

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, the America COMPETES Act, the yeas are 66, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

# AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4521) to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5002

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 5002.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of March 22, 2022, under "Text of Amendments.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5003 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5002

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5003 to amendment No. 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5004 TO AMENDMENT 5003

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5004 to amendment No. 5003.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 5005

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have an amendment to the underlying bill at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5005 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5006 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5005

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5006 to amendment No. 5005.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 2, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

## MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5007

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to commit H.R. 4521 to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. The clerk will report. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to commit H.R. 4521 to the Committee

on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 5007.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5008

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5008 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 2, strike "5 days" and insert "6 days".

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 5009 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5008

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5009 to amendment No. 5008.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 1, strike "6 days" and insert "7 days".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, as President Biden begins the most important foreign trip of his Presidency, the best thing the Senate can do this week is pass permanent normal trade relation legislation so we can land another devastating blow on Putin's economy. In a few moments, I will ask the Senate for consent to do just that.

Last week, the House passed legislation revoking Russia's normal trade relations with the United States by 424 to 8—424 to 8. The vast majority of House Republicans backed it, including Leader MCCARTHY and the Republican leadership.

Here in the Senate, my friend, the senior Senator from Idaho, sincerely believes that we should amend the bill by including an oil ban. I don't believe we should do that. As I said earlier today, there are four reasons why we should move forward quickly on PNTR and then have a separate discussion on the oil ban.

First, President Biden has already implemented a ban on Russian oil and gas, so passing something the President has already done is not even remotely as urgent as passing the PNTR first, especially because the President is leaving today and meeting with our European allies. What could be better than a united Senate putting further sanctions on Russia as the President meets with our European allies, where he has done a very good job of bringing them together?

Second, there is still some disagreement, including with the administration, about how to best draft an oil ban proposal. There are some who worry that the proposal that my friend from Idaho is pushing would actually delay the ban on Russian oil compared to the President's proposal. This is a consequence no one wants.

Third, it is so important we show unity right now as President Biden meets with our European allies. Swift Senate action, combining Democrats and Republicans with one voice supporting PNTR, would do just that.

Finally, the House is not in session. Any changes we would make to the PNTR legislation by amendment delays enactment by at least a week. There is no reason—absolutely no reason—to change the PNTR legislation the House has already approved and delay action.

Now, again I repeat: I am, Senator WYDEN is, and all we Senate Democrats are willing to work with Senator CRAPO on this issue, if he can agree to let the process move forward.

So let me say again, PNTR has already been overwhelmingly passed by the House. It is a very important and logical step in the fight against Putin's barbaric war. We should move the House bill ASAP.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7108

So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 7108, which is at the desk; that there be 4 hours of debate equally divided; and that no amendments be in order; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

I rise to address Ukraine's perilous situation. There is broad agreement in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives that America's response in all areas to Russia and Belarus's aggression against Ukraine must be comprehensive and strong.

Leveraging the benefits of the U.S. trade relationship with Russia is just such a response that will add to the pressures on Putin to rethink his actions in Ukraine and punish him for what he has already done.

On March 8, the Democratic and Republican leadership in the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means reached an agreement on precisely that type of response. The bicameral, bipartisan agreement is called the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act, and its provisions include banning Russian energy imports, including various forms of petroleum, natural gas, and coal; moving Russia and Belarus to the same pariah trade status as North Korea and Cuba; providing the President additional authority to raise tariffs on Russia and Belarus even further; calling on WTO members to take similar actions to deprive Russia of its trade benefits; and sending a crystal-clear message to Russia's dictator, Vladimir Putin, that he will never see these trade benefits restored until he reverses his aggression, stops threatening our NATO allies, and recognizes the right of the Ukrainian people to live freely.

None of this is controversial, and all of it is necessary.

Yet only a day after the deal was made and with neither warning nor explanation, the House split the energy ban from the trade status provision and bifurcated the two measures further by imposing separate standards on Putin's actions in Ukraine before any President can think to restore these trade benefits to Russia without congressional approval.

Each bill passed by over 400 votes, but the House decided to only transmit the bill on Russia's trade status, its permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR piece, even though it had passed more than a week after the energy ban.

The important point is that our House colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree both restrictions need to happen. Some may wonder why the urgent need for the congressional energy import ban after President Biden provided one in his Executive order.

Speaker PELOSI was asked just that question when she put the new House version of the import ban up for a vote, and she stated, correctly, to her House colleagues: "You're here to legislate."

Absolutely, that is why we are here. And our legislative response—more es-

pecially its certification requirements—must deliver an unmistakable message to Putin: no relief until you stop your aggression and recognize Ukraine's inalienable right to live free and choose its leaders. The energy ban and its trade status revocation are complementary, and they must work together.

While President Biden's Executive order to ban Russian oil was a positive step, the Senate and House need to impose tough conditions on Putin's treatment of Ukraine to be met before any President seeks an end to the energy import ban. These conditions are like those Congress had done in the bipartisan CAATSA legislation, which we negotiated when I was the Banking Committee chairman during the Trump administration.

Enacting a Russian oil ban will demonstrate to the Ukrainian people and our NATO allies that Congress is committed to cutting off Russia's funding for its war effort.

Many of our allies, including in Europe, are debating whether to adopt an energy ban against Russia. By the U.S. Congress acting definitively and with certainty through our congressional action, our allies will all be more encouraged to take similar stands against Russian energy exports, which account for over a third of Russia's budget.

I seek to continue our bipartisan tradition by introducing text that is as close to the original deal as possible, except in two respects, that respond to the points made by our majority leader—both made to facilitate our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

First, I am making a single technical correction, made at the request of Senators MANCHIN and MURKOWSKI, to comport with the timeline of the President's Executive order regarding the oil ban so that no delay such as was mentioned as a possible problem will exist. This edit is necessary to avoid that delay, and it solves that problem.

Second, I have revised the certification criteria that would allow the restoration of trade benefits to match exactly what the House passed. The original deal provided that benefits could not be restored until Russia withdrew its forces and stopped posing an immediate threat to NATO allies and partners. To secure bipartisan support, I yielded to what the House passed: that Russia need only reach an agreement with the President to withdraw its forces rather than have definitively withdrawn them and that Russia not pose a threat to NATO members as opposed to NATO members and their partners.

Again, this is to match what the House has requested. Mind you, I have many colleagues on my side who would like to do many more things, and I agree with their requests. But on the trade front, I am willing to make these concessions to get this done.

My view is that we should act quickly. I agree with the majority leader on

this. We must do it together, and we must do it today. There is no reason to wait for another revenue bill to come from the House before we act. So let us mark the bravery of the Ukrainian people by passing the strongest legislation we can, today, in the trade space.

Accordingly, I am asking the Senator to modify his request to take the firm, comprehensive action against Vladimir Putin that circumstances require. I would like to ask that the Senator modify his request to make it in order for the Crapo substitute amendment, which is at the desk, to be considered and agreed to and that the Senate vote on the passage of the bill as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object to the request from the Senator from Idaho, it is my understanding that the Senator's modification would not include provisions that were included in the House-passed legislation that modifies the global Magnitsky sanction regime.

I just would like to speak for a moment, if I might. There is no question that we stand with the people of Ukraine against the unprovoked attack by Mr. Putin. We are inspired every day by the courage of the Ukrainian people and by their inspirational leader, President Zelenskyy.

The United States has shown leadership, and I congratulate the Biden administration. We have led the free world in providing defensive lethal weapons to Ukraine to defend itself. We have provided humanitarian assistance, joining the global community, including dealing with 3 million Ukrainians that are now refugees in other countries and 10 million that have been displaced as a result of Mr. Putin's unprovoked attack.

And we have led on sanctions. We have led in getting the global unity to impose sanctions against not just the Russian sectors, but also against individuals. And when Mr. Zelenskyy spoke before the Members of Congress, he specifically mentioned the importance of these sanctions; and he asked us to expand those covered by the sanctions to include the enablers, those that are enabling Mr. Putin—the oligarchs—to be able to fund his aggression against Ukraine.

So what did the House send over to us? In their bill, they sent over a global Magnitsky modification. It is identical to legislation that was filed by Senator PORTMAN and myself that included the revocation of PNTR for Russia, along with the global Magnitsky. First and foremost, it removes the sunset that is in the legislation that would sunset this year.

Mr. Zelenskyy asked for us to be resolved in being willing to stand up to Mr. Putin, that it would take some time. A clear message is that we remove the sunset on the global Magnitsky statute. And we know how difficult it is to get legislation passed in this body.

It also expands the global Magnitsky to include the enablers—exactly what Mr. Zelenskyy asked us to do—those that enabled—the oligarchs that allowed him to be able to finance this. The language that is included in here is very similar to the language that was included in President Trump's Executive order. This is critical legislation.

Now, let me just tell you how appropriate it is that it is included in a PNTR bill—because the first Magnitsky sanction bill—and Senator WYDEN was very important in getting this done—was included in the original PNTR bill for Russia, and we were able to get it done at that time.

We then made it a global Magnitsky, and my partner on that was the late Senator McCain. It has always been bipartisan. My partner now is Senator WICKER. The two of us have joined forces to make sure we get it done now. It is critically important in order to impose banking restrictions on those that are targeted under the global Magnitsky, as well as visa restrictions on being able to travel.

How important is it? Ask Mr. Usmanov, who is one of the principal oligarchs to Mr. Putin, who solves Mr. Putin's business problems. Guess how he solves those problems? Well, his yacht has now been confiscated in Germany. That is how important these sanctions are and how we have to move them forward.

So, if I understand my colleague's request, it would deny the opportunity for us to act on the global Magnitsky, which Mr. Zelenskyy has specifically asked us to do. We would lose that opportunity. We would be sending this bill back to the House that is not in session, which means there will be a further delay in repealing PNTR for Russia, which is something we need to do now, today. We can get it to the President for signature today under the majority leader's request.

And as the majority leader has indicated, I support the energy ban—I support the Russian energy ban. President Biden has already taken steps to do that. And I agree with my colleague from Idaho. I would like to incorporate that in statute, but there is no urgency to do that as there is on repealing PNTR and the global Magnitsky. That is the urgency. That is what we need to get done today. That is what we can get to the President this afternoon under the majority leader's request, and that will be denied if my friend from Idaho's request were granted.

So, for all those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, reserving the right to object and just briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. I would like to say to my colleague Senator CARDIN, I believe we could easily work the global

Magnitsky legislation into whatever we do today. I don't believe there will be objections to moving ahead on that. It is not included in what I submitted because that was not a part of the original four-corners agreement which I am proposing. I think that could be added.

I also have colleagues on my side of the aisle who have other items they would like to see discussed because the idea we are talking about here is to move ahead with no amendments on legislation that is major. And I am willing to discuss that as well, but I believe we need time to work this out.

We can get this done today. And even though the House is not in session today, our passage of global legislation on this entire issue would send a powerful message that the House could affirm when it does come back into session next week.

So I will still need to object, but I will commit to my colleagues on the other side that I will work with you today to try to iron out these differences. I need to have assurances that these other pieces that, for some unexplained reason, the House has not been willing to put into this package can be put into a package that will pass. And if we can get to that point, we can move today.

So I commit that I will work with you; but at this point, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I thank my colleague from Idaho. I know he sincerely wants to move forward. The best way to send a message is pass the House bill, get it to the President, and have him be able to sign it while the European allies and we are meeting.

But I am disappointed, though, that we were unable to take quick action now, but I very much appreciate what Senator CRAPO has said now. And Senator CRAPO and I had a good discussion this morning. We agree. We want to get to a bipartisan resolution to this legislation.

So Senators WYDEN, CRAPO, and my staff are going to work throughout the day on language related to the oil ban and the other issues that Senator CRAPO talked about that we could consider separately. We would then move to pass PNTR separately, which we hope we can pass today or certainly tomorrow.

So I am committed to getting this issue resolved and very much appreciate my friend, the Senator from Idaho's willingness to discuss it so we can work out something that both sides can accept.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank Leader SCHUMER.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, let me pick up on what both of my colleagues have just said. Senator SCHUMER and Senator CRAPO have both said

how committed we are to getting this worked out today. And as Senator SCHUMER said, under his leadership, the Finance Committee—the chair and the ranking member—that is what we are going to be working on so that this actually happens.

And I want to make sure everybody understands what that means. It means that while the President is in these crucial discussions right now in Europe, the Senate—in the most expedited way, which is to pass the House legislation today—would revoke permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

And here is why that is so important. Vladimir Putin's inhumane conduct means that Russia has forfeited the right to the benefits of the international trade order that was established after World War II. And what the Senate can do by passing the House bill today would amount to the harshest economic consequences in a generation. Let me be specific about that.

When we pass that legislation that came over from the House here in the Senate, it would immediately trigger a significant increase in tariffs on Russian-made products. Adding to that, the proposal also includes authority for the President to raise tariffs even higher in the future. These tariffs would directly level a significant set of restrictions on Putin's circle of oligarchs, who export everything from chemicals to plywood. This is an absolutely essential step in ensuring that Russia is a pariah state.

So to wrap up, apropos of the comments from the distinguished Senate majority leader and our ranking member—and the President of the Senate has worked with him as well—we had a good discussion over the last half-hour that is going to focus on getting passage of the House bill done today. And as Senator SCHUMER, Senator CRAPO, and I have all noted, those discussions have been ongoing, but we are going to step it up so we can get this done today and send the House bill to the President's desk by close of business today.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I wanted to join in the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, which I currently sit on, and my distinguished colleague on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is the author of the Magnitsky Act.

I just hope—I came loaded for bear to the floor because I thought we were going to have a different result, but I am optimistically going to expect that we are going to have a resolution because, look, there are burnt bodies in the streets of Ukraine. There are mass graves to bury the dead. There are Ukrainians who are melting snow in order to drink water to survive. So it is truly mind boggling that we cannot get this legislation passed that eliminates

Russia's preferred trade status and reauthorizes the Magnitsky Act.

We see that Putin's actions are not only creating a horrific set of circumstances in Ukraine; they are creating a severe shortage of wheat across the Middle East and North Africa, bombing maternity hospitals and theaters housing children, causing the worst refugee crisis in Europe in decades.

While we have long called out Putin's thugishness, his unprovoked and devastating attack on Ukraine has united the world in its resolve to levy severe repercussions for Putin and his cronies. So we must revoke this preferential trade status immediately. I think we should do the same for Belarus, which continues to provide a launching pad for Putin's war.

But, certainly, not including Magnitsky makes no sense. Now, it makes no sense when last week I came to the floor and asked for unanimous confirmation of a key number of nominees at the State Department and USAID that are at the heart of helping the United States help Ukraine on coordinating sanctions, on our USAID Director for that part of the world, on the Assistant Secretary for refugees—millions of Ukrainian refugees. We should have these people in place to do the job.

But we also have to have the law that is going to expire in place that Putin hates. He hates it. It is named after someone he was trying to eliminate. We have to continue to expand our options for keeping the pressure on Putin's regime and those who enable him. Reauthorizing Magnitsky is a critical part of doing just that.

With Magnitsky sanctions, we can hold human rights abusers to account. We can call out their unacceptable and appalling acts, and we can hand the President a powerful tool to sanction those who profit off the Russian people and exploit state assets.

But if we don't act, Magnitsky provisions will sunset later this year. Putin shouldn't be able to think: I can wait it out. He should know that the law is going to continue and the sanctions that have been levied under Magnitsky will continue to be levied and enhanced.

He wants to see this law go away. His oligarchs and top officials would breathe a sigh of relief. Allowing Magnitsky sanctions to expire would send exactly the wrong message at the most critical time.

This bill not only extends these tools; it sharpens them. This reauthorization would expand sanctions to cover other serious human rights abuses, giving the President the power to sanction a broader array of conduct.

So we have to get this done today. We have to revoke normal trade relations with Russia. We have to send an unequivocal message that Putin's cronies cannot and will not act with impunity. They will pay a price, and we must show the world that whether

human rights abusers are in Moscow or Minsk, America stands up for our values and our principles, and we put them into action wherever they are attacked. That is what this effort is all about.

I do hope that before this day is out, we will see this passed on the Senate floor. There is no excuse not to get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank the chairman on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his incredible leadership on this issue and so many others.

I want to point out that our committee has already approved this language. This is already approved. This is not something that is new to this body. We have been debating this for some time. It has been the United States and the U.S. Senate that have taken the leadership to provide tools to go after human rights abusers. We were the first to act, but, as a result of our action, Europe has now acted, the UK has acted, and Canada has acted. So we have provided global leadership. It is one of the strongest tools we have against human rights violators, and our No. 1 target today is Mr. Putin and what he has done.

So we have a chance to really show our leadership—continued leadership—in this area.

I am also encouraged by Senator CRAPO's assurances that we are going to try to get this done today. We want to get this bill to the President. We want to have it clear that we reauthorized it in a way that would be effective moving forward.

On one last point, if I might, no one knows exactly what happened in the first summit meeting between President Putin and President Trump, but the reports were that probably one of the very first issues that was raised by Mr. Putin was global Magnitsky sanctions, how it is so sensitive to him.

A clear message against Mr. Putin is the passage of the reauthorization and, as the chairman said, fine-tuning of the global Magnitsky statute. I hope we can get that done today. I thank my colleagues for their comments.

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

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

IRS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, Tax Day 2022 is fast approaching. Americans around the country are prepping their tax returns.

If you talked to most Americans, I don't think you would find that the IRS is their favorite government Agency and with good reason. The Agency

has gained a reputation for poor taxpayer service. The last tax filing season was particularly miserable for taxpayers. “If you call the IRS, there is only a 1-in-50 chance that you’ll reach a human being,” noted a headline in the Washington Post last April.

The national Taxpayer Advocate noted in her 2021 report to Congress:

Calendar year 2021 was surely the most challenging year taxpayers and tax professionals have ever experienced—long processing and refund delays, difficulty reaching the IRS by phone, correspondence that went unprocessed for many months, collection notices issued while taxpayer correspondence was awaiting processing, little or no information on the Where’s My Refund? tool for delayed returns. . . .

And bad customer service isn’t the only thing tarnishing the IRS’s reputation. The IRS has also gained a reputation for mishandling the confidential taxpayer information it has access to. In fact, the IRS was recently subject to a massive leak or hack of private taxpayer information—information that somehow ended up in the hands of advocates at ProPublica, an outfit that promotes progressive causes and went on to publish taxpayers’ private information last June. Months later, neither the Treasury Department nor the IRS has provided meaningful followup about the data breach, much less any accountability.

Who could forget the IRS scandal during the Obama administration when the IRS targeted a number of organizations based on their political beliefs? Nor did the IRS inspire confidence a few months ago when it announced it would start requiring taxpayers to submit biometric data in order to access certain IRS services.

Fortunately, after Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee and others weighed in, the IRS abandoned its plans to allow the harvesting of taxpayers’ biometric data, but it was a concerning instance of government overreach from an Agency notable for repeated mishandling of private taxpayer information.

The IRS was a frequent subject of discussion in regard to the Democrats’ so-called Build Back Better plan. It would have been nice if this was because Democrats had proposed a real plan to improve taxpayer services and increase Agency accountability. But, no, what they proposed in their Build Back Better plan was a massive increase in funding for the IRS—\$80 billion—essentially doubling the size of the Agency without any plan for ensuring improvements to basic taxpayer services.

I am hard pressed to imagine why anyone would contemplate handing a massive budget increase to the IRS without simultaneously prioritizing a plan to substantially increase accountability and improve taxpayer services. But, of course, Democrats weren’t interested in improving taxpayer services. Their main interest in handing the IRS a supersized budget increase was to increase tax collections to raise

revenue to help pay for their partisan tax-and-spending spree.

It is the same reason why they included a provision, until widespread public opposition forced them to remove it, that would have allowed the IRS to examine the details of Americans’ bank accounts. Under one version of this provision, the IRS would have been able to sift through the bank records of any American with just \$600 in annual transactions—\$600. In other words, the IRS would have been able to look through the bank records of just about every American and find out just how much you spent on Starbucks or your last doctor’s bill or that new pair of running shoes.

Republicans are not opposed to enhancing resources for the IRS if needed to improve taxpayer services, but any enhanced resources for the IRS must be paired with serious reform, including measures to improve customer service, ensure that existing resources are being used optimally, and promote smarter and more effective audits.

I am a cosponsor of Senator CRAPO’s Tax Gap Reform and IRS Enforcement Act, which would codify additional protections for taxpayers against IRS overreach.

Among other things, the legislation would help ensure that the IRS is not able to target taxpayers for their political and ideological beliefs, and it would prohibit the kinds of bank reporting requirements that Democrats sought to impose in their Build Back Better spending spree. It would also take steps to increase IRS expertise and improve the audit process. It would improve the information that we have on the tax gap, which is the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid.

Reducing the size of the tax gap and improving enforcement of our tax laws is something we should look at, but any effort has to be balanced with taxpayer responsibilities and taxpayer rights. Vastly increasing the size of the IRS without any new accountability or Agency oversight, as Democrats wanted to do with their Build Back Better spending spree, would be more likely to result in increased harassment of law-abiding taxpayers than in a meaningful reduction in the tax gap.

Just in case anyone thinks I am exaggerating about harassment, I would like to note that a provision in the House version of Democrats’ reckless tax-and-spending spree would repeal a measure requiring written approval of a supervisor before an IRS agent can assess any penalties. The provision was intended to prevent overreaching IRS agents from threatening Americans with unjustified penalties. It is hard to imagine why Democrats would try to repeal this measure if they were not trying to pave the way for much more aggressive IRS pressure on American taxpayers.

In her 2021 report to Congress, the National Taxpayer Advocate noted that “there is no way to sugarcoat the year 2021 in tax administration. From

the perspective of tens of millions of taxpayers, it was horrendous.”

Taxpayers deserve better. They deserve an efficient and accountable IRS and timely and effective customer service, and Congress should focus on giving it to them. I hope to be able to move away from Democrats’ intrusive and reckless Build Back Better IRS proposals and toward bipartisan efforts to reform the IRS and ensure the taxpayers can reliably depend on the Agency.

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

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

#### UKRAINE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, since Russia’s brutal invasion of Ukraine, Vladimir Putin has been shocked by two things: He has been shocked by the courage and the resilience and skill of the Ukrainian army and the resistance by the Ukrainian people.

He has also been shocked by the way President Biden has unified the world and put together this broad, effective coalition. Think about this: Countries like Germany and Sweden and Finland, even Switzerland, have never been involved in these kinds of international operations. They are all on board, all working with us on weapons and on humanitarian assistance and on sanctions.

The President’s team has done an extraordinary job in mustering the strength of this allied coalition to impose a broad range of powerful, punishing sanctions. We have cut off huge portions of their banking, finance, and business sectors from the Western financial world. We have shut down access to their monetary reserves—what Putin considered his war chest. We have sanctioned their central bank, their large commercial banks, and their sovereign wealth funds.

We have cut off their ability to finance their debt. We have blocked key sanctioned banks from the SWIFT financial messaging system. We are shutting down their borrowing privileges at international institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

We have gone after Putin personally and the oligarchs who prop up his regime. We have gone after their intelligence entities and defense firms and others supporting them and supporting the war effort.

We have sanctioned disinformation agents, freezing their assets, cutting off their ability to propagandize Putin’s lies.

Together with our allies, we have begun to go after their lucrative energy sector. We shut down the Nord

Stream 2 gas pipeline. We imposed a broad ban on Russian oil and gas and coal coming to the United States. We have cut off all new American investments into their oil and gas sector, and our big oil and gas firms have withdrawn in droves.

We have cut off the sophisticated technology Russia's refining industry needs and other technologies that have powered their industrial efforts.

In all this, we make it clear: Russia cannot invade its neighbors, cannot kill civilians, cannot expect to benefit from being part of the international economic order.

And again, this has been the leadership of President Biden and the State Department and the Defense Department and the Commerce Department and others and strong leadership that has pulled everybody together. The fact that we have put together this coalition so quickly, again, with countries that really haven't, since World War II, participated in anything like this—again, Sweden and Finland; Germany for the first time; Switzerland, which has been a neutral country since way before even you were born, Mr. President. So this has been a long time that these countries that were neutral are coming to the fore and making a difference for us.

Putin's mistake will set back a generation or more. It will sever its main economic, political, and diplomatic ties with the West and countries around the world which want to have nothing to do with Putin and his regime.

In Brussels tomorrow, the President is set to announce a major new wave of powerful sanctions, including against hundreds of members of the Russian Parliament, the duma, and other elites who have enthusiastically supported this brutal war.

He will intensify American efforts, along with our allies, to impose further sanctions on any defense or intelligence or other Russian firms that have in any way supported this invasion, either directly or indirectly. Our goal is to reach everybody that has been part of Putin's machine, of Putin's war crimes.

Every day, large teams at Treasury and the Department of Justice work with our allies to find and freeze and seize the assets of the oligarchs and other Russians who have supported Putin's war machine—their yachts, their mansions, their overseas bank accounts. There will be no place to hide. All of that is vital. We can always do more.

Russia should not have free and unlimited access to America's economy or to the global economy. The President has committed already—and one of the reasons we are here today—to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia so that they aren't permanent.

We need to do our part to give the President the immediate legal authority he needs to work with our allies on

this to shut off access to favorable tariff treatment for Russia's goods here and around the world.

We should not delay this another day.

The bill passed the House with a nearly unanimous bipartisan vote. We need to finalize this in the Senate so we can ratchet up the pressure further and cut off Russia's ability to finance any of its unprovoked invasion of another member country of the World Trade Organization.

Even before this war, we knew that Russia, along with China, cheats on the rules of trade. They subsidize their industries, and they pollute the environment to gain an unfair advantage in the global market. My State, Ohio, knows all too well about being forced to compete with countries that cheat.

If we don't remove this now, Russia will continue to use its status to position their industries in the global market, hurting American companies in the process.

It is not a partisan issue. I introduced a bicameral, bipartisan bill with Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana to remove Russia's permanent normal trade relation status. We did that almost a month ago. There is bipartisan support to do this quickly.

I have worked with my colleague Senator CRAPO from Idaho on many Russian sanction efforts over the years. I know we share the same goals.

I am hopeful there is a path forward in getting this done today. He is arguing that an oil ban should be included in this, even though the President already issued an Executive order on this that is already in effect.

I hope we can work out our differences quickly so we can send a clear, strong, unified message to Russia and to the world: Countries that invade another sovereign nation will not ever have free and unrestricted access to our economy. They will not be able to finance that invasion by continuing to cheat the rules on trade.

It is time to come together to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

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.

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

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

#### GAS PRICES

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if you know anything about Michigan, you know we love our cars. We put the world on wheels, and we have been keeping Michigan moving ever since. But recently this love affair has hit a rough patch.

Nearly everyone in Michigan drives—to work, to school, and to the lake on the weekends, and it is getting warmer and warmer to be able to do that. And high gas prices have made this Michigan way of life a lot more expensive.

I am thinking of the driver who uses his own car to deliver meals and other essentials to families in Detroit. Gas prices have gone up so much, he is barely breaking even. I am thinking of the student who drives 40 minutes every day to attend classes at Michigan Tech in Houghton. She is training for a great career, but the price at the pump is cutting into the money she needs to pay her tuition and her rent. And I am thinking about farmers. Fuel is absolutely essential to power our tractors and produce fertilizer and keep the world fed.

But income is tight even in the good times, and in the tight times, the folks who grow our food can struggle to fill their own refrigerators.

High fuel prices hurt Michigan families, our businesses, and our economy. And that is why it is so frustrating when oil and gas companies make choices that keep prices high to boost their own bottom lines.

It is true that part of the reason gas prices are so high is because demand is so high. Thanks to President Biden and Democrats in Congress, our economy came roaring back from COVID-19. Now, with all the challenges of the supply chains and the cost issues we are dealing with—but the foundation of our economy is strong, and that is a good thing.

But a roaring economy requires energy, and production isn't keeping pace. It is not that we don't have enough oil. In fact, the United States is the world's largest oil-producing country. And we could be producing more. There are currently 9,000 approved oil leases that the oil companies aren't even using. Yet the oil companies have made a conscious decision to hold back production, to raise prices, and pad the pockets of their shareholders. One CEO even admitted as much last month when he said that his company is "capturing value from higher prices for gas."

Let me translate that. "Capturing value from high prices for gas" really means taking money out of your pocket and my pocket and putting it into the pockets of their shareholders.

It is working for them. His company's revenue nearly tripled during the fourth quarter, and they are not alone. In fact, the 25 largest oil and gas companies raked in \$205 billion in profits last year—\$205 billion in profits last year—while price-gouging now at the pump.

And they used that money to buy back \$40 billion of their own stock and pay their shareholders and top executives \$50 billion in dividends. And they are not particularly eager to pass on any savings to anybody else, unfortunately.

It is interesting. The last time a barrel of oil was \$96, gas was \$3.62 a gallon. Last week, a barrel of oil was again \$96, but this time gas was \$4.31 a gallon.

What is the difference?

Well, the truth is, they set the price based on what they can get away with,



arguing a global economy and supply and so on, a supply which they determine, and they set the price with what they think they can get. And that is called price-gouging right now; taking advantage of situations around the world, our willingness to sacrifice to be part of supporting the Ukrainians and what is happening.

And instead of doing their part to maybe say: OK, \$205 billion in profits last year, pretty good. OK. Maybe we can, like, do our part here—instead, the prices at the pump go up and up and up, and it has got to stop.

A single mom of three in Michigan is standing at a gas pump right now with a knot in her stomach, watching her bill go up and up and her monthly budget for everything else go down.

So that is the problem. What is the solution?

First of all, the Senate Commerce Committee is calling for the CEOs of the major oil companies to testify before the committee, and I am really looking forward to that hearing and what they have to say for themselves on why. I want to thank the chairwoman, Chairwoman CANTWELL, and the committee for their leadership.

Secondly, I introduced the Gas Prices Relief Act with a number of my Democratic colleagues. This gas tax holiday is immediate relief—yes, short term, but it would save Michigan drivers nearly \$650 million at the pump this year.

I also think it is about time to stop subsidizing these oil companies that are doing just fine on their own. They don't need our tax dollars to subsidize them anymore. For more than 100 years, Congress has given major, permanent tax benefits to the fossil fuel industry. This decade, they have received \$35 billion in fossil fuel-related tax breaks. Do the American people really need to keep subsidizing an industry whose pollution is responsible for creating the global climate crisis, all the while enjoying record profits and picking people's pockets? The answer is no. Yet our Republican colleagues stand with the oil companies over and over again.

I just came from an Environmental and Public Works Committee meeting on this very topic and heard over and over again the rationale for letting the oil and gas companies keep doing what they are already doing with no accountability and no real effort for us to move in the direction of clean energy where we need to move.

Most importantly, it is time to shift to new clean sources of energy. For more than 100 years, scientists have known that burning fossil fuels creates carbon pollution that builds up in our atmosphere, and that traps heat. It just stays there. For more than 100 years, we just kept on burning fossil fuels anyway. And the industry has spent billions trying to convince us it is not really happening. We really aren't seeing the climate change. No, this isn't happening. Don't look up.

Well, it is time for a change. We can start by using more homegrown and cleaner burning biofuels to save consumers money. It is time to allow the year-round sale of E15—a change I have encouraged the administration to make. According to the Renewable Fuels Association, E15 is 10 to 15 cents per gallon less than standard gasoline and cleaner.

There is no time like the present to accelerate our shift to clean energy production, which I know the Presiding Officer cares deeply about and has been a leader in, and the use of electric vehicles. We know that part of that is moving to clean energy electricity—power as well as electric transportation. Both are very, very important.

Buying an amazing Michigan-made EV means you can drive right on by the gas station. You don't even have to stop. That is what I am looking forward to. You don't even have to pay attention to what is on the sign—won't matter.

The exciting thing is, we can take action to make this happen more quickly by ensuring that electric vehicles are affordable for more families and, critically, that they are built right here in America—not in China, not somewhere else around the world, in America—and I am laser-focused on making that happen.

The good news is, we will tackle the climate crisis at the same time because the transportation sector is the single largest source of carbon pollution.

Shockingly, a few weeks ago, a fossil fuel executive said this about his industry:

You've made a promise to be more disciplined about getting cash back to shareholders with these dividends. The question is, are you going to keep your promise? Or are you going to be patriotic?

Hmm. It is pretty clear whose side the oil companies are on, and it isn't the side of the American people. It is time for them to stop price-gouging and try a little patriotism.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PUTIN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be 1 month since Putin started his war in Ukraine. Every day, we get a chance to see that war being fought on our TV, so I want to tell you what I have seen in 1 month of viewing the war in Ukraine or what I have heard from people who report on that war in Ukraine.

Putin is a child killer.

Putin kills hospital patients.

Putin is a bully.

Putin kills elderly people.

Putin kills pregnant mothers and their babies.

Putin has uprooted at least 10 million people.

Putin deliberately shells residential areas.

Putin shells shopping centers.

Putin shells apartment buildings.

Putin destroys historic buildings.

Putin bombs theaters.

Putin bombs hospitals.

Putin destroys cultural heritage.

Putin threatens world peace.

Putin silences dissent.

Putin threatens nuclear war.

Putin starts war to boost his popularity.

Putin jails his political opponents.

Putin jails citizens speaking against the war.

Putin twists history.

Putin is consumed with power.

Putin feeds off corruption.

Putin is acting like a true Nazi.

Putin kills to feed his ego.

Putin lies to his own people and the world.

Putin admires Stalin.

Putin acts like Stalin.

Putin forcefully deports civilians, like Stalin.

Putin is intentionally starving Ukrainian civilians, like Stalin.

Putin is destroying families.

Putin reintroduced mass graves to Europe—no different than the executions of 20,000 Polish generals and soldiers at Katyn Forest in 1940.

Putin lies to mothers of Russian soldiers.

Putin poisons with impunity, particularly people whom he considers traitors.

Putin came to power by bombing Russian apartments and blaming Chechens.

Putin is still KGB.

Putin lied before invading Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula.

Putin lied about Russian troops in the Donbas.

Putin lied that he would not invade the rest of Ukraine.

Putin lies that NATO had anything to do with his decision to invade.

Putin thinks Ukraine isn't a real country.

Putin thinks other Eastern European countries belong to Russia.

Putin thinks Ukrainians are lesser people than Russians.

Putin is afraid of his own people.

Putin imprisons political opponents.

Putin is afraid of Ukrainian democracy.

Putin got rich by stealing from Russians.

Putin is destroying his own country.

Putin has damaged the global economy.

Putin uses banned weapons against civilians.

Putin kidnapped Ukrainian mayors.

Putin tries to assassinate Ukrainian President Zelenskyy.

Putin has troops fire on humanitarian corridors.

Putin is in bed with organized crime.

Putin supports America's enemies.

Putin has made the Russian Orthodox Church a tool of state power.

Putin oppresses religious minorities.

Putin has forced labor camps for prisoners.

Putin has people who support him or just follow orders or who are afraid to speak up, just like Hitler did.

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.

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, President Biden's nominee to be an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Jackson brings an exceptional level of experience to the bench. After serving for nearly 8 years on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Jackson has more trial court experience than any sitting Supreme Court Justice and more than almost any Justice in a century. She will also be only the second sitting Justice to have served on all three levels of the Federal judiciary.

Judge Jackson's nomination is historic. If confirmed, she will be the first Black woman to sit on the Supreme Court, bringing a long overdue representation to the Bench. After serving as an assistant Federal public defender in Washington, DC, Judge Jackson will also be the first former Federal public defender to serve on our Nation's highest Court.

It matters that someone nominated to sit on our Nation's highest Court has represented people other than corporate clients. It matters that someone nominated has had real experience with people who can't afford lawyers. It matters that someone nominated has had real experience in fighting for the public interest.

The Sixth Amendment of our Constitution grants criminal defendants the right to have the assistance of counsel in their defenses, but it wasn't until 1963, in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, that the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the Constitution required State courts to appoint lawyers for defendants who could not otherwise afford one.

Now, some Republicans have complained about the very idea of having a public defender on the Supreme Court, but their objections run squarely afoul of the meaning of the Constitution. This fundamental constitutional right to counsel is safeguarded by the work public defenders do every single day. Public defenders are literally on the frontlines of helping America live up to our constitutional ideals. Every American who supports and defends the Constitution should welcome a Supreme Court Justice who has worked so hard to turn our constitutional ideals into reality.

When asked about her work as a public defender, Judge Jackson said:

Every person who is accused of criminal conduct by the government, regardless of wealth and despite the nature of the accusations, is entitled to the assistance of counsel.

Judge Jackson restates a foundational constitutional point, one that she has lived—up close and personal.

Public defenders understand better than anyone that none of us should be defined by the worst thing we have ever done. Everyone, regardless of who they are or what they have been accused of, deserves a lawyer. Our legal system, as imperfect as it may be, strives to deliver equal justice under law. It is only because of the commitment of public defenders, civil rights attorneys, and legal aid lawyers that we can aspire to achieving that ideal.

That is why we need Judge Jackson's expertise on the Supreme Court, and that is why, for a long time now, I have called for prioritizing professional diversity on our Federal bench.

For far too long, our Federal judiciary has been dominated by those who only have experience representing the wealthy and well connected, but what about those who don't have money or influence? We need more judges with experience in representing the voiceless and the disadvantaged. The make-up of our Federal and State courts has never fully reflected the American people. Over time, this lack of representation has formed cracks in the foundation of our legal system—cracks that weaken public trust and threaten the legitimacy of our institutions.

A diverse judiciary matters. Judges—all judges—draw on their past personal and professional experiences when analyzing the law and reviewing the facts of individual cases. Judges who have experience as public defenders, civil rights attorneys, and legal aid lawyers are well equipped to understand the circumstances that bring everyday Americans into courtrooms. It is that background that strengthens public trust and that reinforces the legitimacy of our judicial system.

Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan said it best:

If the court doesn't have legitimacy with the American public, it can't do all that much. All kinds of different people should be able to look at the court and say, "I see somebody there who looks like me, who thinks the way I do, who has experiences of the kind that I had." And that's the kind of thing that gives the court public legitimacy.

Justice Kagan is right. Our judiciary will, undoubtedly, be made stronger because of Judge Jackson's confirmation to the Supreme Court.

It is not only her work as a public defender that informs Judge Jackson's experience. Prior to joining the bench, Judge Jackson served first as an assistant special counsel and, later, as the Vice Chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission. These experiences give her deep insight into the sentencing guidelines and enhance her ability to think critically about our criminal legal system's impact on ordinary people.

Judge Jackson's first stint on the Commission inspired her to become an assistant Federal public defender in order to gain practical, firsthand in-

sight into our criminal legal system. Her work in the trenches, representing those without means or power, provided Judge Jackson with an invaluable perspective into our system of justice, and it gave her the opportunity to effectuate the fundamental right to counsel, which is outlined in our Constitution.

I look forward to supporting her confirmation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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.

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

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

#### UKRAINE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I returned to the United States Sunday night after leading a bipartisan Senate delegation visit to Poland and Germany. Ten Senators—Republicans and Democrats—traveled together to demonstrate America's unwavering support for the freedom-loving people of Ukraine and affirm the strength of the world's most powerful alliance.

I will never forget an engagement with Ukrainian civil society leaders. This group of passionate, strong women demonstrated Ukraine's spirit and their will to fight. They delivered a very clear message to the United States. They said that Ukraine can win, but they need more lethal aid delivered now.

Our bipartisan delegation departed with the conviction that the United States, Ukraine, and the free world have the will and the means to stop Vladimir Putin's tyranny. I am here on the Senate floor today to state my belief that Ukraine will beat back Vladimir Putin's bloody invasion. They will throw the Russian army out of their country, and they will declare victory over this lawless criminal incursion.

Folks, Ukraine can win this war. When the shooting is over, the Russian military will be broken, and the Russian economy will collapse—consequences brought about by Putin's chosen isolation and rejection of the free world. He and his cronies, their futures are not bright either. Putin's propaganda media machine will break down. He will be marked by the international community as a war criminal and, I predict, will be held accountable by his own people. His best days are behind him. Freedom will win.

Most of us thought these outcomes were improbable just a few weeks ago. The President's policymakers circulated intelligence assessments in the first days of the invasion which concluded unequivocally that Ukraine didn't stand a chance. They predicted Putin would topple Kyiv within 3 to 5 days. Tomorrow marks 1 month since the start of the war. The Russian military is disorganized and demoralized.



Four separate divisions are all competing for logistics resupply.

Putin knows he is losing, and he is panicking. He jailed his deputy chief of intelligence, and his military is burning the bodies of their Russian casualties. Russia's manpower and ammunition are tapping out while, on the other side, Ukraine's forces are hanging tough.

The weapons the United States and our allies and partners provided are being deployed with lethal proficiency. The frontlines have been frozen for over a week, and Russian casualties are greater than 1,000 a day.

Ukrainians are intercepting unclassified calls and eliminating Russian field commanders. Most crucially, the Ukrainian people are ready to fight to the last man. The Russian army is a force of teenaged conscripts, subjects of an authoritarian war criminal whose delusions of grandeur about the old Soviet Union drove this invasion. The Ukrainian army is made up of free citizens who chose freedom over Russian tyranny. Putin's invasion doesn't change Ukraine's choice, and they will not go quietly.

Given all of this, has the United States shifted its strategy? Do we believe we can help make a Ukrainian victory a near certainty? We all know why we must come to Ukraine's aid. This body's memory is not that short. The United States is an agreement-bound partner with Ukraine. We entered into an agreement. We are their partners.

In 1994, Ukraine dismantled and surrendered its nuclear armament entirely in exchange for our security guarantee—the protection of the world's greatest superpower. Our agreement resulted in a prosperous Ukraine and made the world a much, much safer place.

Before Vladimir Putin attempted to snuff it out for good 3 weeks ago, the American people and the world benefited from the breadbasket of Europe's vital agricultural sector and energy production. Ukraine has been an invaluable economic and security partner for nearly 30 years.

Putin is not only testing that agreement today in the streets of Kyiv, Mariupol, and Kharkiv, he wants to break freedom's momentum all around the globe. Folks, we can't allow that to happen. We must not.

If it has not been made clear enough already, an unshakeable commitment to allies and partners keeps Americans prosperous and our families safe. Authoritarians—whether it is the Taliban, Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, the terrorists who rule Iran—they cannot dictate terms to our security and our economy. We still are the world's superpower 28 years after we made a security agreement with Ukraine. America cannot be pushed around.

We also know how we can come to Ukraine's aid. Congress just passed \$14 billion of support for Ukraine, which included nearly \$2 billion of lethal

weaponry. That aid—those weapons and that logistical support—must flow right now. I fought for a provision in the aid package that allows the President to draw down on pre-positioned military equipment, and I will be ensuring he follows through and gets these weapons into Ukrainian hands. There is no excuse for American inaction.

The Commander in Chief now has the authority to transfer pre-positioned weapons and logistical support, including as many as 40 Soviet-style helicopters purchased for Afghan security forces, to the Ukrainians. America's commitment to Ukraine and our NATO allies demands we expedite the delivery of weapons and capabilities to Ukraine. Any delay due to the fears of escalation is reflective of a doctrine of appeasement that will only further embolden our adversaries.

Pentagon Press Secretary John Kirby said recently that success for the U.S. mission in Ukraine is, at the end of the conflict, a free and independent, sovereign Ukraine.

Folks, I wholeheartedly agree with this sentiment, but if that is our mission, America has to provide more support to enable Ukraine to win this war. We cannot hold back. The U.S. mission in Ukraine must go beyond ensuring the country merely has the means to defeat itself—defend itself against Russian aggression, defeat the Russians. Now is not the time to be risk-averse.

This administration did little to deter Putin's march on Kyiv, an invasion set in motion as early as April 2021. President Biden lifted sanctions on Nord Stream 2, framed the United States-Russia relationship as stable and predictable as late as June of last year, and canceled European Command military exercises calling them “too provocative.”

Public opinion, Congress, and even European nations have hammered, begged, dragged, and pushed the Biden administration to action. From economic sanctions to the Russian oil ban, the administration has led from behind and from a position of weakness.

Take the Polish MiG debacle; three Sundays ago, Secretary Blinken gave Poland a green light to transfer MiG fighter jets to Ukraine. The following Tuesday, the White House did a flip and rejected the transfer of planes out of fear Putin would see the move as escalatory. Forty-one Republicans joined my letter voicing displeasure to the President for his failure to act. Letting an adversary define your military's rules of engagement, letting the aggressor dictate the boundaries of our response is not just a folly, it is suicidal.

The administration crossed their fingers and hoped Putin would play nice. Well, folks, we know Putin. He didn't play nice, and deterrence failed. But the failure of this administration's doctrine of appeasement doesn't mean Ukraine will lose the war.

I commend actions taken to shore up the NATO alliance following the inva-

sion, but our Commander in Chief must now lead and give Ukraine the means to win. If he is to continue being the most powerful man in the free world, he must act as such.

Delaying the loss of Ukraine to Vladimir Putin is not a strategy. Success is not a Russian-occupied Ukraine. Success is not a protracted insurgency. Success is a free, independent, and sovereign Ukraine. Defending freedom in Ukraine is defending freedom everywhere. Authoritarianism cannot prevail in this conflict.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I would like to thank my fellow Senator, Senator ERNST from Iowa, for leading the delegation trip that we took this past weekend, the bipartisan delegation. It was most informative, impactful, and she did a wonderful job leading that. I was proud of the efforts.

I am here to join my colleagues today to discuss the invasion—the unjust and immoral invasion of Ukraine by Vladimir Putin—in light of the trip that we just took to Germany and to Poland. In a way, I am kind of hesitant to do so, not because there isn't a lot to say or a lot to share but because of the powerful words that some of the Ukrainians whom we met implored us, which was: Enough talking. It is time to act.

I could not agree more. But out of deep respect for them, I would like to take a moment to make sure we all understand why we have to act and why we must act now.

As Americans, you realize this when you talk to—we did, certainly, when we were talking with Germans and other Europeans. We don't have the same perspective sometimes that Europeans have who faced World War II. One of the most powerful comments conveyed when we were meeting with German officials was that their new generation who has heard for decades about the atrocities from their parents and their grandparents—they were told this would never happen again. And yet what we see is that it is happening again.

This is an unjust war, and there seems to be no level of atrocity that Vladimir Putin is unwilling to commit. Putin overestimated his ability, his army, his ability to conquer. “This must be over in 3 days,” according to him. He overestimated his own abilities, and he grossly underestimated the will of the Ukrainian people and the will to not just live but to live freely.

On top of this, Putin has also failed to understand the commitment of the free world—of NATO—to stand up for freedom. We certainly saw that over the last several days.

We, in our Nation and in our history, know that freedom is worth fighting for, and it is also worth defending. Generations have done this in our past and will do this in the future. We believe this to our core.

We also believe that the deliberate and evil bombing of hospitals, targeting supply routes, and killing civilians are the actions of war criminals.

But in the face of all of this evil, we see hope. We see hope from the Ukrainian people; we see hope from the Ukrainian leadership; we see hope from the Ukrainian military; and we see hope in our own military forces as a part of NATO, including all nations of NATO as well as the generosity of people around the world, the nongovernmental organizations we saw helping at the refugee center, and, most especially, the Polish people. We saw them stepping in militarily. And on the humanitarian side, we saw an incredible outpouring. We saw this firsthand at the refugee center.

Poland has now taken in over 2 million people into their country, which is more than the entire population of my State. During our trip, as I said, we visited the refugee center where Ukrainians are going first to be processed as they are leaving and having to flee their country. After this, they end up not at another refugee center but most likely in somebody's home or a friend's. That is the level of care and support that they are receiving. And that is the level of care and support that they deserve as a tribute of their willingness to fight and defend their freedom. Many of these women and children—mostly women and children—are leaving their husbands and their homes behind.

Ukraine is united. As we were told, Ukraine will fight to the last man. May it never come to the last man because the free world must help. Make no mistake, the United States of America has chosen a side. We side with freedom. We side with the people of Ukraine.

Just a few weeks ago, Congress passed \$14 billion in support for Ukraine and Central European allies amid Putin's unprovoked war. It is critical to get these funds and equipment to them now because time is of the essence.

As an example, Congress took an extra week to pass this package. When you are there on the ground talking to the leadership who are trying to push back on Putin, a week is a lifetime—a week is a lifetime. So we cannot afford to hesitate or to cause inaction.

In our efforts to get them funds—lethal aid—and to oppose sanctions on Russia, we must act now and keep acting.

Madam President, as you know—you were on the trip, as well—we met with diplomats and generals, representatives from many of our executive branch Agencies, NGOs, brave soldiers, including many from our home States. But I will never forget the words of a woman we met named Katarina, whom we met at the refugee processing center. She said, in desperate tones, she didn't want to leave Ukraine. She didn't want to leave her home. She wants to live in freedom and peace, but she has a 6-year-old and 8-year-old who

are constantly hearing the sirens of bomb alerts, the sounds of bombing—just the violence. She had no choice. She had to leave to protect her children.

Let's do what we can, as much as we can, and as fast as we can—and that last part is critical—to return freedom to Ukraine and justice to those who do not respect the sovereignty of nations. This is really what we owe every child in Ukraine, in Germany, in Poland, and in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on February 24, approximately 1 month ago, Vladimir Putin launched an unprovoked and unjustified war against his neighbor, the free, democratic, and sovereign nation of Ukraine.

The bipartisan Senate delegation visit to Europe led by Senator ERNST that I joined over this past weekend was truly extraordinary. It has reinforced my already strong belief that the United States must do all that it can to provide lethal aid to the courageous Ukrainians fighting for their families and their freedom, as well as to provide the humanitarian assistance necessary to ease the suffering of the Ukrainian people.

The Presiding Officer was on this trip, as well.

Like the Senator from West Virginia, who just spoke, my most memorable conversation was with a young mother named Katarina, who had two children, one age 8 and one age 6, with her. I met her at the Polish refugee welcome center. It was only a few miles from the Ukrainian border.

She said to me:

I want to live in peace. I want to be back in Ukraine, but I have to keep my children safe.

She was weary-looking but determined to keep her children safe. This young mother and her two children were leaving the only country she had ever known. She left her husband behind, not knowing when or if she would see him again—all in order to keep her children safe.

We have only to watch the scenes of what Putin is doing to try to destroy Ukraine and to break the will of its people. He has bombed apartment buildings, schools, theaters, shelters, humanitarian corridors. He has bombed a maternity hospital. What does that tell you about this man, this war criminal? What more do we need to know?

The only way that we can end this humanitarian crisis is to provide Ukraine with the weapons, supplies, ammunition, and other assistance that they need to bring to an end this Russian war of aggression. We must provide, without further delay, the Ukrainians with the MiG fighter aircraft that have been held up by this administration and which Ukrainian President Zelenskyy has requested. We

must ensure that Ukraine receives additional anti-aircraft defenses, including the S-300, whether directly from our stocks or those of our allies.

We must ensure that the Ukrainians have the means to fight and defend their people from these ongoing atrocities ordered by Putin. And we know of—we saw firsthand—their extraordinary bravery, their determination to fight for their country, to put everything they have on the line.

Every moment, every hour, every day counts. We do not have time for endless debate and delay that costs the lives of innocent Ukrainians. As the Ukrainian leader told us, the administration must stop telling Putin what America will not do. It must say what we will do.

The administration should also make every effort in collaboration with Congress, when necessary, to ease the process of allowing Ukrainians with family members here in America to come stay with them until it is safe to return home. I know many Mainers are eager to help.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the terrific American soldiers that we met, including several from the great State of Maine. Many of them left their families with days' or even hours' notice over the past few weeks. They rapidly deployed to Germany, Poland, and other NATO allies to deter Russia's aggression and defend these NATO members from any Russian threats. Each of these members of our military were motivated, patriotic, and impressive, and I am so grateful for their service.

I have read that President Biden is considering stationing our troops close to the frontline to send an unmistakable message to the Russians on a more permanent basis, and I hope that he will indeed do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, it is a privilege to be here on the Senate floor speaking to Kansans and to Americans, to Vladimir Putin and to Ukrainians, and to the rest of the world, our allies, our friends, and our adversaries. It is a privilege to be here with the opportunity of speaking with one voice.

As we know, that does not happen frequently enough in the U.S. Senate, but the Presiding Officer was on this trip with us to Eastern Europe and to the Ukrainian border, and my colleagues here on the Senate floor—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents; Members of the U.S. Senate, together—saw what we saw and resolved what we resolved together.

I am so pleased that that is the case. Particularly our adversaries, but clearly our allies, as well, must know that this is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is an American issue. It is a world issue. It is something about freedom that transcends any of the differences that we have here in the United States or in the U.S. Senate.

And every day matters. While it is important for us to bring our report

home to our colleagues and to our constituents about what we saw, what we heard, and what, most importantly, we felt, it is important that we act.

Remember the Ukrainian citizens who told us: It is OK to proclaimate. It is OK to have a statement. It is OK to pass a resolution. But what we need is action.

Every day matters in the fight against Vladimir Putin's unprovoked, unjust, and immoral invasion of Ukraine.

To any of the people who say Ukraine is at fault here, I cast all doubt about that. That is not the case. What is happening in Ukraine, what is happening in Eastern Europe, and what may happen beyond the borders of Ukraine is the result of an evil man named Vladimir Putin.

The United States—this administration—must stop telling Putin what we won't do. Don't ever tell our adversaries: We are not going to do this.

It makes absolutely no sense.

But we do need to do what we said we will do and even more.

Our slow bureaucratic march to provide aid is not keeping up with the Russian forces. I dread when I get up in the morning, each morning, before, but especially after, I returned from the Ukrainian border. I dread turning on the television to see what the latest news is and what the sights are from Ukraine, only to find more onslaught, more death, more destruction.

Every minute, every day matters. We have delayed ourselves in providing financial sanctions and in imposing financial sanctions. We were slow in energy sanctions, and we were slow in getting a defensive military package in place. But we are moving now.

This Congress has reached its conclusions about the importance of these things. This administration has acted, but the things that we have promised, apparently, still have not in total reached Ukraine.

How difficult it must be to be a Ukrainian, knowing that something is coming from the outside world to help? While I get up and dread the news of the day, every moment in their lives has to be the expectation, the hope that something is going to arrive today to bring this incursion, this massacre, this death and destruction to an end.

If you are a parent in Ukraine, it is not about what you see on the nightly news, on the morning news. It is about how am I going to save my children's lives today? What is going to occur in a few moments? And our answer can't be: It is coming. We will be there later.

It has to be: We are there now.

The defensive military package includes Stinger anti-aircraft systems, Javelin anti-armor weapon systems, tactical unmanned aerial systems, grenade launchers, firearms, ammunition, and body armor and helmets. But they must be delivered. They mean nothing on a list. They mean nothing on a piece of paper that says we are shipping these things, on a bill of lading. They

mean nothing en route to Ukraine. They mean something when they are in the hands of the Ukrainians that we know to be committed, brave, persistent, undeterred.

You know in visiting, the Senator spoke about the military men and women we have seen from our own country and what an inspiration they are and how much we appreciate their service and their sacrifice and their families back here in Kansas and across the country.

Our military men and women from Kansas have been training Ukrainians over the last several years, and even they are amazed that, despite their relationships and training with the Ukrainian soldiers, how successful they are. I think, unfortunately, in this country we thought that this invasion would last a few days and that it would be over and the Ukrainian people decimated or surrendered.

And so our expectations, apparently, were that we were not necessary, that we were not a solution to this problem. The course of events is already predetermined, but the human spirit defies all expectations—the human spirit of the Ukrainian people, the tremendous leadership.

My experience suggests to me the value of a leader. You can have highly trained soldiers, but if you don't have leaders who inspire, their abilities to succeed, their abilities to persevere disappear. And President Zelenskyy has been the role model.

My guess is that citizens around the world look at Zelenskyy and say: Oh, that is the kind of clear leadership, determination that we need—clear spoken, clear acting, not running, fighting the fight.

We must make certain—this is a moral issue, Americans, the world. If you think that the war was going to be over in a few days, you may have a different attitude. But now that we know that it is not, we have to provide the military equipment, the means for the Ukrainian people, their military, their civilians, not just to survive another day but to win the war. How immoral it is to provide just enough to live but not enough to win.

What we saw on the Polish-Ukrainian border is the impact of Putin's war to these people, to the people of Ukraine, to the people of the neighboring countries—the fear that our NATO allies have that Ukraine may not be next. Not only do we need to provide the equipment and support for Ukrainians to win for purposes of the Ukrainian people, but if Putin doesn't pay the price, if he feels that he is all-empowered after his march through Ukraine, I have no level of comfort that he stops at the Ukrainian border.

I am saddened by what I saw: the human suffering, the tragedies. We all have kids and grandkids. And we saw Ukrainian children; we saw parents who love them but had to give them up for their safety and security. We saw families—wives who love their hus-

bands, spouses who love each other but departing because dad, brother needs to stay behind to fight the fight.

And on the other hand, there was the tremendous relief in seeing the response by others. It happens often in crises around the world, when Americans and others—the whole world—resolve to help people in these circumstances.

But this is not a flood; this is not a tsunami; this is not an earthquake. The sadness of this comes from: This is unnecessary. This is one man's evil actions causing the desperation and death, the tragedy, in Ukraine.

And we should know that it doesn't end at the Ukrainian borders. Even if Putin doesn't cross the border, the hunger, the starvation, the lack of food around the world—Ukraine is the breadbasket of Europe, and its ability to feed itself and its ability to feed the rest of the world is disappearing.

We will see the need for assistance and humanitarian aid in countries around the globe only increase at a time in which there is famine in so many places.

It is a circumstance caused by a tyrant, whose actions will not just affect Ukrainian people, but the rest of the world.

We must be unified with our NATO allies. And it was so pleasing to see the NATO countries who now recognize the importance of NATO and are stepping up to fulfill their commitments, in support of the Ukrainians, but in support of this pact that at the end of World War II, across the Atlantic, it was decided that America had a role to play, but we could only play that role with the cooperation of others.

It is still true today. America has a role to play, but we need friends and allies, and we made our commitment to NATO. They, too, need to know that America will be steadfast. We can demonstrate that by being steadfast in Ukraine.

It is immoral, it is death causing, it is damning should the United States of America fail in its obligations.

I will conclude with the story I have told before. It comes from watching the news—something I try to avoid doing—about the reporter who is asking what appears to me to be a 10-, 11-year-old boy in a Ukrainian orphanage that question we often ask young people: What do you want to be when you grow up?

This little boy, through an interpreter, answered that question, What do I want to be when I grow up? His response was: I want to be an American.

What does that tell us about us? Americans? It tells us that we are still something special. We still matter. The rest of the world still pays attention to us, and an 11-year-old boy across the globe knows enough about us to know that is what he wants to be.

That should make us feel proud as Americans, but it also ought to make us accept and fulfill our responsibilities.

No 11-year-old boy in an orphanage in Ukraine ought to be in an orphanage in Ukraine. And we, our allies, must fulfill our responsibilities of what it is to be an American.

Madam President, I offer my willingness to work with you and everyone in this U.S. Senate, the Congress, and the administration to make sure that, knowing that there are people in the world who know what they want when they grow up is to be an American, to do my part to make sure that America is the place and an American is who you would want to be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, let me start by thanking the junior Senator from Iowa for her leadership.

I thank Senator ERNST for fighting for freedom. Thanks for showing me the way to continue to fight for those who need help.

This weekend, together, we witnessed the worst of mankind, but we also saw the best of humankind, and that would be the Polish people and the job that they have done welcoming—yes, welcoming—almost a million refugees from Ukraine over a period of about 2 weeks.

They didn't just welcome them. They gave them food; they gave them clothing and shelter. And then more than that, they helped process them and get them to a location, to a friend, to a relative, buying them plane tickets, putting them on trains.

I have done missionary healthcare work all across the world, and what we saw the Polish people doing there was absolutely incredible. Half of the Polish people have taken a refugee into their own homes.

But like I said, we also witnessed the worst of humankind, the worst of mankind, and that would be Vladimir Putin's war on the people of Ukraine.

One Ukrainian woman—her name was Olena—whom I spoke with said:

The Russians are attacking Ukraine from the north, from the east, and the south. With their missiles, they can reach every place of our country—there is no safe place in Ukraine any more. Everything can be targeted: hospitals, kindergartens, maternity wards, hospitals, everything.

And another Ukrainian we spoke to, Daria, said:

In the city of Mariupol, almost every single building was hit by a Russian bomb or a Russian missile. People are residing in bomb shelters. They are cut from electricity. They are cut from aid, food, and from water. They are melting snow to drink water. Russians are deliberately throwing bombs into hospitals.

And, again, I am quoting Daria.

There is only one hospital remaining. One of the hospitals was a maternity hospital. Men were trying to evacuate a woman who was in labor, and she died with her unborn baby. Another pregnant woman—her name was Mariana—was going down the stairs. She survived. She gave birth. They don't have food now to feed the mother. I don't know if the baby girl is still alive. There are thousands of people dead, but it's impossible to

bury them. The bodies—it's a horror movie which is happening—people are dead on the streets.

These stories are heart-wrenching, and there is no doubt the world needs to step up and we need Europe to lead. And I am so proud to report the buzz across Europe and the buzz across Germany as we landed, that the Germans are committed once again to this transatlantic partnership and a willingness to commit dollars and funds to this NATO alliance and to the security of the world.

That said, there is so much more that we can still do short of boots on the ground. And like my Ukrainian friends remind me: This war didn't start with Russia on February 24.

And this is Olena again. She said the weakness of the United States started much earlier:

Since the beginning of November, we've been shouting out loud to help arm Ukraine, sanction Nord Stream 2—why did the U.S. lift sanctions on Nord Stream 2 and basically give the green light for Putin to move forward in Ukraine? We clearly warned that that might happen—we were not heard.

Earlier this month, the Ukrainians said that they met with Secretary Blinkin and they begged him to please send air defense systems now. But weeks later, they still don't have them. This is day No. 26 since Russia invaded, and the Ukrainians are telling us they are not seeing any American weapons yet.

I asked them to describe to me what they needed to win this war, and their answer was very simple: maximum military assistance as it relates to weapons, including, MiGs, A-10s, Javelins, Stingers, drones.

Look, the Ukrainians can win this ground war, but the problem is Russia is launching bombs from their own airspace, from their own land, from the seas as well. What they need are missiles that will intercept the Russian bombs.

Another Polish woman we met said:

We were ready as Poland to give these MiGs—

This is a Polish woman speaking now.

We were ready as Poland to give them the MiGs, but the Biden administration didn't want us to provide them. And what happened—instead of consulting us, the Biden administration decided to go public without the Polish Government even knowing that this was the case.

The impression in Ukraine is that the White House is undermining the giving of weapons from our allies to the Ukrainians, that they are thwarting the transfer of these weapons. One of the Ukrainians even went so far as to say she wanted to steal the MiGs because there was just no other option.

This war was completely preventable had the United States projected its strength. The United States can do so much more. President Zelenskyy has begged us, the United States, to lead more, but this administration is following the footsteps of President Obama by leading from behind. They have been slow to react at every step.

This is a portion of a cruise missile that hit in Ukraine. Two Ukrainian diplomats describing to me what happened, where 35 people were killed by the cruise missile. This was launched by Russia on one of the days that President Biden said what NATO will not do to help Ukraine.

Let me say that again. This was launched the day that President Biden said what NATO will not do to help Ukraine.

This is the very telegraphing that has, yet again, proved to be deadly. As Ukrainians pointed out to us, this is what led to the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal. In their words—the words of the Ukrainians, not mine—they say this administration is operating what they call an “Afghanistan syndrome.”

The Ukrainian people don't need speeches. They don't need words. They don't need resolutions. They don't need Americans forming committees and praying about it. They need more than our prayers. They need action. They need action.

I call for a war tribunal to be formed and Putin and his generals to be held accountable and put on trial for crimes against humanity.

The world needs to seize his personal assets and the assets of his oligarchs, and we need to use those personal assets to rebuild Ukraine. The world needs to stop doing business with Russia today. Don't wait on your governments. Don't wait on the sanctions. I call on every business in the world to stop doing business with Russia today.

And finally, the United States needs to implement our sanctions today, not yesterday. We don't need to delay until June 24 a waiver on energy payments from Russian banks.

We still have so much more we could do short of putting American boots on the ground. We need to send this military aid yesterday—not tomorrow, not next week.

It is not a time to debate. Give them the damn weapons. The brave Ukrainian people will use them. They will fight to the death, but they have to be empowered to do it, and every day we wait, thousands more will die.

I want to finish on a positive note. I am so proud of these young men and women, American fighters in the Big Red One, the 1st Infantry Division of Fort Riley, KS. They have been there for years training Ukrainians, training our partners.

Some of the folks will ask me back home: Are we going to be safe? I have got all the faith and confidence in the world of our soldiers, of our military—all the confidence in the world of these men and women that are willing to put their lives on the line.

And let me reassure you also that the Ukrainian people are not going to give up. They are not going to give up. They are going to fight for every inch, every mile of their home soil.

In Poland, Olena and Daria told me just before we departed:

America is the leader of NATO. Every NATO country is looking at what America is

doing and not doing. What America is saying and what America is not saying. We know that there are NATO countries here on the border who have weapons which we need, but they simply need backup from America. We will win this war. But, at which price will we win this war? Help us win it at the price of less casualty. That's what we are asking the United States.

Like I said earlier, the Ukrainians can win this war. There is a path to victory. I believe in them, but the world has to step up. We have to empower them. We are doing so little of what we could be doing.

I was taught at a young age: Of him who much is given, much is required. And the United States has been given so much. We are still the leader of the free world. It is time we start acting like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 683, the nomination of Julie Rubin, under the previous order.

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

The bill clerk read the nomination of Julie Rebecca Rubin, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

#### VOTE ON RUBIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rubin nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Ex.]

#### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Coons	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Kaine
Booker	Durbin	Kelly
Brown	Feinstein	King
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Cardin	Graham	Leahy
Carper	Hassan	Lujan
Collins	Heinrich	Markley

Menendez	Reed	Tester
Merkley	Rosen	Tillis
Murkowski	Sanders	Van Hollen
Murphy	Schatz	Warner
Murray	Schumer	Warnock
Ossoff	Sinema	Warren
Padilla	Smith	Whitehouse
Peters	Stabenow	Wyden

#### NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Casey	Manchin	Shaheen
-------	---------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, there is a lot going on in the world right now: Ukraine; what is happening in China; what is happening with the Iran nuclear conversation right now with Russia and the United States and China; record inflation here in the United States. There is so much going on that I am concerned that we are not also focused on an area at our southwest border.

It is interesting; I have had folks who have caught me and have said: Things must be going better at our southwest border because I don't hear about it as much.

Actually, there is just so much other news that it is drowning it out.

So what is actually happening at our southwest border right now, and where are we? Let me give you a little bit of context and then to be able to talk through some of the issues that are happening.

Today, on our southwest border, about 6,300 people have already illegally crossed. Now, a day that they can manage is about 3,500 people. So we are still hearing record numbers of people illegally crossing the border.

To set this in context, during the 4 years of the Trump Presidency, there were 2.4 million people who were encountered illegally crossing the border during the 4 years of the Trump Presidency. During the first 14 months of the Biden Presidency, we have already exceeded that number. We have had more illegal encounters in the first 14 months than there were in the previous 4 years.

In this process of all these individuals crossing the border, it has been interesting. There was something that was put in place in January of 2020 called title 42 authority. Now, let me explain this briefly. Because of the pandemic that was happening, in March of 2020, the Trump administration put in place that, for single adult individuals who were crossing the border, they would be turned around at the border based on the pandemic that was happening. The Biden administration agreed with that policy, and when they came in, they kept title 42 in place. In fact, last year, 1.1 million people were turned around at the border under title 42 authority.

Title 42 authority was always intended to be temporary. It is not a permanent immigration policy; it is during the pandemic, although it is ironic that the administration is looking to lift title 42 authority on the border at the same time—this month—members of the National Guard are being forced to resign if they don't have their vaccine. So if you don't take your vaccine and you are in the National Guard, you are being forced out, or if you are in the military and you haven't taken it, you are being forced to resign the military, but people illegally crossing our border can come into the United States.

At the same month that there is conversation about dropping the title 42 authority, we are still wearing a mask on our planes, in buses, and in trains based on a requirement of the administration on a threat to COVID. At the same time that is occurring, the administration is looking to lift the title 42 issues at our southern border.

They have had a year to be able to plan for this. I have been in conversation with Ali Mayorkas and with DHS. We have had multiple conversations with the leaders. I have been on the border multiple times to be able to talk to the leadership there, to say we have all known that at some point, title 42 authority is going away, so when that occurs, what is the plan to deal with illegal immigration or what they call irregular migration? What is the plan at that point?

Well, we are finally getting bits and pieces of the plan. The plan is, apparently, from the notes that we are getting and the conversations we have had at the staff level and that I can piece together from multiple conversations with multiple leaders, after a year of considering what to be able to do about illegal immigration and increasing numbers at the border, apparently, within the next couple of weeks, they are going to stop title 42 to be able to more rapidly move people into the interior of the country faster so the border looks less chaotic. The plan is to move people into the country faster so there is not a camera shot on people backed up at the border. That is the plan.

I wish I was kidding on that, but in a briefing with my staff last week, DHS