

treatment of peaceful activists and the continued targeting of independent civil society organizations.

I have used my prerogative as chair of the Foreign Relations Committee in the arms sales process before, and I will continue to do so in the future regarding systems that may consistently relate to these concerns.

But in the end, our relationship with Egypt has to be one of maintaining a balance between the foreign policy and national security concerns of the United States and our partners.

We should, however, continue to raise human rights concerns and press for meaningful reforms. We should continue encouraging the government to uphold its own commitments, but to this end, because these are purely, not only—they are logistical at best, I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to discharge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, tonight we are going to consider S.J. Res. 35 and 36, and they are the resolutions of disapproval regarding arms sales to Egypt. Egypt has been a key partner of the United States since the 1979 Camp David Accords.

It continues to play a critical role in Middle East peace. Egypt is a valuable counterterrorism partner and is essential to U.S. accession in the region and the U.S. success in the region. Look, for those who haven't had the good fortune of being there, when the peace broke out between Israel and Egypt decades ago, Egypt played a key role in making that peace. And ever since then, the border between Egypt and Israel on the Sinai has been peaceful, notwithstanding the fact that they have incidents there all the time.

But the Egyptians and the Israelis, brokered by the multilateral force that is there, keeps the peace, and it has been a great success story in the Middle East, one of the few that has had duration. And so in that regard, Egypt has been very valuable in helping keep the peace in the region.

The Biden administration and Democratic Senate and House leaders agreed on these sales because they are in the interest of the United States and, indeed, of the world and particularly of the Middle East. These sales of cargo aircraft and radar support the United States-Egypt relationship and are in keeping with Egypt's legitimate defense requirements.

Human rights are a critical element of our foreign relations. They always have been, and they always will be. And Egypt has problems it needs to fix.

The United States has withheld aid and taken other measures to highlight our concerns to the Egyptian Government. Indeed, Egypt is not a perfect partner, and we have almost no perfect partners when we are dealing with foreign countries on national security.

Nonetheless, each of these is transactional, and they have to be weighed

and viewed individually. These sales that we are talking about here to Egypt present no direct human rights concerns and should be separated from that conversation.

So, on substance, I oppose the resolution.

In addition to that, there is a bigger issue here. The statutory 30-day congressional notification period for these sales expired last Wednesday, March 2. The Parliamentarian has now ruled that the statutory 30-day period is effectively irrelevant and that any Senator can offer for privileged consideration a resolution of disapproval for any arms sales notified over the course of an entire Congress.

If this stands and continues, it would have a chilling effect on U.S. alliances and partnerships worldwide, and it could set a new procedure as far as dilatory tactics are concerned on the Senate floor.

The 1987 precedent that the Parliamentarian cites as justification is from a time when there was a bipartisan agreement to extend the timeline for simple procedural reasons. This is not the case now. And I disagree with the Parliamentarian's interpretation thereof.

It always amazes me around here that we can get a Parliamentarian ruling that is in direct—I mean direct contradiction of a statute, which is what we have here.

I ask—and I would urge—Senate leadership to work to ensure the intent of the statutory 30-day notification period is restored. Perhaps we should repass the statute and say we really, really mean it. Nonetheless, that is where we are, and this really needs to be corrected.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 80, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Blumenthal
Brown
Carper
Heinrich
Hirono
Leahy
Lee

Luján
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Ossoff
Padilla
Paul

Peters
Sanders
Smith
Stabenow
Warren

NAYS—80

Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blunt
Booker

Boozman
Braun
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin

Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto

Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hassan
Hawley
Hickenlooper
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kaine

Kelly
Kennedy
King
Klobuchar
Lankford
Lummis
Manchin
Marshall
McConnell
Menendez
Moran
Murkowski
Murray
Portman
Reed
Risch
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse

Schatz
Schumer
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shaheen
Shelby
Sinema
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Tuberville
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The motion was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maria L. Pagan, of Puerto Rico, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Ex.]

YEAS—80

Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cramer
Crapo
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Gillibrand

Graham
Grassley
Hassan
Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Hoeven
Kaine
Kelly
Kennedy
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Luján
Manchin
Markley
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Portman

Reed
Risch
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sanders
Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NAYS—19

Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Braun	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Hagerty	Marshall	
Hawley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as if in executive session, I ask that the motion to reconsider with respect to the Pagan nomination be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ENERGY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to offer a few remarks about claims that have been made on this floor over the course of the last few days regarding the path forward to American energy independence.

The oil industry—reaping record profits in the billions of dollars—is taking advantage, quite artfully, of the crisis in Ukraine to make arguments to the U.S. Congress and this administration that they should be given new liberties to drill on lands in the United States to be able to reap even greater profits.

And the claim that the oil industry makes that is often parroted by friends inside this body is that the path to American energy independence runs through drilling for more oil in the United States of America. That is not true. That is an oil industry talking point. That is a means by which the industry can get Congress and the administration to provide them with new opportunities for more profit.

But the facts belie the argument that America could achieve energy independence solely through drilling for more oil and exploring for more gas in the United States. Why do we know this? Well, we know this, primarily, because the oil industry doesn't drill in the United States to benefit our national security. They drill in the United States to make money. And the reality is, when the price of a barrel of oil is too low compared to the cost of pulling it out of the ground in the United States, the oil companies don't drill. Right now, for instance, the oil industry has thousands of leases to drill on public lands that they are not utilizing.

As you would hear it on the floor of the Senate, the failure to be energy

independent is Joe Biden's fault because he is not providing for any new leases on public lands. Well, you do not need any new leases on public lands because there are thousands of leases that the oil industry already has to drill that they just are not using. There is nothing in the ground. There is no oil coming up. And the reason for that is, well, the economy was in shambles, so there wasn't demand; the price of oil was down so that the companies didn't see a big enough profit; there is a general workforce shortage right now in the industry. But none of those reasons are Joe Biden. Those are market-based reasons why the oil industry has not been drilling on land they already own.

The second reason why there is not a path to energy independence through drilling alone is because the oil that we drill in the United States, it doesn't stay in the United States. Some of it does, but much of it gets exported. In 2020, we were drilling about 18 million barrels a day in the United States. About half of that was shipped overseas. Only half of that stayed in the United States. I wanted to make sure that wasn't something we needed to pay closer attention to.

The oil that we drill in the United States doesn't stay here. It goes to the highest bidder. In fact, often, the oil we drill in the United States is going to China. For as hard as my friends on the other side of the aisle say we should be on China, the reality is, during some months of the last several years, America was sending record amounts of oil from U.S. oil production facilities to the Chinese Government.

It just isn't true that there is a path to American energy security simply by drilling for more oil in the United States. That oil only comes out of the ground when the price is high enough. The oil industry doesn't drill to be patriotic. They drill to make money. And there is never a guarantee that that oil or that gas stays in the United States; much of it is sent overseas.

As I mentioned, there is also no argument to be made credibly that Joe Biden is waging some war on American energy independence.

The two biggest changes that are often cited that the President made: One is, as I referenced, this pause on new leases on public lands. That just has very little impact because, first of all, very little of the oil that the industry drills is on public lands. Only 10 percent of the oil the industry drills is on public lands. Ninety percent of it is on privately held lands, so a pause on 10 percent of the leases just doesn't have a macro effect on oil drilling.

Second, any leases that the administration would give out right now, they don't end up in drilling occurring for years. So whether or not we are pausing or not pausing leases on 10 percent of the opportunities to drill in the United States, that has an impact years from now, not today.

The argument is, "Well, the President stopped the Keystone Pipeline

from going into effect." Same thing. The Keystone Pipeline was years out; and, second, most of the Keystone Pipeline oil wasn't staying in the United States. Most of that oil was going to be shipped overseas.

There is a reason why the Keystone Pipeline was ending up near the terminals in the Gulf that ended up sending oil to places other than the United States. Once again, the Keystone Pipeline was not a guarantee for American energy independence; that was a guarantee that the majority of that oil was going to end up in some other country.

And so if you are serious about energy independence, then you are not serious if you are talking about getting there through drilling. This is not a serious solution, because the facts tell you that the drilling only happens when the oil industry makes enough money and that the lion's share, at least half of that oil and gas, can end up going overseas, not to American consumers.

Do you know how you do make this country energy independent? Investing in renewables, because we don't ship wind power overseas. We don't ship solar energy overseas. When a wind turbine is running in Iowa or a solar panel is generating energy in California, that energy goes straight onto the American grid. That energy stays right here in the United States.

Now, it also has a tremendous benefit of being clean energy, of not contributing to the warming of the planet. That alone is a good enough reason to prioritize clean energy over fossil fuel energy, but renewable energy also has the benefit of being truly domestic energy; truly secure, American-only energy, as opposed to fossil fuels, which only get turned on when the price is high enough and often end up leaving the United States to other countries.

Those are the facts. The oil industry delights when crises like this occur and the prices go up at the pump, and friends of theirs come down and claim that the only path to energy independence is through more drilling. But the problem is it just isn't true.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about our Nation's energy policy and the crisis that we find ourselves in as the cost of energy continues to go up and up and up.

Right now, gas prices are nearly double what they were the day that Joe Biden became President of the United States.

So you ask: Why is this happening? That is what consumers, that is what