

# **BUSINESS MEETING**

*Wednesday, March 8, 2023*

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m., in Room S-116, the President's Room, Hon. Robert Menendez presiding.

Present: Senators Menendez [presiding], Cardin, Shaheen, Coons, Murphy, Kaine, Merkley, Booker, Schatz, Duckworth, Risch, Paul, Young, Barrasso, Cruz, Hagerty, Ricketts, and Scott.

## **OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY**

**The Chairman:** This business meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will come to order.

As we begin our work in the 118th Congress, I would like to welcome back all of our committee members, especially our new members, Senators Duckworth, Ricketts, and Scott. Again, welcome to the committee.

During the last Congress, this committee made several major contributions to our foreign policy and the operation of the State Department. We had two bipartisan State authorization bills enacted into law. We reported out critical Taiwan legislation that was enacted into law. We confirmed nearly 200 nominees, and we provided advice and consent through ratification of momentous treaties. None of this could have happened without the partnership of the Ranking Member and the contributions of all the Members of the committee, so you have my thanks.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

In the year ahead, I look forward to working with everyone in the same productive, bipartisan manner, including on strengthening our tools to confront China. As you know, Senator Risch and I are working on a comprehensive bill to help us compete with China, and we would like the thoughts of Members, advancing another State authorization bill to modernize the Department, reforming security assistance to ensure the State Department and the Pentagon leads in this area, promoting and advancing versions of foreign policy, working to ensure that Russia offers a strategic defeat in Ukraine, and promoting democracy, human rights, and the rule of law around the world.

I want to take the beginning of this opening session to reiterate two important housekeeping measures from last Congress. First, I will enforce amendment deadlines when we mark up legislation. This way, everyone has time to consider amendments before we debate and vote on them. To be fair and consistent, there will be no exceptions, so please submit them on time.

Second, there was some abuse of holdovers last Congress. These are intended to give Members more time to consider a particular item or a nominee, not as a blanket approach to hold up entire business meetings. I'll continue to honor holdovers consistent with the committee practice, but I will not honor blanket holdovers [inaudible].

We have a number of qualified nominees on the agenda slated for important posts. I will not speak about them individually, but I hope we can work together to get these nominees confirmed expeditiously. Let me speak briefly about -- there are three bills on the agenda. I have received a letter asking that S. 430 be held over to the next

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

business meeting, and I will honor that request.

S. 509, a bill to provide resources for United States nationals unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad. Today, we will be considering supporting Americans wrongfully or unlawfully detained abroad after 2023, a bill I introduced with the Ranking Member, Senator Shaheen, and Senator Hagerty. Currently, families of Americans held hostage by non-state actors of ISIL or al-Qaeda have access to firms that travel to Washington so they can advocate for release of their loved ones. In contrast, families of Americans wrongfully detained by foreign governments, be it Iran, China, Russia, Venezuela, or others, receive nothing. This bill will rectify that inequity and make sure that all families with loved ones held hostage abroad are treated equally. It is a simple matter of fairness, and I hope all of my colleagues will work to get it quickly enacted.

Next, we will be considering S. 316, a bill repealing the 1991 and 2002 authorization for the use of military force against Iraq, and we commend Senators Kaine and Young for their commitment and leadership on this issue. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this important bill.

AUMFs are the most solemn responsibility of this committee, and our duty is not just to pass them and move on. We must be vigilant as to how they are used and whether it would be wise to continue to keep them on the books. I believe it would be a serious mistake not to repeal the 1991 and 2002 AUMFs. We feel it would have no negative impact on our national security, but, critically, it will mean future administrations cannot abuse these authorizations and using military force, using it in ways Congress never intended, much less imagined.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

The Administration is of the view it has the authority under Title -- Article II, I should say, of the Constitution or the 2001 AUMF to do everything it needs to do in the counterterrorism space and to protect our troops deployed around the Middle East, and they have committed to coming back to Congress to ask for additional authority if a new exigency arises for which authorities are needed. That is the way it should be. And I appreciate our colleague in the House, Congresswoman Barbara Lee for being present today with us.

As I said, S. 430 I will hold over and honor that, and with that, let me turn to the Ranking Member for his comments.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES E. RISCH,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM IDAHO**

**Senator Risch:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Like you, I want to welcome our new members, Senators Ricketts, Scott, and Duckworth, and I welcome everyone back. I also want to associate myself with your remarks about the good bipartisan legislation passed in the last Congress. I really think that it is important that this committee act in a nonpartisan, bipartisan manner as much as possible. We really do that to a large degree. Of course, there are matters that are partisan, and from time to time we deal with those when we get them as best we can.

I want to talk briefly about some of the nominees we have in front of us, starting with Ambassador Verma on the agenda to be the next Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources. A former ambassador, Ambassador Verma understands the departmental resources needed for the embassies to do their job. I hope he can bring common sense to a number of challenging issues. I am impressed with his qualifications.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

Regarding the Gupta nomination to be Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, I was opposed to her nomination for this role in the last Congress. I remain opposed. Fundamentally, I think she is going to try to expand the mission of the office, particularly with regard to the use of foreign assistance -- U.S. foreign assistance in performing abortions abroad. We had a discussion about this and the background on this issue. I remain unconvinced. Again, I am going to vote no on her nomination.

My views also remain unchanged on the Martinez nomination to be U.S. Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank. His hyper-partisan remarks on social media were offensive to me and other Members of this committee and go beyond even the more extreme statements of other confirmed nominees. He has not shown that he can serve in this role in a bipartisan way. I will still be voting no.

On the Garcetti nomination, information on the question of his knowledge of harassment by a former senior aide is less than precise. The new information raised enough questions regarding his judgment. I will be voting no.

On the legislation before us today, while I support the [inaudible]-- on the AUMF, which is a huge issue for us. It is an incredibly important issue for Congress, for America. I have sat -- for many years I have been here, I sat on both this committee and the Intel committee, and I have sat through dozens and dozens of hours of debate on this, of lawyers arguing about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, and it is a difficult, difficult issue.

The 2002 Authorization for the Use of Force has long been used to address

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

threats emanating from Iraq. Specifically, multiple administrations rely on this ability to address the threat from Iran-backed Shia militias. Should the statutory authority fall away, we are only left with the President's [inaudible] policy to protect Americans. Instead of reasserting congressional authority, we would be ceding it solely to the executive branch. Worse, I remain unconvinced that the Administration has conducted any legal consultations with Iraq, Israel, or other partners to deal with how to repeal this authority. This would [inaudible] deterrence against the Iranian regime.

Iran and its proxies have attacked American troops and diplomats over 100 times since the Biden Administration took office with almost no response. Clearly, there are doubts of American resolve. I am concerned about the message this repeal would send to the region as much as anything else. Most importantly, I am really concerned that the repeal of this will have less clarity on future administrations when the President determines that action needs to happen. I do not disagree that it needs reform. If it is going to be repealed, I have no problem with that and put something in its place. We do not have that.

Finally, on Senate Bill 509, I agree with the Chairman's statements regarding the ability to [inaudible] of those declared wrongfully or unlawfully detained and authoritarian states' increased use of hostage diplomacy. We must do everything we can to prevent further hostage taking of Americans for families who are suffering. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as well.

The last thing, Mr. Chairman, the pending nominees, I ask that Members be able to record a no vote. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chairman:** Okay. With that, we have a series of nominations before the

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

committee. Before I make a motion for their consideration, is there any Member who wishes to speak on the nominations? Senator Shaheen?

**Senator Shaheen:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to respond to Senator Risch's comments about Dr. Gupta, and that is supported by these issues because, in fact, as I have said on multiple occasions, the Office of Global Women's Issues does not deal with healthcare for women or reproductive healthcare for women. I think it is really important to recognize what the role of the Office of Global Women's Issues is. We put a gender lens on our foreign policy, which we know when women are empowered in countries, it contributes to the stability of those countries, to the stability of families, and the stability of communities. So, again, I think it is a real mischaracterization to suggest that Dr. Gupta is interested in expanding abortion rights for women. That is not the role of the Office of Global Women's Issues.

**Senator Risch:** May I respond briefly?

**The Chairman:** Senator Risch?

**Senator Risch:** First of all, I have tremendous respect for Senator Shaheen's views on this and other related issues, and I certainly agree with her a lot of the time. I just cannot get there with Dr. Gupta. I think she is going to expand the office. Her answers were not satisfactory to me after doing that, and if she is not doing it -- if this has nothing to do with women's healthcare and she is not going to expand the office, it is incredible to me that Planned Parenthood aggressively supports her for this position. Planned Parenthood should not have anything to do with the position or the office. So in any event, I am going to vote no, and I appreciate you.

**Senator Shaheen:** And --

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Risch:** And I appreciate -- I do honestly appreciate you.

**Senator Shaheen:** I respect your ability to vote no. You disagree with her, but we should not mischaracterize what the Office of Global Women's Issues does, and that is what I am objecting to.

**Senator Cruz:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** Anyone else willing -- wish to be recognized? Senator Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** I want to inquire. Are you proposing to take all the nominations en bloc, or are we going to have separate votes?

**The Chairman:** We are going to have a group of nominees that I understand there is not objection en bloc, and then we will have individual votes.

**Senator Cruz:** Okay. So we will have a separate vote on Nucete and Garcetti?

**The Chairman:** We will have a separate vote, the Ranking Member has reminded me, of Garcetti, Gupta, and Martinez.

**Senator Cruz:** Okay. I would also ask for a separate vote on Nucete.

**Voice:** Is that not Martinez?

**Voice:** Yes, Martinez.

**Senator Cruz:** Oh, I am sorry. Okay.

[Cross talking.]

**The Chairman:** Anyone else who wishes to speak to the nominees?

[No response.]

**The Chairman:** If not, I would ask that we approve the following nominations en bloc: the Honorable Richard Verma of Maryland to be Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources, the Honorable Stephanie Sanders Sullivan to be



U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

Ambassador to the African Union, Michael Ratney to be Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, and Mr. Felice Gorordo to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Richard Weiner to be U.S. Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Is there a motion?

**Voice:** So moved.

**Senator Kaine:** Second.

**The Chairman:** Moved and seconded.

All those in favor will say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

**The Chairman:** All those opposed will say no.

[No response.]

**The Clerk:** The ayes have it, and these nominations are favorably reported to the Senate.

**Senator Cruz:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask with Senator Risch that I be recorded as a no on Gupta.

[Cross talking.]

**The Chairman:** We have not -- we have not had -- we have not had --

**Senator Cruz:** Oh, so never mind.

**The Chairman:** We have not had that vote.

**Senator Cruz:** Never mind.

**Senator Shaheen:** The Senator was here today.

[Laughter.]

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Chairman:** Senator Hagerty will be voting no on the Ratney nomination.

**Senator Scott:** I am a no on --

**The Chairman:** Senator Scott will be recorded no on the Ratney nomination.

All right. With that, the nominees are approved and sent to the Senate.

Let us turn to legislation at this point. First, S. 509, a bill to provide resources -

**Senator Kaine:** Mr. Chair --

**Voice:** Mr. Chairman?

**Senator Kaine:** Are we going to --

**The Chairman:** I am going to hold in abeyance the ones that have to have a recorded vote [inaudible].

**Senator Kaine:** Okay.

**The Chairman:** A bill to provide resources for U.S. nationals unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes. We talked about this earlier in the introduction, both myself and the ranking member. Is there anyone who wishes to be heard on S. 509?

[No response.]

**The Chairman:** If not, I will entertain a motion that --

**Voice:** So moved.

**The Chairman:** So made. A motion has been made. Is there a second?

**Senator Kaine:** Second.

**The Chairman:** Made and seconded. The question is on the motion to approve.

All those in favor will say aye.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

[Chorus of ayes.]

**The Chairman:** All those opposed will say no.

[No response.]

**The Chairman:** The ayes have it. A majority of Members having voted affirmatively, the ayes have it, and the amendment -- I mean, the legislation is approved and sent to the Senate for its full consideration.

Now we will go to S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for the use of military force against Iraq. Would any members seek to comment on this bill? Senator Kaine, the sponsor?

**Senator Kaine:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to colleagues. I am going to distribute an article that appeared in Reuters two days ago, and it was an article about the visit of General Austin, our Secretary of Defense, to Iraq. He went in an unannounced visit, and he said the following after meeting with Iraqi Prime Minister Mohammed al-Sudani: "U.S. forces are ready to remain in Iraq at the invitation of the government of Iraq. The United States will continue to strengthen and broaden our partnership in support of Iraqi security, stability, and sovereignty." Prime Minister al-Sudani additionally commented about the value of the U.S. partnership in defeating the continuous threat of terrorism, especially ISIS, and the value of the U.S. partnership in trying to curb Iranian aggression in the region.

This is a strong security partnership that has value. We had an Armed Services hearing yesterday, and Pentagon officials testified to that important value. The challenge, though, is that we have two war authorizations against Iraq. One was passed in 1991 to commence the Gulf War, and one was passed in October of 2002 to

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

commence the Iraq War. The mission in the Gulf War was to push Iraq forces out of Kuwait. That was done in a short period of time. The mission has essentially been completed for more than 30 years, and yet the war authorization against the government of Iraq is still on the books. The mission of toppling the Iraqi government that led to the Iraq War resolution in 2002 was complete in 2003, 20 years ago. The 20th anniversary of the invasion of Iraq is a week from Sunday, and yet the war authorization against this nation that is now a security partner of the United States remains on the books.

The very simple bill that we put forward -- Senator Young and I as co-sponsors -- would repeal both the 1991 and the 2002 authorizations for four reasons. One, it is a reflection of the current reality. Iraq is no longer an enemy. We no longer seek to topple the government of Iraq. Iraq is a security partner in at least two important American security priorities to defeat non-state terrorist organizations and check Iranian aggression.

Second, it is important for Congress, as the Chairman mentioned in his opening comments, to exercise vigorously the powers accorded to Congress in Article I, the protection over our decision-making regarding war, peace, and diplomacy. These were wars that were started with congressional votes, and given that the mission that occasioned those votes is now long in the rearview mirror, it is time for Congress to exercise the muscle, the Article I power of repealing them.

Third, repealing authorizations has a way of removing the possibility for mischief because a live authorization years after its mission was completed becomes sort of a zombie authorization, and it can be used in circumstances if a President wants to go

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

around Congress and say I can do this because Congress voted for it, you can pull up a zombie authorization and stretch it to cover activities that were never intended by the Congress as they voted for the authorization.

Finally, a last reason, I think it is not a bad thing to send a message that the United States has a way of turning adversaries into partners. We have done it with nations like Japan. We have done it with nations like Germany. We have done it throughout our history, and that is a tribute to American magnanimity and our desire that just because we are engaged in hostilities with you today, we hold out the hope we can beat a sword into a plowshare at some point in the future to have a partnership, and that is what we have done with Iraq, and it ought to be recognized.

I think the Iraqi government recognizes it. In conversations with Iraqi officials, they appreciate it, and I think it would be positive in the U.S.-Iraq relationship, but also sending the message to nations we are in adversarial tensions with around the world right now that the U.S. has no permanent adversaries. We may be an adversary today, but we would hold out the hope that we could turn it into an olive branch at some time in the future.

The Biden Administration has weighed in and said these two authorizations cover no current military activities. Their repeal would not jeopardize in any way the authority of the President to keep the U.S. safe. The President retains very broad power to fight non-state terrorist groups, including some that many in this committee are worried about. Obviously, under the 2001 authorization that remains on the books, the President retains very broad power under Article II to defend the United States against an attack or against the imminent threat of an attack, and that term

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

has some subjectivity to it. But I think we all agree that the tie goes to the President on that one. If a President believes there is an imminent threat of attack, the President needs to take action without coming to us.

So for the four reasons that I have outlined, I think after 20 years, it is time to set the Iraq War aside, show that Congress takes Article I power seriously, and repeal these authorizations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chairman:** Anyone else seeking to be heard?

**Senator Young:** Yes. Mr. Chairman, thank you for adding this to the agenda. I, of course, want to thank the Ranking Member for your cooperation as we worked to add it to the agenda. Senator Kaine, thank you for your longstanding leadership on this issue. I think we are poised for a strong vote today and on the floor.

As the folks around this table know, we are approaching the 20th anniversary of the war against the regime of Saddam Hussein. I, like everyone around the table, am proud of the service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform. We lost 4,400 Americans in that conflict, 31,000 wounded. I am proud of the Iraqi people as well. Under the most adverse of circumstances, they have finally, after working for, roughly, the last year, been able to assemble a government under Prime Minister al-Sudani. They live in a dangerous neighborhood. There is a terror state not too far from them by the name of Iran. I had the opportunity, along with Senator Murphy, to sit down with the Iraqi Foreign Minister and discuss a number of issues just days ago, and it was reassuring to me how much he and the Iraqi government support us taking this step today.

Iran looms large for the region. It also looms large for the country of Iraq itself.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

I completely agree with my colleagues who emphasize the importance of countering Iran and stopping their aggressive behavior, but voting against a repeal of outdated authorities aimed at removing Saddam Hussein in 2003 is not the way to counter Iran in 2023. The region has changed, the threat has changed, and our authorities for the use of force need to change along with it. I once again thank the Chairman, and I encourage a yes vote for S. 316.

**The Chairman:** Anyone else who wishes to speak to the bill? Senator Paul?

**Senator Paul:** I wholeheartedly support the public and official ending of the Iraq War. I think the war was a mistake from the beginning. I think it was sold under false pretenses. I think we should remember that 100,000 soldiers were sent over there, and 4,400 of them died. Countless -- hundreds of thousands of Iraqis died. That is what the authorization allowed, and this was a big vote when it happened. Those who voted to authorize that bear some responsibility for that war, and if you vote today to keep this -- that is essentially what we are voting on today -- you are basically voting on an authorization that was used to allow 100,000 troops to go to Iraq.

So to keep this means you still support an authorization that that was the original intention. I think nobody believes that it really applies anymore, but that is essentially what you are voting for. You would have no leg to stand on if a President, Republican or Democrat, sent 100,000 troops in because we have this authorization, he will simply say, you all had a chance to repeal it and you kept it, so I guess you do not care that I am sending 100,000 troops in. So while some of this is symbolic, I think some of this actually has real import because it originally allowed 100,000

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

troops and 4,400 of our soldiers to die, and if we think it is over, by golly, let us end it today.

**The Chairman:** Any other Members seeking recognition? Senator Coons?

**Senator Coons:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just -- I want to thank the co-sponsors, Senator Kaine and Senator Young, who have worked so hard on this over a number of years, over several administrations now. It is long overdue. A young man who grew up next door to me was killed in Iraq in December of 2005. I will never forget the words his widow left me with: "Tell me why my husband died in Baghdad." He was proud of his service. He was training Iraqi police. He was contributing to a pathway towards peace.

But to the point Senator Paul just made, it is long since time for us to repeal an authorization that no longer has any meaningful purpose. And as Senator Kaine said, it is an invitation to mischief if we do not assert our full constitutional duty and remove it. I understand some have concerns about it, but I think those are well and thoroughly addressed, and I hope we will move expeditiously on this.

**The Chairman:** Any other Members who wish to make -- Senator Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** Mr. Chair, is it time to call up the amendments?

**The Chairman:** Yes.

**Senator Cruz:** Mr. Chairman, I call up my amendment, Cruz First Degree 1, and let me start by commending the authors of this bill. I agree with what you are trying to do. Much of what you have said here I agree with emphatically. I think it is critical that Congress assert its authority on war making. I think Congress, for far too long -- Congresses, both Republican and Democrat, have been far too willing to roll



**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

over and cede war-making authority to the Executive, and we have been far too willing to abdicate our constitutional authority over declaring war and over supervising the conduct of war.

I also believe the Iraq War was a mistake, and I have been vocal and unequivocal on this point. The world was made more dangerous by going in and toppling a horrific dictator but leaving a power vacuum from which emerged more powerful and more dangerous American enemies. However, the last time we debated this in the prior Congress, I argued that these debates do not occur in a vacuum, and I expressed the deep concern that the Biden Administration was preparing to exercise a hard pivot towards Iran, and that doing so would be turning a blind eye to the Ayatollah's malign activities, which directly endanger the safety and security of Americans.

And I said then what I do not want to see. I did not want to see this resolution adopted, these AUMFs repealed, and have the Administration have another pretext for inaction against Iranian aggression, and that I fully expected, not only brought inaction, but that the Biden Administration would use any and every pretext to justify that passivity and inaction towards Iran.

Unfortunately and catastrophically, everything that has happened in the past year and a half since our last debate has confirmed the predictions made in that room that day. Attacks against American forces and our allies in the Middle East by Iranian-controlled forces have become frighteningly normalized and ruinous. The IRGC has been conducting a global campaign of assassination, including plots to murder American officials on American soil. While these plots were happening, the Administration was in negotiations to lift the terror designation on the IRGC. Iran

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

continues to run proxies across the Middle East that fund terrorism and war against our allies, including especially the State of Israel, while the Biden Administration has allowed Iran to rebuild its oil exports above a million barrels a day, funding this terror regime.

As Senator Young said a minute ago, Iraq is in a dangerous neighborhood, and they have a terror state next to them in Iran. This administration is so committed to inaction against Iran that they have even subordinated victory in the war in Ukraine to their practice of appeasement towards Iran. They have denied our Ukrainian allies the missiles they needed to target Iranian drones that have devastated Ukrainian infrastructure because where there are Iranian drones, there are undoubtedly Iranian personnel, and it would have been inconvenient to have dead Iranian terrorists littering Crimea while trying to make a deal with Iranian terrorists.

Russia uses Iranian banks to dodge sanctions. They use the tankers that Iran used to transport oil, the ones the Biden Administration did nothing about, to move their own oil. Ukrainian President Zelensky has repeatedly said that Russia pays for Iranian drones in part by providing nuclear cooperation, cooperation enabled by President Biden's sanctions waivers on Iran.

Against this backdrop, against this, I think, inexplicable commitment to inaction against Iran, I do not doubt that the Biden Administration will cling any pretext for further inaction. And in the course of debates over these repeals, advocates have said, well, the ability to respond to Iranian aggression, it is contained within Article II, and so we do not need to do anything on this, and I agree with that as an abstract matter, but we are not living in an abstract world. We are living in a real world.

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

All my amendment does is memorialize that in this bill so that if the Administration comes back after the next Iranian attack on American forces and says, well, Congress took away our ability to respond to Iran, so we need another AUMF act, or if Iran crosses the nuclear threshold, the Biden Administration says, well, Congress took away our ability to act to protect ourselves, we can absolutely say no, that is false. You chose not to act.

The Ayatollah is listening to this debate. I hope not literally. If this amendment is adopted, I will vote yes on the underlying bill to repeal the AUMFs, and I believe that what this bill is trying to accomplish is a good thing. But if this amendment is not adopted, I am going to be forced to vote no because I am not going to sanction the President sitting idly by while the Ayatollah continues to murder Americans and continues to murder our allies, and actively tries to murder former senior officials of our government.

**The Chairman:** Anyone else wishes to speak to the amendment?

**Senator Young:** Could I just very briefly speak?

**The Chairman:** Senator Young?

**Senator Young:** I appreciate what my colleague, Senator Cruz, is attempting to accomplish with this legislation. It seems to me he wants this body to make a public statement of -- as it pertains to potential actions that might occur against our forces or our interests in Iraq by the regime of Iran or its proxies. But in attempting to do so, it seems to me he is potentially circumscribing the President's Article II authorities, not envisioning all the other threats that could conceivably emerge to our forces, to our interests. Article II is just fine how it is. It does not need elaboration. I think when

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

we attempt to elaborate, when we call out specific regimes like Iran, it is -- it could narrow the authorities that we wish the President to exercise as opposed to expand them.

But I believe this is unnecessary. All these authorities are already implied in Article II, and to the extent that this body could in any way undermine the President's Article II authorities, I fear it does that.

**The Chairman:** Senator Paul?

**Senator Paul:** There are Article II powers given to the President, but there is also Article I, Section 8, which limits the President's powers in saying that we do not go to war without a declaration of war by Congress. This alone would appear to, I do not know, perhaps change the balance between Article I, Section 8, and Article II, and would appear to adjudicate the separation of powers. And I think it is a huge mistake, and I think it would be such a statement that we would have long, long constitutional debates over whether or not does this mean Article I, Section 8, does not apply any longer. So I think it is misguided, and I will oppose the amendment.

**The Chairman:** Senator Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** I certainly appreciate the arguments with regard to Article II brought up by the Senator. I just returned from a CODEL in the Middle East as part of it, and one of the things we consistently heard from the heads of state there is that when America projects power, Iran is curbed, and when America projects weakness, Iran is emboldened. And my concern about this is, again, if we are not sending the message that Iran is somebody that we are going to continue to push back against, this would be another message after Afghanistan to those countries in the Middle East

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

that America is withdrawing from the area. That will not only empower Iran, but also encourage China to take our place in that power vacuum.

So I believe that this amendment, again, getting back to is the reality the President may have the opportunity to be able to keep us safe. I do not disagree, but I think this sends a message, to your point, Senator, about perception is reality. If we say that we are repealing these but we are going to continue to keep the option open to strike Iran, that sends a message to our allies in the Middle East that we are not disengaging, and we are going to be there to support them, and that they should not go into China's arms, and that they should stay with us and that we will continue to push back against Iran.

**The Chairman:** Senator Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I think it is not a good idea to conflate war authorizations against one country with another country. We do have really serious issues with Iran, and I think the issues only got more serious in the last year for a variety of reasons. But this was a very straightforward two authorizations to topple the government of Iraq, and continuing to -- and starting the tradition of conflating the Iraq authorizations with Iran is a bad idea, and I would just urge a no vote.

**The Chairman:** Let me close this at this time --

**Senator Cruz:** Go ahead. Go ahead, Mr. Chairman. You can comment or I can respond.

**The Chairman:** I'll go afterward.

**Senator Cruz:** Several observations. One, I respect the sincerity of the views

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

around this table on this issue. Senator Young and Senator Paul suggested something in this amendment would somehow alter Article II or weaken Article II, and as all of us know, we do not have that ability in Congress. No legislation we pass can alter or weaken Article II of the Constitution or any other article of the Constitution. That constitutional authority is the supreme law of the land and supersedes any legislation passed by this body.

Secondly, you know, I -- the arguments made against this amendment have varied. On one level, some of the arguments have been, well, it is unnecessary because Article II already does it. Well, if it is unnecessary then it ought to be easy to vote "yes." If it is restating what Article II already does, it ought to be easy to vote "yes," and, if nothing else, you will get one more vote because I will vote for the bill if you adopt it, and I will vote against it if you do not. So, if it is unnecessary, it ought to be a very easy give.

But the real problem, and nobody has disputed what I said, which is that if Congress repeals the AUMF, the Biden Administration will use that to say, gosh, we cannot act against Iran. And what I said a year and a half ago, that was prospective. It was looking forward predicting what they would do. We now know what they would do, which is not a damn thing.

And the argument was raised, well, gosh, this suggests that the President cannot act against other countries. If someone is aware of another country that right now is the leading funders of terrorism across the globe, is actively funding terrorists who are murdering Americans, is actively funding terrorists who are murdering our allies, and if someone knows of another country against whom the United States State

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

Department has to pay \$2 million a month to protect a former secretary of state from being murdered by them, then feel free to add that country. I am not aware of any other country that is currently entailing that kind of security risk in trying to murder a former secretary of state. I still remember asking Tony Blinken, “Is trying to murder a secretary of state is a pretty big deal? And Secretary Blinken unsurprisingly laughed and acknowledged, “Yes, it is.” I do not want to give any excuse for inaction, and so I would encourage senators to support my amendment.

**The Chairman:** The Administration has not cited the 2002 AUMF in recent U.S. defensive actions against Iranian-backed militias. It has done so without using the 2002 AUMF. And it has made clear it has sufficient authority under Article II to defend U.S. interests and personnel against Iranian-backed militias. So, I agree that the United States does not need the 2002 AUMF to defend U.S. interests and personnel against Iranian-backed militias.

And as the Administration committed to this committee when we held a hearing on this topic, the Administration would come back to Congress for any sustained action against Iranian-backed militias or Iran that goes beyond Article II authority, and that is the way I would hope that we would want it as Members of Congress. We want and should have a say in the scope of future authorizations of military force. But I see no reason to provide the executive branch with an expansive characterization of its Article II powers. Doing so would represent a renunciation of Congress' own war power prerogatives. The point of this exercise is to remove two outdated AUMFs from the books, not endorse a further tilt towards the executive branch on using force.

And finally, as someone who has been the architect of both of the sanctions

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

against Iran for nearly two decades, and who opposed the JCPOA and has continuously taken among the strongest actions based on our policies against Iran, I do not accept the proposition that, in fact, the Administration will do nothing. It is attacking Iranian militias as it seeks to do, and it would be the use of an AUMF if it was going beyond its Article II powers. It has Article II powers. It will use it, and if it were to declare an all-out war against Iran, then I would expect that ultimately it would come back to Congress for the ask of use of authorization. With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Does the Senator want a recorded vote?

**Senator Cruz:** Yes, please.

**The Chairman:** A recorded vote. The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**Senator Shaheen:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** No.



U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Paul:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Barrasso:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Cruz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Scott:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** No. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are eight. The noes are 13.

**The Chairman:** And the amendment is not agreed to.

Are there any other amendments to be presented on this legislation?

**Senator Risch:** Mr. Chairman --

**The Chairman:** Senator Risch?

**Senator Risch:** I call up Risch First Degree Number 1.

**The Chairman:** Risch First Degree Amendment Number 1. Now, as we call that up -- we got -- do you want to hold the vote open until we finish this round?

**Senator Risch:** I do not think --

**The Chairman:** Senator Risch.

**Senator Risch:** This first-degree amendment would condition repeal on the certification from the Attorney General and Secretary of Defense, that tension authorities and the litigation position of the U.S. with respect to the tension would not be weakened. It is critically important that a proper Justice Department [inaudible] any difference. In the years from 2002, the AUMF has been cited as an initial authority for detention. [Inaudible] found that 2001 AUMF did not provide the

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

authority for detention. Supplemental legal authorities, like the 2003 AUMF, were actually critical.

The amendment is simple. Before we take the significant step of repealing 2002 AUMF, both the [inaudible] and Secretary [inaudible] by Congress that our ability to detain terrorists would not be weakened by such an agreement. This is one of those issues that is incidental to this, and one the reason I am voting against the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chairman:** Anyone wish to speak to the amendment?

[No response.]

**The Chairman:** I appreciate the Ranking Member's desire to make sure we account for every possible hypothetical development we could imagine. The fact is that the 2002 AUMF is not the answer to any threats we are facing today. Further, as the acting State legal adviser testified before this committee, the 2002 AUMF is not necessary for the detention of terrorists abroad. It seems to me that our job is to ensure that we are sufficiently preserving congressional prerogatives as long as we protect [inaudible], and as such I will oppose the amendment. Does the Senator want a --

**Senator Risch:** A roll call.

**The Chairman:** A roll call vote. The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**Senator Shaheen:** No.

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Ricketts:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Paul:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Scott:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** No. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are nine. The noes are 12.

**The Chairman:** And the amendment is not agreed to.

Is there anyone else wishing to offer an amendment? Senator Paul?

**Senator Paul:** Some argue that the bill in front of us does too much, and I will argue that it may be too little. Some have argued it will change the President's ability to repel Iran, et cetera, but I actually believe that there may be a great deal of symbolism in revealing this, and it may do absolutely nothing. I think that the vast majority of the congressionally authorized power has been with the 2001 AUMF, and it

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

has been a long time, longer than the Iraqi AUMF. And also, I think it should be evaluated in the sense that it has been used, I think, and abused by presidents in both parties to effect war in over 20 different countries. Repealing the 2002 AUMF, I think, is a step in the right direction, but one of the reasons I think the Biden Administration does not oppose this bill is because they do not think they really need it for anything.

The 2001 AUMF was written very narrowly. It was a big deal, and it was passed nearly unanimously in the Senate and nearly unanimously in the House. It authorizes force only against those who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11th, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons. Now, over the decades, it has come to mean many other things to many other people and to authorize wars across the continent of Africa and throughout the Middle East. That is not what was voted on in 2001, and it is a generation ago now.

We really should not leave things on the books. If you want to be at war in Mali, you want to be at war in Syria, and you want to be at war throughout the Middle East, vote on it. If you want to be at war in Iran, vote on it. We should not leave this to another generation. These are questions that are too important.

Over the years, the definition of what the 2001 AUMF means has broadened, but really, without congressional alteration. Now people say it is to cover associated forces, meaning the President can claim the authority to go to war against any group, no matter how tenuous the relationship to be involved in a 9/11. Today, according to one academic study, U.S. presidents cited the 2001 AUMF to justify military operations in at least 22 countries. So, repealing the 2002 AUMF will still allow the

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

President to be fighting wars in 22 different countries. No one who voted on this in 2001 believed they were voting for a decades-long war fought in over 20 countries. Our job is not just to put a congressional imprimatur on war. The important job of Congress is to determine where and when we send our sons and daughters to fight.

Would anyone here vote to authorize the status quo? If we put forward a resolution today to say do you want to give the President power to be at war in the 22 different countries we are at war in, would you vote for that? That is why it has been so difficult in putting forward a new authorization because people are not sure they want to authorize a war in 22 places, but that is essentially what was really claimed by 2001.

Some argue that repealing this would put us at risk, but let us have that debate. My amendment makes no mention of whether we should continue these operations. My amendment sunsets the 2001 AUMF after 6 months. We can use that time to debate exactly where and how to authorize force. War is sometimes necessary, but going to war should not be the decision of one person. Our Constitution intended it to be a congressional authorization. A vote for my amendment is a vote to give the American people an opportunity to vote their opinions on the question of ending our endless wars. This amendment would sunset the 2001 AUMF in 6 months, and I request a recorded vote.

**The Chairman:** I thank the Senator. Senator Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think our failure to update the 2001 AUMF will go down as one of the greatest abdications of congressional lawmaking authority in the history of this country. I think the Senator is right that the American

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

people have no concept where American forces are today engaged in hostilities, and they would like to have a say in those questions.

I think we have largely avoided having this debate because it is difficult. It is hard. The enemy we face today is harder to define. Victory is harder to understand. And so we have outsourced this decision about where and when we fight simply because it is difficult for us to come up with the right definition about who the enemy is and when the fight is meritorious. And so I would hope that on our list of priorities, this committee is taking a hard look at rewriting the 2001 AUMF.

Senator Menendez led the last effort to rewrite that law. We did it. We passed it through this committee. The Obama Administration took it pretty seriously and convened a bipartisan group to try to get it to work, but it remains unfinished. That being said, I do not think this is the right place to have this debate. The underlying bill is too big a priority, and the addition of this amendment would greatly compromise our ability to pass the underlying bill, which, frankly, I think is a predicate to having the conversation on the 2001 AUMF.

Getting this bill done cleanly is the way in which we build a bipartisan consensus that can help us take the next step, which I would argue is having this tough conversation about how we properly authorize armed action against the variety of dangerous groups around the world who are still seeking to do harm to the United States. And so I appreciate Senator Paul continuing to push this issue. I oppose the amendment as applied to this underlying bill. I hope that this is work ahead for the Committee.

**The Chairman:** Let me go to -- we will come back to Senator Paul for a



**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

comment. Senator Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** I agree with all the sentiments expressed by Senator Paul. If we look at the actual language from 1991, it is "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, persons the President determines planned, authorized, or committed a terrorist attack that occurred on September 11th, 2011, or harbored those organizations." It has been stretched and expanded in many ways since. I would welcome this committee having separate debate, and I would be supportive of repealing 2001, but not in the context of this bill in which we are on the verge of accomplishing something significant in terms of both 1991 and 2002 that would be undermined should we add this provision into this legislation.

So and it is important today, my colleague, Senator Murphy, really articulated it effectively, just to be on the record, I support the effort the Senator is pursuing but is not supported in the context of this bill.

**The Chairman:** Senator Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** Thank you. Just to agree with Senators Murphy and Merkley. I just wanted to say on the Paul Amendment, if this was a standalone, I would be a "yes," but, frankly, for the same reasons that I support Senator Cruz's amendment, it has got to be one AUMF at a time and one country at a time when possible. If we load this thing up, we are never going to enact anything.

**The Chairman:** Senator Paul?

**Senator Paul:** I guess my -- just my response would be, are any of you willing to actually do a separate bill and have a vote on this? You can be on record as being actually for this. I understand not wanting to -- you know, you do not want to on this

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

bill. But, you know, is somebody is willing to come forward and actually sponsor this with me and we actually have a vote on a bill so we actually have recorded votes, then you can record your, you know, position.

So I guess today -- I have had this vote. You know, we had this two years ago, had the vote. I think I was probably the only vote, and I will probably be the only vote again, but I would just as have the vote again. But if you want to be on record, if you will come to my office or have your staff talk with us, we would love to do a bipartisan bill on this. Even though we will probably still lose on that, we would have the ability to say we do not believe in unlimited war and say that for your constituency, but I guess I would still rather have the vote.

**The Chairman:** Senator Risch?

**Senator Risch:** I am going to vote against this, but, look, everybody here is right. I mean, this is an incredibly important discussion we are having and have been having it for as long as I have been here. And the 2001 AUMF is the cornerstone, legal authority that the U.S. uses as they fight to have counterterrorism operations around the world. It needs a suitable replacement before it is repealed, and I think that is the major issue here. We cannot repeal this and say, oh, okay, six months and put something else in place. It truly needs to be replaced. So, I am going to vote against this. I suspect that we will be debating this for a long, long time to come, but this is a [inaudible]. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chairman:** Thank you. As I previously said, I welcome a broader discussion on the 2001 AUMF, and I know there, obviously, a significant interest by members on debating -- to examine this further. But we have not yet had that vote on

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

this discussion, including with the Administration, and I do not believe it would be wise to repeal the 2001 AUMF without engaging in that debate first. For those the reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The Senator asked for a recorded vote. The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**Senator Shaheen:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Chairman:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Paul:** Yes.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** No. The clerk will report.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the noes -- or the ayes are one, and the noes are 20.

**The Chairman:** The amendment is not agreed to.

Is there anyone else wishing to offer an amendment on this legislation?

[No response.]

**The Chairman:** If not, the question is -- is there a motion to approve the bill?

**Senator Coons:** So moved.

**The Chairman:** So moved. Is there a second?

**Senator Shaheen:** Second.

**The Chairman:** Motion has been made and second. Senator Risch, a recorded  
vote?

**Senator Risch:** Please.

**The Chairman:** The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**Senator Shaheen:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Merkley:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Paul:** Yes.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** Aye. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 13. The noes are 8.

**The Chairman:** And with that, the legislation is favorably reported to the Senate.

This business meeting will now be put into recess -- we have votes pending on the floor. We will go into recess, subject to the call of the chair. We will continue the meeting at 2:30 pm to vote on the remaining items on the agenda.

[Recess.]

**The Chairman:** This business meeting will come back to order. Thank you all for coming back.

We now have three additional nominees included in our agenda for which we did not have a vote on this morning. Given that we have already spoken about these nominees, we will proceed to vote on them. I have a request for roll call votes, and so we will start with the roll call vote on Eric Garcetti to be the U.S. Ambassador to India.

The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Cardin:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** Aye.

**Voice:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Oh, I am sorry. Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** Oh, aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**Senator Duckworth:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?



U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Risch:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Risch:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair?

**The Chairman:** Aye. Senator Booker wishes to be recorded as aye and present.

Aye and present.

**Senator Booker:** Thank you very much. Aye and present.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Chairman:** Because we used your proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman --

**The Chairman:** Senator Young, do you want to be recorded as present? Your vote on the --

**Senator Risch:** In person.

**The Chairman:** In person?

**Senator Risch:** On Garcetti. They just --

**Senator Young:** Aye.

**The Chairman:** The clerk will report.

**Voice:** Cruz.

**Senator Risch:** Senator Cruz.

**Senator Cruz:** You want Garcetti? No.

**The Chairman:** Okay. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 13. The noes are 8.

**The Chairman:** And the nomination is favorably reported to the Senate.

The next vote is on Geeta Rao Gupta to be the Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues.

The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**Senator Cardin:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Coons:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**Senator Duckworth:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

**Senator Ricketts:** No.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** Aye. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 11. The noes are 10.

**The Chairman:** And the nominee is favorably reported to the Senate.

The final nominee is Leopoldo Martinez Nucete to be U.S. Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The clerk will call the roll.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cardin?

**Senator Cardin:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Shaheen?

**Voice:** Aye by proxy.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**The Clerk:** Mr. Coons?

**Senator Coons:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Murphy?

**Senator Murphy:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Kaine?

**Senator Kaine:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Merkley?

**Senator Merkley:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Booker?

**Senator Booker:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Schatz?

**Senator Schatz:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Van Hollen?

**The Chairman:** Aye by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mrs. Duckworth?

**Senator Duckworth:** Aye.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Risch?

**Senator Risch:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Rubio?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Romney?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Ricketts?

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

**Senator Ricketts:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Paul?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Young?

**Senator Young:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Barrasso?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Cruz?

**Senator Cruz:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Hagerty?

**Senator Hagerty:** No.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Scott?

**Senator Risch:** No by proxy.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman?

**The Chairman:** Aye. The clerk will report.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 11, and the noes are 10.

**The Chairman:** With the majority of the members present having voted in the affirmative on all of these nominations, the yeas have it. The nomination is agreed to, and they are reported favorably to the Senate.

This completes the Committee's business.

I ask unanimous consent that staff be authorized to make technical and conforming changes.

Without objection, so ordered.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

**Business Meeting**

*March 8, 2023*

We are adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

**[Whereupon, at 2:10 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]**