



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020

No. 36

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2 p.m.

## Senate

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the center of our joy, make us Your captives so that we may live liberated lives. Provide our Senators with the spiritual, mental, social, and physical revitalization they need just for today.

May they place their trust in You and experience Your profound peace. Lord, grant that they will relinquish their worries to You as they permit Your perfect love to cast out every fear. Show them Your redemptive purposes in every problem they must solve.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WICKER). Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of February 4, 2020, the

junior Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, will now read Washington's Farewell Address.

Ms. BALDWIN, at the rostrum, read the Farewell Address as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country—and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power,

consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1091

value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise and as an instructive example in our annals that, under circumstances in which the passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts—of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The *North*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *South*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The *South* in the same intercourse, benefitting by the agency of the *North*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it con-

tributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The *East*, in a like intercourse with the *West*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The *West* derives from the *East* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason

to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical discriminations—northern and southern—Atlantic and western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen in the negotiation by the executive—and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate—of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a Constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the

right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions, that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country, that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guard-

ian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, fomented occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true—and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary

purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every

species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which

indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be

impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy,

humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them—conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take—and was bound in duty and interest to take—a

neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.  
UNITED STATES, 19th September 1796.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL JOSEPH MAGUIRE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, this afternoon I would like to recognize the career and public service of retired VADM Joseph Maguire, whose

tenure as Acting Director of National Intelligence and Director of National Counterterrorism Center concluded last week.

Joe Maguire spent 36 years serving our Nation as a U.S. Navy special operator. His leadership record included SEAL Team 2 and the U.S. Navy Special Warfare Command, where he guided some of our Nation's most sensitive military operations.

Admiral Maguire retired from the Navy in 2010, but it was not long before public service came calling again. In 2018, the President asked him to direct the NCTC. The Senate confirmed him on a voice vote.

He took on an even more challenging assignment last summer when he agreed to follow our former colleague Senator Dan Coats and act in the role of the DNI.

Our Nation asks our intelligence community to fulfill an enormous array of sensitive missions. These men and women work day and night to protect the homeland from terrorists. They fight nuclear proliferation. They keep watch on dangerous adversaries, like Russia and China. They guard against what hostile intelligence services are doing in our Nation, and they work to protect American elections from foreign interference that seeks to sow division and chaos and reduce public confidence in our democracy.

Recent reports suggest that adversaries, including Russia, are likely continuing efforts aimed at dividing Americans, sowing chaos in our politics, and undermining confidence in our elections. Fortunately, in stark contrast to the failures of the Obama administration in 2016, the Trump administration, once again, appears to be doing the right thing—in this case, by promptly providing a specific counterintelligence briefing to a Democratic Presidential candidate in question. This is just the latest example of the vigilance and the action we have seen from this administration on this crucial issue.

In parallel with hundreds of millions that Congress has appropriated in new election security assistance for State and local authorities, the administration has taken major proactive steps. The Treasury Department has sanctioned numerous Russian entities involved in the 2016 interference. The Department of Homeland Security has worked closely with States, local jurisdictions, and the private sector to bolster our cyber security defenses.

The Obama administration's naive and belated efforts failed to deter or to defend against Russian interference in 2016 and failed to provide substantive counterintelligence briefings to the Trump and Clinton campaigns. By contrast, the Trump administration has been vigilant and appears to be providing timely warnings to candidates affected by foreign intelligence activities. This is critically important work, and it wouldn't be possible without the hard work of our intelligence community to identify the hostile activities.

This is just one of many critical tasks the intelligence community performs for our country. Our country is safer and stronger when they have the tools and the resources they need and leadership that understands that political bias must have no quarter in intelligence work and that all Americans' rights need protecting.

#### SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, this week the Senate will continue to fulfill both of our constitutional charges: We will vote on important legislation, and we will provide advice and consent on a number of Presidential nominations. We will begin with two nominations to the Federal bench in U.S. territories.

Judge Robert Molloy, who currently sits on the U.S. Virgin Islands Superior Court, is nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Virgin Islands for a term of 10 years. Judge Silvia Carreno-Coll currently serves as a U.S. magistrate judge for the District of Puerto Rico and has been nominated to be a U.S. district judge. Both nominations were reported out of committee on a voice vote.

This week we will also consider Katharine MacGregor, the President's nominee to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and Travis Greaves, a nominee to serve as judge on the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years.

But first, following the first two nominations, the Senate will turn to important legislation put forward by Senators GRAHAM and SASSE to expand protections for innocent lives. Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would finally remove the United States from a list of only seven nations, including China and North Korea, that permit elective abortion after 20 weeks. It would bring our Nation's regard for the unborn off this sad and radical fringe and bring us more in line with the global mainstream.

I do not believe this legislation should be controversial, but even less controversial should be Senator SASSE's Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It would simply ensure that infants who survive abortion attempts receive the same level of professional care as any other children.

My colleagues and I will have more to say on this subject in the days ahead, but I will urge all Senators to join me in supporting these nominees and these pieces of legislation when we vote on them this week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a period of ten years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month and to pay tribute to Pennsylvanians whose work has made a real difference in our Commonwealth.

This year we will honor three individuals who have dedicated themselves to uplifting the lives of others. We know that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said: "Life's most persistent and urgent question is: 'What are you doing for others?'" For purposes of today's remarks, I will substitute one word. I will substitute the word "children" for the word "others" and ask: What are you doing for our children?

It is an important question, not only for those of us who gather for Black History Month today and to celebrate this month, but it is also an important question for every Member of Congress to ask themselves.

This year we are going to honor these three Pennsylvanians: Kathy Elliott, Rosemary Browne, and Ellyn Jo Waller. All three have dedicated their lives to answering this urgent question and to building pathways toward hope for children in their communities.

I can think of no calling more important and no mission more essential than this one: to help our children. It is an honor for me to have the privilege to recognize these remarkable Pennsylvanians. They are beacons in their communities, and they are each, in their own way, an inspiration to me in my work in the Senate and, I know, to the work of our staff as well.

American children face a crisis created by policy choices made by adults over now several decades. Despite low unemployment and overall economic growth, children are being left out and left behind. Almost half of young children in the United States of America live in poverty or near poverty, with infants and toddlers at greatest risk.

Nearly half of children live in those circumstances.

According to the Census Bureau's "Supplemental Poverty Measure," which takes into account many of the government programs designed to assist low-income families and individuals, childhood poverty worsened—worsened—in 2017 for the first time since the Great Recession.

Poverty harms children both immediately and for a lifetime, the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine concluded in their 2019 seminal report, "A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty." They found that poverty itself, especially when it occurs in early childhood or is persistent over time, is damaging to children in ways that last a lifetime.

Specifically, the report finds the following—and I am quoting the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine: "We find overwhelming evidence . . . that . . . a child growing up in a family whose income is below the poverty line experiences worse outcomes than a child from a wealthier family in virtually every dimension, from physical and mental health, to educational attainment and labor market success, to risky behaviors and delinquency."

This is a crisis of untapped potential opportunities. It is a crisis, as well, of contributions not made. When a child faces needless obstacles to becoming the person he or she might become, it is a profound tragedy that affects all of us because we are denying not just that child but also that family, that child's family, their community, and our country the contributions that child could make if we were investing in that child.

Over time, corrupt forces have perverted the basic notions of freedom while creating a society that works for corporate interests rather than our children's best interests. Freedom, as we know, is not simply the right to be left alone. Real freedom must include the opportunity—the affirmative ability—to achieve one's dreams.

A country that claims to support the freedom of its people must provide opportunities to its citizens. For example, in his second inaugural address, President Obama said the following:

We do not believe that in this country freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the few. We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us, at any time, may face a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other . . . these things do not sap our initiative, they strengthen us. They don't make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.

President Obama was right, and he knew then that there were and are today extraordinary people across the country who are working to give our children the opportunity to achieve and grow and contribute so much to our Nation.

Today I will speak about three women who are doing this work in the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: first, Rosemary Browne of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. For over 35 years, Rosemary Browne has been a leader in South Central Pennsylvania. During that time, she has held a number of critical roles in both the government sector and the nonprofit sector.

She is currently the President and CEO of Alder Health Services, the mission of which is to improve the health and well-being of persons living with HIV/AIDS and members of the LGBTQ community in a culturally competent, affirming, and empowering environment. The agency provides behavioral health, primary care, case management, wellness services, HIV/STD testing and treatment, family planning, and a host of other programs.

Critically, Alder Health provides a safe haven for LGBTQ youth, and we know that significant progress has been made in advancing the rights of LGBTQ individuals. However, the progress has been uneven, and we are still falling far short, for example, in serving transgender young people, especially transgender young people of color who face disproportionately higher rates of suicide and violence. Alder Health, under Rosemary Browne's leadership, has played an indispensable role in helping us better understand the challenges of LGBTQ adolescents and providing them with the services they need.

In 2018 Rosemary was appointed to Governor Tom Wolf's Pennsylvania Commission on LGBTQ Affairs, the first-of-its-kind statewide commission in the Nation. Rosemary's work at Alder builds on her primary work at the Highmark Foundation, where she led efforts to address emerging community health challenges and to make sure that uninsured and underserved populations in South Central Pennsylvania had the attention and the services that they needed. In this capacity, she spearheaded efforts to address bullying in our schools and our communities as a public health problem and also provided leadership on a strategy to reduce childhood obesity through school and community-based partnerships.

Prior to her work at Highmark Foundation, Rosemary spent a decade at the Foundation for Enhancing Communities as a program officer and then director of programs and community investment, where she oversaw tens of millions of investment in community services and tuition assistance, giving hundreds of area college-bound students the opportunity to pursue higher education.

Over her career, Rosemary Browne has heeded the call of service and lent her considerable passion and expertise in many different capacities. Whatever the role, the work has been the same: putting a spotlight on the needs of the underserved populations—LGBTQ youth, girls of color, and other underserved populations who lack access to healthcare, higher education—and al-

ways—always—helping them to obtain the services they need and to remove the obstacles that stand between them and their full potential.

Service has always been a part of Rosemary's work, believing, as she does, that we are given resources and influence not for ourselves but for others.

Also, like Rosemary Browne, Dr. Kathi Elliott's career has been defined by her service to others and to the children and young people of Pennsylvania. In this case, in Southwestern Pennsylvania, Kathi came to this work naturally, having had those values instilled in her by her late mother, the former police commander of Pittsburgh, Gwen Elliott.

We have had South Central Pennsylvania with Rosemary Browne. Now we are in Southwestern Pennsylvania with Dr. Kathi Elliott.

Kathi's mom, Gwen, the late police commander, was herself a trailblazer and someone whose story also should be told. We don't have time for two stories in one family today, but I will tell part of Gwen's story as well.

Gwen was one of the first African-American women officers in the Pittsburgh Police Department, joining the department in 1976 and eventually rising to the rank of commander. In 2002, Gwen founded Gwen's Girls, an organization dedicated to empowering girls and young women through holistic, gender-specific programs, education, and experiences through after school—school and community-based programming throughout the communities in Southwestern Pennsylvania. Gwen's Girls has grown to provide service throughout the region with sites in Pittsburgh, Wilkesburg, and Clarendon, PA.

Given her mother's leadership, it is no surprise that Dr. Kathi Elliott has demonstrated the same commitment to and passion for leadership, development, and empowerment of girls.

Prior to accepting the position of CEO of Gwen's Girls in 2015, Kathi spent years providing leadership in social service, community, and individual mental health treatment. Kathi began her career as a victim advocate at the Center for Victims, working mostly in the juvenile justice space. She also remains a practicing psychiatric nurse practitioner. In that capacity, she provides psychiatric evaluations, medication management, and clinical consultation services and treatment at the VA of Pittsburgh—their outpatient mental health clinic.

Dr. Elliott completed dual master's degrees in nursing and social work from the University of Pittsburgh and earned a doctor of nursing practice degree from Chatham University in 2014.

Through Dr. Elliott's leadership, Gwen's Girls has become recognized as a frontrunner in the integration of evidence-based, clinical prevention and intervention policies and practices that enhance the child and social welfare system.



Gwen's Girls convenes an annual equity summit for Black girls to address the racial and gender biases that exist within the juvenile justice, health and wellness, child welfare, and education systems.

Dr. Elliott has also remained a constant leading force and convener of the Black Girls Equity Alliance—a collaboration of over 75 stakeholders committed to addressing systemic inequities in the juvenile justice, child welfare, education, and healthcare systems.

Dr. Elliott currently serves on the board of trustees at Chatham University. In December 2017, she was appointed by Mayor Bill Peduto to serve as a commissioner on the newly formed Gender Equity Commission for the City of Pittsburgh.

Our third honoree today, Dr. Ellyn Jo Waller, though she was born in Queens, NY, we are proud to call her a daughter of Pennsylvania. Many in Philadelphia know her as a member and a leader at Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church, as well as the partner, in both life and ministry, of Dr. Alyn Waller, senior pastor of Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church. Ellyn Jo Waller earned a bachelor of special education from Ohio University, a master of education in curriculum, instruction, and technology in education, and a doctor of education and curriculum, instruction, and technology in education, with an emphasis on literary education, from Temple University.

Dr. Waller has devoted her passion and her time to promoting women's education and empowerment. She has especially devoted much of her time to combating human trafficking, both here in the United States and internationally. She is an active member of the Philadelphia Anti-Human Trafficking Coalition and serves as cochair of the religion subcommittee.

In 2011, Dr. Waller founded She's My Sister, an anti-human trafficking ministry at Enon Tabernacle. She's My Sister works to ensure that the faith community in Greater Philadelphia is aware of the issue of human trafficking and also partners with the Greater Philadelphia Salvation Army on the issue of participating in street outreach, supporting and strengthening the drop-in centers, and advocating on behalf of victims of human trafficking and sexual exploitation.

In October of 2015, under Dr. Waller's leadership, the ministry hosted its Inaugural Human Trafficking Awareness 5K Walk/Run to raise funds for a transitional residential program for young women exiting the life and aging out of the child welfare system.

Internationally, Dr. Waller regularly participates in rescue and restoration efforts in Italy and South Africa. Dr. Waller also serves on a number of boards and provides community leadership in other ways. She is a member of the board of the City School in Philadelphia, on the advisory committee of the United Negro College Funds, Dela-

ware Valley Women of Faith for Education annual luncheon, and is president of the Charitas Foundation, which is the philanthropic Waller family foundation established to positively impact the lives of individuals by sowing financial seeds into organizations that change lives through their missions.

Dr. Waller has served on the Foundation Board of the Community College of Philadelphia since 2014 and currently serves as the president of the Foundation Board.

Each of our honorees today—these three remarkable women—have worked tirelessly to ensure that our children can flourish and can fulfill their potential. When others may look the other way or even wash their hands of the solemn duty to help our children, our honorees have instead volunteered for service over and over again.

To refer back to the first question I started with, "What are you doing for our children," each of us has an obligation to answer that question. Each of our three honorees today have answered that question by devoting their lives to the urgent work of helping our children. These three remarkable women—all Pennsylvanians—have provided pathways to hope. For that, we owe them our deepest gratitude.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ABORTION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this week, the Senate will vote on two bills that will protect our most vulnerable citizens—literally, our babies. The first bill we will vote on is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which was introduced by our colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It requires physicians and healthcare providers to treat babies who survive an abortion with the same lifesaving care that other infants born at the same stage receive. While you might be forgiven for wondering, why would we need such a bill; surely, that standard must already exist in our law—unfortunately, no. There are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for abortion survivors, just as they would for any other infant in their care.

One of the most notorious reasons why we need this law sits in the Governor's mansion in Virginia. About this time last year, our country was shocked and outraged by comments made by Gov. Ralph Northam—a pediatrician, believe it or not—about what should happen when a baby is delivered and survives an abortion. He said:

The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would

be resuscitated if that's what the mother and family desired. And then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.

Rather than immediately doing everything possible to save the baby, to provide the same sort of care he would to any infant, he wants to sit around and decide whether the baby will live or die. That is not healthcare; that is infanticide. Voting for the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is how each Member of this Chamber can go on record to say they are against killing innocent babies.

While some are desperately trying to paint this as an anti-abortion bill, which would infringe on women's reproductive rights, those claims could not be further from the truth. There is nothing in this bill about limiting access to abortion, no mention of first, second, or third trimester abortions, nothing about overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

There is one goal with this legislation and one goal only: to give every baby a fighting chance. In a rational world, we wouldn't be having this discussion but would, rather, unanimously be condemning this practice for the evil that it is. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill and, once again, vote to stop the practice of infanticide and protect babies who survive abortions alive.

We will be voting on a second bill, which will provide protections for unborn children that are practiced in almost all of the civilized world. This is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that would make it a crime for doctors to perform abortions on unborn babies at or beyond 20 weeks.

There is significant medical research that shows that unborn children at this stage experience pain. At 5 months into a pregnancy, these babies are beyond halfway to delivery.

One of President's Trump's guests at the State of the Union a few weeks ago was 2-year-old Ellie Schneider—one of the youngest babies to survive in the United States. Ellie was born at 21 weeks and 6 days—just 13 days beyond the point in time we are discussing. She weighed less than a pound at birth and is living proof of the medical achievements and advancements that have improved the chance of survival for extremely premature babies.

Ellie and her mother Robin are an example of the impact this legislation would have on the lives of many Americans families. Unfortunately, just as our Democratic colleagues have tried to deceive the American people about the purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, they are trying to mislead everyone about what this bill would do as well.

First, this bill would apply only to elective abortions, not those involving rape or incest or where the life of the mother could be in danger. It in no way places the mother in legal jeopardy for seeking an abortion. It clearly and solely places responsibility on healthcare providers.



Passing this legislation wouldn't make the United States an extreme outlier when it comes to abortion practices. In fact, it would put us in line with international norms. Currently, only seven countries in the world allow elective abortions after 20 weeks. One, of course, is the United States. The other countries on the list should make all of us second-guess allowing abortions beyond 20 weeks—China, Vietnam, North Korea. Countries with a history of human rights violations are hardly the model we should aspire to.

It is time to give every baby a chance to live and stop doctors from performing abortions on infants who feel pain. I am proud to be a cosponsor of both of these bills and stand with my colleagues in the fight for human life.

Our friend from Montana, Senator DAINES, established the first-ever Senate Pro-Life Caucus to fight for the lives of our most vulnerable citizens. A couple of weeks ago, he said: "These back-to-back votes will present an opportunity for Senate Democrats and all of us to show the American people whether there are any limits at all to radical abortion extremism." We will soon learn the answer.

I appreciate our colleagues—Senator SASSE, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator DAINES—for their leadership on this legislation and for consistently fighting for the most vulnerable among us. I will be a proud "yes" vote on both of these bills—yes to protecting newborn babies, yes to equal medical care for all infants, and yes to a fighting chance for all babies.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, we are returning to Washington, DC, from time spent in our States. I was happy, for one, to get time to spend in Texas with constituents. I traveled the State, as I am sure many of us did, traveling from Midland, to Ft. Worth, to Corpus Christi, and a number of spots in between. Texas is a pretty big place, so it takes a little time to move around, but it is really great to be able to hear from the folks I represent—the folks we all represent—about what they care about the most.

One of the most interesting things to me is how little they talk about what is talked about inside the bubble here known as Washington, DC. In San Antonio, for example, I met with State and local officials to discuss their growing concerns over coronavirus. Lackland Air Force Base is one of the designated locations where Americans evacuated from overseas with suspected exposure to coronavirus are being held under the first Federal quarantine in more than 50 years. Folks were naturally concerned about the fact that these evacuees were scheduled to be transported to local civilian hospitals for testing rather than remaining on the base where they are quarantined. In our meeting, we were able to speak with not only the mayor and two council persons, but we were able to speak with officials from the

Department of Health and Human Services and the Defense Department about these concerns, and I am glad we were able to come up with a better solution. The Department of Health and Human Services has now updated their protocol to ensure that testing for coronavirus will be conducted at Joint Base Lackland's quarantine housing, so evacuees will not be sent to hospitals in the area for their tests.

I appreciate my colleagues at the city who have been working overtime to keep their residents there safe. I am grateful to the administration for addressing our concerns and being responsive to those questions.

On the very day we met, 90 evacuees were released from quarantine, and I am happy they are finally headed home. I am sure I am not as happy as they are after being quarantined. We owe a huge thank-you to the medical professionals who have and will continue to care for those in quarantine and to the Bexar County and San Antonio officials who are working to safeguard public health.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, I traveled up I-35 and was in Ft. Worth at the Northside Community Health Center to hear about an entirely different healthcare challenge, which is high prescription drug costs.

I met with local healthcare professionals, advocates, and patients to hear about their experiences with these rising costs, and I have introduced legislation to address them. For example, we heard from Randall Barker and his daughter Emma, who both have diabetes. They need insulin. They told me that one bottle of insulin costs upwards of \$281. Randall continues to make sacrifices to afford the lifesaving drugs he and Emma need to lead healthy lives.

As I mentioned, to address the high costs of prescription drugs, I introduced a bipartisan bill with our colleague, Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut, called the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. The purpose of the bill is straight forward: to stop drug companies from gaming the patent system to keep their profits high.

Patents, of course, are granted for scientific innovations in order to encourage more of them. What happens under the period of a patent is that whatever the item is—in this case, a drug—that company reserves the right to sell it exclusively, without any competition, in order to recoup its costs and incentivize innovation when it comes to these drugs. But when companies game the system by establishing patent thickets—multiple patents used to unfairly block competition—this prevents new drugs, as well as competing drugs at a lower price, from entering the market.

For example, the most widely prescribed drug in America is called HUMIRA. It has more than 120 different patents, for no real purpose

other than extending that period of exclusivity as long as possible to continue to make money. In Europe, there are five competing products, but in America, there is only HUMIRA. That is a patent thicket. That is gaming the system, and it is hurting American consumers.

I appreciate the support from healthcare providers and advocates and patients I heard from in Ft. Worth. They encourage us to get our work done sooner rather than later.

I have come to the floor twice and asked unanimous consent to pass the bill. It was voted unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee. The Democratic leader blocked it both times. I hope he will reconsider his position. I am sure his constituents in New York would like a little bit of a break when it comes to prescription drug costs. I happen to think it has to do more with the upcoming election than it does the merits of the legislation.

#### E-CIGARETTES

Madam President, I traveled to a couple of other Texas cities, where I was able to talk to people about the rise of e-cigarette use, particularly among teens. In Corpus Christi along the gulf coast and in Odessa in deep West Texas, I met with a range of local officials, health professionals, and community advocates about the impact of teen vaping.

One study found that in the Permian Basin, in the middle of the Odessa area, about half of high school students used e-cigarettes and 25 percent of them had vaped in the past month. This study found that in schools, the average age of first-time e-cigarette users is just 13 years old. E-cigarettes—even the closed systems, where you can't add other ingredients, like the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana, THC—even in the closed systems that are designed to deliver only nicotine, nicotine is an addictive drug. When children get access to these addictive drugs, it may well end up being a gateway to other use—whether it is tobacco or other drug use—later in life. It certainly encourages them to remain a user of this nicotine delivery device.

I have introduced legislation called the Preventing Online Sales of E-Cigarettes to Children Act, which would make it difficult for children to get their hands on these devices, particularly when they buy them over the internet. All it does is apply the same safeguards already in place for online purchases of tobacco—it applies that to e-cigarettes. Customers would have to verify their age at the time of delivery—a practice which, shockingly, does not currently exist.

A recent survey published in the American Journal of Health Promotion found that 32 percent of underage e-cigarette users reported purchasing products online, making online sales the single largest source of purchases for underage users. We recently raised the age from 18 to 21 to get access to these e-cigarettes, but still, as these studies

indicate, use of e-cigarettes and vaping devices is epidemic in our middle schools and our high schools. It is dangerous to the physical and mental health of our children. That is something you would think we would be able to address. If we are going to turn the tide on e-cigarettes and prevent more young people from facing their deadly health consequences, passage of this legislation is a necessary first step.

#### STATE WORK PERIOD

Madam President, when I was home in San Antonio, I was able to help celebrate the investiture of one of our newest Federal judges, Jason Pulliam, who filled the vacancy in the Western District of Texas. Then I got to spend a little time in Midland with folks and talk about the importance of our oil and gas industry and why innovation in that space and concern about conservation and the environment were not mutually exclusive.

At each step along the way, I was able to hear from countless other Texans about changes they would like to see coming out of Washington. They encouraged us to try to work together and avoid some of the partisan gridlock we have seen that characterized so much of the recent impeachment proceedings. It was a great week recharging at home. I came back ready to get back to work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### VETERANS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, the Disabled American Veterans is celebrating 100 years of helping military veterans, and I rise to recognize this remarkable occasion.

Throughout its history, the DAV has been influential in identifying ways to best support our veterans—from pushing for the consolidation of veterans programs, in its early years, to direct outreach to veterans in communities with the launch of the Field Service Unit Program, to pressing for more funding for VA healthcare and benefits.

There has been so much progress in advancing veterans services thanks to the DAV's efforts. The organization's members and partners have a lot to be proud of. DAV members have been leading advocates for injured and ill veterans and their families, which has made a difference for countless wounded warriors. The DAV's advocacy has helped and continues to build better lives for disabled veterans. We are thankful for the more than 1 million DAV members and auxiliary members who are doing great work to ensure our country keeps the promise we made to the men and women who have served in uniform.

This week, members of the DAV Department of Arkansas are visiting the Nation's Capital to share the organization's legislative priorities for 2020. They are part of an extensive network that has been influential in identifying how the Department of Veterans Affairs can strengthen its services. They are among the DAV members from across the country who are in Washington, DC, to advocate on behalf of veterans.

There is simply no substitute for coming to our Nation's Capital and visiting with Members of Congress to let them know of DAV's priorities. These include strengthening veterans mental healthcare and suicide prevention programs, improving benefits and services for women veterans and ensuring veterans who have been exposed to toxic substances receive full and timely benefits. The good news is we are working on these priorities because we all agree that our veterans deserve nothing less than quality care and the benefits they have earned.

Last month, the Senate's Committee on Veterans' Affairs advanced the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act. This comprehensive legislation will strengthen our ability to provide veterans with the mental healthcare they need. It includes language Senator WARNER and I authored to leverage the services of veteran-serving nonprofits and other community networks in our overall strategy to reduce veteran suicides.

VA Ranking Member TESTER and I are also working to improve services to our women veterans. Our Deborah Sampson Act legislation would eliminate barriers to care and services that many women veterans face and would help to ensure the VA could address the needs for women, which is so critical because they are more likely to face homelessness, unemployment, and to go without needed healthcare. We are pleased to have the support of the DAV for this important legislation.

I am proud to cosponsor the Veterans Burn Pit Exposure Recognition Act, which would allow veterans who suffer from the effects of burn pits to get the benefits and services they have earned.

I encourage my colleagues to support these bills so we can provide the resources that have been promised to our veterans.

For years, the DAV members have supported the passage of the Blue Water Navy bill. Thanks, in part, to their advocacy, Congress approved this critical legislation last year that extends benefits to more veterans who were exposed to toxic chemicals during the Vietnam war.

The DAV's attention extends beyond the Halls of Congress. Its National Service Program helps to direct services to veterans across the country.

I applaud the efforts of the more than 11,000 DAV members in Arkansas whose outreach is helping veterans to understand and access their benefits. They

have spent countless hours in advising fellow veterans about the assistance they qualify for and in helping them fill out the paperwork to secure those benefits through the VA.

One of the well-known services provided by the DAV is the transportation of veterans to VA medical centers and hospitals. In rural States like Arkansas, the services these volunteers offer is critical to meeting veterans' healthcare needs. The Arkansas fleet is made up of 16 vans. Last year, more than 6,600 veterans were driven to medical appointments with the help of volunteers who logged more than 18,000 hours behind the wheel.

I look forward to continuing to work with DAV members as Congress crafts and reforms policies to improve services for veterans and their families.

This country made a promise to our veterans that we must live up to, and I am proud to join with the DAV to ensure we follow through on that commitment. In working together, we can find solutions and take action to deliver the results veterans have earned and expect. We will continue looking to the DAV to understand how we can improve the lives of the men and women who have served in uniform.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees VA funding, I have seen the dedication of the DAV to support disabled veterans in Arkansas and across the country. I am proud to recognize the DAV on its 100 years of engaging veterans, in its advocating to advance benefits, services, and care, and in its making a positive difference in the lives of veterans and their families.

#### REMEMBERING CHARLES PORTIS

Madam President, on a separate subject, I also pay tribute to an Arkansas veteran who is one of the State's most famous sons—literary icon Charles Portis. Mr. Portis, the author best known for his 1968 Western novel "True Grit," passed away on February 17, 2020.

Born in December 1933, in El Dorado, AR, Portis spent his childhood in southern Arkansas. He enlisted in the Marine Corps and served as an infantryman and, during the Korean war, reached the rank of sergeant before his discharge in 1955. Following his military service, he attended the University of Arkansas and wrote for the student newspaper, the Arkansas Traveler. He graduated from the university in 1958 with a degree in journalism.

After graduating, Portis began his career as a reporter. He first worked at the Arkansas Gazette and then at the New York Herald Tribune. Though he voluntarily ended his journalism career in 1964, he used the skills and tools he had acquired as a reporter when he returned home to Arkansas to begin writing fiction.

His most celebrated work is the Western classic "True Grit." This book chronicles the efforts of a Yell County

teenager, Mattie Ross, along with U.S. Marshal Rooster Cogburn, to avenge the death of Mattie's father at the hands of a drifter. The novel incorporates distinct references that are familiar to many Arkansans, and it depicts life on the frontier in what was then the wild, wild West. It was later adapted into film in 1969 and 2010. While it is his most well-known work, Mr. Portis also wrote four other novels and several shorter works of fiction and nonfiction.

During his career, Portis was honored with the Oxford American's first Lifetime Achievement in Southern Literature award and was presented with the Porter Prize's 30th Anniversary Lifetime Achievement Award. "True Grit" has been praised as "one of the great American novels."

I take this opportunity to say how proud we are of Charles Portis and his legacy as an acclaimed writer and storyteller. My thoughts and prayers are with his friends and family as they remember and reflect on his life. I hope they find comfort in the fact that Mr. Portis has left a profound, lasting mark on Arkansas, as well as within our Nation's culture and literary traditions.

Charles Portis had a remarkable career that will be remembered for a long time to come. I wish to honor him and his loved ones today and help to celebrate his life. On behalf of all Arkansans, we celebrate Charles Portis and his notable contributions to our State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am pleased to have arrived on the Senate floor just a bit early to have heard the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN, pay tribute to the DAV, Disabled American Veterans, and I very much want to join in his comments.

I will also take a moment to thank him for his continual service for veterans, not only for those of Arkansas but of our Nation, and to recognize that he and I, since our days in the House of Representatives, have worked together on veterans' issues and both now find ourselves in positions in the hopes that we can do even more.

To Senator BOOZMAN, I say thank you for his continued efforts in making sure that all who serve our Nation have a better future and that the Department of Veterans Affairs, as well as the American people, do everything they can to make sure that what they are entitled to they will receive. So I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

TRIBUTE TO KENT CORNISH

Madam President, I come to the floor to congratulate and pay tribute to a Kansan, Kent Cornish. He is retiring as the President of the Kansas Association of Broadcasters.

He has spent the last 40 years in the broadcast business and the past 12 at the KAB in his advocating on behalf of broadcasters across our State. His dedication to making certain that rural

communities in Kansas have access to quality broadcasting programming is a testament to his commitment to rural America at large. I, in particular, find that very pleasing as we know how important broadcasting is—local broadcasting in particular—to the future and well-being of the citizens of Kansas and, particularly, to those who live in our smallest communities.

Kent is widely recognized as one of the most knowledgeable and effective advocates for broadcasting in our State and around the country. He has been a leading voice in Topeka and Washington, DC, and is someone whom I hold in high regard.

Kent is a native of Topeka who dedicated his life to broadcasting at an early age. With dreams of becoming a sportscaster, Kent attended the University of Kansas, where he earned a degree in journalism. He later attended Washburn University School of Law.

After joining his hometown station, WIBW, as an intern, Kent worked his way up through the ranks to become a news reporter, anchor, and, eventually, an assistant news director. He also spent time at WDAF in Kansas City and later returned to WIBW. He left the station in 1980 and turned his attention to sales. He served as executive director of the Kansas Manufactured Housing Institute, but he could not keep his passions in the background.

He left that job to return to broadcasting. Four years after leaving WIBW, he rejoined the station at which he would ultimately be named program director and operations manager. He later took over as general manager of KTKA, in Topeka, and eventually moved to Wichita to manage two television stations. After having spent decades running broadcast stations that Kansans from all over our State have relied on for both local and national news, he became the president and executive director of the Kansas Association of Broadcasters in 2008.

Kent has had a long and successful career. He has earned esteemed awards, including the Grover Cobb Award from the University of Kansas. He has also served in numerous leadership capacities, including as the former president of the National Alliance of State Broadcasters Associations and as the former chairman of the Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce and of the Topeka Community Foundation.

Kent has been a powerful voice in the Nation's Capital for critical Federal policy, all framed in the larger lens of improving communities' access—people's access—to quality broadcasting. Like the rest of us from rural States like Kansas, Kent knows how quickly these communities can be forgotten and has always been determined to ensure access to local information, news, and weather.

I am proud to call Kent a friend, and I look forward to seeing where his life now takes him. We meet many people in the business that we are in here in the U.S. Senate and in politics in gen-

eral. Kent is one of those whom you appreciate from the first day you become acquainted with him. He is straightforward and honest and tells it like it is. He is there to be supportive but is there to provide the necessary information for me and others to make the best decisions, not just on behalf of broadcasters but for those they serve in their communities.

I add my voice to the well-deserved praise that he has received and will continue to receive. Congratulations and thank you to Kent for all his work.

On behalf of Kansas broadcasters, you are highly regarded by them and their listeners. Your efforts have benefited Kansans and have improved our Nation. You will be missed at the Kansas Association of Broadcasters, but I have no doubt you will continue to make your community a better place.

I look forward to many more years of friendship and working together on behalf of Kansans, and I thank you for your friendship and for all you have done to make our State a better place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

ABORTION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this week the Senate has another chance to vote on basic pro-life protections for babies, both born and unborn.

This week we have another choice to live up to our Nation's highest principle—that every person has the right to life—or to stoop down to a narrow vision of humanity peddled by the abortion industry and its cronies.

The first bill we are considering—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—would prohibit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, when there is clear, scientific evidence that these young babies can feel pain in their mother's womb.

The abortion lobby and all of its defenders will dispute this science, claiming that babies or fetuses—which is the euphemism they like to use for babies—can't feel pain at all or at least until the very latest stages of pregnancy. Anyone pedaling that myth must have never visited a neonatal intensive care unit, or the NICU, as they are usually called. Ask any one of those NICU nurses who cares for little preemies, even micro-preemies, and they will tell you how they can hold that small infant sometimes even in the palm of their hands, and they can see it grimace at a poke or a prod, maybe even slap away a tube or a needle as they approach—just as older kids do, just as some grownups do.

The undeniable fact of fetal pain in these young babies influences every aspect of how we care for the young in our hospitals. We swaddle them with only the softest fabrics because their little bodies are so easily stimulated. We give them pain medicine during surgery, whether they are in the womb

or outside it. But we offer no such comfort during abortions, even in the latest stages of pregnancy, when abortionists crush a baby's skull and dismember it.

Indeed, a scientific paper published earlier this year in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* noted a curious fact: Abortion is the only—the only—invasive procedure performed on unborn infants without pain medication. Then again, abortion is unusual in so many ways, as so few hospital procedures are designed to end a life, not to save a life.

Are we comfortable with this state of affairs? Are we comfortable with the fact that more than 11,000 abortions were performed after 21 weeks when, again, we have clear, scientific evidence that these babies feel pain and that many of them could survive outside their mother's womb?

I would suggest the American people are not comfortable with this situation, and we can do something about it in the U.S. Senate this week.

The second bill we are voting on, called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is even more modest but perhaps even more urgent. This bill would simply protect babies when they are born alive during an abortion.

I know it is amazing to even hear this, but there are rare and horrible cases in which babies are intended to be aborted, yet they are born alive, and the doctors are under no obligation to provide medical care for that young baby with a spark of God living in its soul. So this bill would simply obligate abortionists to render lifesaving medical care to a baby struggling for life on the operating table. It would require abortionists to act as those babies' friends and their doctors, consistent with their oath—not act like the baby's mortal enemy.

Of course, the abortion lobby will tell you: Oh, this never occurs. All of their defenders in the media will say that it never occurs. But if you are being honest, the facts are, they do occur.

The implication here is clear. They simply want us to look away from this horror. That doesn't mean we should, though, because, in fact, we do know—we do know—that babies can survive abortions. We have the numbers to prove it from a handful of States that require abortionists to confess when they fail to kill a baby in the mother's womb and, instead, murder it on the operating table.

In Florida, 11 babies were born alive during abortions in 2017; another 6 were reportedly born alive in 2018; and another 2, last year. There were 19 precious little babies born alive during abortions in just 1 State in just 3 years. Other States have reported dozens more cases.

Still, the abortion industry will dismiss these lives as a mere rounding error: Let's not even focus on it. It is not a serious matter.

But forgive us if most Americans see the matter differently. These are pre-

cious little children, made in the image of God and endowed by him with the same worth and dignity as you and me and all of us.

We have a duty to these little children. We have a duty not to look away from them.

These pro-life bills are modest and humane. They have the strong support of the American people—clear majorities. But the real reason we must protect these babies is not because it is popular but because it is right.

Every human being is created equal and deserves recognition and protection under our laws. It says so right in the preamble to our Declaration of Independence.

Our country doesn't always live up to that noble principle. But right now we have an opportunity to live up to it just a little bit more, if only in just a few more cases—but those cases in which life is most vulnerable and most innocent.

So I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity and protect life by acknowledging the humanity of these precious little children. We must not look away any longer.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, the World Health Organization has now reported that there are 79,000 cases of coronavirus across at least 30 countries, with at least 53 confirmed cases here in United States.

As the virus continues to spread, the global economy is already beginning to suffer. All of the warning lights are flashing bright red. We are staring down a potential pandemic, and the administration has no plan. We have a crisis of coronavirus, and President Trump has no plan, no urgency, no understanding of the facts or how to coordinate a response.

We must get a handle on the coronavirus and make sure the United States is fully prepared to deal with its potentially far-reaching consequences, but the Trump administration has been asleep at the wheel.

President Trump, good morning. There is a pandemic of coronavirus. Where are you? Where is your plan?

It is just amazing. As the crisis grows and grows, we hear nothing.

Coronavirus testing kits have not been widely distributed to our hospitals and public health labs.

President Trump's State Department overruled the recommendations of the scientists in the CDC and allowed infected passengers from a cruise ship to be flown back into the United States.

Amazingly, at a time when we know that these pandemics can spread, this administration cut the CDC—the agency in charge of fighting these global viruses—with a 16-percent senseless cut to its budget.

My fellow Americans, that is what they do on all these things. They just

cut, and then the President tries to claim credit after we restore the money. He did it in his State of the Union. He was claiming, because of his great work with NIH, we are curing cancer. He has cut the NIH every budget, including this one.

It is a disgrace how this man can say one thing and do another and confounding that it doesn't catch up with him with too many Americans and none of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and it is probably, right now, most dangerous and most egregious when it comes to coronavirus.

It wasn't just that the President cut CDC last year. It follows years of drastic cuts to the global health division at CDC by the Trump administration.

In 2018, CDC was forced to reduce the numbers of countries it operated in from 49 to 10. That is how bad it is.

We have crises, and we have a world that is different, and this administration, instead of stepping up to the plate, runs away, listening to the clarification call of the far right: Just cut, cut, cut, cut, no matter how it affects people.

In 2018, even worse, President Trump ordered the National Security Council to scupper its entire global health security unit and asked the Department of Homeland Security to do the same. We don't have epidemic teams in the National Security Council or DHS.

I hope and pray to God that corona doesn't spread here, but if it does, we have been inadequately prepared because of President Trump's lack of leadership, lack of understanding science, lack of ability to listen to experts and do something about them instead of being concerned—it seems all the time—with his own ego.

The President has not even taken the simple, sensible step of designating a single official to lead response efforts.

In 2014, President Obama made the smart decision to appoint Ron Klain to lead an interagency response to the Ebola outbreak. But President Trump, in contrast, has hollowed out so many agencies that one of the key figures responding to coronavirus is Ken Cuccinelli, an immigrant hard-liner with no experience in public health. Unbelievable. A man totally unprepared for coronavirus, an ideologue—a rightwing, nasty ideologue who has spent his career kicking around immigrants—is now in charge of our fight against coronavirus. This is after the President cut CDC, eliminated the global health security units in Homeland Security and at the NSC, and we are in trouble.

President Trump has not only failed to marshal a capable domestic response to the coronavirus; he has been slow to take action to confront the virus abroad. We all know that the best thing to do is to stop it from spreading abroad before it spreads to these United States.

Of course, the President—ego above anything else—has been afraid to criticize President Xi or the Communist

Party of China for silencing dissent and obscuring the truth about the coronavirus—where it originated. When China obscures the truth, it puts Americans in danger. Where is President Trump's voice?

The videos emerging from behind the Chinese Communist Party's internet wall show Chinese people pleading—pleading—with the international community to expose the scope and scale of this epidemic.

The response so far by the Trump administration is exactly what happens when science skeptics with alternate facts try to run emergency response that requires expertise, planning, knowledge, money, cooperation, and science-based actions.

But being anti-science is not just rhetoric. It hurts us. It hurts every American in many ways, and that is what President Trump and his administration do, and our Republican colleagues just blithely go along.

After months of tiptoeing around the Chinese Communist Party, after 3 years of cutting funding for our epidemic response programs, President Trump simply has left the United States unprepared to confront a possible epidemic like corona.

I will have more to say this week about what the administration must do to right the ship.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President, on another front, again, the frustration of how this administration has conducted itself is unprecedented. I know some of my colleagues like to say that it is just like Obama. It isn't even close.

Here are some more examples, unfortunately, on the trampling of the rule of law in this country.

Emboldened by the refusal of Senate Republicans to hold him accountable in his impeachment trial, President Trump has been interfering with the Justice Department and retaliating against officials in his administration who dare testify truthfully before Congress.

In the short week that we have spent in recess, the President has managed to plunge our country even deeper into chaos and certainly has shown the need for having a trial during impeachment with witnesses and documents, getting the truth and not rubberstamping President Trump's behavior.

The President continued to purge his administration, firing officials who refused to pledge allegiance to the President over their allegiance to the Constitution. The President classified Bolton's book in another blatant attempt to cover up the facts. This is what dictatorships do—dictatorships. They say something is classified; they hide the truth. It is a disgrace.

The President continued to abuse the pardon power, in one instance commuting the sentence of a notoriously corrupt former official without rhyme or reason. Maybe most egregious of all, the President, angered that the Director of National Intelligence had the

gall to conduct a bipartisan briefing for the House Intelligence Committee on foreign interference in our elections, replaced him with a political lackey—a yes-man as the head of DNI, where truth needs to be spoken probably more than any other place in the government. He has no experience in the intelligence community and is simply known as an acolyte to President Trump.

With each of these actions—I hate to say it, but it is true; any objective person will know—President Trump brings our Nation closer and closer and closer to a banana republic, a government not of laws but of one man, a government where officials are asked to swear loyalty not to our country or the Constitution but to the President himself, a country where truth is obscured or covered up or deemed fake simply because it is not flattering to the President and is not what he wants to hear.

President Trump's decision to dismiss the DNI Director, the Director of National Intelligence, is particularly pernicious. Our intelligence community is an institution that is supposed to report on threats to our country with accuracy, without regard to politics, to speak truth to power, to protect us. For the President to install a yes-man at the top of the intelligence community, to politicize a part of our government designed to be apolitical, to so debase the morale of the brave men and women in the CIA and the NSA, many of whom risk their lives for our safety, is a disgrace.

There are media reports that our intelligence community has found that Putin continues to engage in activities to influence the outcome of our election. That is reportedly what former DNI McGuire's team was briefing Congress about.

So today, along with my Democratic colleagues on the Banking and Foreign Relations Committees, I am sending a letter to Secretary Pompeo and Secretary Mnuchin urging them to impose new sanctions on Putin and his cronies using existing sanctions authority. They have it; they can do it. Let me repeat that. The Trump administration has broad authority to impose sanctions for meddling in our elections. It does not need new legislative tools or approval.

Our message is clear: Secretary Mnuchin, impose sanctions now.

No one on the Intelligence Committee, Democrat or Republican, has disputed that Russia is attempting to interfere in our elections. Most say Russia has already started to do so. So this should be an easy, bipartisan effort. We are being attacked today in real time by foreign adversaries. This is not about party politics. It is not about what Trump doesn't want to hear. The Russians wanted him to win in 2016 and in all likelihood will want him to win in 2020. It is about the oath we swear to defend our Republic. Americans—I don't care what their party, what their ideology—if they start be-

lieving our elections are not on the level, this democracy will be in big trouble.

I hope my Republican colleagues will join us. The administration could impose sanctions tomorrow, and it should. A repeat performance of 2016—another campaign of foreign influence in our elections—is perhaps the greatest threat to our democracy. The Founding Fathers thought so. Read what James Madison said.

We demand that Secretary Pompeo and Secretary Mnuchin identify and target all those determined to be responsible for ongoing election interference. Anything less would be an abdication of their responsibility, their sacred, solemn responsibility to protect and defend the United States from the serious threat to our national security and the integrity of our electoral process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

#### LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1919

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge passage of bipartisan, compassionate legislation that I introduced on April 2 of last year with my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN, to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program. This program provides respite services to family members who are caring for loved ones with special needs. Oftentimes, they are taking care of a spouse with Alzheimer's disease or a child with several disabilities, and it is a 24/7 job. They need a break, they need help, and that is what respite service is all about.

This is not a new program. It has long been a bipartisan priority, and our bill is widely supported by a total of 100 leading caregiver and respite organizations across the country.

The Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee reported our bill unanimously on October 31 of last year, and we have been working since then to secure its passage by the full Senate. It cleared the Republican side of the aisle on December 17, but the bill has been stalled on the other side of the aisle due to an unknown objection by an anonymous Senator, making it very difficult to resolve. If you don't know who has lodged the objection and you don't know what the concern is, it becomes impossible to resolve it. Thankfully, I am pleased to report that the objection has now been lifted, and we are poised to pass this bill that will help our seniors caring for a spouse with Alzheimer's or another disease, as well as parents caring for children with disabilities.

Our bill would authorize \$10 million annually for the Lifespan Respite Care Program over the next 5 years to assist States in establishing or enhancing statewide lifespan respite programs. Since the program's enactment 15

years ago, 37 States plus the District of Columbia have received grants to increase the availability and quality of respite services. Failing to reauthorize this program would put this funding in jeopardy.

While respite care is the No. 1 service caregivers say they need, 85 percent of our Nation's caregivers have not received any respite services at all. Respite care has been shown to help sustain family caregivers' health and well-being and avoid and delay out-of-home placement for those for whom they are caring.

From families caring for children with disabilities to those caring for older adults, the need for respite care today continues to grow. Our bipartisan legislation would help the 45 million caregivers in our country who provide an estimated \$470 billion in uncompensated care each year.

As a Senator representing the State with the oldest median age in our Nation and as chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, the well-being of our seniors and their caregivers is among my top priorities. The need for respite care continues to outpace available resources. This program is an attempt to provide a modest amount of Federal grant money toward this goal.

Along with Senator BALDWIN, this bipartisan bill is cosponsored by Senators MURRAY, REED, and SINEMA. More than 50 national stakeholders have signed a letter urging immediate passage of the bill, including the ARCH National Respite Coalition, the AARP, Easterseals, The Arc, and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation. In addition, State-based organizations representing constituents across the country have also signed this letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 24, 2020.

Re Lifespan Respite Care Program Reauthorization Act (S. 995).

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,  
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education,  
Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate, Wash-  
ington, DC.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,  
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Health, Edu-  
cation, Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN ALEXANDER, RANKING MEMBER MURRAY, SENATOR COLLINS, AND SENATOR BALDWIN: We, the undersigned national, state and local organizations representing all ages and disabilities, are writing to offer our support for the bipartisan Lifespan Res-

pitate Care Reauthorization Act (S. 995) to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program at \$50 million over five years. We are very grateful that with your strong support, the bill was unanimously approved by the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee last October, and we now urge the Senate to take swift action to pass the bill. We also want to acknowledge and express our deep gratitude to Rep. James Langevin for his championing of Lifespan Respite in the House since 2003, when he first introduced the Lifespan Respite Care Act in Congress. He continued to lead the effort with subsequent reauthorization bills in every Congress since 2011.

Every day, millions of American families are faced with unexpected illness, disease, or disability. A soldier is injured in war, a spouse develops multiple sclerosis or Alzheimer's disease, or a child is diagnosed with a developmental or physical disability or chronic illness. These are but a few examples of events that can forever change an individual's and family's trajectory.

While each situation is unique, the one thing that they often have in common is the incredible role family caregivers play. Forty-three million family caregivers provide a vast majority of our nation's long-term care, permitting individuals of all ages to remain in their communities and avoid or delay nursing home or foster care placements.

While the benefits of family caregiving are plentiful, caregiving can take its toll. Respite—short-term care that offers individuals or family members temporary relief from the daily routine and stress of providing care—is a critical component to bolstering family stability and maintaining family caregiver health and well-being. Respite is a frequently requested support service among family caregivers, but 85% of family caregivers of adults receive no respite and the percentage is similar for parents caring for their children with special needs.

The Lifespan Respite Care Program, though competitive grants to states to establish or enhance statewide Lifespan Respite systems, work to maximize existing resources and help ensure that quality respite is available and accessible to all family caregivers. With more than half of care recipients under age 75 and more than one-third under age 50, Lifespan Respite rightly recognizes caregiving as a lifespan issue and serves families regardless of age or disability.

Though the program has been drastically underfunded since its inception, thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia have received grants and are engaged in impressive work such as identifying and coordinating respite services available through various state agencies, including veterans caregiver services; helping unserved families pay for respite through participant-directed voucher programs; addressing the workforce shortage by recruiting and training respite workers and volunteers; and building capacity by awarding mini-grants to community and faith-based agencies for new services; and raising awareness about respite through public education campaigns. Enactment of the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act is necessary to continue this excellent momentum, better coordinate and supply respite care to our nation's 43 million family caregivers through statewide Lifespan Respite programs and ensure that states are able to sustain the great work they have begun and still allow new states to receive a grant.

We thank you for your commitment to individuals living with disabilities, older individuals in need of assistance and support, and the loved ones who care for them and we look forward to continuing to work with you as the bill moves forward. If you would like

more information, please contact Jill Kagan with the National Respite Coalition at [jkagan@archrespite.org](mailto:jkagan@archrespite.org).

Sincerely,

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AARP, ACCSES, Aging Life Care Association, Alliance for Aging Research, Alliance for Retired Americans, ALS Association, Altarum, Alzheimer's Association, Alzheimer's Foundation of America, Alzheimer's Impact Movement, American Academy of Pediatrics.

American Association of Caregiving Youth, American Association on Health and Disability, American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, American Music Therapy Association, American Network of Community Options and Resources (ANCOR), American Occupational Therapy Association, American Therapeutic Recreation Association, Autism Society of America, Caregiver Action Network, Caregiver Voices United, Caregivers on the Homefront.

CommunicationFIRST, Easterseals, Elizabeth Dole Foundation, Epilepsy Foundation, Family Caregiver Alliance, National Center on Caregiving, Family Voices, Generations United, Lakeshore Foundation, Leading Age, Lupus Foundation of America, National Alliance for Caregiving.

National Asian Pacific Center on Aging (NAPCA), National Association for Home Care and Hospice, National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a), National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services, National Association of State Head Injury Administrators, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, National Down Syndrome Congress.

National Foster Parent Association, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Respite Coalition, Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Rosalynn Carter Institute for Caregiving, Sibling Leadership Network, The Arc of the United States, United Cerebral Palsy National, Well Spouse Association, Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER).

#### STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

##### Alabama

Alabama Governor's Office on Disability, Alabama Home Health Services, Alabama Lifespan Respite Resource Network, Alabama Lifespan Respite Coalition, Madison County 310 Board, North Alabama Community Care, United Cerebral Palsy of Alabama, United Cerebral Palsy of Huntsville and Tennessee Valley, Inc., United Cerebral Palsy of Mobile and Central Alabama, West Alabama Area Agency on Aging.

##### Arizona

Arizona Caregiver Coalition, Benevilla, Posada Life Adult Day Services, SunTree Adult Day Health & School For Seniors.

##### California

Association of Caregiver Resource Centers, YMCA Childcare Resource Service.

##### Florida

Florida Lifespan Respite Alliance.

##### Idaho

Center for the Study of Aging, Families Together, John & Junes Mission, Inc., Idaho Caregiver Alliance, Kids 1st Disability Resource Center, Legacy Corps for Veteran and Military Families/Jannus, Rays for Rare, Relatives As Parents INC., Senior Connection.

##### Illinois

Illinois Respite Coalition.

##### Kansas

Kansas Lifespan Respite Coalition.



**Maryland**

Maryland Respite Care Coalition.

**Mississippi**

Mississippi Family Caregiver Coalition.

**Montana**

Developmental Educational Assistance program (DEAP), Montana Lifespan Respite Coalition.

**Nebraska**

Nebraska Caregiver Coalition, Nebraska Lifespan Respite Network.

**Nevada**

Nevada Lifespan Respite Care Coalition.

**New Jersey**

The Family Resource Network, Caregivers of New Jersey.

**New York**

Fulton Co Office for Aging & Youth, Livable Communities Caregiver Collaborative, Livable Communities Alzheimer's/Dementia Collaborative, Livable Communities Intergenerational Collaborative, New York State Caregiving and Respite Coalition.

**Oklahoma**

Oklahoma Caregiver Coalition, Sooner Success.

**Pennsylvania**

Alliance for Community Respite Care.

**South Carolina**

Central Midlands Area Agency on Aging, Charleston Area Senior Citizens, Inc., Down Syndrome Association of the Upstate, Evolve Senior Solutions, Family Connection of South Carolina, Federation of Families of South Carolina, Leeza's Care Connection, Richland/Lexington Disability and Special Needs Board, South Carolina Autism Society, South Carolina Respite Coalition, South Carolina Spinal Cord Injury Association, Tri-County Adult Day Services, Inc.

**Tennessee**

Tennessee Respite Coalition.

**Washington**

Washington PAVE, Washington State Respite Coalition.

**Wisconsin**

Greater WI Agency on Aging Resources, Inc., Inclusa, Respite Care Association of Wisconsin.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I have shared how important it is that we pass this legislation, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019, without further delay, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 283, S. 995.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 995) to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019".*

**SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE PROGRAM.**

(a) **DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.**—Section 2904 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii–3) is amended to read as follows:

**"SEC. 2904. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.**

*"(a) IN GENERAL.*—Each State agency awarded a grant or cooperative agreement under section 2902 shall report such data, information, and metrics as the Secretary may require for purposes of—

*"(1) evaluating State programs and activities funded pursuant to such grant or cooperative agreement, including any results pursuant to section 2902(d)(2)(B)(xii); and*

*"(2) identifying effective programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902.*

*"(b) REPORT.*—Not later than October 1, 2023, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding the outcomes of the programs and activities funded pursuant to section 2902, including any effective programs and activities identified."

(b) **FUNDING.**—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300ii–4) is amended by striking "title" and all that follows through the period and inserting "title, \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through fiscal year 2024."

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 995), as amended, was passed.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued**

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we are running a little bit behind, so I would ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, which reflects the amount of time we are running behind.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

**WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE**

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is having yet another debate on legislation to restrict healthcare for women, and I am going to take just a few minutes to talk about what this debate is really all about.

The old Republican slogan was "a chicken in every pot." The new Republican slogan is "a Republican in every examining room."

The Senate has done remarkably little legislating while under the recent control of the other party, but somehow, some way, there always seems to be time to have an attack on women's healthcare. It has come up again and again, and it is always the same basic proposition on offer: Republican politicians trying to somehow squeeze themselves in between women and their physicians.

My view is that the government ought to make sure that women can get healthcare from the doctors they trust and that politicians ought to stay out of things. Roe v. Wade says that is supposed to be the law of the land when it comes to access to abortion. More than four decades of settled law says that these are choices to be made by women and their doctors, and the ideological agendas of politicians ought to have nothing to do with it. The legislation up for debate this week, based on yet another far-right cause, says the opposite. Amongst other problems, one of the proposals on offer this week would actually criminalize the practice of intensely personal healthcare. It would essentially say to doctors: Just throw out your training. Throw it away. Discard your medical judgment, and forget what is in the patient's best interest.

Rightwing politicians are going to call the shots in the exam room. Doctors who provide necessary medical treatment and care that can be life-saving could be thrown in jail if they run afoul of these new ideological government standards.

Now, this isn't a debate just here in the Senate. There have been hundreds of bills brought forward in States across the country restricting women's healthcare, including safe and legal abortion. Among the people hit hardest by these proposals are the millions of women in this country who are every single day walking an economic tightrope. If they can't see the doctor they trust and if their local Planned Parenthood clinic is forced to shutter its doors because of these harsh new rules, they may not have anywhere else to turn to for vital healthcare. It is another way in which the far right and the Republican agenda supporting it goes back to the days when healthcare was really just for the healthy and the wealthy.

Bottom line: This debate is fundamentally about whether the government gets to control women's bodies. It is a dangerous, in my view, unconstitutional proposition that just throws in the garbage can decades of settled law. This Republican majority has proved that we can always find time here in the Senate to go after women's healthcare with ideological bills, regardless of what other healthcare challenges Americans are facing at home.

I guarantee that across this country right now there are persons lined up at



pharmacy counters with every last penny they have who know they are about to get mugged when it comes to paying for the cost of prescription medicine. Millions of Americans struggle to pay for their medications, but the majority leader of this body has blocked our best efforts to give them a hand. Instead, the Senate is debating yet another ideological attack on women's healthcare that really has no chance of becoming law.

The likelihood is these attacks, in my view, based on what we know, are going to keep coming. It will only get more serious in the months ahead. Four more years of Donald Trump would mean the end of *Roe v. Wade*. It would guarantee more healthcare discrimination against women, and it would mean a whole lot more government control over women's bodies. Again and again, we would see the government in the exam room. I urge my colleagues to reject these proposals when they come up.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from

Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Ex.]

#### YEAS—88

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Harris	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Booker	Heinrich	Sasse
Boozman	Hoeven	Schatz
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Brown	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kennedy	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Loeffler	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wicker
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Perdue	
Fischer	Peters	

#### NAYS—1

Hirono

#### NOT VOTING—11

Burr	Markey	Sanders
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Klobuchar	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Texas.

#### ABORTION

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today for every child who has been denied the chance to live; the little boys and the little girls who never got the chance to breathe a breath of air, to live life; never got the chance to grow up to be athletes, doctors, poets, or inventors; never got the chance to live their own unique lives.

This year marks the 47th tragic anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that forced on all 50 States abortion on demand and has tragically led to the loss of life of over 60 million unborn children. Since that decision, so much life has been lost. So many unborn and even newborn babies have suffered.

In recent years, we have seen the Democratic Party not listening to the concerns of a great many people of good will on both sides of the party but, rather, radicalize. We have seen leading contenders for the Presidential nomination in the Democratic field declare that pro-life Democrats are no longer welcome in the party. We have seen far too many Democrats embrace extreme positions on abortion—abortion up until the moment of birth and even, horrifically, after that.

I think the radicalization of today's Democratic Party was made crystal clear for a great many Americans with the radio interview that Virginia Governor Ralph Northam did on January 30 of last year. In that interview, Governor Northam was speaking in favor of a bill that would allow abortion when a mother was already in labor.

Stop and think about this for a moment. There have been debates about abortion for a long, long time. A mother in labor, in the process of delivering a child, this bill would allow a doctor to kill that child instead of delivering the child in the midst of labor. For a great many people, even Americans who identify as pro-choice, the idea of killing a child while the mother is in labor delivering the infant is horrifying beyond words. But Governor Northam didn't end there. He wasn't content simply with saying that abortion should be allowed even in the midst of birth. He went further. He said on that radio interview:

The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and the family desired. And then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.

Now, so nobody is lost on what Governor Northam was saying, he was describing something that has euphemistically been called post-birth abortion. He was describing his view of the right way to approach delivering a child, which is a child who is delivered, who is outside the womb, who is breathing and crying and living. That is an infant. And Governor Northam calmly, with virtually no emotion whatsoever, described comforting that infant and then having a conversation about whether to deny that child the necessary care to live or simply to callously let a newborn infant die.

For virtually every American, that is a concept that is so extreme, that is so radical, that—other than elected Democrats who have decided to embrace a radical view of abortion in all circumstances—almost every other American would be, rightly, horrified by the notion of a doctor allowing a newborn infant outside the womb to die. That was Governor Northam's position.

Well, tomorrow the Senate has an opportunity to speak out against those extreme, radical positions, to say this isn't OK, to draw a line, to find what should be some degree of common ground. We are going to be voting on two bills in the Senate tomorrow: the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of both pieces of legislation. Those are both commonsense pieces of legislation that would work to restore fundamental rights for the unborn and for newborn babies. They are simple pieces of legislation.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act requires doctors to provide medical care to infants who survive attempted abortion procedures. It

would help make sure that, when an infant has already been born, when the infant is alive, is breathing, is crying, is outside the womb, that that child receives the medical attention he or she needs.

The second bill is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that would ban late-term abortions that result in pain and suffering and agony for an unborn child.

What you will not hear from congressional Democrats is that after 5 months, an unborn child's toes and eyelids and fingers and eyelashes have already formed. He or she has a heartbeat and can feel pain, and science confirms this. We know that these late-term abortions, embraced by more and more radical partisans, produce pain and suffering and agony. We should not be a part of allowing the deliberate infliction of pain on a little girl or a little boy.

These two proposals, in any sane and rational world, would be agreed to unanimously. If you look at the last 3 years, we have seen enormous victories when it has come to defending life, when it has come to confirming 192 new Federal judges committed to following the law in the Constitution; when it has come to restricting taxpayer funding of Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in this country; when it has come to defending the religious liberties of Americans all across this country, including the Little Sisters of the Poor. We are making major steps in the right direction, but we can go further. We can agree on these commonsense provisions. We can also test whether Senate Democrats agree with their colleagues running for President, whether Senate Democrats agree with the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who has said: If you are a pro-life Democrat, get out of the party; you are not welcome.

I can tell you in Texas, I certainly welcome pro-life Democrats to speak up for their values and defend their values, and we should come together behind commonsense propositions that say we should not be committing procedures that result in pain and agony and suffering, that science demonstrates causes that suffering, and we should not be allowing newborn infants to die because medical care is denied to those children.

This should bring us together. I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand together for life—every life, as a precious, unique gift from God. Every life, whether the child has a disability, whether the child is valued or not, that child should be valued, should be protected because that child is precious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, it must be a day that ends in "Y" because, once again, Republican Senators are pushing for backward, ideological

bills to restrict a women's constitutional right to abortion. Once again, Republicans are peddling a ban that is blatantly unconstitutional. Once again, they are pretending we don't already have laws on the books that protect infants and are using that as a pretext to drum up fear and misunderstanding about one of the most heart-breaking situations a family can face, and are pushing for anti-doctor, anti-women, anti-family legislation.

Once again, I am here on behalf of women and men across the country to deliver the same message we have already made clear countless times: not on our watch. Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has indicated he wants to pivot to legislating, which makes these two atrocious bills an interesting choice because all 100 Senators know they are going absolutely nowhere. The truth is, Republicans' charade today is not actually about passing laws any more than it is about people's health or medical science or what is best for patients. It is really about Republicans' crass political calculation that they can fire up their far-right base with an all-out war against the constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion.

The two bills differ in some significant ways, but they have the same consequences. They would criminalize—criminalize—abortion, take deeply personal, often painful decisions out of the hands of parents and use scare tactics and misinformation to try to weaken strong public support for Roe.

Another thing they have in common? They have already been panned by leading medical groups. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has called one of these bills "an unconstitutional attempt to intimidate health care providers and prevent them from providing the safe care their patients want and need." And they have said the other is "a gross legislative interference into the practice of medicine."

It is not just medical experts. Families across the country have actually faced these decisions, have spoken out to make clear politicians should have no part in them. Pressing for these awful bills year after year may be nothing more than a cynical political tactic for Republicans, but passing them would be an unconscionable exercise in cruelty to the people who would actually be affected:

People like Judy, who is from my home State of Washington. Judy learned over 20 weeks into her pregnancy that her son's organs were not developing properly. One lung was 20 percent formed. The other was missing entirely.

People like Kate, whose doctor informed her that if her daughter survived birth, she would not be able to walk, talk, or swallow and likely would not even be comfortable enough to sleep.

People like Lindsay, who learned her daughter had a fast-growing, inoper-

able tumor growing into her brain and heart and lungs, wrapping around her neck and eyes and chest, and making her odds of survival incredibly slim.

People like Darla, who was pregnant with twins when she got the unthinkable news that one of her twins had serious medical complications. Not terminating that pregnancy could put her other twin's healthcare at risk.

Those are just a few of many stories. There are more families across the country who have struggled with the painful reality that the child they have hoped for cannot survive. Each of them has spoken out to underscore that in those wrenching moments, they wanted to make the decision that was best for their child and their family, with their healthcare provider. But each of these bills would take the ability to make the decision best for that child and family away from women like Judy, Kate, Lindsay, and Darla. Those bills would prevent doctors from offering the best medical advice, all because extreme politicians are more concerned with spreading misinformation and firing up their base than they are with actual women's lives. In other words, in the most private moments of personal tragedy, these bills would take precedence over a family's wishes as they grieve.

To the politicians supporting these bills, I have to ask: How dare you think your opinion is more important here than the knowledge of medical experts and the wishes of the family who is affected?

I don't understand how anyone can think, instead of letting patients make their own very personal decisions, that they should have that decision made for them by President Trump and Vice President PENCE. That is exactly what we are talking about today. Why? Even though *Roe v. Wade* has been the law of the land for almost a half a century, even though a large majority of people do not want to see that landmark decision overturned, Republicans think somehow they can benefit politically and fire up the most ideological elements of their base by using every tool imaginable to chip away at the right to safe—safe—legal abortion.

I am here to say they can try, but women, medical experts, and those of us elected officials who trust them are not going to stop calling these bills what they are: anti-women, anti-doctor, and anti-family. We are going to make clear we oppose every single one of their efforts to further chip away at access to safe, legal abortion under *Roe*: every extreme, cruel abortion ban, every fearmongering effort to gin up controversy and pretend we don't already protect infants, every far-right judge they try to pack onto the courts to chip away at *Roe v. Wade*, every barrier to care and information like President Trump's title X gag rule, and every new shameful scheme they concoct in their all-out war on access to reproductive healthcare.

Whatever Republicans try next, Democrats are going to continue fighting alongside women and men across the country to protect their ability to make their own decisions about their own families, continue standing up for doctors' ability to practice medicine without politicians getting in the way, and lifting up the stories of real people, like Judy and Kate and Lindsey, Darla, and many others—so Republicans can't ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am really disappointed to feel like I need to come to the floor today to respond to these anti-women, anti-family bills that have been introduced. Not only would these bills interfere with a woman's ability to make her own reproductive choices, they would threaten doctors with prison time if they perform abortion services that women have a constitutional right to receive.

These bills are dangerous, extreme, and they are part of an ongoing effort by this administration to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. We don't need this legislation to prevent the killing of infants.

Let's be very clear. Infanticide is already illegal under Federal law. In fact, prosecutions have occurred under the current law that prevents infanticide. This legislation would do nothing but set up ambiguous standards for cases that are often medical emergencies and add uncertainty to laws that are already on the books to prohibit infanticide.

This uncertainty will have a chilling effect on the ability of women to access the services they need in the United States. The legislation we are voting on would also imprison doctors for up to 5 years for performing abortions after a woman is 20 weeks pregnant, even though—even though Federal courts have ruled that this 20-week abortion ban, as is proposed under one of these bills, would violate the Constitution.

The 20-week abortion ban bill would only allow for exceptions for minors who are victims of rape or incest if those young women report that rape or incest to the police. For adult women, the rape exception would only apply if she waits 48 hours and gets counseling from a healthcare provider that her government—not that she or her family but the government—determines is acceptable.

These exceptions are just shameful because my colleagues know, as I do, that almost three-quarters of rape and sexual assaults are never reported, often because women have legitimate fears of being victimized again. They fear the rapist or the person who has assaulted them.

More broadly, it is really this simple: We should not be putting doctors in prison for providing a woman with the reproductive care she chooses. We must always remember that abortions that are performed later in pregnancy are

almost always done as a result of severe fetal diagnoses and the serious risk that the pregnancy poses to the life of the woman.

This isn't a decision that any woman or family wants to be in a position to make. It is tragic, and it is heart-breaking. The fact that these bills would demean the women who have to make these decisions by suggesting that this is something that government should decide for them instead of the woman with her family and with her doctor is nothing but tragic. I don't understand how people can think the government is better positioned to make these personal decisions than women and families and their doctors.

Protecting pregnant women, new mothers, and children is about more than scoring political points with anti-choice legislation. It is about ensuring that women have access to maternity care. That means prenatal care. It means having access to affordable healthcare coverage. That is why this legislation rings so hollow. People who are speaking on the floor who are supporting these bills are not talking about improving the lives of women and children.

Right now, this administration is in court, backing a lawsuit that would tear down the Affordable Care Act despite the fact that there is no alternative if the ACA is struck down. If the administration and States succeed in striking down the Affordable Care Act, we are going to go back to the days when insurance companies can exclude maternity care from coverage and when women can be charged higher premiums than men. If they succeed, the Medicaid expansion would be gone, and States would have fewer dollars to cover more people at a time when 43 percent of childbirths in this country are covered and paid for by Medicaid.

These are the fundamental issues that are at stake for women and families across this country. Given these stakes, I am disappointed that here we are again, debating two anti-choice bills that the Senate already rejected in 2018 and 2019. Nothing has changed since then. This is time that is being used, as the Senator from Washington said, just to try and stir up the base of some of the Senators who are in this Chamber.

If my colleagues were serious about protecting mothers and children, they would join in supporting efforts to ensure that the healthcare coverage that families rely on isn't ripped away in court. I urge my colleagues to oppose these bills and to vote no when they are considered on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

RUSSIA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor today with a sense of urgency. Our next national election is a little more than 8 months away. We know from public reporting that Russia is back to its 2016 playbook and

working to interfere again. What some called a political Pearl Harbor in 2016 is in the process of happening again. It is happening to us again.

I notice that every Member of the Senate has Washington's Farewell Address. It is an annual ritual in which that address is read by Members. It is interesting, in the introduction, that one of the things Washington warned about is interference by foreign powers in the Nation's domestic affairs; George Washington, President, one of the Founders of our country, wrote back then about the interference of foreign powers in our domestic affairs.

This isn't about the Kremlin helping Donald Trump, although we know that was their preference the last time. But it has become increasingly clear that at least at this point, chaos is the true goal. We haven't seen anything that may have changed what their preference was 4 years ago. Nothing that the President has done should be a reason for them not to want to see him be reelected again. But regardless of whether that is or is not the case, chaos is part of their goal. Rendering our democracy incapable of standing up to bullies abroad is their goal.

What is this administration's response? Is it paralysis? No, it is anything but. This administration now appears to be engaged in a proactive strategy to deny this body access to information on this interference. With the appointment of Ric Grenell to serve as Acting Director of National Intelligence, the administration is sending a clear message to the American people, to the Congress, and to governments around the world that our intelligence services are now political commodities to be manipulated and used to gain electoral advantage. Amid all of the oversight challenges we face with this administration, we will likely look back on this decision as perhaps one of the most consequential and most damaging to our democratic institutions, and that is saying a lot about this White House.

These reports of Russian interference do not come as a surprise. They should not find us flatfooted. Several of us have introduced sanctions legislation that would deter such Russian behavior from happening. The DASKA bill that I introduced with Senator GRAHAM had broad bipartisan support and passed out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with a strong bipartisan vote and is waiting on the Senate floor for action.

What are we waiting for? The election is 8 months away. What are we waiting for? We are waiting for responsible Senators to defend our democracy, waiting for a vote. Yet it sits here, and it is an outrage.

Inaction at this very precarious stage in our democratic story violates the very oath that Members swore to uphold upon their election. Inaction by this body at this time is truly unimaginable. Yet here we are with this lack of will to stand up for our national security, this lack of will to defend our

democratic institutions, this lack of will to fulfill the oath to our country. History will not judge well the Senate in this hour.

Only Americans should decide American elections—no one else, no foreign power, no foreign player, no foreign individual. Only Americans should decide American elections. I think that is a pretty simple proposition, but it is a powerful one.

Our legislation and others are not the only tools available to the President. If he decided to stand up for our democratic institutions, existing CAATSA legislation includes several sanction mandates already on the books that could be used. Obama and Trump era Executive orders are sitting on the shelf, gathering dust. Both could be employed right this minute to impose crippling sanctions on Russia to send a clear message: Do not mess with our elections or there are serious consequences.

But what is the message from this White House in response to public reporting that Russia is again interfering? Is it following the laws that Congress has passed, full implementation of CAATSA, crippling sanctions on the Kremlin, full activation of all the powers involved and Executive orders? No, no. Instead, the President decided to fire the guy who delivered the news to Congress and replace him with a political sycophant. This would be like FDR dismissing the congressional declaration of war after Pearl Harbor and firing members of his staff who reported on the Japanese attack. It is pretty astounding.

Never before have we had a President so transparently willing to bow down to a foreign foe, unwilling to challenge in the collective national interest and security of the United States, in the collective democracy of our country. The core of our democracy is citizen participation in casting a vote to decide who governs them, from the President to the Congress, to local States and mayors. When that is eroded by the engagement of a foreign government—a foreign government that is nefarious in its activities and consequential in its actions—it undermines the very essence of our democracy.

I don't care who they are helping. They are supposedly helping, according to the press reports, Senator SANDERS as well. That is wrong. I don't want them helping anybody in our country. I don't want them engaged on behalf of anyone in our country.

Never before have I seen a President unwilling to challenge Putin and Russia. Never before have I seen a President so willing to sacrifice national security for his own political gain. And every single Member in this body who does not stand up and hold him to account and try to make sure that we pass legislation and challenge the President to ultimately sign it and enact it and to pursue the law as it is already on the books in terms of CAATSA, to pursue the Executive

order powers that exist today—which would send an incredibly powerful message if invoked—is complicit. We will have to bear the judgment of history. I expect the judgment will be rather harsh.

For myself, I am going to do everything possible to ensure that our elections are sacrosanct and that they do not have the interference of a foreign power. I do not want to be among those whom history is going to judge very harshly for being silent in the face of an invasion of information and efforts to undermine our elections. In any other context, we would consider it a war. I consider it no less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my Senate colleagues.

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

#### ABORTION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, we are here today to discuss two pieces of legislation that will be voted on tomorrow in the U.S. Senate. These two important bills address the issue of life, a most basic human right—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

This first bill, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, would end the barbaric practice of late-term abortions after 5 months. It is a time, in fact, that the science tells us that babies feel pain.

The second bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, will protect babies who are born alive after surviving botched abortions.

These back-to-back votes will present an opportunity for every Senator and, more specifically, for nearly every one of the Senate Democrats to show the American people whether they believe there are any—limits to radical abortion practices.

I am joined this evening by several of my esteemed Senate colleagues and good friends: Senator ERNST of Iowa, Senator SASSE of Nebraska, and Senator BRAUN of Indiana. These folks, like me, know how important it is that we protect the sanctity of life and put an end to the cruel practice of late-term abortions and the horrific act of infanticide.

I founded the Senate Pro-Life Caucus last year because I believe the U.S. Senate needed to take bolder action to protect human life.

In fact, at the State of the Union Address, President Trump invited Ellie Schneider and her mother, from Missouri, as his guests. Ellie's mother

stood proudly as the President shared their story and the miracle it was that Ellie was with us that night, healthy and thriving.

You see, Ellie was born at 21 weeks and 6 days. In fact, she is one of the youngest premature babies to survive in the United States. Despite the odds being stacked against her, Ellie was given a chance at life. Thanks to the grace of God, she is alive and she is healthy today.

Ellie's story and the stories of so many others like her underscore how important it is that we put an end to this very cruel practice of late-term abortion. It is heartbreaking to know that here in America—in the United States of America—nearly 12,000 children a year are lost to late-term abortions.

At 20 weeks, science tells us, these babies can suck their thumbs. They can feel pain. They can yawn. They can stretch. They can make faces.

In fact, if you have a smartphone, if you are watching tonight, just Google 20weekbaby—2-0-W-E-E-K-B-A-B-Y.

Here is one of the images that will show up on your smartphone. That is what a 20-week baby looks like.

It is unconscionable that preborn babies, after 5 months of pregnancy, can be killed, even though they are capable of feeling pain.

In fact, during this age, preborn babies are oftentimes given anesthesia if there is fetal surgery involved.

Now, here is one of the shocking statistics. The United States is only one of seven—seven—countries in the world, which include North Korea and China, that allow these barbaric late-term abortions after 20 weeks. That is a list we don't want to be on, but we are. As Americans, we must strive for better. This isn't political. This is about working to ensure that every single child has a chance at life.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense bill and has overwhelming public support. Do you realize public attitude and opinion on abortion and late-term abortion keeps swinging in the pro-life direction? Why is that?

Well, perhaps one reason is because technology has gotten so much better, and 3D ultrasounds give us such a clear picture of what is happening there in the womb.

Look at this picture right here. The images are very clear. I believe in a principle that people believe what they discover for themselves. Technology is helping young people see that what we are talking about here is a baby. It is life.

Sixty-two percent of voters oppose late-term abortion. This bill is something that I firmly believe every Republican and every Democrat can get behind. Why can't we at least come together on late-term abortion and banning it? Passing this bill would be a major step forward for the pro-life cause.

The next bill we are voting on tomorrow is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Back home in Montana, this piece of legislation moved through our State legislature up to our Governor's desk. It was called the "Baby Born Alive" bill. It is the same thing. It mandates that if a baby is born alive following a botched abortion, the doctor must protect that baby and give the same medical care that any other baby would receive.

Is that really too much to ask for? Honestly, the fact that we are having this debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate is astonishing. The American people agree. In fact, 77 percent of pro-abortion advocates believe that babies born alive should be medically protected.

Sadly, today there are States that do not offer protections for babies born alive. In fact, just earlier this month, in Colorado, State legislators killed a bill that would grant legal protections for babies born alive after abortions.

I would like to turn to my colleague from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST. She has been an unwavering, relentless champion for life, and she has been a dear friend. She is a great colleague and a great leader on this issue of protecting the most vulnerable—these little babies.

Senator ERNST, would you agree with me that Senate Democrats should join us in voting for these commonsense bills that protect innocent human life?

Ms. ERNST. Absolutely, Senator DAINES, and I am proud to join you on the floor for this colloquy this evening. I will take your place, and I have just a few words that I would love to share on these bills as well and protecting our unborn.

Again, I would like to thank the Senator from Montana for arranging this colloquy.

We want to get into some of these commonsense measures that we are speaking about this evening. I appreciate the Senator from Montana's words, and it is astounding that we are even having this debate on the floor of the Senate.

Very, very commonsense, lifesaving measures are coming before us this week, and, first, I would like to step back a little bit and take a moment to answer the one key, big-picture question at the center of this debate and the debate that we have over life, and the basic question there: Is life valuable? And my answer to that question is absolutely.

I see value in every single life, and we all have different ideas on how we measure the value of life, but I can boil it down a little bit. Some folks would say it is what a human being will bring to this world. Now, what that is can be determined by different measures, but what impact does a person have.

Now, some, of course, will see celebrities. They will see athletes. They will see trailblazers and scientists and say: Wow, they have made their mark on the world, and they contribute so much. There is so much impact there.

But then I see it in everyday, common people at home in Iowa, as well. I

even reflect upon folks like a friend of my daughter's who grew up in our small community of Stanton. He has Down syndrome, and yet he contributed so much—and still does to this day—in our home community. He is our hometown spirit coordinator at every football game, and he is leading everyone in their cheers and supporting our hometown teams. And this young man brings so much joy to everyone. I would say that his life has made a huge impact on all who know him. We can think of the smallest among us as well, that baby in the womb, and how does that baby make an impact. As a mother, I know that fellow mothers can relate to this as well, but that baby makes an impact even in the womb. The experience of pregnancy can change a woman forever, not just physically but mentally and emotionally.

Women I talk to will often comment on the amazing feeling and bond they will have with that child who is growing in their womb. They experience that heartbeat in the womb. And even to the effects that maybe we don't like to reflect on—I remember the swollen ankles I had in the last month of pregnancy. No offense to Fred Flintstone, but I had Fred Flintstone feet. Even things like that we can reflect on. But the impact of having that child stays with me. It changed me forever.

I know that other mothers know that whether it is from the beginning of a pregnancy with a healthy, full-term child or whether it is a scary premature birth or, for some, the difficult and life-ending decision to abort, the fact remains that the tiny human being carried within us has forever left a mark on their mother. This truth spurs me on to fight even harder to protect the undeniable value that every human life has. Every human life has value.

So today I stand with my pro-life colleagues in asking our pro-choice friends—many of whom are mothers and fathers themselves—to meet us in the middle. We may not be able to get on the same page when it comes to recognizing the inherent value each of these lives holds, but surely we can agree that protecting our most vulnerable from painful death is a unifying and humanitarian cause.

What I would like to do is just tell you the story of my fellow Iowan, Micah Pickering. Micah is joining us on the Hill this week, and I encourage all of my colleagues to take some time to meet this incredible boy. He will be on the Hill tomorrow.

When I first met Micah, he was just a couple years old, and his family had brought him into my office. I had this picture. I had just this picture in my office. Micah, then 2 years old, ran over to this picture, not knowing it was he, and he pointed at it and he said: "A baby!"

I started to cry, and I said: "Yes, Micah, that is a baby."

Today Micah is happy, healthy, and he is 7 years old. He was born at 22

weeks, and that is the age of some of the babies we are talking about today—born at 22 weeks. When Micah was born, he was literally the size of a bag of M&Ms, a tiny baby.

Folks, can't we all agree that this is a baby and that babies like Micah who survive a premature birth at 20 to 22 weeks—we are talking about those who survive at 20 weeks, which is more than halfway through pregnancy—are deserving of protection? I agree with that.

The only difference between Micah and the more than 10,000 children who are aborted after 22 weeks' gestation—which is what Micah was—the difference, the dividing factor, is that Micah was wanted by his parents. His parents, Danielle and Clayton, saw his inherent value.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a measure that should meet the approval standard of my pro-choice friends because supporting this bill means giving all of the Micah Pickering of the world an equal, fighting chance. The degree to which a child of any age is wanted does not diminish their value, and we have an obligation as lawmakers to protect their right to life.

But if we cannot come together in support of a bill that protects viable babies from abortion at the point when they feel pain, then surely, surely a baby who survives an abortion attempt deserves the same degree of care as any other newborn. Folks, just think about it. These babies, their lives—they have already survived a horrific abortion attempt and have been given a second chance at life. But without our putting the necessary protections in place, these precious babies can literally be left to die. Those in the medical field who fail to care for these precious newborns need to be held accountable.

Senator SASSE has helped lead the way in protecting these living babies with his Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a commonsense bill that I proudly support. Given that we have an estimated 143 babies who died between 2003 and 2014 after surviving abortion, it is clear that we need to strengthen the current law. These babies deserve the basic medical standard of care regardless of how wanted they may have been.

I implore you to think about the issue of life in a new way, one that is very simple. When you think about everyone you have come into contact with, whether it is your family, your friends, your coworkers, your spouse, even yourself, every single person was at one time a defenseless child in their mother's womb. Every life, from the baby who has just been conceived, to each and every one of you in this room tonight, has value. Whether you are that star athlete, whether you are that scientist making new discoveries, whether you are that hometown cheerleader, every life has value.

To my Senate colleagues, we have had this debate before, but I ask that

you consider these bills with new eyes focused on the inherent value of life. You have the opportunity to save lives, and I hope you will join me in doing so.

I thank the Senator from Montana for raising this issue this evening, and I am proud to be a “yes” vote on both of these tremendous bills. I hope we can get others to join us in that effort.

Thank you, Senator.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DAINES. Senator, thank you, and thanks for your very moving story about Micah Pickering. It helps to take these ideas and translate them directly into these children today, whom you can see there as a little baby.

There are critics of the born-alive bill who would say this horrible act that we described here tonight simply doesn't happen. For those who say that, they should talk to somebody named Melissa Oden. In fact, just last year when we had the born-alive bill on the floor of the Senate, I was coming down to speak on behalf of the bill. I was just about maybe 50 feet from where I am standing right now, outside the doors of the Senate, as I was making my way to speak, and guess who was standing outside the door of the Senate. It was Melissa Oden. She is a beautiful mother today. She survived a saline-infusion abortion as a little baby at about 5 months. She was left for dead, and she was discarded—this was in Kansas City, MO—until a hospital nurse heard her little cries. This nurse saved Melissa's life, for which we are very thankful. It was quite an experience to meet her just outside these Chamber doors. Now Melissa herself is a mother.

I believe we have a duty, an obligation to protect life and particularly the most innocent life and the most vulnerable life, like a little baby who can be born alive as a result of a botched abortion attempt.

It is my hope that the Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, will vote to support and defend this most basic human right and recognize that late-term abortions—I recognize this is a very divisive issue in this country, but I would think that on the issue of late-term abortions, on the issue of babies born alive as a result of botched abortions—can we at least come together where public opinion overwhelmingly supports both and say, let's stop these barbaric practices. These are extreme positions. They should be outlawed in this country. We can no longer simply stand by as our children—we talk about children in this country losing their lives to abortion and infanticide.

As Americans, we have an obligation to honor our Nation's founding promise enshrined in our Declaration of Independence that all men and all women and all human life are created equal and endowed by our Creator with these certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Think about it this way: Of these important rights, you can't have liberty and the

pursuit of happiness without first having the right to life. This right to life is the first and most important of these inalienable rights.

So I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting these commonsense bills to stop this brutal violence of late-term abortions of pain-capable babies. That is why it is called the Pain-Capable Act. Babies are capable of feeling pain at about 20 weeks. That is why, when in utero surgery is performed, they administer anesthesia—because the baby is feeling pain. That is where we are drawing the line with these bills to stop late-term abortion and also babies who are born alive—which isn't about abortion; this is about infanticide. We must protect these innocent babies, standing for life, standing for those who are most vulnerable.

I see that my colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE, has come to the floor. Senator SASSE authored the baby born alive bill. I am grateful Senator SASSE is joining us here tonight in this colloquy.

Senator SASSE, can you explain the importance of passing the bill you have authored?

Mr. SASSE. Thank you, Senator DAINES of Montana and Senator ERNST of Iowa. I know Senator BRAUN is going to be here shortly. I want to speak about both pieces of legislation we are going to be considering tomorrow. Both of them are very important to distinguish. I know it has been brought up a few times tonight, but just to be sure we are all on the same page, Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a very important piece of legislation, and I think my Born-Alive Abortion Survivor's Protection Act—both of them, which my colleagues here have spoken on, are very important pieces of legislation. They are important pieces of legislation, but they are distinct and have to be clarified to the American people, via the press, on how they differ.

These two bills are different, but they are connected by a simple question, which is, Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies? This is about as straightforward a question as you can possibly have. Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies?

Let's talk first about Senator GRAHAM's legislation. Every mom and dad knows what it is like to see your child hurt, to see somebody fall down, maybe with something as minor as a scraped knee or a burnt hand on the stove or a finger slammed in a car door or a bedroom door. You know that experience of a deep breath that is going to be followed by the piercing cry. Something drops in the pit of your stomach. Every parent knows this feeling. You want to scoop them up. You want to grab them. You want to hold them, and you want to take away the pain. You would take Tenex for the pain, if you could, to protect your baby from that pain. You want to make it stop, and you want them to know that they are going to be okay. When your child hurts, you hurt,

and it is far worse to watch your child hurting than to feel the pain yourself.

So we have this gut feeling when it comes to pain. When we see someone hurting, we know this is not the way the world is supposed to be. Pain is not natural. This is not the order of things as it was meant to be, and so our heart leaps at the sight of someone in pain—not just a child, but especially when it is a child, a family member, or a friend, or even a complete stranger. When you see somebody in pain, we want to make it stop. Human beings are compassionate; that is, we feel along with others. When they suffer, we suffer, and so we reach out to protect. We want to give comfort.

Tomorrow, we have the opportunity to extend that reach of care and comfort and protection. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would protect babies as early as 20 weeks into pregnancy—that is halfway through—by inscribing in law our responsibility to protect innocent babies in the womb from the pain that is inflicted by abortion.

The responsibility that we have when a 2-year-old skins her knee is also a responsibility that we have when a 20-week-old baby in the womb is threatened. The science is clear: Modern medicine is allowing surgeons to perform operations on in utero babies, and these intricate, amazing—amazing—little operations available nowadays are saving the lives of thousands of babies with what would have once been fatal conditions. These surgeons frequently administer drugs to the baby, just like they do to the mother. These doctors are treating two patients—not just one—and they do everything in their power not just to advance the health of both of the patients but to protect both of the patients from pain. They want to be sure that both patients are safe and comfortable and as well cared for as possible.

Science has shown us that these babies feel pain, and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a simple recognition that, although the baby in the womb might be mostly invisible to us, we are not blind to her needs. We have a responsibility to spread that umbrella of law over every vulnerable person, no matter how small. Size doesn't determine dignity or worth.

The question before us tomorrow is, Will the U.S. Senate vote to protect these babies? It is pretty simple. You are going to hear lots of crazy commentary talking about other stuff than what we are actually voting on tomorrow, but what we are voting on is, Should the U.S. Senate vote to protect these babies? I plan to vote in favor of compassion because I believe that being pro-mom and pro-baby and being pro-science are all bundled up together. So tomorrow, we are going to consider compassionate pro-science and pro-baby legislation, and I implore my colleagues, all 100 of us, ought to be doing the same.

I also know that, although I am unapologetically pro-life, many of my



colleagues in this body are not. So tonight, I also want us to talk about a different piece of legislation. It is motivated by that same care and that same concern with having the U.S. Senate vote to protect babies. It is actually a different piece of legislation than Senator GRAHAM's important pro-life anti-abortion piece of legislation. I want to talk about this second piece of legislation.

Even if you are unwilling to vote to defend unborn babies, I hope that my colleagues would at least consider joining with us in voting to protect babies that have already been born. Senator GRAHAM's legislation is about protecting babies in utero. We have got a second piece of legislation before us tomorrow that is about protecting babies after they have already been born.

Will we acknowledge that a baby outside the womb should not be left to die? That is what the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is actually about. One year ago tomorrow, the U.S. Senate, sadly, shamefully, shrugged its shoulders at babies who had already been born after botched abortions. A bipartisan majority in this body—let's be clear—a bipartisan majority voted in favor of protecting these babies, but we didn't have enough votes. We didn't have enough votes voting with us in this Chamber to break the filibuster in favor of infanticide. That is what happened a year ago tomorrow in this Chamber.

Today, there is nothing in our Federal law that criminalizes the denial of care to a baby that has survived an abortion, so when a baby lives through an abortion procedure and ends up born and is outside mom, there is nothing in Federal law that criminalizes denying care to those babies and allowing her or him to die, and we have to change that.

This second bill tomorrow is not actually about abortion. It is not about *Roe v. Wade*. It is about something different. It is about what happens after an abortion that didn't succeed in terminating the baby's life. When a baby survives and is lying on that table cold and naked and alone, what does our society do? Are we a country that protects babies that are alive—born outside the womb after having survived a botched abortion—are we a country that says it is okay to just sit back and allow that baby to die? That baby that is fighting for life, is it okay for us to just let that baby die? It is a plain and simple question, and we all know what the right answer is. There are hard calls that we consider in this body sometimes. There are a lot of gray issues. This isn't one of them. This isn't a hard call.

Since last year's vote, we have brought before this body testimony from medical experts who have been involved in abortion procedures and who have had in their hands 1-pound little babies that had survived abortions. That was the purpose of the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing on this

bill 2 weeks ago. In that, we heard testimony that made clear why this bill is necessary, and it made clear that the other side actually can't confront the arguments head on. That is what happened 2 weeks ago in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We were looking at the text of this bill. We had in front of us medical experts who had the experience with people who had babies who had survived abortions, and they talked about what happened in their clinics. Everybody who spoke against the Abortion Survivors Protection Act didn't talk about the bill at all. They talked about all these other things. Some of them aren't actually hard debates, but none of them had anything to do with the legislation that we were actually considering. That is because they couldn't actually defend opposing a bill that the purpose is simply to prohibit infanticide.

That is why Planned Parenthood, NARAL, and the Big Abortion doctors' lobby resorted to simple misinformation. That is all the hearing was by those who were opposed to the legislation. They say that what we are trying to do is prevent something that doesn't happen. That is not true. That is a myth. There are 8 States where we have some reporting information. We should have reporting information from all 50 States, but in the 8 States that we have, we have information about the babies that survive abortions and what happens to them. They wouldn't confront those facts, so they just made these blanket statements that this legislation deals with something that doesn't happen, but it does, which is why we had a hearing and why we brought in experts.

Then the opponents of this legislation talked about completely unrelated things. They said that there are no such things as abortion survivors. We would like to introduce you to some of them. Perhaps they should also consult the CDC's records. Of the several States I mentioned, there were eight that reported data on survivors.

Or they should talk to the Abortion Survivors Network. They should look into the eyes of spouses and friends and neighbors and coworkers and parents who are abortion survivors, and they should try to tell them that what we are doing is pointless or a waste. They can't do that because their position is morally indefensible.

Who are the spouses and friends and neighbors who are not here today because they did not receive lifesaving medical care in their first moments of life? The terms of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act are simple: A child born alive during a botched abortion would be given the same level of care that is provided to any other baby born at that same gestational stage. That is it. That is all the second piece of legislation we are going to deal with tomorrow does.

It says, when a baby survives an abortion, that baby should get the

same level of medical care that is provided to any other baby at the same stage of gestational development. That is all it does. It doesn't create, as opponents charge, some mandate to prolong the suffering of a dying child. It doesn't do anything like that. It simply says, if a baby survives an abortion, it has to get the same level of medical care that would be provided to any other baby at the same stage of gestational care that had parents that wanted that baby. It doesn't force the doctor to do anything that violates medical best practice. It simply says that a baby who survives an abortion is a baby and should be treated as such, as a baby, with care and compassion.

Do Senators in this Chamber believe their own campaign slogans? Our colleague from Vermont, who is on the verge of becoming the standard-bearer for the Democratic Party in our country, has declared: "The mark of a great Nation is how it treats its most vulnerable people."

Senator SANDERS is right. America is dedicated to the proposition that all men and women, all boys and girls, are created equal—even the littlest ones, even if they happen to come into the world in the most horrific of circumstances and even if they are crippled or inconvenient or unwanted. America recognizes the immeasurable dignity of every human being, regardless of race or sex or creed or ability. If we are hemming and hawing about whether it is okay to let children die of neglect, we know we have lost part of our soul.

Tomorrow, we have a chance to recognize and secure the dignity of some of the most vulnerable members of our society. We have a chance to protect those babies who come into the world under the worst of conditions, and we have the chance to extend to them the possibility of life and of love. Tomorrow, we can speak up for the voiceless. We can defend the defenseless. We can come to the aid of the innocent.

This is not about *Roe*. This is not about politics. It is about a simple question: Will the U.S. Senate, tomorrow, stand for the proposition that babies are babies and they deserve care? Will the Senate vote tomorrow to protect babies?

I defer to my colleague from the State to the east, Iowa, Senator ERNST.

Ms. ERNST. I thank Mr. SASSE, the great Senator from Nebraska. I want to thank him for joining the colloquy and for offering the bill that would save these babies that, as he described, are born in horrific circumstances. But a baby is a baby, and it is undeniable.

I do hope that we have a number of our friends and colleagues from across the aisle join us tomorrow in that vote and say that, yes, this is a life that deserves dignity and a chance and an opportunity. That is what we are asking for. So thank you very much for your work there.

We will continue our colloquy. We have another speaker that is joining us



from the great State of Indiana. I will yield to the junior Senator.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, a little over a month ago—or a year ago—I was here with Senator SASSE and asked for a unanimous consent vote. I was here, mostly curious to see who might object to a bill that wants born alive—where you do everything you can to keep that child alive. I was appalled then, and here again, we are talking about the same thing, but I think we have got room for optimism.

We have got two bills that have gotten, I think, more support at this stage of the game than in a long time. First on the Pain Capable bill, last month, two researchers, with broadly different views on abortion, published research in the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, stating conclusively that “the neuroscience cannot definitely rule out fetal pain before 24 weeks.”

As we continue to learn more about the science of when unborn children can feel pain in the womb, the moral imperative to provide a cutoff point for abortions grows stronger and stronger. I hope that my colleagues, especially on the other side of the aisle, will not deny science by allowing abortions to be performed on unborn children capable of feeling pain.

The Born Alive bill—again, we are closer than ever. On a procedural vote, we have 53 votes, bipartisan, almost there, with 3 Republicans not able to vote. So, theoretically, 56 votes possibly. I stepped up here a year ago, and I do it again because I also sense, across the country, things are starting to change.

Millennials are now leaning towards what the solemnity and sanctity of life is about, and I think, if we just take guidance from that younger generation, it ought to be able to move four Senators to get in line and do what seems to be so clear from a moral point of view.

Some will say that a bill to ensure medical care for babies born after failed abortions is unnecessary because it doesn't happen that often. That is not a good reason. It doesn't matter how common it is. It matters if it is right or wrong. Even if my colleagues do not agree with me that every baby conceived has the right to be born, we should at least agree that every baby that is born has a right to live. If you go back a few years ago, 2015, there were 38 votes for the same bill. In 2017, there were 36. A little over a year ago, there were 53, or 56, however you want to look at it.

I plead to citizens across this country, just as I did a little over a year ago, to get ahold of your Senators. In States where the sanctity of life—the solemnity of life—is important, get ahold of your Senators and tell them that we need their votes.

I yield the floor.

Ms. ERNST. Thank you very much to the junior Senator from Indiana. We really appreciate his efforts on these bills as well.

Again, I think all of us would agree that these are commonsense pieces of legislation, and we would love to see some movement coming from our friends on the left.

We have had a wonderful colloquy this evening.

Of course, again, thanks to the Senator from Montana, Mr. DAINES, for leading this colloquy and for sharing his time with us this evening as we have talked about some of these measures.

To the junior Senator from the great State of Nebraska, as well, Mr. SASSE, thank you so much for authoring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act.

And thanks to Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, of course, for authoring his pain-capable bill.

Again, we have talked this evening about those two bills that really hit close to home. I did happen to sit through the Judiciary Committee hearing that was led by Senator SASSE a couple of weeks ago, where we did talk about the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act. It was true that so many of our friends across the aisle were deflecting on the legislation. They were talking about a woman's right to choose. They were talking about being pro-choice and supporting abortion. The bottom line is, this is not a bill that has anything to do with those topics. This is about saving babies who are born alive after a botched abortion attempt. So I think we have to make that very clear as we move through tomorrow's proceedings.

Again, thank you for the colloquy this evening. It has been very helpful in expressing our views about the rights of these babies to live and to make a difference in our world.

With that, we will close out the colloquy, again thanking those who are supporting the bills, as well as those who joined us here on the floor this evening.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 25, the Senate vote on the following: one, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 384; two, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 491; three, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 569; further, that if cloture is invoked on the nominations and following the third vote in the series, the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. to accommodate the weekly party luncheons; that following the lunch recess, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3275 and the time from 2:15 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 p.m., cloture on the motions to proceed to S. 3275 and S. 311 ripen and that following the votes on those motions to invoke cloture, the Senate vote on the following: one, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 491;

two, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 569; and, three, cloture on Executive Calendar No. 416.

I further ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the Greaves nomination, the vote on confirmation occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, February 27; further, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### LITHUANIAN AND ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAYS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today is Estonia's 102nd Independence Day.

Lithuania celebrated 102 years of continuous statehood on the 16th, and Latvia will in November.

This is significant not just because the Baltic States are close American allies with shared values; it is worth noting because Russia has been waging war on historical truth.

Vladimir Putin recently made the absurd claim that Poland was to blame for World War II.

In 1992, Boris Yeltsin made public the secret annex to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, making it clear that the Nazis and Soviets colluded to carve up Poland and the Baltics.

That also puts to lie the myth that the Baltics “joined” the Soviet Union. The United States recognized them as occupied sovereign states.

We ought to continue to defend their sovereignty as well as historical truth.

#### WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to elaborate on my statement of February 13 in support of S. J. Res. 68. This resolution puts the Senate on record with regard to war powers and Iran in the wake of the U.S. strike against Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Commander Qasem Soleimani on January 2, 2020.

The resolution, which directs the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran, passed the Senate with a strong bipartisan majority. This bipartisan consensus is a testament to Senator KAINE's leadership, and I commend him for that.

It is also a reflection of the Senate's deep concern about the risk of a broader military conflict between the United States and Iran.

There is no dispute that Soleimani was an enemy of the United States, but this extraordinary killing of a high-ranking foreign military official nearly brought us to the brink of war. The strike would be justified if it had been necessary to defend against an imminent attack against the United States, but the administration has failed to provide any persuasive evidence of such a threat.

Instead, the administration appears to be laying the foundation for further military action against Iran, without coming to Congress. Let's be clear: It is not just that there is no existing authorization. To the extent that the administration continues to confront Iran militarily, it is doing so in direct opposition to Congress—both the House and Senate have now passed bipartisan resolutions directing the President to terminate hostilities with Iran—and without the support of the American people.

With that in mind, I would like to address some of the features of S.J. Res. 68, as well as the administration's legal rationale for the Soleimani strike and why that rationale is so problematic.

Before doing so, I want to take a step back and make sure that everyone understands the real world impact. Today, over 100 service men and women are suffering from traumatic brain injuries incurred during an Iranian retaliatory attack over Soleimani. My heart goes out to them and their families.

Thankfully there were no American casualties, but we will not be so lucky if President Trump stumbles into a broader conflict with Iran.

So when I raise the alarm over this administration's actions, it is not academic. It is about our sons and daughters, husbands and wives, and brothers and sisters serving in harm's way. It is about honoring their service with more than just words. It is about ensuring that they are not needlessly put in danger by an arrogant and lawless administration that refuses to recognize any limitation on its ability to drag our country into war.

S.J. Res. 68 has a number of important features. I will highlight three of them briefly.

First, this resolution established a new precedent in the Senate.

The War Powers Resolution, as amended, provides for privileged consideration of joint resolutions that direct the President, in broad terms, to stop the use of U.S. forces in specified hostilities. The only such privileged resolutions in the Senate prior to S.J. Res. 68 mandated that the President "remove" U.S. forces from hostilities. The operative language of S.J. Res. 68 uses a variation of that language. Instead of "remove," it directs the President to "terminate" the use of U.S. forces for hostilities.

In a failed bid to prevent privileged consideration of S.J. Res. 68, the Re-

publican majority asserted, in effect, that "remove from hostilities" was a term of art and that privilege was available only for resolutions that used that specific phrase. That rigid approach is inconsistent with the overarching purpose of the War Powers Resolution—for Congress to reconfirm and reassert its constitutional powers over the use of force—and contrary to the statutory framework and legislative history of the War Powers Resolution. The statute does not prescribe specific language, and the legislative record is full of examples of the interchangeable use of "remove," "terminate," and multiple other synonymous terms.

Ultimately, the Senate moved forward with consideration of S.J. Res. 68 on a privileged and expedited basis.

This precedent is noteworthy for two reasons: First, it clarifies that there are no magic words required for privilege. This means that a resolution that requires the President to stop the use of U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities will not be deprived of expedited consideration in the Senate over semantics. Second, it provides a degree of flexibility for Senators who seek to stop such hostilities. For example, "terminate" or other synonyms may be more appropriate than "remove" for certain situations, like cyber operations, where implying a need for or requiring the physical removal of forces may not be practicable or desirable.

Second, S. J. Res. 68 includes a rule of construction stating that it does not prevent the United States from defending itself against imminent attack. This is a critical feature. While we cannot abide by this President or any President usurping Congress' role and responsibility to authorize the use of force, the United States always has the right to defend itself against an ongoing or imminent attack.

In tandem with this rule of construction, the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senator Risch that added the following finding: "The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack."

The responsibility to "take actions" in defense of the United States and our people and interests is a core function of the Presidency. This responsibility includes the full range of resources available to the executive branch—diplomacy, law enforcement, intelligence, military force, and beyond. Each type of action is subject to different legal and constitutional considerations, and the President never has a blank check. He or she is obligated to act consistently with the law and the Constitution at all times, even when in defense of the country. When using military force in self-defense, this means his or her actions must be in response to an attack or imminent attack unless Congress has explicitly authorized some other action. Against

this backdrop, the Risch amendment is consistent with both the rule of construction in S.J. Res. 68 and the constitutional balance between Congress and the executive branch over the use of force.

For these reasons, I voted in favor of the Risch amendment and am not surprised it passed overwhelmingly.

While Senate passage of S. J. Res. 68 is a major step against an unnecessary and unauthorized war with Iran, I am concerned that the administration may not heed the message. At minimum, its legal rationale for the Soleimani strike suggests that it is attempting to lay the foundation for further military action against Iran.

The administration has publicly asserted three legal bases for the Soleimani strike, but none of them add up.

First, let me address the 2002 Iraq authorization to use military force, AUMF, a law that this administration has distorted beyond recognition.

The administration has stated that the 2002 AUMF is a valid legal basis for the Soleimani strike because Soleimani was a threat "emanating from Iraq." I am sorry to say that does not pass the laugh test.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF for a single purpose—to address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's alleged weapons of mass destruction. Nothing about the law, its text, or its legislative history suggests that it ever authorize or was intended to authorize the use of force against Iran.

I know because I was there. I debated the AUMF, and I voted against it. But even the most staunch supporters would never have claimed that the authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein in 2002 extended to the killing of a senior Iranian commander 18 years later.

The administration also cites article II of the Constitution as a legal basis for the Soleimani strike. Article II would be available to the extent the strike was necessary to defend against an imminent attack; however, as I noted earlier, nearly 2 months have passed, and Congress and the American people are still waiting for proof—proof that such an attack was, in fact, imminent and, if so, that killing Soleimani was required to prevent the attack.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the lack of supporting evidence, the administration does not limit its article II claim to self-defense. Like other recent administrations, it asserts that the Constitution empowers the President to use military force "to protect important national interests."

But what kind of legal standard is this?

At best, "protecting important national interests" sets an incredibly low bar for the most consequential of actions. At worst, it is a self-serving power grab that the President can use to justify military action anywhere in the world without congressional authorization.

We should not be surprised—this “standard” was concocted by and for the executive branch to maximize the President’s ability to use military force without congressional authorization. It does not reflect a neutral analysis of the separation of power, it has not been tested in the courts, and it has not been approved by Congress.

Just a few weeks ago, in this very Chamber, we listened as the President’s defense lawyers argued during the impeachment trial that steps taken in support of the President’s reelection are inherently in the national interest. That was a shocking and frightening claim in the impeachment context. But now consider it in the context of sending the men and women of our Armed Forces into harm’s way.

Surely the Constitution does not authorize the President to use force in support of his or her reelection. Surely, it does not. Then again, this administration has been unable or unwilling to identify any limits on its purported article II authority, any instance in which it would concede that it needs Congress to authorize the use of force.

Finally, I refer you to Secretary Pompeo’s January 17, 2020, appearance on the Hugh Hewitt radio show. While on air, Secretary Pompeo insinuated that the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization, FTO, served as a legal basis to target IRGC members, presumably including Soleimani.

FTO designations are administrative actions taken pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; they are clearly not congressional authorizations for the use of military force.

Now, I was hoping that Secretary Pompeo himself or a State Department official on his behalf would issue a simple clarification and acknowledge what we all know: An FTO designation has no bearing on whether this or any administration can use military force, period.

I have written the Secretary on this question, and I have posed the same question to the State Department’s Acting Legal Adviser. We continue to await a response, and I must say that the delay does not leave me with much confidence that we will receive the right answer.

As so clearly demonstrated by the flimsy legal rationale advanced in relation to the Soleimani strike, we cannot rely on this administration or any administration to guard Congress’ prerogatives over war powers.

I am hopeful that the Soleimani strike and the Senate debate over S.J. Res. 68 will serve as a wake-up call. I am hopeful that all of our colleagues in this Chamber and in the House will work to reassert Congress’ role over the use of force.

We owe it to the Constitution, we owe it to the American people, and we owe it to the men and women who fight and die on our behalf.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 300 on the Nomination: Confirmation: Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the nomination.

Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 339 on the Amendment S. Amdt. 1209; Lee Amdt. No. 2109; To prohibit the expenditure of certain amounts from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for land acquisition. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the amendment.

#### RECOGNIZING 175 YEARS OF HOSPITALITY IN FRENCH LICK

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to recognize 175 years of tourism, history, and hospitality that the French Lick Resort has brought to my home State of Indiana.

In 1832, two Hoosier brothers, Thomas and Dr. William Bowles, purchased 1,500 acres of property near French Lick, IN. Part of the property’s allure was the abundant mineral springs loaded with Epsom salt and sulfur. As a physician, Dr. Bowles became intrigued by the medicinal benefits that the mineral springs possessed, which famously turned into the Hoosier tonic Pluto Water. In 1845, the brothers welcomed their first guests after building a unique, three-story, wood-framed hotel.

In 1901, a small group of investors, including former Indianapolis mayor Tom Taggart, bought the property from the Bowles brothers. Mayor Taggart’s vision and political expertise aided in the development of the hotel and the expansion of the Monon Railroad from Chicago to the front entrance, encouraging more tourists to “take to the waters.” By 1905, the French Lick Springs Hotel had become a grand destination, and its services were greatly sought after by all of Indiana society. Soon enough, it had gained worldwide recognition. With the hotel’s stunning success, Donald James Ross, “the Michelangelo of golf course design” and a member of the World Golf Hall of Fame, was hired to build the French Lick Springs Golf Course. In 1924, the course hosted a PGA championship, attracting more national attention and further success. By 1931, the hotel became the unofficial headquarters of the national Democratic Party and became the site for the 1931 Democratic Governor’s Conference. As a socialite destination, numerous notable guests visited the springs, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Ronald Reagan, John Barrymore, and Howard Hughes.

Because of its heritage of tourism and hospitality, in 2003 the French Lick Springs Hotel was added to the National Register of Historic Places—a distinction of notable merit. In 2005, the French Lick Springs Hotel and its

former competitor, the West Baden Springs Hotel, were purchased by the Cook Group, Inc., a family-owned company headquartered in Bloomington, IN. After a complete 1-year renovation, the French Lick Resort was born, continuing its legacy of attracting visitors from the around the world to Southern Indiana with a variety of events.

The French Lick Resort and its world-class amenities have served millions of guests and has greatly added to the cultural history of the United States. On behalf of the State of Indiana, I wish the resort continued success for another 175 years and beyond.

#### TRIBUTE TO BETTY COLBERT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Ms. Betty Colbert on the occasion of her retirement from her position as program assistant for the U.S. Senate Youth Program, USSYP, after 57 years of remarkable service.

Ms. Colbert started working for the USSYP during its first program in 1963 and has continued her impressive tenure ever since. With her guidance, the program has provided unparalleled educational opportunities and experiences for countless high school students.

Her involvement with the program started thanks to her late husband, Mr. George Colbert, a Tuskegee airman who served as Mr. Randy Hearst’s driver while Mr. Hearst was helping to develop the USSYP. Despite working full time with the National Institutes of Health, Ms. Colbert took leave each year in order to devote herself to the USSYP’s administration. A thoughtful, giving woman, she took a hands-on approach, doing everything from taking calls from Senate offices and the White House to making sure each participating student got an individual flag flown over the Capitol to recognize their accomplishment.

The success of USSYP alumni is in part thanks to Ms. Colbert’s tireless efforts. I participate in the program every year, including serving as co-chair in 2019, and I can attest firsthand to her unfailing work ethic and the level of care she puts in to every aspect of the USSYP.

Students, Senators, and staff members have all bore witness to Ms. Colbert’s extraordinary commitment to her role. Not only does she ensure everything runs smoothly for all involved, but she also focuses on the small details. Her driven, considerate nature plays a significant part in giving students the most enjoyable and transformative experience possible. Ms. Colbert leaves behind a legacy that will continue to positively shape the USSYP for years to come.

I applaud her over half a century of service and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Ms. Betty Colbert on her well-earned retirement.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## TRIBUTE TO TROY WAYMAN

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the CEO and president of One Acadiana, 1A, Troy Wayman, and the entire 1A organization for the distinguished honor of becoming an accredited economic development organization, AEDO. 1A has joined the ranks of only 66 economic groups in the world to earn the AEDO standing.

In 2015, the Greater Lafayette Chamber of Commerce's board of directors ventured out to create an organization that would embody its longstanding mission—to be the leading force in the improvement of the business environment as well as the economic health and development of the region. Over the last 5 years, 1A has grown to more than 800 investors, members, and partners while serving the 9-parish Acadiana region. After a yearlong process, 1A was recognized and was awarded as an AEDO, cementing its place among the best of the best in the industry.

Being honored and recognized by the International Economic Development Council, IEDC, as an AEDO speaks volumes to who they are as an organization. The dedication and passion that drives these members is a testament to their organization and speaks volumes to all of Louisiana. Congratulations, One Acadiana, on becoming an AEDO. I look forward to witnessing what the future holds for 1A and the entire Acadiana region.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM GASTON  
CAPERTON III

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, it is a great privilege of mine to rise and honor the legacy of one of the most influential, generous, and inspiring West Virginians I have ever had the pleasure of calling a dear friend: William Gaston Caperton III. My friend Gaston turns 80 years young on February 21, 2020, and it is an honor to celebrate his legacy with my fellow West Virginians.

It would be difficult to find anyone as knowledgeable or dedicated to our home State as Gaston. The son of Eliza and William Gaston Caperton, Jr., Gaston was born and raised with his sister, Cary, in our home State's capital, Charleston. I have always said there is no greater accomplishment in the world than to be in a position to give back to the community you love, that made you who you are. That is what made Gaston the wonderful, inspiring, and generous person he was. After attending Episcopal High School in Alexandria, VA, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Gaston returned home to join the family business. Under his leadership, the McDonough-Caperton Insurance Group became the 10th largest privately owned insurance brokerage firm in the United States. Along the way, he

owned and operated a bank and a mortgage company.

The people of the home State that Gaston and I share have an exceptional can-do spirit, a neighborly love that is unrelenting, and are grounded by the same core principle: to help others be the best they can be. That is Gaston's legacy as a public servant and as a leader. After a successful business career in finance and insurance, Gaston was elected as West Virginia's 31st Governor in 1988 and quickly revolutionized West Virginia's education system. During the 8 years of his administration, the average teacher salary went from 49th in the Nation to 31st. He launched one of the country's earliest and most comprehensive basic skills computer initiatives, as well as invested more than \$800 million into building, modernizing, and improving school facilities throughout the State. He also conducted an aggressive program of international trade missions to promote the export of West Virginia products. Gaston's focus on investing in the future paid off, adding almost 90,000 jobs between 1989 and 1997, lowering the unemployment rate to its lowest level in 17 years, and increasing total investment by new and expanded businesses by more than \$3.9 billion.

Throughout the years, we bonded over our passion for public service, for inspiring the next generation of leaders, and we share the common goal of helping the rest of the country discover all that West Virginia has to offer. Gaston left office in 1997 and spent 2 years teaching at Harvard and Columbia Universities before becoming the eighth president of the College Board in 1999. As president, he helped transform the century-old institution into a mission-driven, student-first operation promoting college success and opportunity for all Americans. During his 13 years of leadership, the College Board touched the lives of students in nearly 27,000 high schools and colleges, promoted the importance of writing by adding a writing section to the SAT, and doubled the number of students succeeding in Advanced Placement. Gaston's leadership also renewed the organization's focus on education in a globalized marketplace by initiating a new series of AP world language and culture course, as well as embarking on a historic education exchange program with China.

During his more than 20 years in government and education, Gaston chaired the Democratic Governor's Association and the Southern Regional Education Board, participated in the executive committee of the National Governors Association, received 10 honorary doctoral degrees, and has been presented with numerous awards, including the 1996 Computerworld Smithsonian Award for his tireless efforts to introduce technology into the classroom, the 2007 James Bryant Conant Award for his significant contributions to the quality of education in the United States and the 2012 Policy Maker of the

Year by the National Association of School Boards of Education.

After retiring from the College Board in 2012, Gaston moved back to his hometown and served on the board of directors of a variety of U.S. corporations. He has two sons, Gat and John, and is the proud grandfather of Eliza, Katie, Evie, Ella, and Genavieve.

I can't speak enough to what a good-hearted, wonderful person he truly is. I always think of Gaston as true renaissance man; no matter the circumstances, he kept a cool head and a warm demeanor, always able to discern the most honorable path forward. He has always been one of West Virginia's most proud representatives, no matter where life has taken him. Again, it is a privilege to join the people of the Mountain State in celebrating Gaston Caperton's life and legacy and to wish him a very happy 80th birthday.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE  
RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENTENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS  
SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 14, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 375. An act to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, and for other purposes.

S. 394. An act to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 2107. An act to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.R. 504. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed on February 20, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN).

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 20, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 375. An act to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, and for other purposes.

S. 394. An act to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions.

S. 2107. An act to increase the number of CBP Agriculture Specialists and support staff in the Office of Field Operations of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4002. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2021"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4003. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2021"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select

Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4004. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Agency Drug-Free Workplace Program"; to the Committees on Appropriations; and Armed Services.

EC-4005. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for two Army programs as of September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4006. A communication from the Management Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subpart C - Conveyance of Small Tracts" (RIN0596-AD40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4007. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mali Sanctions Regulations" (31 CFR Part 555) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4008. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4009. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4010. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Regulations and Legislation, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Project Approval for Single-Family Condominiums" (RIN2502-AJ42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 7, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4011. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on appropriations legislation within seven days of enactment; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4012. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Revisions to NOx SIP Call and CAIR Rules" (FRL No. 10005-34-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4013. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Linn County; State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 10005-35-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4014. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Washington; Revised Public Notice Provisions and other Miscellaneous Revisions" (FRL No. 10005-18-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4015. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Administrative Revisions to Definitions, Remedies, and Enforcement Orders Sections and Incorporation by Reference of National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 10005-16-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4016. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; 2019 Amendments to West Virginia's Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 10005-34-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4017. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Ogden City PM 10 Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes and State Implementation Plan Revisions" (FRL No. 10004-94-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4018. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Wyoming" (FRL No. 10004-97-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4019. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Georgia; Final Approval and Incorporation by Reference of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions" (FRL No. 10004-27-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4020. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Stationary Combustion Turbine Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10005-14-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4021. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain

Chemical Substances (18-1); Technical Correction" (FRL No. 10003-45-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4022. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Ecuador" (RIN1515-AE52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4023. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the UK to support the manufacture, production, test, inspection, modification, enhancement, rework, and repair of the Trailing Edge Flap Bonded Assembly for the F/A-18E/F/G aircraft in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-059); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4024. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Japan to support the manufacture of 2.75-inch rockets and subcomponents, including MK66 rocket motors, M261/M267 submunition warheads, M151 warheads, M274 practice warheads, and WTU-1/B practice warheads in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4025. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the Republic of Korea to support the manufacture of 155mm artillery combustible cartridge cases, 60mm and 81mm mortar increment containers, and 120mm tank combustible cartridge cases in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-080); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4026. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Israel and the Netherlands, to support the manufacture, production, test, and inspection of composite components, subassemblies, and metallic components for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) aircraft center fuselage in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-063); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4027. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4028. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Miscellaneous

Corrections, Clarifications, and Improvements" (RIN1212-AB34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4029. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Communicable Diseases; Foreign Quarantine" (RIN0920-AA75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4030. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4031. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Performance Plan for fiscal years 2019-2021, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal years 2019-2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4032. A communication from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4033. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 13, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4034. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 3323. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize certain processes regarding expulsion of credit union members for cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3324. A bill to permit the Miami Nation of Indiana to apply for acknowledgement as a federally recognized Indian tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3325. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve out-

comes for children by supporting parenting time agreements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 3326. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to remove outdated responsibilities of boards of directors of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3327. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to officials of the Government of Lebanon responsible for the wrongful or unlawful detention of citizens and nationals of the United States held in Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 436

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 436, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 476

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide greater transparency of discounts provided by drug manufacturers.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware



(Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 1238

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to provide requirements for Executive agency spending at the end of a fiscal year, and for other purposes.

S. 1352

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1352, a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1399, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Services Act to revise and extend nursing workforce development programs.

S. 1719

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1719, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors, and for other purposes.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for military families.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from North Caro-

lina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multi-employer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2321, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Negro Leagues baseball.

S. 2373

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2373, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve obstetric care in rural areas.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2679

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2679, a bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2705

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2705, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the requirements relating to the use of construction authority in the event of a dec-

laration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2715, a bill to develop and implement policies to advance early childhood development, to provide assistance for orphans and other vulnerable children in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2753, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 2950

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2950, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2986

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2986, a bill to amend part A of title XI of the Social Security Act to establish an interagency council on social determinants of health, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote



health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, *supra*.

S. 3023

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health to make awards to outstanding scientists, including physician-scientists, to support researchers focusing on pediatric research, including basic, clinical, translational, or pediatric pharmacological research, and for other purposes.

S. 3095

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3095, a bill to develop voluntary guidelines for accessible postsecondary electronic instructional materials and related technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 3144

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3144, a bill to establish a competitive grant program to support out-of-school-time youth workforce readiness programs, providing employability skills development, career exploration, employment readiness training, mentoring, work-based learning, and workforce opportunities for eligible youth.

S. 3154

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3154, a bill to improve the effectiveness of tribal child support enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3249

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3249, a bill to amend the FAST Act to modify a provision relating to the Motorcyclist Advisory Council.

S. 3263

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3263, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the production and use of certain single-use plastic products and packaging, to improve the responsibility of producers in the design, collection, reuse, recycling, and disposal of their consumer products and packaging, to prevent pollution from consumer products and packaging from entering into animal and human food chains and waterways, and for other purposes.

S. 3267

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3267, a bill to provide adequate information about excessive Federal spending, and for other purposes.

S. 3286

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3286, a bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government.

S. 3299

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3299, a bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws.

S. 3319

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3319, a bill to reauthorize comprehensive research and statistical review and analysis of trafficking in persons and commercial sex acts, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. CON. RES. 35

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 35, a concurrent resolution providing for a joint hearing of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of

the House of Representatives to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the executive branch.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 502, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Henning Schulzrinne, Nancy Kusmaul, Luis Rivera, and Nicholas Wondra be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

#### COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THE AUSCHWITZ EXTERMINATION CAMP IN NAZI-OCCUPIED POLAND

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 481.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 481) commemorating the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. ERNST. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 481) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 21, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 25; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Molloy nomination under the previous order.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:52 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 25, 2019, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be brigadier general*

COL. KATHLEEN M. FLARITY  
IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be brigadier general*

COL. STEVEN L. ALLEN  
COL. ROBERT L. BARRIE, JR.  
COL. GUILLAUME N. BEAURPERE  
COL. CHRISTOPHER G. BECK  
COL. TREVOR J. BREDEKAMP  
COL. WINSTON P. BROOKS  
COL. JACQUELINE D. BROWN  
COL. LARRY Q. BURRIS, JR.  
COL. PAUL G. CRAFT  
COL. LANCE G. CURTIS  
COL. CLANCE A. DEAN III  
COL. MATTHEW L. EICHBURG  
COL. DAVID C. FOLEY  
COL. PATRICK L. GAYDON  
COL. CLAIR A. GILL  
COL. MARK A. HOLLER  
COL. DARYL O. HOOD  
COL. MARK J. HOVATTER  
COL. JAMES P. ISENHOWER III  
COL. RYAN M. JANOVIC  
COL. MICHAEL B. LALOR  
COL. DOUGLAS S. LOWREY  
COL. STEVEN M. MARKS  
COL. GENE D. MEREDITH  
COL. BRADLEY D. MOSES  
COL. THOMAS W. O'CONNOR, JR.  
COL. ISAAC J. PELTIER  
COL. KEITH C. PHILLIPS  
COL. RONALD R. RAGIN  
COL. HOPE C. RAMPY  
COL. WILLIAM A. RYAN III  
COL. DAVID F. STEWART  
COL. CURTIS D. TAYLOR  
COL. DAVID C. TRYBULA  
COL. COLIN P. TULEY  
COL. JOHN W. WEIDNER  
COL. TIMOTHY P. WHITE  
COL. DAVID B. WOMACK  
COL. JAMES P. WORK  
COL. RICHARD L. ZELLMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### *To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT L. MARION

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. TERRY W. EDDINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. PATRICK S. HAYDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. ERIC L. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. DONALD Y. SZE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. STEPHEN D. DONALD  
CAPT. GREGORY K. EMERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) GRAPTON D. CHASE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) EUGENE A. BURCHER  
REAR ADM. (LH) JOEY B. DODGEN  
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM G. MAGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. WILLIAM L. ANGERMANN  
CAPT. MARC S. LEDERER  
CAPT. DONALD M. PLUMMER  
CAPT. JEFFREY S. SPIVEY

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

#### *To be vice admiral*

VICE ADM. SCOTT A. BUSCHMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

#### *To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. STEVEN D. POULIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(D):

#### *To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS G. ALLAN  
REAR ADM. (LH) LAURA M. DICKEY  
REAR ADM. (LH) DOUGLAS M. FEARS  
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. MAUGER  
REAR ADM. (LH) NATHAN A. MOORE  
REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. PENoyer  
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW W. SIBLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

#### *To be rear admiral (lower half)*

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER A. BARTZ  
CAPT. SCOTT W. CLENDENIN  
CAPT. MARK J. FEDOR  
CAPT. SHANNON N. GILREATH  
CAPT. JONATHAN P. HICKEY  
CAPT. GREGORY T. PRESTIDGE  
CAPT. MELISSA L. RIVERA