

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Baldwin

NOT VOTING—2

Braun

Vance

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMY). The Senator from Vermont.

# MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 113

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 113, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations S.J. Res. 113, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale of the Government of Israel certain defense articles and services.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the resolution.

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

Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the law is very clear. This is not a complicated issue.

U.S. weapons cannot be provided to countries who violate internationally recognized human rights or block U.S. humanitarian aid. It goes without saying that Israel had a right to defend itself from the horrific Hamas terrorist attack of October 7. But Israel did not have the right to kill 43,000 Palestinians and injure over 100,000—60 percent of whom are women, children, and the elderly. It did not have the right to destroy Gaza's infrastructure, healthcare system, schools, and university. And it certainly does not have the right to starve thousands and thousands of children in Gaza.

The United States cannot be complicit in these atrocities. We cannot give billions of dollars to the Netanyahu government and have them defy U.S. law while they take U.S. money.

I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. In opposition to the resolution, let me just cite the views that we received from the administration, which we urge you to oppose the resolutions which will prolong the wars, not shorten them, put Israel at risk and inject wind into the sails of Iran and its proxies just as they are facing a historic low point and looking for a deal.

This resolution will only prolong the war. It will put Israel at risk fighting our mutual enemies, and I would urge my colleagues to reject the resolution.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 78, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Leg.]

## YEAS—19

Durbin	Markey	Smith
Heinrich	Merkley	Van Hollen
Helmy	Murphy	Warnock
Hirono	Ossoff	Warren
Kaine	Sanders	Welch
King	Schatz	
Lujan	Shaheen	

## NAYS—78

Barrasso	Ernst	Padilla
Bennet	Fetterman	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Peters
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Graham	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Britt	Hagerty	Romney
Brown	Hassan	Rosen
Budd	Hawley	Rounds
Butler	Hickenlooper	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeven	Schmitt
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Marshall	Tuberville
Cramer	McConnell	Warner
Crapo	Moran	Whitehouse
Cruz	Mullin	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Wyden
Duckworth	Murray	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Baldwin

NOT VOTING—2

Braun

Vance

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). On this vote, the yeas are 19, the nays are 78.

One Senator responded present. The motion was not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

# MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 115

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 115, relating to the disapproval of the proposed license

amendment for the export of certain defense articles, defense services, and technical data to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to discharge.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 115, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed license amendment for the export of certain defense articles, defense services, and technical data to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, two basic points: The first one is the same point that has to be made over and over again. What we are doing is in violation of the law. U.S. weapons cannot be provided to countries that violate internationally recognized human rights or block U.S. humanitarian aid.

According to all of the international and humanitarian organizations on the ground in Gaza right now, that is exactly what Israel is doing. So a "no" vote is to allow us to continue breaking the law.

As to the second point, this one deals with JDAMs, which are systems that make bombs more precise. And, on the surface, it sounds like, well, that is a good thing. You would rather use "smart" bombs than "dumb" bombs, and when you do that, you save civilian lives. The problem is that what Israel has been doing is using JDAMs to target U.N. schools packed with displaced people and to target refugee centers and kill large numbers of innocent people. So a "smart" bomb does not save civilian lives when it is directly targeting civilians.

I would ask for a "yes" vote on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in opposition to the resolution, quite frankly, I am perplexed with this one because, as the sponsor indicated, we are talking about the guidance system on munitions, which makes it precise, and despite what the sponsor of the resolution says, Israel targets military targets of terrorists. Yes, Hamas makes it more challenging by where they locate the targets—in hospitals, in schools, et cetera—but without the guidance system, there are going to be greater civilian losses. So, if you are concerned about humanitarian issues, I don't know how you can possibly vote for this resolution.

In addition, of course, as the administration pointed out, they oppose this resolution because it would prolong the war, not shorten it. It would put Israel at risk and inject wind into the sails of Iran and its proxies just as they are facing a historic low point and looking for a deal.

I urge my colleagues to reject the resolution.

## VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 80, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 294 Leg.]

## YEAS—17

Durbin	Markey	Smith
Heinrich	Merkley	Van Hollen
Hirono	Murphy	Warnock
Kaine	Sanders	Warren
King	Schatz	Welch
Lujan	Shaheen	

## NAYS—80

Barrasso	Fetterman	Padilla
Bennet	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Reed
Booker	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hassan	Romney
Brown	Hawley	Rosen
Budd	Helmy	Rounds
Butler	Hickenlooper	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeben	Schmitt
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Marshall	Tuberville
Cramer	McConnell	Warner
Crapo	Moran	Whitehouse
Cruz	Mullin	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Wyden
Duckworth	Murray	Young
Ernst	Ossoff	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Baldwin

## NOT VOTING—2

Braun Vance

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

# RELATING TO THE DISAPPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENTIAL REPORT WITH RESPECT TO THE INDEBTEDNESS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 566, S.J. Res. 117.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 566, S.J. Res. 117, relating to the disapproval of the Presidential report with respect to the indebtedness of the Government of Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 1 hour for debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, yesterday marked a somber milestone: 1,000 days since Russia invaded Ukraine. Over a million lives have been lost or wounded—a staggering human toll. Yet, instead of seeking a path to peace, the Biden administration is choosing escalation. Billions of taxpayer dollars have been funneled into this conflict with little or no oversight and no end in sight. It is as if writing blank checks has become our primary foreign policy strategy. This has extracted a huge human cost.

Just days ago, President Biden authorized Ukraine to use American-provided long-range weapons to strike inside Russia. Let me repeat that. We are now enabling attacks using U.S. weaponry inside Russian territory. When I first saw the headline, I didn't believe it. I hoped it was maybe a joke or fake news. It was neither. It was real.

Now, this is not a step toward deescalation. Nothing could be further from that. In fact, this is a dangerous provocation, one that brings the United States perilously, unacceptably close to a direct conflict with a nuclear-armed adversary. In response, Russia has updated its nuclear doctrine, lowering the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons.

This is not a game. The rounds are live and flying—and, I would add, deadly. The specter of nuclear war is now looming larger than it has in decades. Yet the administration seems undeterred, even willing, as if eager to risk U.S. security for the sake of scoring one last cheap political point against the incoming Trump administration and the American people.

Now in the twilight of its tenure, the Biden administration is quietly attempting to forgive half of Ukraine's economic aid package from the last supplemental appropriations bill—a whopping \$4.7 billion given away for free if President Biden has his way.

The American people are being deceived by the Biden administration. Americans were told Ukraine would repay that sum when this bill passed. In fact, that is part of how they got it passed. It was, you might say, a "without which not" of that bill's passage. Now they are being stuck with the tab.

Now, let's be clear: Forcing the American people to pick up this tab removes an essential point of leverage for the United States to bring Ukraine to the negotiating table. It prolongs a bloody war. It drains our own scarce precious resources and gives Ukraine a freebie we don't extend even to our closest allies, all without accountability or a strategy that prioritizes America's interest first.

But it is worse than that. It does so in a way that puts us in the firing line—the firing line of a nuclear-armed adversary. Moreover, a significant portion of this sum was allocated to fund the salaries of President Zelenskyy and Ukrainian bureaucrats.

What kind of message does that send?

At a time when American families are pinching pennies—pinching pennies—because we spent money we don't have, causing us to print more money, causing every dollar the American people earn to buy less, it is absolutely unconscionable that their hard-earned tax dollars are being used to underwrite the administrative costs of a foreign government and the salaries of foreign bureaucrats—all in a way that makes us less safe, all in a way that puts us in a precarious position we haven't faced since most of us were children.

Our constituents are tightening their belts and making tough decisions about healthcare, education, and basic necessities. Yet we are being asked to finance the operational expenses of another nation's government.

Madam President, we have a duty—a solemn duty, a sacred duty—to our constituents to ensure that their hard-earned money is spent wisely and ethically and, at a minimum, not in a way that makes them less safe, not in a way that paints a target on their back or an adversary with nuclear weapons. We certainly have a constitutional duty to prevent unnecessary escalation that could lead to catastrophic consequences. And we have a duty to uphold the will of the American people who very recently—just over 2 weeks ago—voted for a different President with a different foreign policy, one that works for the American people and not against them.

Instead, as a final parting gift—and, yes, I use that word very, very euphemistically—the Biden administration wants to saddle the American people with a tab that they don't want, that they never agreed to, that they expressly rejected at the ballot box, and that they cannot afford.

That is why I stand in full wholehearted support of Senator RAND PAUL's joint resolution of disapproval to block this misguided, dangerous, reckless, wealth transfer to a corrupt foreign government. I call on all of my colleagues to do the same.

We need to halt this dangerous path and give the incoming administration every tool to pursue a strategy that prioritizes peace and America's interests. The American people have spoken and resoundingly, with good reason, rejected the policies of this administration that escalate conflict and prolong wars.

The American people deserve better. They should expect more. They strive and yearn for peace. RAND PAUL's measure would help advance that. Doing nothing would impair it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Georgia.

## U.S. ARMS SALES

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I rise not in response to the Senator from Utah or to address the matter being raised by Senator PAUL but to address the resolutions that were debated previously with respect to U.S. policy in the Middle East.