more of us, and we should demand more of ourselves. What we are doing here is wrong. We have been wrong year after year by ignoring this debt.

You know, I rarely come to the floor and make this argument, especially when people want to go home. I mean, this is a week we were supposed to be out of session. We were supposed to be getting a week off, and it would have been richly deserved because what happened here last week had a lot of people ready for a cooling-off period. But we don't get a cooling-off period because it was decided by the leadership that we need to march forward with this. We can't amend it because then we would have to send it back to the House, and the House isn't in session.

You know, this is not the way this institution was designed to function. We shouldn't ram things down each other's throats. We shouldn't use the calendar as a weapon to force people to vote for things that could be fixed, that could be better.

I would like to vote for this bill, but I am not voting for something that is not paid for.

In 2008, after the financial crisis, we printed \$3 trillion basically to bail out the banks, and we got addicted to easy money—to quantitative easing, it is called. Then, when COVID came around, we printed \$5 trillion more. We are so addicted to easy money, to money where we just turn on the printing press and keep it going 24/7, that we are causing inflation and we are making it worse.

Last week, the International Monetary Fund said the United States faces “significant risks” from “loose fiscal policy” stemming from “fundamental imbalances between spending and revenues.” It is sad that the IMF has to point that out to us.

Additionally, Federal Reserve Chairman Jay Powell remarked recently that “the U.S. is on an unsustainable fiscal path” and that “effectively, we are borrowing from future generations.” These are quotes from the Chairman of the Fed.

I have been working on bipartisan legislation since I was elected to the Senate to address our addiction to spending. I introduced the bipartisan, bicameral Sustainable Budget Act in 2021 and 2023 to establish a fiscal Commission. There are so many proposals outside of that that we could address.

We ought to be listening to our fellow Senator BILL CASSIDY, who is coming up with some great ideas that we can sustain and reform and nurture and keep the solvency of Social Security. Social Security is going to go broke in 2034. We are down to 10 years. The law says that when Social Security is drained of its excess funds, by law, the amount of money that comes in and is collected each year is the amount that can go out. We can’t subsidize it in another way. If that happened, 70 million Americans would see their Social Security benefits cut by a quarter.

The highway trust fund goes broke in about 2028. We haven’t fixed that. We are not talking about fixing that. Yet we know that EVs—electric vehicles—don’t pay fuel taxes, and the more EVs that are on the road, the less money we collect to maintain our roads. Our highway trust fund is going broke. It is going to be insolvent in about 4 years. We are not talking about fixing that.

Let’s look at Medicare Part A. That is hospitalization. It goes insolvent in the 2030s. We are not talking about that.

We are talking about spending \$95 billion more today so we can pat our chests and say we did something great for our colleagues around the world. In fact, we are doing something great for them, but we are doing something that is extremely harmful to ourselves because we will not address our own unsustainable fiscal path.

You know, I sit in my office and listen to my colleagues, and there are so many really worthy arguments, brilliant arguments, articulate people in

this body. And I rarely come to the floor and have these conversations because I feel: I know this bill is going to pass tonight. I am going to vote no. The vast majority of people are voting yes. Nobody cares that we are spending this much money and it is unpaid for.

I am tired. I woke up at 2 a.m. in Wyoming this morning to try to get back here for these votes. I am tired. A lot of people want to go home tomorrow. A lot of people wish this debate was not occurring because the vote is a foregone conclusion. But, you know, I have been here now for 3½ years, and I have watched all of this happen, all this spending that we never pay for—we never pay for it. We don’t talk about it. We pretend it is not a problem. We hear it is unsustainable. We hope the Nation doesn’t go broke while we are here. Maybe people who are sitting in our chairs can deal with it when we are gone, but we are leaving them an unsustainable fiscal path and a big mess.

I would like to support this bill tonight. I would like to vote yes. But it is not paid for, and I will be voting no.

I encourage my colleagues to want to do better. We can do better. We can improve these bills. But we have to be allowed to amend them. We have to have these conversations before the tree is filled, as we say in the Senate, before amendment opportunities are lost.

This process is designed to cram the product down the throats of U.S. Senators and their constituents, without debate, meaning without the opportunity to amend and debate the amendments.

I know we can do better because I know the people in this room. There are so many smart, thoughtful, patriotic, caring Senators on both sides of the aisle. I know we can do better. But we have to want to.

We have to want to deal with the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room is that we are \$34 trillion in debt, and we will not talk about it. We will not address it. We will not try to fix it.

Every time, in the last year, that we have been talking about Ukraine funding, I have said: Let’s go get our money that we have at the IMF and lend it, interest-free, for, heck, 30 years to Ukraine.

Nobody wants to talk about that. I don’t know why. We just want to use taxpayer dollars to pay for things—taxpayer dollars, meaning printed money down at the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Just churn those printing presses, send money out the door, and export to other countries our inflation.

Other countries use our dollar because we are the world’s reserve currency and because they are trying to do business with us and among other countries, in some common language, some common fiat currency, and the common fiat currency of the world is the U.S. dollar. Well, the more we print it and send out monopoly money, the more we export to other countries our inflation.

Every Senator in this room makes \$174,000 a year. That is our salary. By the way, our salary is the exact same as it was when I arrived in Congress in 2009. Congressional salaries have been frozen since 2009. So \$174,000 then is worth \$122,000 today. That is how much inflation has eroded the paychecks of every Member of Congress. Yet we think we can live with frozen salaries since 2009. Why can’t other people live with frozen dollars in Federal Agencies?

Do you know that our Federal Government is bigger than China’s? This place has got to do some homework about its own spending, about its own fiscal situation, about what we are doing to the value of our dollar, about how we are threatening the dollar as the world’s reserve currency because we are not nurturing and caring for and being good stewards of the U.S. fiat currency. It is time to face reality.

So this isn’t the first time nor is it the last time that I will be discussing this on the floor of the Senate. And I wish that we could work together to have a more perfect Union. I know my colleagues and I can do it, but we have got to have the will, the gumption, the moral integrity, the virtue, the faith, and the freedom to do it.

I yield the floor.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it wasn’t too long ago when Republicans made a promise to ourselves and to the American people that before we sent another dollar, another dime, another nickel, another penny to Ukraine, we would ensure that our own house was in order, that our own country was secure, that our own border was secure, that we would pass a real border security measure. And yet here we are, months later, preparing to dispatch nearly \$100 billion. If you say it slowly, you sound a little bit like Dr. Evil in the original Austin Powers movie—\$100 billion to foreign countries while the security of our own homeland languishes.

House Republicans have broken their promise and at least a critical mass of them, under the direction of House Republican leadership, have betrayed the American people because they have gone back completely on what they—what we—promised.

Tonight, we are seeing the same movie played out on the Senate floor. This occurs at a time when about 60 percent of Americans live paycheck to paycheck, and yet Congress continues to add to a national debt that is about

to blow past the \$35 trillion mark. How can we justify this to the American people as a Congress?

Are we really more concerned with the borders of a foreign country—Ukraine—and with foreign wars around the world than we are with the safety and the security of the United States and its citizens?

This bill tells the American people that the answer to that question is an unambiguous resounding “yes.” Congress cares more about sending billions to wage endless war in foreign countries, cares more about this than saving our own country, especially at a time when we are being invaded. We have seen an invasion of between 8 and 13 million people over the last few years alone. That is a big deal.

We are forgetting the wise caution left to us by our first President, the Father of our Country, George Washington, who warned against entangling our peace and our prosperity with the affairs of other nations. He said:

Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It seems no price is too high, no weapon system is off limits. Our only strategy appears to be “spend, spend, spend, and then spend some more,” with little to no thought given to the consequences. It is the continuation of a lackluster approach to the Ukraine-Russia conflict, devoid of coherent strategy, while allocating the vast majority of its funding to Europe and the Middle East, neglecting, of course, the looming threats from China and the warnings from great national policy experts, like Elbridge Colby, who warn us, time and time again, that the same weapons that we are depleting, sending to other parts of the world, sending to Ukraine, are those that are in such dire need in Taiwan and elsewhere.

The \$13 billion in military aid to Israel is juxtaposed with the up to \$9.1 billion in civilian aid going to Hamas. Now, some would say: You mean Gaza. And I say: No, I mean Hamas.

You cannot send this aid. Even if it is labeled as humanitarian or for some other noble-sounding purpose, if you send it to Gaza, it is aid to Hamas—Hamas terrorists. These are the same terrorists who massacred, who butchered, who savagely mutilated innocent men, women, and children in Israel just a few months ago in October. The architects of this bill undermine their own goal to secure stability and peace in the region.

So I have come to the floor in an attempt to soften the blow to the American people. To that end, I would like to call up Lee amendment No. 1902 for consideration. My amendment would require Ukraine to repay the money loaned to it and that the funds repaid be used to secure our border. If Congress is so determined to send taxpayer money abroad, then the repayment of this loan should not be waivable and must be used to secure our border.

It is sad that shoring up our border and protecting our own citizens has to come at the mercy of our debtors. But that is what this administration thinks of everyday Americans—that they don’t deserve protection.

We should be voting on H.R. 2, and we should be doing that today. We should be addressing the crisis at the border. Instead, we are focused on sending money to secure Ukraine’s border, not our own.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments and motions in order to call up my motion to concur with amendment No. 1902.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. If the objection is that my proposal is somehow not germane, then I will offer up another amendment. I want to bring up Lee amendment No. 1857 for consideration. It would ensure that the repayment of the loan Congress seems so determined to give Ukraine is exclusively used to pay down the U.S. national debt.

This bill demands the American people dig deeper into their pockets, funding the salaries and pensions of Ukrainian officials as humanitarian efforts under the guise of a loan. The unsettling truth is that this loan can and almost certainly will be waived, possibly leaving Americans without any reimbursement. I think that is part of the plan, in fact. It makes it easier to swallow. It makes it look like something less than what it is.

My amendment addresses this concern by prohibiting any cancellation of a debt owed by Ukraine and making sure repayments go directly to the U.S. national debt.

By presenting this amendment, I aim to offer the American people the financial security and oversight this bill currently lacks, deliberately so, effectively serving as an insurance policy against irresponsible fiscal gambles half a world away.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments and motions in order to call up my motion to concur with amendment No. 1857.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Next, I am going to call up, in a moment, Lee amendment No. 1882 for consideration. If we are genuinely concerned about security, let’s just start by securing our own citizens’ personal information, securing it from foreign adversaries. My amendment would prohibit the sale, transfer, or sharing of American personal data to governments like China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran without explicit consent from the individual.

For weeks, proponents of the House-passed bill to force the sale of

TikTok—legislation included in the package we are debating—have told us this legislation is vital to protecting the security of Americans’ data.

The reality, however, is far more complicated. Indeed, forcing the sale of TikTok through that legislation won’t, itself, secure the data of users. Instead, it will simply allow another company to purchase TikTok and do with their users’ data what they may.

Only by changing the underlying law and preventing companies from handing over Americans’ information to our adversaries can Congress secure the personal information of every American. My amendment aims to do just that rather than engage in a regulatory game of Whac-A-Mole, whereby we allow ourselves to be distracted by whatever company happens to be making headlines at the moment. My amendment would implement a comprehensive prohibition on any individual or company operating in the United States from selling, transferring, or sharing the data of an American citizen to the government of a foreign adversary without that individual’s express consent.

This is a serious solution to a serious problem. No company should profit by exposing the personal information of an American citizen to a hostile foreign power, whether that company is owned by a foreign national or by an American citizen.

To that end, I ask unanimous consent to set aside any pending amendments and motions in order to call up my motion to concur with amendment No. 1882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is noted.

Mr. LEE. This really is too bad. These are some really good amendments. Apparently, we are not allowed to have those. We are just allowed to sing off of whatever hymnal they happen to hand us that has been preblessed by the law firm of SCHUMER, MCCONNELL, JOHNSON, and JEFFRIES. That is unfortunate.

Next, I want to call up Lee amendment No. 1860 for consideration, which proposes to strike all emergency spending designations from the bill. We cannot continue to spend under the guise of an emergency, especially when an actual emergency—a real-life, present-tense, presently located emergency—involving the security of our own Nation’s national border is not even being addressed in this bill. It is not just that it is not being resolved. It is not even being addressed at all.

This irresponsible practice has led to a ballooning national debt now nearing \$35 trillion. It will soon blow past that. If this spending is necessary, it should be subject to the same budgetary constraints as all other government expenditures. This bill spends almost \$100 billion—\$100 billion we don’t have—on

top of the more than \$100 billion Congress has already appropriated for the war in Ukraine over the last 2 years—in excess of \$113 billion, if I am not mistaken. It will spend more money on interest payments on our national debt this year than on all base defense spending. And, within a year, I believe, we are likely to be spending well over \$1 trillion a year just in interest on the debt.

If Congress believes it is worth spending \$100 billion we don't have, Congress should be making sure that sum of money will be fully offset or subject to appropriate budgetary enforcement.

My amendment would strike the emergency designations of this bill to subject this additional spending to the annual caps Congress agreed to last year, while simultaneously predicting the bill's budgetary effects from escaping proper enforcement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside any pending amendments and motions in order to call up my motion to concur with amendment No. 1860.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is noted.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is profoundly distressing—disappointing, to say the least—that these commonsense amendments have been so cavalierly objected to and have been met only with one-word objections.

Although my amendment to strike the emergency designations—all of them drew an objection—pursuant to section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I intend to raise a point of order against these same emergency designations for international disaster assistance and migration and refugee assistance for Gaza.

We are, in the end, going to have to acknowledge that we are at a critical juncture, compelled to reevaluate our priorities as a nation and our responsibilities to the American people. Every decision we make must be weighed against the best interests of those we are sworn to serve, not those people abroad but those who are right here at home.

Waving the flag of another nation in Congress as you vote to send them tens of billions of dollars doesn't inspire confidence; it creates distrust.

As legislators, we fail in our duty if we don't heed the call to prioritize the American people first.

So to all out there who find this distressing—the distressed Americans, the distressed carpenters, the distressed plumbers, the distressed poets—I am sorry that we weren't able and willing to secure the border. We should have been able to do that. We made a promise, and we as Republicans shouldn't have deviated from that promise—certainly not with the critical mass necessary to facilitate passage of this in the House and then, before the night is

finished, likely the Senate; certainly not under the leadership of our own elected Republican leaders, who themselves have repeated this promise not too many weeks ago—a promise that is now apparently a thing of the past that we are supposed to forget.

This \$95 billion aid package to foreign countries is a stark testament of the misguided priorities of our current congressional leadership and a clear indication that we have let ourselves and, perhaps more critically, the American people down. The situation demands a wake-up call.

To every Member of this body, by failing to address the fundamental needs of our own people, the American people, in favor of international interests, we risk not only the prosperity but also the security of our Nation.

And make no mistake, this isn't free, although it can feel free to those of us who work in this hallowed Chamber. It can feel free to us. It can feel as if we draw from an endless, unlimited well, but we don't.

As we have seen to an acute degree over the last few years, every time we spend more money than we have, that comes at a cost. Sure, we borrow the money, and sure, the credit of the United States is still just good enough that it can feel like we have the capacity to just print our own money, which is essentially what we are doing. But every time we do that, every dollar earned by every hard-working American—every mom and dad, married or single, in this country, just trying to put food on their table for their kid, suffers, as they are having to shell out an additional \$1,000 a month every single month just to live, just to put a roof over their head and keep food on the table.

I agree with the assessment of Nobel laureate and famed economist Milton Friedman, who said that in any given moment, the true level of taxation in America can best be measured not by the top marginal tax rate or even the average effective tax rate but, instead, by the overall level of government spending.

This, he explained—perhaps referring to an odd combination of credit rating, the way our deficit spending works—in effect, every year when we look at overall government spending, especially Federal spending, that is the true cost of the Federal Government because what we don't collect in taxes, we effectively print and thereby devalue every dollar that is earned by every American by degrees. Unlike other expenses that people have—the monthly bills they receive or the annual tax return they file—there is no billing moment attached to this, there is no pricetag. You don't ever see the overall amount that you are spending on this, as you do at least once a year when you file your Federal income tax return. No. It is very different with inflation. Each dollar is diminished bit by bit.

The Federal Government is costly, and when it sends money abroad that

we don't have to fund somebody else in fighting a war against somebody else, that costs money.

Another thing we learn about these proxy wars is that in the United States of America, which has assembled the greatest military force the world has ever known—certainly the strongest military force that exists today—proxy wars carry on for going on 2-plus years now. We are in our third year of this effort. They don't remain proxy wars forever.

It becomes especially startling when the proxy war is being fought against a nuclear-armed adversary. That is not to say we can never push back against any nuclear-armed adversary, but it does mean we should be darn careful when we do that. We should know exactly what our objective is, what it is going to take to secure the peace so that we don't have to fight that war.

We don't avoid the profound risk to our own national security simply by funneling money through a proxy, whether that proxy is a great steward of the funds, weapons, and resources that we send or not. Whether that country happens to be one that has proven impervious to fraud, corruption, money laundering, and gift or not, we should be concerned about what happens to that money because it is ours and because how it is spent is going to have a very direct, very real potential outcome on the American people.

We cannot pretend anymore that we have the money to do this, that the economic cost is free, or that the military risk is free. None of them are.

Shame on us if we don't turn this around. Shame on us if we pass this tonight. Shame on us if we do this without taking any steps to secure the integrity of our own border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, here is the good news: A few weeks ago, the approval rating for Congress was 10 percent. It has gone up to 14 percent. According to a recent YouGov poll, 14 percent approve of what Congress is doing and 68 percent oppose.

And I would tell my friends on both sides that it is about equal. In terms of whom people want to elect, it is about half Democrats, half Republicans. Why is that? Why do we have a 14-percent approval rating? Well, it might have something to do with things like we are witnessing today and the degree to which the Congress is completely out of touch with where the American people are.

So let me read some other polls, not on favorability but on people's feelings toward the role the United States is now playing in the war in Gaza. April 10, Economist YouGov poll, 37 percent support decreasing military aid to Israel; 18 percent support an increase.

And to my Democratic colleagues, I would say 48 percent of Democrats support decreasing aid; 10 percent support increasing aid.

Then there is a March 29 poll from Axios-Ipsos-Telemundo poll of Latinos—Latino people: 16 percent of Latinos said the United States should continue to support Israel with arms and funds; 39 percent said the U.S. should not be involved in the conflict.

March 27 Gallup poll: 36 percent of Americans approve of Israel's military action; 55 percent disapprove. Among Democrats, 18 percent approve; 75 percent disapprove.

March 27 Quinnipiac poll: Overall, voters oppose sending more military aid to Israel by 52 percent to 39 percent—52 percent oppose more aid; 39 percent support more aid—Democrats, 63 percent oppose sending more military aid; 25 percent support it.

March 11, YouGov: 52 percent of Americans said the United States should hold weapons shipments to Israel until it stops attacks in Gaza.

So you got a whole bunch of polls. They differ a little bit, but they say, pretty overwhelmingly, that the American people do not want to give more military aid to the Netanyahu war machine to continue its horrendous destructive policies in Gaza. That is what the American people are saying.

Earlier today, I tried to bring up two amendments dealing with the crisis in Gaza. One of them basically said that the United States should not support—should not supply any more offensive—offensive—military aid to the Netanyahu government. I support defensive measures—the Iron Dome. The Israeli people have a right not to be attacked with missiles and drones. That amendment not only—that amendment could not even get a vote. That is the U.S. Senate today. People overwhelmingly are in opposition to more U.S. aid. We can't even discuss this issue and have a vote.

Why are the American people as opposed as they are to more aid for the military in Israel? Well, among other things, it may have something to do with what some of the Israeli leaders are saying and, in fact, who they are. And I think the American people are catching on that what we have today in Israel is not the Israel of Golda Meir, Yitzhak Rabin. It is a government now significantly controlled not only by rightwing extremists but by religious zealots.

Today, what we are seeing is a situation where Netanyahu himself has never favored a two-state solution, and he has made that very clear and has worked to systematically undermine the prospects for a deal. And I might mention that a two-state solution is

the policy of the U.S. Government. His party's—Netanyahu's party's—founding charter reinforced in the current coalition agreement says “between the Sea and the Jordan [River] there will only be Israeli sovereignty.” For many years before October 7, Netanyahu told his allies, in private, that it was important to bolster Hamas to ensure that the Palestinians could never unify and form their own government.

In January, in terms of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, Netanyahu said:

We provide minimal humanitarian aid. If we want to achieve our war goals, we give the minimal aid.

The rest of the government or many others in that government is similarly extreme. At the start of the war, the Israeli Defense Minister declared a total siege, saying:

We are fighting human animals, and we are acting accordingly.

There will be no electricity, no food, no fuel. Everything is closed.

Another minister, at the start of the war, posted a picture of a devastated area in Gaza, saying it was “more beautiful than ever, bombing and flattening everything.”

Another Israeli lawmaker said:

[T]he Gaza Strip should be flattened, and there should be one sentence for everybody there—death. We have to wipe the Gaza Strip off the map. There are no innocents there.

Several officials have openly talked about reestablishing Israeli settlements in Gaza. The current Intelligence Minister, among others, openly talks of permanently displacing Palestinians from Gaza.

Israeli National Security Minister Itamar Ben-Gvir, who oversees the police, has long advocated for the forceful expulsion of Palestinians from the region. This is the current Israeli National Security Minister.

Finance Minister Bezalel Smotrich, responsible for much of the occupied West Bank has, likewise, long expressed the extreme racist views and has called for the expulsion of Palestinians from their lands. He has called for segregated hospital wards for Jews and Arabs because “Arabs are my enemies.” As a younger man, he was arrested by the Israeli authorities on suspicion of anti-Palestinian terrorism.

That is the man who is the current Israeli Finance Minister.

This is a significant part of Netanyahu's government. Those are some of the people whose war we are subsidizing.

We can pretend to ignore all of this. We can pretend that today's Israel is the Israel of 20 or 30 years ago, but that is just not the case. And the reason I raise these issues and talk about some of the people in the Israeli Government is to understand that what is happening today in Gaza is not an accident. It is a bringing forth the doing of what many of these people have wanted to do for a long time.

It should come as no surprise that this extreme government in Israel, right now, is not simply waging a war

against Hamas—and Israel has the right to defend itself from the terrorist organization of Hamas—but it is at war with the entire Palestinian people and fighting that war in a deeply reckless and immoral way. And that is why the Netanyahu government has consistently ignored President Biden's request that they do more to minimize civilian casualties, that they be more targeted in their approach, and that they let more humanitarian aid in.

And so given the attitude and the beliefs—the racist beliefs of a number of people in the Netanyahu government, let us take a look and see what is happening today in Gaza.

We all know that Hamas, a terrorist organization, began this war with a horrific attack on Israel that killed 1,200 men, women, and children and took more than 230 captives, some of whom are still in captivity today. And as I have said many times and repeated a moment ago, Israel has the right to defend itself; but it does not have the right to go to war against the entire Palestinian people, including women and children.

Let's take a deep breath and listen to some of these facts—and no one disputes these facts. The war is about 6½ months old. More than 34,000 Palestinians have been killed, and 77,000 have been wounded—70 percent of whom are women and children. That is 70 percent of whom are women and children. That means that 5 percent, 5 percent of the 2.2 million people in Gaza have been killed or wounded in a 6½-month period. That is an astronomical figure—astronomical. The number of people getting wounded—70 percent are women and children—is almost beyond comprehension.

Mr. President, 19,000 children are now orphans in Gaza—19,000—having lost their parents in this war. And when you think about the children in Gaza, literally, it is hard to imagine.

Imagine a 7-year-old in an area where the whole community has been flattened, where there is massive death, where there is no food, there is no water, no schools. Your parents may or may not be alive. Your relatives are dead. That is what the children in Gaza are going through right now, and I doubt that any of them will ever fully recover from the psychic trauma—the terrible, unbelievable trauma that they are experiencing at this moment.

And the killing has not stopped. Over the weekend, 139 Palestinians were killed and 251 were injured. Of these, 29 were killed in and around Rafah, including 20 children and 6 women, one of whom was pregnant.

Just today, more news emerged about mass graves found by Palestinian health authorities and U.N. observers at the Nasser Hospital in Khan Younis and the Al-Shifa Hospital in Gaza City. So far, more than 300 bodies have been found. The U.N. Human Rights Office reports that the dead include elderly people, women, and wounded people, and that some had

been bound and stripped of their clothes. Some of these bodies apparently had their hands tied, the U.N. said.

What can we say about this horror? Roughly 1.7 million people—and it is, again, hard to understand. Maybe think—Members of Congress, think about your own State and what this would mean and look like in your own States. We are dealing with a population of 2.2 million people which is about 3½ times the size of the State of Vermont.

Roughly 1.7 million people—over 75 percent of the population—have been driven from their homes. It is not a community which has been forced to evacuate in order for a military action to take place. This is three-quarters of the population driven from their homes.

Satellite data shows that 62 percent of the homes in Gaza have been damaged or destroyed, including 221,000 housing units that have been completely destroyed.

A number of months ago in Vermont, we had a terrible flood, and dozens of houses were destroyed. And I saw the impact of what the destruction of dozens of houses in my small State meant. We are talking about 221,000 housing units that have been completely destroyed.

But it is not just housing. Gaza's civilian infrastructure has been devastated. There is little or no electricity apart from generators or solar power. Most of the roads are badly damaged. More than half of the water and sanitation systems are out of commission. Clean water is severely limited, and sewage—raw sewage—is running through the streets, creating disease. But it is not just housing and civilian infrastructure.

And this is quite unbelievable, but there is a reason, I think, for all of this. None of this is happening by accident. Israel has systematically destroyed the healthcare system in Gaza. We are not talking about an occasional accidental bomb that destroys a medical unit or a hospital. Those things happen. What we are talking about is the reality that 26 out of 37 hospitals are completely out of service. They have been bombed and attacked in all kinds of ways. The 11 hospitals that are remaining are partially functioning, but they are being overwhelmed by tens of thousands of trauma patients, and they are short on medical supplies.

So you got 77,000 people who have been wounded, and you got almost all of the hospitals out of commission.

I met recently with a group of American and British doctors who recently returned from Gaza where they had gone, bravely risking their own lives, to try to help alleviate the terrible suffering taking place there. And it is difficult to relate the unspeakable things they witnessed. They saw thousands of patients, many young children, killed or maimed in Israeli bombings. They operated on little children, already or-

phaned, on dirty hospital floors. On many days, they had no morphine; on other days, no water or clean gloves. They knew that many victims, even if they survived the week, would die of infection without access to sanitary environments or antibiotics.

They reported that the Israelis would not allow them to bring in wheelchairs or syringes, claiming they might have some military use. They witnessed Israeli forces systematically cutting off electricity, food, and water to hospitals and abducting medical workers with no affiliation to Hamas. They reported that Israeli soldiers destroyed medical equipment, like MRIs, oxygen tanks, and CT scanners, for no apparent reason. These are American doctors who witnessed these things.

Overall, 84 percent of health facilities have been damaged or destroyed, and more than 400 healthcare workers have been killed—an extraordinary number.

But we are not just talking about housing being decimated. We are not just talking about physical infrastructure being decimated. We are not just talking about a healthcare system being decimated. Gaza is a young community. A lot of children live there, and their educational system has been destroyed. Fifty-six schools have been bombed and completely destroyed, and 219 have been damaged—schools. The last of Gaza's universities—I think they had 12 universities in Gaza, and the last one was demolished in January. Now, I am not quite sure how fighting Hamas has anything to do with destroying universities, but it does lead to the fact that some 625,000 students in Gaza have, today, no access to education.

Just today, David Satterfield, the U.S. Special Envoy for the Gaza humanitarian crisis, said that the risk of famine throughout war-devastated Gaza, especially in the north, is “very high” and that more aid must reach those areas.

He said:

We have always stressed that we were in a man-made situation, and it can only be addressed by political will and decisions.

So, on top of the destruction of housing, infrastructure, healthcare, and education, we are now looking at mass starvation and malnutrition. The United Nations estimates that more than 1 million Palestinians, including hundreds of thousands of children, face starvation. Desperate Gazans have been scraping by for months, foraging for leaves or eating animal feed. At least 28 children have died of malnutrition and dehydration. That is a number that came out several weeks ago, and there is no reason to believe the real number is not much, much higher. USAID Administrator Samantha Power said that famine was already present in northern Gaza.

Without food, clean water, sanitation, or sufficient healthcare, hundreds of thousands of people are at a severe risk of dehydration, infection, and easily preventable diseases. Yet, for

months, thousands of trucks carrying lifesaving food, medicine, and other supplies have sat just miles away from starving children. Got that? I hope we all try to put that image in our minds: starving children over here and trucks loaded with food on the other side of the border that are unable to get through and kept from entering Gaza by Israeli restrictions in a brutal war fought with little regard for civilians.

But let us be clear, and I think this is the main point I want to make this evening. This war stopped being about defending Israel and going to war against Hamas a long time ago. This is not any longer a war against the terrorist organization called Hamas. This is now a war that has everything to do with the destruction of the very fabric of Palestinian life. That is the goal of this war.

It is impossible to look at these facts and not conclude that the Israeli Government's policy has been to make Gaza uninhabitable. That is what some of their government leaders have wanted, and that is, in fact, what is happening. These are not accidents of war—mistakes. This is calculated policy. Indeed, this is what has been going on systematically over the last 6 months. These cruel actions are entirely consistent with the public statements of numerous Israeli senior officials, including Prime Minister Netanyahu himself.

That brings us to the role of the United States in this horrific war. Put simply, we are deeply complicit in what is happening. This is not an Israeli war; this is an Israeli-American war. Most of the bombs and most of the military equipment the Israeli Government is using in Gaza is provided by the United States and subsidized by American taxpayers. The U.S. military is not dropping 2,000-pound bombs on civilian apartment buildings. The U.S. military is not doing that, but we are supplying those bombs. The United States of America is not blocking the borders and preventing food, water, and medical supplies from getting to desperate people. We are not doing that, but we have supplied billions of dollars to the Netanyahu government, which is doing just that.

So this is not just an Israeli war; this is an American war as well. Yet, despite the massive financial and military support the United States has provided to Israel for many years, Netanyahu's extremist government has ignored urgent calls from the President and others to alter their military approach and to end this humanitarian disaster.

In my view, the U.S. unconditional financial and military support for Israel must end. That is why I offered an amendment to this bill—to do, in fact, what a majority of the American people wants us to do, and that is to no longer provide military aid to the destructive Netanyahu government.

I would have welcomed the chance to vote for the humanitarian aid provision in this bill. It is terribly important that we start feeding people not only in Gaza but in Sudan and all over the world. It is an important provision, and I support it. I believe very strongly we should support Ukraine and help them end—defeat—the imperialist ventures of Putin and the Russian army. But I am not going to be able to do that because I am going to stand with the American people today who oppose more money for Netanyahu.

Let me conclude by simply saying this: What we are doing today is very bad policy. We are aiding and abetting the destruction of the Palestinian people. What we are doing today is not what the American people want, and I say to my Democratic friends, it is absolutely not. A lot of Republicans don't want us to continue that as well, but a strong majority of Democrats is saying: Enough with Netanyahu's war. You just can't give him another \$10 billion for unfettered military aid.

But I suppose, in a little while, as things happen here in Congress, we will ignore the needs of the American people; we will not pay attention to what they want. Then we are shocked—just shocked—that we have a 14-percent approval rating.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as our Nation and our allies face a host of challenges across the globe, it is critical that we deploy the necessary resources to protect freedom, support democracy, and address humanitarian crises abroad. For Ukraine, especially, this assistance could not come at a more crucial time. While Putin continues to wage his war of aggression against the Ukrainian people and on democracy itself, Ukraine is running dangerously low on artillery and air defense munitions, as well as other vital supplies. This aid is critical not only to support the Ukrainian people in their fight against Putin, but also to defend freedom and democracy worldwide. Our allies and adversaries alike are watching closely to see if the United States and our partners will keep our promises to the people of Ukraine in their hour of need or whether we will retreat.

In particular, we know that President Xi has one eye on the war in Ukraine and the other eye on Taiwan. As Taiwan prepares to inaugurate its newly elected President next month, the PRC has ratcheted up diplomatic and military pressure against Taipei. We have also recently seen increasingly provocative maneuvers by China's coast guard against the Philippines' vessels in the South China Sea. These actions underscore the need for increased security cooperation between the U.S. and our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific. That is why I am glad this bill provides additional funding for security assistance to our partners there.

This bill also includes important provisions to protect our security here at

home by investing more in the Non-profit Security Grant Program—NSGP—which helps protect various community institutions that are at risk of hate crimes, including synagogues, mosques, and certain other houses of worship. The alarming rise of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and anti-Arab incidents since the October 7 attacks underscores the vital need for more resources to help protect our communities from bigotry and hate. As we confront these challenges across the country, I believe it is critical that all Americans feel safe in their houses of worship. This legislation makes that possible with investments to install essential security measures. Additionally, it boosts screenings and inspections at border points of entry to better protect American families from the threat posed by the deadly flow of fentanyl into our Nation, a drug that has caused pain and loss for far too many.

In addition to these provisions, this legislation includes over \$9 billion in humanitarian aid that will reach people in desperate need around the world, from Gaza to Sudan and elsewhere. Last week, we marked the solemn anniversary of the start of the civil war in Sudan, where more than 25 million people currently need humanitarian assistance. This aid will also support innocent civilians in Gaza, where four out of five of the hungriest people anywhere in the world currently reside. I am glad to support this funding that will provide necessities like food, water, shelter, and medical care to the world's most vulnerable people. That being said, I am deeply disappointed that this bill prohibits any of the available funds from going to UNRWA, which provides vital services to Palestinian refugees in many countries and is the main humanitarian aid distribution entity in Gaza. According to USAID Administrator Samantha Power, famine is already occurring in Gaza. Amid such a crisis, it is unconscionable to cut off funding, without a mechanism to reinstate it, for the primary distributor of urgently needed aid to starving people. To rectify this, I put forward an amendment to provide a process to restore that funding following the ongoing investigation and appropriate remedial actions. While we did not have an opportunity to vote on that amendment, I will continue to seek to reverse the current ban—which Republicans demanded be included in the recent government funding bill—on U.S. funding for UNRWA through March 2025. I will also press the Biden administration to encourage other countries to continue to support UNRWA and use our support for international organizations in a way that advances that goal. The underlying bill does include substantial assistance that is desperately needed at this time in Gaza and around the world and is better than our alternative at this point—which is to provide nothing.

Within this legislation, I also support the funding for defensive weapons sys-

tems, like the Iron Dome, to protect Israel from Hamas, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Hezbollah, and other threats in the region. The October 7 Hamas terrorist attack on Israel was horrific; we must prevent any such future horrors and secure the release of all remaining hostages. I fully support Israel's right—indeed, its duty—to defend itself. But while this war is just, it must be fought justly. I do not support a blank check for offensive weapons for the Netanyahu government's current campaign in Gaza. I will continue to press for a cease-fire and the return of all the hostages but, in the meantime, we cannot turn a blind eye to what President Biden has described as “indiscriminate” bombing or to the failure of the Netanyahu government to meet its obligations to facilitate, and not arbitrarily restrict, the delivery of assistance to address the humanitarian catastrophe in Gaza. Given these concerns, had this been an up or down vote strictly on military assistance for Israel, I would have insisted on amendments to ensure that no funds for offensive weapons would flow to the Netanyahu government until it cooperates fully in the delivery of humanitarian assistance to starving people in Gaza; agrees not to launch an invasion into Rafah, where over 1.3 million Palestinians were told to seek safety; and allows an independent investigation into the deaths of all humanitarian aid workers killed in Gaza. For now, I will continue to press the administration to pause any further transfers of offensive military aid until the Netanyahu government meets President Biden's demands and will use the congressional review process to reinforce that position. A partnership should not be a one-way street.

I appreciate that President Biden issued National Security Memorandum 20, based on the amendment that I, together with 18 of my colleagues, proposed when the supplemental was first considered in the Senate months ago. That amendment, and the ensuing NSM-20, are designed to better ensure that American taxpayer dollars are used in a manner consistent with our values and our interests. Specifically, NSM-20 requires recipients of U.S. security assistance to use our support in accordance with international law and to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance in conflict areas where they are using U.S.-supplied weapons. It also requires the Biden administration to submit to Congress by May 8 a written report on whether recipients of U.S. security assistance have been complying with those obligations. The administration's report will be a test of whether they are willing to apply those standards to allies as well as adversaries and take any actions necessary to ensure accountability.

This sweeping national security bill has many provisions that raise concerns, but on balance, it provides the resources that are vital to support the people of Ukraine and advance important American priorities around the

world. That is why, despite certain reservations, I support this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it has been no easy task to get us to this point. The world has been watching; the clock has been ticking; but we are finally at the finish line.

I am not just glad but relieved we are finally about to pass the bill from the House that, as many of us noted, includes every pillar of the package we passed overwhelmingly here in the Senate back in February, essentially identical in the funding that we are providing.

I think it is fair to say, thanks to the bipartisanship and a shared commitment to doing what is best for America, the Senate has made its voice heard in this process.

In particular, I want to, once again, thank my counterpart and vice chair, Senator COLLINS. We don't agree on everything, but we both had a real appreciation for the seriousness of this work and the importance of negotiating a bill that would pass both Chambers. As I have said, this package is not the product I would have written just by myself; it is the result of a difficult bipartisan process. Crafting this package has required serious, sober discussion, not partisanship, not political show.

So thanks to Senator COLLINS, Leader SCHUMER, the minority leader, and many others, this legislation provides the resources necessary to make the world safer for America and its allies. We are delivering investments to address the challenges of today and investing in our strategy for the future. This package makes clear that Congress understands that the conflict in Ukraine is not disjointed from future aggression by the Chinese Communist Party.

From the beginning I was clear: The challenges we face around the world are interconnected. We have to deliver a comprehensive package. Half steps cannot cut it. This package ensures that America keeps its word to all of our allies and stands by all of our commitments.

Especially important to me: in passing this package, we do not lose sight of the human reality on the ground, the fact that in the middle of every conflict are civilians—people displaced from their homes, people facing obstacles getting basic medical services, and kids and families who desperately need food and water.

I made certain at every step that this bill delivers badly needed humanitarian assistance for Gaza, Sudan, Ukraine, and many other regions caught in conflict.

So now we are at the finish line. Let's vote to stand by our allies, to say to dictators like Putin that they cannot invade sovereign democracies freely and unchecked and that America will not ignore the humanity and the cries for help from civilians who are caught in the middle of conflict and crossfire whom we must protect.

Tonight, Moscow and Beijing are watching closely to see whether we have the vision to recognize how these crises are related and the resolve to come together and respond forcefully to them. Our adversaries are cheering for dysfunction. Let's show them unity instead. Let's show them the strength of democracy. Let's vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the pending measure, the House message to accompany H.R. 815, contains an emergency designation: on page 12, lines 3 through 6, and another emergency designation on page 12, lines 12 through 15. I, therefore, raise a point of order pursuant to section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against both of these designations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget points of order for the purposes of the pending measure, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 153 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Baldwin	Coons	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Cornyn	Hirono
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Hoeven
Booker	Cramer	Hyde-Smith
Boozman	Crapo	Kaine
Brown	Duckworth	Kelly
Butler	Durbin	Kennedy
Cantwell	Fetterman	King
Capito	Fischer	Klobuchar
Carper	Gillibrand	Lankford
Casey	Graham	Lujan
Cassidy	Hassan	Manchin
Collins	Heinrich	Markey

McConnell	Ricketts	Tester
Menendez	Risch	Thune
Merkley	Romney	Tillis
Moran	Rosen	Van Hollen
Mullin	Rounds	Warner
Murkowski	Schatz	Warnock
Murphy	Schumer	Warren
Murray	Shaheen	Welch
Ossoff	Sinema	Whitehouse
Padilla	Smith	Wicker
Peters	Stabenow	Wyden
Reed	Sullivan	Young

NAYS—20

Barrasso	Daines	Marshall
Blackburn	Ernst	Rubio
Braun	Grassley	Sanders
Britt	Hagerty	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lummis	Vance

NOT VOTING—5

Cardin	Paul	Tuberville
Hawley	Scott (SC)	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). On this vote, the yeas are 75, the nays are 20.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. This has been an extremely important day in the history of our country and the free world. They are all watching, waiting to see what we would do.

When Putin escalated his war against Ukraine, I told our colleagues that allies and adversaries, alike, would pay very close attention to America's response. When Iran-backed terrorists invaded the Jewish State on October 7 to slaughter innocent Israelis, I warned that the world would watch closely for signs that American leadership was actually weakening.

For months, our friends have watched to see whether America still had the strength that won the Cold War or the resolve that has underpinned peace and prosperity, literally, for decades. Our enemies have tested whether the arsenal of democracy is, in fact, built to endure.

Well, tonight, the Senate will send a clear message. History will record that, even if allies and partners have worried about the depth of our resolve; even as Moscow, Beijing, and Tehran grew more convinced that our influence had run its course; and even as loud voices here at home insisted on abandoning responsibilities of leadership, America stepped up and the Senate held firm.

It is time to reaffirm some basic truths. Alliances matter. Foreign nations' respect for American interests depends on our willingness to defend them. And the peace, prosperity, and security are not accidents. They are products of American leadership and American sacrifice.

The votes we are about to cast will be among the most consequential. But the difficult work of restoring and sustaining hard power, defense, industrial capacity, and global influence must continue beyond this supplemental.

So I will just say to my colleagues: We can wish for a world where the responsibilities of leadership don't fall on

us or we can act like we understand that they do. Tonight, as in so many moments in our history, idle calls for America to lower its guard ring hollow. None of us is absolved of our duty to see the world as it actually is. None of us is excused from our obligation to equip the United States to face down those who wish us harm.

I said it before: History settles every account. And I welcome the eyes of posterity on what the Senate does tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, finally, finally, tonight, after more than 6 months of hard work and many twists and turns in the road, America sends a message to the entire world: We will not turn our back on you.

Tonight, we tell our allies: We stand with you.

We tell our adversaries: Don't mess with us.

We tell the world: The United States will do everything to safeguard democracy and our way of life.

This bill is one of the most consequential measures Congress has passed in years to protect America's security and the future—the very future—of Western democracy. And after overcoming a lot of opposition, tonight, Congress finishes the job.

To our friends in Ukraine, to our friends in Israel, to our friends in the Indo-Pacific, and to innocent civilians caught in the midst of a war from Gaza to Sudan: America hears you. We will be there for you.

And to the whole world, rest assured. Rest assured that America will never shrink from its responsibilities as a leader on the world stage.

Tonight, we make Vladimir Putin regret the day he questioned American resolve.

I thank President Biden for his unflinching leadership. I thank Speaker JOHNSON and Leader JEFFRIES for working together valiantly to pass this bill. I thank Chair MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS for their excellent work.

And I particularly want to thank my caucus for standing firm. We were always united. You gave us strength to get this job done. I salute you.

And, particularly, I want to thank Leader MCCONNELL. We worked on this bill arm in arm, together, shoulder to shoulder. Without that kind of strong bipartisan leadership, this difficult bill would never have passed.

We now come to the end of a long, difficult, and Herculean effort. Our allies around the world have been watching Congress for the last 6 months and wondering the same thing: When it matters most, will America summon the strength to come together, overcome the centrifugal pull of partnership, and meet the magnitude of this moment? Tonight, under the watchful eye of history, the Senate answers this question with a thunderous and resounding yes.

For a little more good news, for the information of Senators, the Senate will not be in session on Monday, April 29. The next rollcall vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time be deemed expired.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the pending motion to concur with amendment No. 1842 be withdrawn.

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

MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the motion to concur.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blumenthal	Grassley	Ricketts
Booker	Hassan	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Romney
Britt	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Butler	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Kelly	Sinema
Carper	Kennedy	Smith
Casey	King	Stabenow
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Collins	Lankford	Tester
Coons	Lujan	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Cotton	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Menendez	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Daines	Mullin	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Fetterman	Ossoff	
Fischer	Padilla	

NAYS—18

Barrasso	Hawley	Rubio
Blackburn	Johnson	Sanders
Braun	Lee	Schmitt
Budd	Lummis	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Hagerty	Merkley	Welch

NOT VOTING—3

Paul	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
------	------------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 815 is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 598.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Georgia N. Alexakis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 598, Georgia N. Alexakis, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Mark Kelly, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 211, H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Peter Welch, Brian Schatz, Edward J. Markey, Thomas R. Carper, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal, Mark