United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020 No. 37

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.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.

O Lord our God, how excellent is Your Name in all the Earth. From dawn to sunset, Your mercies sustain us.

Today, inspire our Senators to embrace Your promises. May they remember Your promises to supply their needs, to never forsake them, and to prevent anything from separating them from Your love.

Lord, bestow Your blessings upon our lawmakers, making them wiser, stronger, and better, glorifying You in their labors. Use them to advance Your Kingdom in our Nation and world, as they attune their will to Your purposes.

We pray in Your blessed 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to bring my colleagues up to date on a bipartisan bill to lower drug prices and also, at the same time, give an update on the pharmaceutical industry's opposition to this legislation.

Beware the next time Big Pharma claims what we are trying to do to lower drug prices, in their words, ''undermines the free market.'' Just remember this. The pharmaceutical industry supported ObamaCare.

Big Pharma doesn't want a free market. Take note that this industry opposes every proposal that would cost it money and supports every proposal that ensures another government revenue stream. That is exactly what ObamaCare did and that is what Medicare and Medicaid do now.

Big Pharma has become so big and entitled that they have the gall to claim that limiting taxpayer subsidies is somehow socialism. ObamaCare has a stream that does that, as does Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, this is what ending corporate welfare and demanding accountability to taxpayers is all about. It seems to me that ending those subsidies would be a very conservative principle.

The Grassley-Wyden prescription drug bill saves tens of billions of dollars of taxpayer money and has no negative impact on pharmaceutical innovation. That is exactly what the CBO has said and that is why even the free-market, libertarian CATO Institute has endorsed this legislation.

So I encourage my Republican colleagues to join me and Senator WYDEN in that bipartisan effort.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ABORTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, today, every Senator will be able to take a clear moral stand. We will have the chance to proceed to commonsense legislation that will move our Nation closer to the international mainstream with respect to defending innocent human life. There are only seven nations left in the entire world where an unborn child can be killed by elective abortion after 20 weeks, and the United States of America, unfortunately, is one of them.

Set aside all of the far-left rhetoric that will greet Senator GRAHAM's straightforward legislation and consider this simple fact: Do our Democratic colleagues really believe that what our country needs is a radical fringe position on elective abortion that we only share with China, North Korea, and four other countries in the entire world?

The American people don't seem to think that is what we need. One recent survey found that 70 percent of all Americans believe that at a minimum—at a minimum—elective abortion should be limited to the first 3 months of pregnancy. That even includes about half of the respondents who self-identify as pro-choice.

I hope this body will proceed to Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act later today. I see no reason why at the very least our Democratic colleagues should vote against even proceeding to this legislation and having a debate. If there is a persuasive and principled case why America should remain on the radical international fringe on this subject, let us hear it. Let us have the debate. Few Americans agree with that radical position, but let's have the debate.

If my Democratic colleagues block the Senate from even proceeding to consider this legislation here today, the message they will send will be chilling and clear. The radical demands of the far left will drown out common sense and the views of most Americans.

The same goes for Senator SASSE's legislation, the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act. Even if most Washington Democrats persist in their resistance to any commonsense protections for the unborn, surely, we must

be able to agree that children who are born deserve protection. Surely, that much cannot be controversial.

There is currently no Federal mandate that children who are delivered alive following an attempted abortion should receive medical care. There is no clear guarantee that every child born alive in the United States, whether they were intended to be or not, is entitled to the same life-giving medical attention.

The Kentuckians whom I speak with cannot comprehend why this could be some hotly debated proposition. It almost defies belief that an entire political party can find cause to object to this basic protection for babies. Yet, today, we will see if our Democratic colleagues will even permit the Senate to proceed to this legislation. We will see whether even something this simple and this morally straightforward is a bridge too far for the far left.

I would urge all of my colleagues: Let's advance these bills. Let's take these modest steps. Let's have the courage to say that the right to life must not exclude the most vulnerable among us.

TRIBUTE TO JAY KHOSLA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a totally different matter, I have a duty this morning that somehow ranks among my most favorite activities and least favorite activities simultaneously. The good news is that I get to recognize a key member of my staff whom I have come to know and admire a great deal. The bad news is the occasion. This week, after 15 years of outstanding service, he is bidding farewell to the Senate. So I am unhappy with the circumstances, but I could not be more happy to talk about Jay Khosla.

For just shy of 2 years, Jay has served as my chief economic policy counsel. Trade, taxes, banking, and financial services; pensions and retirement; housing—for 2 years, any answer I needed on any of these subjects was one phone call, one email, or one quick meeting away. You can go a long way in this town if you master either the policy details of big issues or the politics surrounding those issues. Jay has mastered both.

When you have a lot of talent and intelligence, major projects tend to find their way to your desk. So consider the fact that Jay has been at the center of practically every major economic policy achievement over the past decade-plus.

Jay arrived as a young healthcare staffer for then-Majority Leader Bill Frist. Talk about an opening act—not just working for a majority leader, but one who is also an M.D. and who is focused on healthcare. The bar was set high, but Jay, of course, exceeded it.

He moved to the Budget Committee and then crafted policy for Senator McCain's Presidential campaign. Then, he returned to work for Senator Hatch and the Finance Committee. Before long, Jay was Senator Hatch's secret weapon. As he rose through the ranks to policy director and then to staff director, he rapidly became a not-so-secret weapon. He was an invaluable asset to the chairman, to the committee, and, really, to our entire conference.

His relationships extended across the aisle as well. Our Democratic colleagues respect him greatly. His colleagues on the committee remember that, even when it might have been easier to pull back behind party lines and just try to craft a bill within the majority, Jay stayed stubbornly dedicated to the bipartisan process as long as possible.

A team player, an honest broker, Jay doesn't want to just get big things done, he wants to get them done the right way. From trade promotion authority in 2015 and historic tax reform in 2017, to USMCA this past year, these huge accomplishments and many more, like fighting the opioid epidemic and fixing the dysfunctional sustainable growth rate that has plagued Medicare—all of these issues had this staff leader right at the center. In many cases, his work started months or years in advance, meeting with leaders, pouring the foundation for new policy, and staying on the case right through to the finish line.

Needless to say, this is a resume that, basically, anyone in Washington would kill for, but effectiveness is only part of Jay's magic. The colleagues whom Jay supervised at the Finance Committee remember a boss who was kind, generous, patient, and unflappable, even as he guided them through legislation of the highest consequence.

More recently, we in the majority leader's office have relished his laugh-out-loud punch lines, his deadpan sarcasm, and his creative nicknames. Jay is willing to take everyone down a peg when they need it, including himself.

I have worked with all kinds of talented staff, but I have to say that the demeanor that Jay brings to work is somewhat unique. Despite being so knowledgeable, connected, and hard-working, Jay seems to flow through all the challenges with a confidence and calmness that almost borders on relaxation. If you didn't know better, you would almost be suspicious. Somehow, you never see Jay sweat—well, at least not in the office, anyway.

Jay's colleagues like to rib him about the personal training regimen he maintains, along with the ultra-healthy diet and other enviable aspects of work-life balance that he somehow manages to carve out in this place that is so notorious for none of that. It is all part of the unique Jay Khosla magic.

This is someone who has been known to reply to serious email inquiries with a funny photo of a cat dangling from a tree branch, captioned ''Hang In There!''

Jay is someone who frequently concludes his answers to pressing questions, including from Senators, with a smile and this catchphrase: ''I have a feeling it's all going to work out.''

Somebody less accomplished would never get away with this. From someone with less mastery of the details, you would scoff and find someone else to talk with, but when it is Jay, you know everything will actually work out because he is the one on the case. Jay helps make everyone around him as calm, confident, and cheerful as he is. It is not just because of his charisma. It is because he is so good at what he does. So, look, it is never fun to bid farewell to someone who is a big part of the brains of your operation, and it is never fun to say goodbye to someone who is a big part of the heart of your team either, and it is really no fun to say goodbye to somebody who has managed to be both.

Jay has only formally worked for me for a couple of years, but he has been a trusted advisor and an honorary part of my team for a lot longer. He has been a big part of the Senate for more than a decade.

When I say that Jay knows how to prioritize, I mean it, and his real bottom line is family. He and his beloved wife Lisa have two boys, Shya and Asher. They form a tight-knit unit together with Jay's parents, Vijay and Suman, and his sister Anchal and beyond. Jay may have made it look suspiciously easy all these years, but jobs like this are never easy, least of all on your family. It turns out that the Khosla clan would like to see a little more of this guy, and Jay doesn't mind the sound of a new chapter and some new challenges either.

We are really going to miss him. We thank him for everything. We feel certain his next chapters will bring new happiness all their own. As a wise man once told me, ''I have a feeling it's all going to work out.''

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 term of ten years.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the coronavirus has already spread to 30 countries, including South Korea, Italy, Iran, and 53 confirmed cases here in the United States. Officials at the World Health Organization are now warning world governments to begin preparing for a pandemic—a pandemic.

Here in the United States, the Trump administration has been caught flat-footed. The administration has no plan to deal with the coronavirus—no plan—and seemingly no urgency to develop one. Even now, after the virus has already become a worldwide health crisis, with rapidly growing economic risks, the Trump administration is scrambling to respond. We have a crisis, and the Trump administration is trying to build an airplane while already in midflight. The harsh fact of the matter is, the Trump administration has shown towering and dangerous incompetence when it comes to the coronavirus.

Coronavirus testing kits have not been widely distributed to our hospitals and public health labs. Those without these kits must send samples all the way to Atlanta rather than testing them on site, wasting precious time as the virus spreads.

The administration has eliminated—eliminated—the global health security teams. That is global health security, just what we need now. They have eliminated the teams from both the National Security Council and the Department of Homeland Security. And thanks to years of cuts to the global health division at the Centers for Disease Control by the Trump administration, the CDC has been forced to reduce the number of countries it operates in from 49 to 10.

These are our frontlines. If we can deal with these diseases before they get to the United States, we are a lot safer, and the administration has mercilessly and thoughtlessly cut, cut, cut these teams. And then, only a month ago, even as we began to hear about the coronavirus in China, the administration sent us a budget that proposed cutting the CDC budget by 16 percent. The CDC is the agency on the frontlines that keeps us safe, keeps us healthy, and prevents American lives from being lost.

Four words describe the administration's response to the coronavirus: towering and dangerous incompetence. When officials at the CDC recommended that infected passengers from a cruise ship not be flown to the United States alongside the noninfected passengers, the State Department overruled them. Shockingly, they put infected and noninfected on the same plane. Was this because of politics? Did somebody call President Trump or someone else? There are rumors to that effect. We don't know if they are true. They should be checked out.

Typical of the administration, though, or certainly typical in so many different instances, decisions were made based on politics and optics rather than on the informed opinion of our scientists and doctors. It is like the Soviet apparatchiks overruling the nuclear scientists at Chernobyl to avoid embarrassment to the regime.

Federal agencies have been so hollowed out that one of the key figures in responding to the coronavirus in our government is Ken Cuccinelli, an immigration hard-liner ideologue with no public health expertise. Yesterday, Mr. Cuccinelli posted a tweet actually asking for information about the spread of the coronavirus. The one person the administration can come up with to help deal with the issue then emails and asks for information. This is, of course, because he has no knowledge. He is not a scientist. He is not a disease preventer. This is towering and dangerous incompetence.

President Trump, meanwhile, has said that the coronavirus might ''miraculously'' fade once the weather gets warmer—towering and dangerous incompetence. With no plan to deal with this potential health crisis, the administration last night issued an emergency budget request. It was too little and too late. It asked Congress to reprogram funding dedicated to fighting Ebola—still considered an epidemic in the Democratic Republic of the Congo—to deal with coronavirus. That is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is further evidence that the administration is not taking the coronavirus as seriously as it should. I said as much last night here on the floor.

The President seemed upset about my criticism of the budget proposal this morning. I am glad he has noticed. Maybe he will start taking this issue more seriously. Now that I have gotten the President's attention, I want to lay out five things the Trump administration must do to get a handle on the coronavirus.

The administration must, at a minimum, restore the cuts to the CDC budget. Trump's cuts to the CDC budget have had dramatic effects, shrinking the agency's footprint abroad to help combat pandemics. The administration must commit now to reverse it.

The Trump administration must appoint a point person—a czar—to implement a real plan to manage the coronavirus: an independent, nonpartisan, global health expert with real expertise, not a political appointee like Cuccinelli—somebody who is a scientist who knows these issues and can coordinate the myriad Federal agencies to fight the fight and prevent American lives from being lost.

The administration must increase its emergency budget request to at least $3.1 billion with no cuts—no cuts—for Ebola funding, which is still raging in Africa. The $3.1 billion is the amount our public health organizations say is necessary. The funding must also include a commitment to reimburse States and localities for all expenses related to addressing the outbreak.

The Trump administration must expedite delivery of diagnostic testing kits to all 50 States and public health laboratories so the tests don't have to be sent—these samples don't have to be sent to Atlanta and people wait, wait, and wait for a result as the disease spreads.

And finally, the administration must stop the proliferation of junk insurance plans that do not even cover coronavirus tests and other related healthcare services. This is typical of why we have opposed these junk plans. They cover hardly anything. Now that we have this crisis—the coronavirus—so many people who have these junk plans will not get tested because they can't afford it and because their plans don't cover it, a glaring example of why junk health plans—the administration's solution, it seems, to the health crisis—are totally inadequate and dangerous.

These are five basic steps that any competent administration would have already taken in preparation for the pandemic. There may be others as well, but this is what happens when you have an administration and a President so skeptical of science, so contemptuous of expertise, so practiced in obscuring inconvenient facts, and so disdainful of organization and preparation.

Madam President, you need to get your act together now. This is a crisis. We need you to act. We need this administration to finally do the right thing after weeks of dithering and exhibiting towering and dangerous incompetence.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Madam President, on another matter also related to healthcare, today Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans have scheduled votes on two divisive, anti-choice, anti-women, and anti-family bills. The Senate has voted them down before; it will again.

After weeks of complaining that the impeachment trial of President Trump was preventing the Senate from doing the people's business, this is what the Senate Republicans have proposed: fake, dishonest, and extreme legislation that has nothing to do with improving the lives of ordinary Americans. I say ''fake'' because these bills pretend we don't already have laws on the books that protect infants. Additional legislation is completely unnecessary, irrational, a show with no positive effect on the women of America who need healthcare. Healthcare, Mr.

President. Healthcare, Republican Senators. Healthcare. That is what women want, not these show bills that appeal to an extreme view. The American people know it. The American women know it.

Additional legislation such as proposed today is at best unnecessary and irrational. But it is dishonest because these bills are not intended to fix real problems faced by real Americans; they are intended to provoke fear and misunderstanding about a very difficult issue so Republicans can score political points with their far-right base. Any Senator who thinks this is going to appeal to the mainstream of their constituents—women throughout their States—is missing the point.

I say ''extreme'' because these bills would, in effect, criminalize women's reproductive care and intimidate healthcare providers—another example of the Senate Republicans' war on Roe v. Wade and a woman's constitutionally protected right to make her own private healthcare decisions and to not have politicians tell a woman what to do.

Putting these already defeated bills up for a show vote is not a good-faith attempt to improve the lives of everyday Americans—particularly everyday American women—as Republicans claim they want to desperately do. Every single Senate Republican knows these bills cannot and will not pass, but they are putting them on the floor anyway to pander to the hard right and to cover up the fact that they will not provide good healthcare for women, that they are voting day in and day out to take away the right to healthcare of women throughout America and letting the administration, led by President Trump, do just that.

If Republicans were serious about getting back to the people's business, there is no shortage of bipartisan legislation we could consider. Nearly 400 bills have passed the House, hundreds of them on a bipartisan basis, and they have collected dust in this Chamber. They have gone into Leader MCCONNELL's legislative trash can. On healthcare alone, we have legislation to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, legislation that would eliminate junk insurance plans, and legislation to reduce maternal and infant mortality rates, which my colleague from Illinois will talk about, I believe, shortly. All of these bills have languished in Leader MCCONNELL's legislative junkyard.

When Leader MCCONNELL or any Republican says ''Oh, impeachment stopped us from doing things,'' look at what we are not doing today—not only what we are doing, which is meaningless to women, but what we are not doing—protecting their healthcare, protecting Roe v. Wade, which two-thirds of American women want protected.

Any of the proposals that are in McConnell's legislative graveyard would be better than this anti-choice, anti-women, and anti-family legislation, but, typical of Leader MCCONNELL, Republicans have chosen once again to play politics on the Senate floor.

Leader MCCONNELL should stop wasting the few votes he does schedule with these shameless political stunts and instead bring legislation to the floor that would actually improve the healthcare of the American people and of American women in particular.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Democratic whip is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to note that this morning at 8 a.m., an unusual meeting took place in this Capitol Building. It was in the area of the building that is reserved for top-secret classified briefings. All Members of the Senate were invited. The issue at that briefing was the coronavirus.

I sat through the major part of that briefing before I had to leave for another meeting. There wasn't anything in there that should have been classified or top secret. If there were ever a time when we need to be open, honest, and complete in telling the whole story to the American people, it is this moment when we face the coronavirus, which started, we believe, in China and is now spreading across the world.

I back up what the Democratic leader said earlier because the request was made at this meeting for some $2 billion in the United States to respond to this coronavirus threat. When we questioned the administration as to why that number and what they were going to do with it, the answers were limited. In fact, when it came to the source of the money, they had no answer at all.

Remember, this is an administration which has consistently asked to cut the funding for the Centers for Disease Control. It has been a low priority of the Trump administration until we faced this threat, and now they have suddenly awakened. It turns out that even in the next fiscal year, which begins on October 1, the Trump administration has asked to cut the money for the Centers for Disease Control again.

You ask yourself, who is in charge over there? Who is making the basic decisions? Well, it could be the person who has decided that every available dollar needs to be put into a wall on the Mexican border.

Think of this for a moment: Ten billion dollars currently sits in an account for the building of this wall—unspent. They can't spend it. Yet the President recently asked for $3.8 billion more for building his almighty wall—which I thought Mexico was going to pay for—and now comes at the last minute asking for some $2 billion for the coronavirus.

As one Senator said in the meeting this morning, when it comes down to it, if our business is to protect the American people, isn't the highest priority to stop the spread of this virus in the United States? Of course it is, and that is why it should be a higher priority. No wall is going to stop that virus from coming into the United States. The President ought to wake up to that reality.

When you look at the efforts that are being made here in the United States and around the world, we can and should do more. I support this request for a dramatic increase in funding for this purpose now—now, before it spreads across the United States, which God forbid it ever does. We don't want it to. We want to make sure we have done everything in our power to stop it, and that means empowering those in charge with the knowledge, with the expertise, and with the authority to protect our families. First and foremost, protect American families. That is a much higher priority than any campaign promise this President made about a wall on our southern border.

I support the effort by Senator SCHUMER asking for some top doc or some individual with management authority, management experience, and the knowledge of the public health threat we face with this coronavirus, to be put in charge to coordinate the myriad agencies that will be touched by this campaign to protect America. Now is the time to do it. The time to do it—at least now, but it should have been much earlier, with more money dedicated to this purpose rather than cutting back on these key agencies.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Madam President, on a related topic, related to health, this morning Senator MITCH MCCONNELL came to the floor and said that today, this afternoon, we are likely to take up two votes on motions to proceed. This is so typical now of what we do in the Senate. Instead of bringing a measure to the floor with an understanding of an amendment process so that we can discuss it fully, vote on it in many different aspects, and then come to a conclusion with a majority vote in this body, Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor with another drive-by political hit on the issue of women's reproductive health.

We know what this issue is all about. Many of us who have served for years know there is a fundamental difference among those of us here in the Senate, and we know what the outcome of this vote will be because at least one of these votes was cast last year on exactly the same topic. So why would Senator MCCONNELL bring it back? It is to get that drive-by shooting when it comes to this political issue. To me, that is unfortunate, and I would like to suggest there is a better alternative.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Madam President, this is Black History Month, and I want to take the time to celebrate a person who made history when it came to healthcare.

Helen Octavia Dickens was born in Dayton, OH, in 1909, a daughter of a former slave. She attended Crane Junior College in Chicago, now Malcolm X

College. In 1934, she graduated from the University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, as the only African-American woman in her class of 137 students. She was the university's first Black woman physician graduate.

Dr. Dickens became a specialist in obstetrics, eventually moving to Philadelphia to work in a birthing center, where she provided care for the poor. While there, she broke barriers by becoming the first African-American woman to be admitted into the American College of Surgeons, receive board certification in obstetrics and gynecology, and practice medicine in Philadelphia.

Her work to help heal and guide women of all ages was nothing short of inspiring and her efforts to shine light on the troubling issue of health disparities in the United States that continues to this day. Let me be specific.

America has a long history of medical inequality. Sadly, we know that history has not ended. From premature births to premature deaths, people of color disproportionately bear the brunt of America's troubled healthcare system. On average, they live sicker, die sooner, and go without needed medical care more often. Communities of color suffer disproportionately from HIV, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, kidney failure, prostate cancer, and other medical conditions.

President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law nearly 10 years ago. It is still one of my proudest votes. Thanks to that law, 20 million Americans gained health insurance—more than 1 million in my home State of Illinois.

I am proud to say that law has taken strong steps to address racial inequalities in healthcare across America. A report last month found that the Affordable Care Act helped narrow racial and ethnic disparities in healthcare access and coverage, especially in States like mine—Illinois—that expanded the reach of Medicaid. Yet we know that better is not nearly good enough when it comes to healthcare. Nearly half of Black Americans—46 percent—live in the 15 States that did not expand Medicaid coverage after the Affordable Care Act was passed.

Another area of racial disparity is maternal and infant health. I raise this issue because instead of these drive-by issue votes, which Senator MCCONNELL insists on without debate and without amendment, we should be addressing an issue that should have bipartisan support. Let me be specific about what I mean.

The United States ranks 32nd out of the 35 wealthiest nations when it comes to infant death, infant mortality. Let me repeat that. Our Nation ranks 32nd out of the 35 wealthiest nations when it comes to infant mortality, and babies of color are the hardest hit.

If you are an African-American infant born in America today, you are twice as likely to die in the first year of birth compared to White infants.

And the mother giving birth? In the United States, African-American women are three to four times more likely to die giving birth than other women in this country. In Illinois, sadly, they are six times more likely to die.

The United States is one of only 13 countries in the world where the maternal mortality rate is worse now than it was 25 years ago. Instead of impaling ourselves politically on the issues that divide us, can we come together on an issue that could unite us: that we are going to do something in America to reduce the infant and maternal mortality, particularly among African Americans.

I have given a lot of thought to what we can do to try to bridge this racial divide to help women and babies of color. For the past two Congresses, I have introduced a bill with Illinois Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY called the MOMMA Act. The bill would expand Medicaid coverage for new moms from 60 days after birth to a full year postpartum to ensure adequate care after the child is delivered. The bill would also ensure implicit bias and cultural competency training for healthcare providers to help address health disparities in communities of color and increase access to doulas.

We are simply not doing enough to correct this injustice and save the lives of new moms and babies across the country. Instead, Senate Republicans are pushing two anti-choice bills this day that will do nothing—nothing—to help improve maternal and infant outcomes in America nor to help address racial disparities that currently exist. If they actually wanted to save and improve the lives of new moms and babies, they should consider passing legislation like the MOMMA Act, which I have just described. I am going to try to call this to the floor this afternoon. Wouldn't it be a breath of fresh air in the U.S. Senate if, on a bipartisan basis, we could agree to do something about this public health crisis affecting infants and mothers across America?

The fact that we rank so low in the world standings of safety when it comes to delivering a baby among African-American parents in this country is just unacceptable and unforgivable. Can we muster the courage to stop the political shootings here on the floor, this drive-by shooting of political issues, and instead address an issue which truly is a life-and-death matter that we all should agree on? The Republicans have a choice this afternoon to join me in this effort.

I am proud to stand here today and to honor Helen Dickens, the African-American doctor I described earlier who passed away in 2001. Her fierce advancement in the medical field helped pave the way for future doctors, particularly women of color, and led to important discoveries in women's health.

Today, much of what we know about the importance and effectiveness of annual OB/GYN visits was influenced by Dr. Dickens' work. With a grant from the National Institutes of Health, she helped train general practitioners to give women the exams they need to note early detection of cervical and uterine cancer. In 1982, the University of Illinois honored Dr. Dickens with the Distinguished Alumni Award.

While the United States has a troubled past in addressing racial inequality, we need to learn from the mistakes of the past to ensure that all Americans receive the healthcare they deserve in the future.

Dr. Helen Dickens and many other African-American pioneers give me hope for a brighter future.

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

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

ABORTION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today we will vote on two pro-life bills: the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

These bills should be completely uncontroversial. Every one of us in this Chamber ought to be able to agree that infants who are born alive during an abortion procedure should receive the same care that a baby born alive in a hospital would receive.

Every one of us ought to agree that, at the very least, we should not be aborting babies after the point that they can feel pain, but unfortunately the abortion extremism in the Democratic Party is such that it is unlikely that these two bills will even get a chance to be debated.

We shouldn't even need the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It should be obvious that any baby born alive, wherever he or she is born, ought to receive care, but with more than one leading Democrat over the past year refusing to rule out infanticide, it has become clear that we need to underscore that being born alive in an abortion clinic instead of a hospital doesn't eliminate a baby's right to medical care.

Like the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act should be a no-brainer. This legislation would ban abortions beginning in the sixth month of pregnancy, a point at which science has clearly demonstrated that the unborn child is able to feel pain—and not only able to feel pain. By this point in a pregnancy, approximately 20 weeks, babies are almost able to survive outside of their mothers. Babies have survived after being born at 25 weeks, at 24 weeks, at 23 weeks, and, like Ellie Schneider, who attended the State of the Union Address with her mom, at 21 weeks.

It is unthinkable that we are killing babies who are so far advanced that it is possible for them to survive outside of their mothers, but we are. In 2016, somewhere around 11,000 babies were aborted at or after the 21-week mark in pregnancy—11,000 in one year.

Democrats like to point to European countries to support their push for government-run healthcare and other socialist policies, but they never mention—they never mention—that almost every European country has more limits on abortion than we have here in the United States. In fact, the United States is one of just seven countries in the entire world that allow elective abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Among the other countries are China and North Korea—not exactly the kind of company we want to be in when it comes to keeping and protecting human rights because—make no mistake—that is what we are talking about with abortion: human rights.

Abortion denies unique, individual human beings, with their own fingerprints and their own DNA, the most basic of human rights: the right to life. It is happening on a massive scale. Every year, in the United States alone, hundreds of thousands of irreplaceable human beings are killed by abortion. That is not some number that the pro-life movement has cooked up. That is straight. That is straight from the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute, formerly affiliated with Planned Parenthood, which reports, ''Approximately 862,320 abortions were performed in 2017''—862,320. Most of us can't even fathom a number that big.

To put it in perspective, 862,000 is roughly equivalent to the population of the entire State of South Dakota, my home State. That is right. Think about that. In 2017 alone, the number of babies killed by abortion was roughly equivalent to the population of the entire State of South Dakota.

We can do better. Americans are better than this. Our country was founded to safeguard human rights, not to take them away. While we haven't always lived up to that promise, we have never stopped trying. It is time for us, as a country, to stand up and to start protecting the rights of unborn human beings. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will not stop all, or even most, abortions, but they are an important step, a chance for us, as Americans, to draw a line in the sand and to start standing up for the rights of babies who are able or nearly able to survive outside of their mothers. It is time for us to join the vast majority of the global community in prohibiting elective abortions past 20 weeks. It is time for us to make it clear that, no matter what some extreme Democrats may say, Americans believe that all children, whether born alive in a hospital or in an abortion clinic, deserve protection and basic medical care.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will take a stand for human rights and for human decency and allow debate to move forward on these two important pro-life bills.

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.

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

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

VOTE ON MOLLOY NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Molloy nomination?

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Ex.]

YEAS—97

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

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

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 Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 96, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

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 senior assistant 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 Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, John Thune, David Perdue, Lisa Murkowski.

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 Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Perdue
Blackburn	Hawley	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Jones	Sasse
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	King	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Gardner	Murphy	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Feinstein	Rosen
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Harris	Schumer
Booker	Hassan	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider the motion to proceed to S. 3275, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Alaska.

NOMINATION OF KATHARINE MACGREGOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, very briefly, here this afternoon, beginning at 3:30, we will have a series of votes that include the nomination of Katharine MacGregor to be the Deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I would like to provide my support for this nomination.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for working with me to report then re-report Ms. MacGregor's nomination, which moved out on a bipartisan basis.

I thank the majority leader for filing cloture on her nomination before the recess so we could confirm her this week.

She has a lot of work to do at Interior, and we need her on the job. She did very well at her confirmation hearing last year. She has significant experience on the issues she will face as Deputy Secretary, having worked here on Capitol Hill for 10 years, as the principal deputy and Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, as well as the Department's Deputy Chief of Staff, and, most recently, exercising the authority of the Deputy Secretary.

Ms. MacGregor's nomination has drawn the support of dozens of groups, including some in my State: Alaska Federation of Natives, Arctic Slope Regional Association, Doyon Limited, American Wind Energy Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Public Lands Council, and many others.

I personally share those groups' confidence that Ms. MacGregor will do a good job as Deputy Secretary. I think she is well qualified. She has the right experience to succeed in this role. I think she will be a fine asset for Secretary Bernhardt and the rest of the Interior team. I would urge my colleagues to support her full confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 916

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, later this afternoon, we are going to have two votes on motions to proceed. They are procedural votes to go forward on two pieces of legislation relative to the issue of abortion. Those of us in public life know full well that this is a very controversial issue. There are people who feel very strongly on one side and very strongly on the other.

These votes this afternoon will not resolve that conflict. They don't try to. What the Republican majority under Senator MCCONNELL has decided to do is to bring back for a vote two items we already voted on. We know the outcome. We can virtually predict within one or two votes what it is going to be.

At the end of the day, Republicans will turn to a special interest group and say: We told you we could call this every year. We did it.

We will have Members who will vote their conscience on both sides of the aisle, but the net result of that is not going to be to change anything for the better in the United States, when it comes to the issues that challenge us.

What I would like to do is to come to this floor with a radical idea. I have an idea how we can come together, regardless of our position on that issue, and do something constructive for this country. Let me tell you what I have in mind. The United States currently ranks 32 out of 35 industrial nations when it comes to infant mortality. That is right—32 out of 35 when it comes to the survival of babies in the United States once born.

A 2018 report published in Health Affairs by Global Health characterized the United States of America as ''the most dangerous of wealthy nations for a child to be born into.'' What they found was that U.S. babies—babies born in the United States—are three times as likely to die of premature birth and more than twice as likely to die of SIDS than babies in comparably rich countries. Every year, more than

23,000 infants die in the United States, largely due to factors that in many cases could have been prevented: low birth weight, maternal health complications, prematurity.

Babies of color are particularly at risk. Black infants are twice as likely to die in America as White infants, a disparity that is greater than it was in the year 1850 in this country.

We are not only losing babies, we are losing mothers, as well. Listen to this statistic. The United States is one of only 13 countries in the world where the rate of maternal mortality—mothers dying during the birth process, related to pregnancy or childbirth, for up to a year postpartum—is worse than it was 25 years ago. We haven't moved forward. We have moved backward when it comes to mothers surviving child birth.

Nationwide, more than 700 women die every year as a result of pregnancy and more than 70,000 suffer near-fatal complications. More than 660 percent of these deaths are preventable.

Sadly, much like with babies, the tragedy of maternal mortality is even more pronounced when you look at communities of color. In the United States of America, women of color are three to four times more likely than White women to die as a result of pregnancy. If you think it has something to do with poverty and wealth—that is what I thought—there is no correlation. The only correlation is race.

In my State of Illinois, I am sorry to report that if you are an African-American woman, you are six times more likely than a White woman to die in childbirth. That is why Congressional Representative ROBIN KELLY, in the House, and my colleague Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I, in the Senate, have joined in introducing the MOMMA's Act.

First and foremost, more than anything, this bill would expand the length of time that a new mother can keep her Medicaid health coverage. Currently, Medicaid only has to cover women for 2 months after the child is born. Our bill would expand that to a full year. The Medicaid Program pays for 50 percent of all births nationwide—44 percent in Illinois. It is a big part of the treatment of women who are giving birth to children. This program is vital for new moms and babies, and it makes no sense that a new mom's health coverage is terminated 2 months after she has given birth. Why don't we stick with her so she can live? Why don't we do something affirmative to say that we are committed to mothers and children on a bipartisan basis, regardless of our position on any other issue?

The MOMMA's Act would also provide access to doulas, as well as improve implicit bias and cultural competency training among healthcare providers. Too often Black women are ignored or not taken seriously by healthcare providers. Doulas can help provide education advocacy and support for women whose voices today are being ignored. Our bill would establish national obstetric emergency protocols and ensure dissemination of the best practices for healthcare providers dealing with moms and babies. Finally, it would help to standardize maternal and infant health data collection reporting so we have a better idea of what is happening and why.

Our bill is supported by the American Medical Association, Families USA, the March of Dimes, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, and the Black Mamas Matter Alliance. Our bill is supported by these and many other public health and provider organizations because it would save the lives and improve the lives of moms and babies.

We can debate the issue of abortion back and forth all day. We know how the votes are going to turn out, and we know nothing is going to occur. Why don't we come together on something bipartisan that says we are all dedicated to reducing the incidence of infant mortality and maternal mortality in this country? Isn't that one thing we can agree on? That is my challenge to this Senate Chamber.

Leader MCCONNELL has made it clear that he has no intention of allowing the Senate to debate and pass legislation that will actually help families in need. I hope he is wrong. Instead, he wants us only to vote on controversial judicial nominees and politically charged anti-choice legislation that has no chance of passing. If he is serious about wanting to save the lives of babies and their mothers, I hope that he will make an exception for the MOMMA's Act.

I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 916, the Mothers and Offspring Mortality and Morbidity Awareness Act, also known as the MOMMA's Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would like to address Senator DURBIN's comments and his unanimous consent request through the Chair.

First, I am glad the Senator from Illinois wants to reduce infant mortality rates and wants to reduce maternal mortality rates. I agree on both of these goals.

On the subject of infant mortality, the Senate is going to vote on one infant mortality bill in about an hour. The senior Senator from Illinois said a moment ago that there are two anti-choice pieces of legislation this afternoon. For reporters and the public paying attention, LINDSEY GRAHAM's bill is about abortion. I support Senator GRAHAM's bill. I don't exactly agree with the characterization of it as leading with the anti-choice language, but it is an abortion bill.

The second piece of legislation we are considering today is not in any way an abortion bill. The anti-choice legislation rhetoric that you are using doesn't have anything to do with the actual legislation that we are considering this afternoon.

Yet I hope that you would consider on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act the fact that it is addressing some cases of mortality by making sure babies who have survived abortion get care. These are babies who are already born and outside the mother.

The Senator's passionate speech about infant mortality suggests that either we are doing more cynical posturing around here or that folks plan to actually support this bipartisan piece of legislation. I hope it is the latter. I sincerely hope that the Senator would vote in accord with the positions he took earlier in his career and that we would vote in favor getting important stuff done on this legislation.

In addition, as for the comments he made on the subject of maternal mortality rates, I agree with him. Many of these tragedies are preventable and, I believe, despite being the second or third or fourth most conservative Member of the Senate by my voting record and believing in small government, I agree we underfund a lot of these pieces of public health investment, and I would like us to do more to address preventable maternal tragedies as well.

Therefore, in a moment, I am going to ask if the senior Senator from Illinois would agree to modify his unanimous consent request to include the Grassley amendment. I will use all of the appropriate parliamentary language at the end but, for public understanding, this amendment, the Grassley amendment, would give States $2.5 billion new dollars to address maternal health and at-risk communities. In addition, this amendment would give $200 million to address maternal mortality under the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant Program. We are talking about more funding, fully offset, for at-risk moms—no politics, no gimmicks. It is in line with the policies that the senior Senator from Illinois was just advancing.

It is my belief the pro-life position is pro-baby, pro-mom, and pro-science. If the Senator from Illinois wants to spend another $2.7 billion to help moms, I am aligned with him. It would be great if we could get that done forever. If, however, we are trying to change the subject from the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and that means we can't advance a deal to protect these moms and babies, that would be disappointing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request to include

the Grassley substitute amendment, which is No. 1240. I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from its consideration and that the amendment be considered agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I do not question the sincerity of my colleague. I know you come to this issue with a sincere heart. I don't question that at all. What I am saying to you is that you and I could spend the rest of this day and the next on this floor debating the issue of abortion, and we are not going to resolve it—not in this Chamber, not in this country.

What I am asking you to do is look beyond the current issues that are coming to the floor this afternoon and try to find some common ground—Republicans and Democrats—on the issue of maternal mortality.

You have to be shocked, as I am, to read these numbers about the babies and mothers who are dying, particularly babies and mothers of color. If we can do something as a nation to show we truly do care about this, even though we have differences on this issue of abortion, wouldn't that be a breakthrough for this Chamber? I think the people across this country would applaud us and say: They finally did something. They finally came to an agreement.

What I propose is the MOMMA's Act, which is a good bill and is one that I think should pass. The Senator has proposed an alternative. Here is an idea. Listen to this radical idea: What if we bring the MOMMA's Act to the floor and agree that we will debate an amendment—any amendment one would want to offer? Do you know what it would be? It would be like the U.S. Senate. It would be the Senate. Think of it. The Senator as a Republican and I as a Democrat would actually be debating an issue that would make a difference in America. We would be putting our best ideas up for a vote on the Senate floor. How about that for a motion?

We are not going to get anywhere with the Senator's proposal this afternoon, because we have passed it before. We know the outcome. We know the final vote. I would say the Senator's alternative proposal, which was once offered by Senator GRASSLEY on the floor when I tried this before, is just inadequate. The resources aren't there to deal with the scope and gravity of the problem.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we act like Senators? Why don't we do something on a bipartisan basis and bring an issue to the floor that truly counts and that people care about? It would be a breakthrough. It might make a headline. It might even make a tweet somewhere. This is not the way to do it—that it is the Senator's way or my way.

What I would suggest to the Senator, though, is to bring it to the floor and to join me in doing it on a bipartisan basis. Appeal to Senator MCCONNELL to finally let the Senate be the Senate. The Senator knows we have people who come to the Galleries here who look down at these desks and say: You know, I think there used to be Senators who sat at those desks who actually legislated, who actually debated, who actually had amendments. Last year, under Senator MCCONNELL, we had 22 amendments on the floor of the Senate. Why not more than 22?

That is it. We are not talking about anything else. If the Senator truly wants to join me on this floor in a bipartisan debate on this issue of infant and maternal mortality, let's do it. For the time being, I have to object to what the Senator has proposed. Please, I didn't question the Senator's sincerity in bringing up this issue, and I hope he won't question mine in suggesting we ought to be the Senate and debate this issue.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, in reserving the right to object and in turning this all the way around, we have an objection to an objection to an objection, but let me just agree to the last point my colleague from Illinois made.

I think it would be great if this Chamber had 80 or 90 or 95 or 100 people in it instead of how it is now. We are at three today, which is a high-water mark. Usually, there are one or two people in here. Senator BARRASSO is here. We have four. We are setting a record.

I don't think a lot of us think that the month we all spent here was ideal. Last month, during the impeachment, there was one thing that was new in that a lot of Senators spent time talking to each other. So, to the Senator's grand point of wishing we were debating, we are aligned.

I do want to say one more thing before I object, which is the Senator said he is not questioning my sincerity. I appreciate that. The Senator asked that I not question his sincerity, and I am not. I am questioning his logic, though, because he summarized it as if there were two issues at play. He said anti-abortion legislation and maternal health funding. Yet there are three issues at play on the floor today.

One of them is LINDSEY GRAHAM's pain-capable bill, which is a pro-life piece of legislation. One of them is Senator DURBIN's funding request about maternal delivery health. Those things are true, but there is a third thing which, again, he obscured by saying the debate here is that of funding maternal health or of having anti-abortion legislation. The piece of legislation we are voting on today—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—is not about abortion. I am pro-life, and I am going to support LINDSEY GRAHAM's bill. Yet the bill we are voting on does not change anyone's access to abortion. It doesn't have anything to do with Roe v. Wade. It is about babies who are already born. This morning on TV, those on CNN made up this insane phrase. They said it was a fetus that had been born. What the heck is that? It is another way of saying they don't want to debate the actual debate we are having on the floor today.

We are going to vote once on LINDSEY GRAHAM's pro-life legislation, and I am going to support it. We are also going to vote on a piece of legislation called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. These are about babies who are born, who are outside their mothers. What is actually happening is that the senior Senator from Illinois is wanting to obscure the debate because he wants to use euphemisms about choice so that we don't have to admit to the American public that what is actually happening on the floor today is probably going to be like it was last year—with 44 Democrats filibustering an anti-infanticide bill.

There is nothing in the bill that is about abortion—nothing. It is about infanticide. That is the actual legislation. We have 44 people over there who want to hide from it and talk in euphemisms about abortion because they don't want to defend the indefensible because they can't defend the indefensible. We are talking about killing babies who are born. That is the actual legislation we are voting on today in the Senate. That is what the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is. Is it OK in the eyes of the U.S. Senate for us to say: ''Well, you can't actively kill the little baby. You can't take a pillow and put it over her face and smother her to death, but you can back away and kill her that way''?

That is what Ralph Northam—the disgraced Governor of Virginia—was talking about when he said: Well, once the baby is born, if she survives an abortion—and we wish that it would not happen—then we will figure out a way to keep her calm for a little while, while the doctors debate what they want to do. What he means is, kill the baby, and that is the legislation we are voting on today.

There are three buckets. LINDSEY GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a bill about abortion. There is another bill that is about babies who have already been born.

News flash, CNN: If you are a baby and if you have been born and if you are outside of Mama, nobody calls that a fetus. You just want to call it a fetus because you don't want to cover the actual story that is being voted on in the Senate today.

Then there is a third piece of legislation, which is Senator DURBIN's counterproposal about maternal preventable deaths and investments in that category. I am interested in that category as well, but the Senator from Illinois doesn't actually want to talk about the legislation that is on the floor, so he is changing the subject.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, infanticide should be a crime, and it is. That is what the Senator from Nebraska will not concede. He thinks he has come up with a novel idea—that you shouldn't be able to kill a baby with impunity in America. It is not novel. It has been in Federal law for over a decade, and it is in State laws all across the United States. If one has any doubt about it, be prepared to write down a name—the name of Kermit Gosnell. Thirteen years ago, I believe it was, this physician was convicted of infanticide. He is now serving life without parole, plus 30 years. To argue that the Senator has some novel idea that infanticide should be a crime and that we don't cover it now under the law is just not accurate, and it is not factual. That is why I think the Senator's bill is unnecessary.

This bill is necessary. Mothers are dying and babies are dying, and we can do something about it. It doesn't matter whether one goes to a pro-life or to a pro-choice rally; we all agree that this is something we can do on a bipartisan basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, just for the record and just so we all have it clear, the Senator talks about infanticide, and he is right. Active infanticide is illegal under Federal law as there are no crimes for it in half of the States.

More fundamentally, what the Senate is considering today is passive infanticide. Whether they are born in glistening NICUs at fancy hospitals, with a lot of rich cars in the parking lots, or whether the babies are born in the unfortunate circumstances of abortion clinics in strip malls, whether they are 1 day old or 5 days old, it turns out that they die if you wander away from them and deny them care. If you don't give them warmth and if you don't give them food, they die. Passive killing, passive infanticide, is not illegal under Federal law.

The Senator said infanticide is illegal, and he is half right. Active infanticide is illegal under Federal law. You cannot take a pillow and smother a newborn baby to death. What you can do and what does happen in abortion clinics across America—and it is why we held a Judiciary Committee hearing on this 2 weeks ago so as to hear from medical and legal community experts who know what the practice looks like—is the taking of that vulnerable, innocent, little, tiny fetus, putting her on a cart, walking her down the hall, putting that cart in a closet, and leaving her to die by exposure. That is what we should prevent, and that is what this legislation is about.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor to support the two pro-life bills being considered this week and to stand with my friend and colleague from Nebraska in his efforts to promote the legislation that is before us, for both of these bills promote respect for innocent human life.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would ban nearly all abortions at 20 weeks of pregnancy. As a doctor, I know that it is medically proven that babies do feel pain at 20 weeks. Americans overwhelmingly oppose these third-trimester abortions. Yet the United States remains one of only seven countries in the world to allow abortions after 5 months. This group includes China, and it includes North Korea. We need to do much better. The Graham bill puts us on higher ground with the rest of the world. It says, at 5 months, which is 20 weeks, abortion on demand must stop. It includes exceptions for rape, for incest, and for the life of the mother. I strongly support this effort by Senator GRAHAM, and I applaud him for his tremendous work on this issue.

I also stand here on the floor to say I strongly support what Senator SASSE has been saying about his specific bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Senator SASSE is another champion on life issues. The Sasse bill affirms that infanticide is illegal. It upholds the right of all U.S.-born babies to full medical care. Every baby born in this country deserves every chance to live. All doctors must do everything in their power to save babies who survive abortions.

Both the Graham and the Sasse bills fully protect mothers from either prosecution or penalty. Both measures demonstrate character, and they demonstrate courage. These are bills that care for our children, and they do what is medically right.

Thanks to all of those who work to protect innocent human life, we are here on the floor, debating, promoting, and asking for a vote to pass this legislation. I urge all Senators to support these life-affirming bills.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, at the heart of this debate is life. When I reflect on the importance of protecting innocent life, the story of Ellie Schneider comes to mind. She is a child who was born at just 21 weeks 6 days in Kansas City. Ellie is one of the youngest babies to survive, in the United States, a premature birth. She was born so early that most hospitals in Missouri would not treat her, except for the faith-based hospital St. Luke's.

She weighed only slightly more than a can of soda and was about as long as a piece of paper. She weighed just 14 ounces. At 21 weeks, the odds were stacked against her, but she is a fighter. Through the power of prayer and an incredible medical team, Ellie is now a healthy, happy 2-year-old girl. She brings endless joy to her family.

Her inclusion in the President's State of the Union Address is a powerful testament to life. Ellie is an example that every child is a blessing worthy of protection, and we have a moral obligation to defend the born and unborn.

In today's political climate, it is easy to forget that there are both Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, and people from every religious affiliation who believe in protecting the human rights of the unborn. I am proud to be a cosponsor S. 311, the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act. It sends a clear message by establishing the real consequences for those who kill or abandon innocent children after they are outside the mother's womb. We should all be able to agree that once born, each baby deserves the right to proper access to medical care.

I also proudly support S. 3275, the Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act, which places much needed restrictions on elective abortions on children at 20 weeks post-conception. It is unconscionable that America is one of only seven countries that does not have a 20-week abortion ban. These countries include China, North Korea, and Vietnam.

While it is disheartening that this type of horrific practice needs congressional action, I am glad there are commonsense pieces of legislation that can address the atrocities of late-term abortion and severely punishes those in the business of taking the lives of our youngest human beings.

I pray that the American people will recognize that lives hang in the balance, will stand with us to get our Nation back on the right track, and will fight for the born and the unborn. Being a voice for the voiceless requires us to take important steps, like passing the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I rise today to oppose my colleagues' legislation that would limit women's healthcare choices. These bills that are being introduced are part of a wave of efforts to turn back the clock on women's healthcare.

In my home State of Nevada, with the only majority-women legislature in the Nation, we are moving in the opposite direction. We have been fighting to protect a woman's right to choose for decades. I am inspired by women like Sue Wagner, the first woman elected as Nevada's Lieutenant Governor, whose grit and leadership sparked a movement in the 1990s to enshrine women's reproductive freedom in the State's constitution.

Just this year, with women at the helm of the Nevada legislature, the Trust Nevada Women Act was signed into law to remove undue burdens on reproductive rights. Nevadans understand that reproductive rights are part and parcel not just of women's health but of their economic security. When women can't control whether and when they have children, they are more likely to struggle financially. Eighty-three percent of Nevadans are pro-choice, and I stand with them.

I am going to continue to fight for what the American people want: comprehensive healthcare and reproductive justice. Bills to protect women's health are what we should be voting on, like the bipartisan legislation to cover preexisting conditions, to reduce prescription drug prices, to prevent violence against women, and many more that are languishing, unfortunately, on Leader MCCONNELL's desk. That includes pushing for meaningful legislation to protect mothers and babies at a critical time in their lives, like the Healthy MOM Act to expand healthcare coverage for pregnant and postpartum women.

Leader MCCONNELL is more focused on passing an extreme political agenda than on protecting women's health in Nevada and across this country. You know, we really have to stop the assault on women's right to choose and their reproductive healthcare. The rights of American women to make their own health decisions should not be up for debate. These are our fundamental rights, and they are worth fighting for and protecting.

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

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

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, this afternoon, we are going to vote on the simplest bill in the history of the U.S. Senate. It is the simplest bill we have ever considered here. It says that if a newborn baby survives an abortion, she deserves medical care. That is the bill. That is it.

Sadly, a lot of Senators are going to come to the floor, and they are going to read or they are planning to read—I hope they will reconsider—but they are planning to read talking points that were written for them by Planned Parenthood, and they are going to talk about a whole bunch of stuff that doesn't have anything to do with the bill we actually have before us.

Senators are going to muddy the issue, and, sadly, too many in the press are going to report with headlines like ''Abortion Restrictions'' and with anti-science jargon like ''A Fetus That Was Born.'' That was an actual portion of the headline this morning: ''A Fetus That Was Born.''

Sadly, a lot of folks seem determined to look the other way. Looking the other way from the issue that we are considering today in this body shouldn't be an option, so let's start with four straight, undeniable facts—four simple facts.

First, Federal law does not criminalize the denial of care to newborn babies who survive abortions. Federal law doesn't criminalize the denial of care to babies who survive abortions.

Second, we know that babies sometimes survive abortions, and the data backs that up. If Senators don't like this inconvenient fact, they can take it up with the CDC and the States that have mandatory reporting about babies who survive abortions.

Third, this bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, simply says that if a baby survives an abortion, she should get the same degree of medical care that any other baby would get at that same gestational stage. It is really important—same care that would be provided to any other baby at the same gestational stage.

It is a short bill. I know my colleagues are busy, but all of them could read the bill. So instead of coming to the floor and reciting prepackaged talking points that Planned Parenthood wrote for you, take a few minutes and actually read the bill, and you will find that the talking points don't actually match up with the actual bill you are called on to vote on today. Those are the facts.

Finally, this is not about abortion. My colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has a really important piece of legislation that he is going to speak on in a moment, and I am going to support his legislation. It is a really important pro-life piece of legislation. I am in favor of it.

But my legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is not actually about abortion. It is about babies who have already survived a botched abortion. My legislation is not about Roe v. Wade. It is about what happens after a baby is already born when an abortion failed to accomplish the purpose it had—the sad purpose, in my view—the purpose it had to terminate that pregnancy. This is about the babies who have already been born. This is about whether that baby who has survived the abortion and is now lying on the abortion table or on the medical table—whether or not that cold, naked baby alone has a right to medical care.

We all know the answer. The answer is, of course she does. Every baby dies if you leave her to passively die of exposure. Whether she was born in a gold-plated hospital with a lot of fancy, expensive cars in the parking lot outside that NICU unit or whether she was born in the unfortunate circumstances of an abortion clinic in a strip mall, every little baby who has already been born—they will die if you deny care to them. So, of course, we shouldn't do that. Of course, the U.S. Senate should stand up and defend those babies.

We all know that denying care to the most vulnerable among us is barbaric, and this body ought to be able to stand 100 to 0 against that barbarism. It is inhumane, and it is passive infanticide, and the Senate should today condemn and prohibit that practice. Is that practice what my colleagues really want to defend? I can't believe they do.

The 44 who filibustered this legislation a year ago this week, when you talk to them one to one, they get really uncomfortable, and they try to change the subject to all sorts of other culture war debates because they don't want to have a conversation about the actual legislation and the actual babies we are considering today. Why? Because they are scared to death of Planned Parenthood's army of lobbyists, that is why. It is not because any of them really want to defend the morally reprehensible and the morally indefensible practice that is passive infanticide. None of them want to defend it. They are just scared.

Last year, 44 Senators filibustered this legislation. They said that it was OK to look the other way while newborns were discarded. They said that Federal law should not ensure that these babies are treated with care. They seem to have a hard time saying that human beings outside the womb have the same right to life as you and I ought to have and that we get care; we need care. They need care, and they should get care.

Put down your talking points. Please read the bill before you vote today. Read the expert testimony that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee allowed us to hold in his committee room 2 weeks ago, where we brought in both medical and legal experts to talk about what happens in these abortion clinics.

For those in this body who are not on the Judiciary Committee or who didn't do the preparation for today's vote, I want to summarize the testimony of one of the people who came before our

Judiciary Committee—Jill Stanek, who now works for the Susan B. Anthony List. She was at an Illinois hospital in the 1990s and early 2000s. Here is a quote from her:

> Of 16 babies Christ Hospital aborted during the calendar year 2000, four that I knew of [were born alive, and they] were aborted alive.

That is 25 percent—4 out of the 16 abortions at that hospital.

She continues:

> Each of those babies—[there were] two boys and two girls—lived [somewhere] between 1½ and 3 hours. One baby was 28 weeks' gestation [age]—7 months old—and weighed two pounds, seven ounces.

Numbers from the CDC and the States that report data on abortion survivors—that is about 8 of the 50 States that do some reporting and data collection on this—tell a story of babies who were breathing, whose hearts were beating, who stretched their arms, wiggled their fingers, and kicked their legs. This is the actual data. You want to talk about being pro-science—being pro-science is pro-baby.

What happened to the babies? Medical practitioners have testified before Congress about walking into rooms where living babies were lying naked and alone on countertops, where they would be left to expire by themselves—alone, cold, naked, and denied care.

Opponents of this bill don't want to deal with the facts. They prefer to stick to talking points and claim that this never happens. If they will not listen to the medical experts, perhaps they will take the word of the Governor of Virginia, Ralph Northam.

In January of last year, disgraced Governor Northam was explicit during a radio interview in which he said that a baby born alive during an abortion ''would be kept comfortable. . . . then a discussion would ensue'' about whether that baby should be left to die. That is actually what Governor Northam was talking about on the radio in Virginia.

What he did is make the terrible faux pas of saying in public the true stuff about this procedure and this practice of walking away and backing away from these babies and letting them die. He just decided to talk in public about the reality of what happens in some of these abortion clinics.

Governor Northam is not an outlier. Just 3 weeks ago, one of the Democratic candidates for President was asked point blank on national television about infanticide: Would he be comfortable if a mother invoked infanticide to kill her now already born-alive child? Mayor Buttigieg's response: ''I don't know what I'd tell them.''

Really? Somebody asks you if you can kill a baby who has already been born, and you say you don't know what to say?

Every one of us, especially somebody running for the highest office in the land to uphold the laws—laws that promise to protect the right to life—should be able to say without any hesitation that leaving babies to die is unacceptable.

This isn't horrid stuff, people. There are actually some horrid debates we have in this Chamber. This isn't one of them. This is about babies who have been born alive and whether you can decide to kill them. There is really no debate to be had here, which is why so many people who were planning to speak on the other side decided not to speak this afternoon, because you can't defend the morally reprehensible procedure that is backing away, that is passive infanticide.

There are no exceptions. There are no special circumstances. We should protect every human being, no matter how small they are, no matter how weak they are. And if the Senate says that it is OK to ignore born-alive babies, what we are really saying is that we are OK with a society where some people count more than other people. We would be saying that we want a society where some people can be pushed aside if other people decide those folks are inconvenient, a society where we can dispose of you if you happen to come into the world a certain way.

It is unbelievably telling that Planned Parenthood, NARAL, which is the extremist abortion lobby and their armies of lawyers and slick public relations teams and influence peddlers, cannot draw this line. It is pretty amazing.

This bill is not about abortion. Again, I want to be clear. We are voting on two things today. One of them is a piece of legislation about abortion. It is the pain-capable bill. LINDSEY GRAHAM, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is going to speak in favor of it in a minute. I am an original cosponsor of his legislation. I support it, and I am going to wholeheartedly vote for it.

But the other piece of legislation we are going to vote on today isn't actually even about abortion. This should be 100-to-0 no-brainer. This bill is not about Roe v. Wade. This bill will not change one word of abortion law in the United States. My colleagues can vote up or down, but they can't pretend that they don't know the stakes of what we are talking about.

America is a country built on the beautiful principle of equality, and the terms of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act are intended to reflect that. A child born alive during a botched abortion should be given the same level of care that would be provided to any other baby born at that same gestational stage, which is just to say that a born-alive baby is a human being with fundamental human dignity, which is undeniable. They should receive the care and affection due to every other human being.

Today, we have a chance to advance our commitment to human dignity. We can protect those babies who come into the world under the worst of conditions. We can welcome them into a world with love and hope and help and care.

My colleagues, please do not turn your backs on those babies.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, today, we will be voting on two very important bills: the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I would like to thank my colleagues Senator GRAHAM and Senator SASSE for their leadership on these bills, and I would like to thank Senator MCCONNELL, for his efforts to bring these bills to the floor for a vote.

First, I want to talk about Senator Sasse's Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill which I have cosponsored that would ensure that a baby who survives an abortion will receive the same treatment as any child naturally born at the same age, without prescribing any particular form of treatment.

That is just morally right, and I don't see why there would be any disagreement about it. This bill is not even about abortion; it is about infanticide.

Twenty-eight years ago, I came down here to tell the story of Ana Rosa Rodriguez. Here is what I said:

> Mr. Chairman, there is a big misconception regarding abortion and the issue of women and their right to protect their bodies. It is not that right that I object to, but the right that is given them to kill an unborn fetus—an unborn child.
>
> I want to share with you a story that my colleague, Chris Smith told some time ago on this very floor. Ana Rosa Rodriguez is an abortion survivor. At birth she was a healthy 3 pound baby girl except for her injury—she was missing an arm.
>
> Ana survived a botched abortion. Her mother attempted to get an abortion in her 32nd week of pregnancy when she was perfectly healthy—8 weeks past what New York State law legally allows. In the unsuccessful abortion attempt the baby's right arm was ripped off, however they failed to kill Ana Rosa. She lived.
>
> Pro-life supporters agreed that nightmare situations like the Rodriguez case are probably not common, but abortion related deaths and serious injuries occur more frequently than most people are aware.
>
> It is amazing that we can pay so much attention to issues such as human rights abroad and can allow the violent destruction of over 26 million children here at home. We are fortunate that Ana was not one of those children-she survived.

That was in 1992. But today, we still don't have explicit Federal protections for the babies who survive the brutal abortion process. As I said, this issue is not about abortion but about caring for a baby outside the womb.

The need for these protections has become even clearer as we see States like New York and Illinois allow abortion for virtually any reason up until the point of birth and support infanticide by removing protections for infants born alive after a failed abortion.

Just a few years after that speech, in 1997, I was on the floor with my good friend former Senator Rick Santorum to try to pass the partial-birth abortion ban and end the horrific practice

of late-term abortions. Fortunately, we won the battle against partial-birth abortions and finally ended that practice in 2003. That ban was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2007.

But we have yet to pass legislation banning late term abortion.

Only seven countries allow abortion after 20 weeks, including the United States and North Korea. That is horrific. The U.S. is supposed to be an example in regards to global human rights; yet we are on par with North Korea when it comes to protecting the unborn.

Senator GRAHAM's Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would help roll back this horrific practice by prohibiting abortion after 20 weeks postfertilization, when we know babies can feel pain.

This is another commonsense bill that should not divide us along partisan lines; a baby is a baby whether in or outside of the womb, and each baby deserves a chance to live as an individual created in the image of God.

There still much more we need to do to end the abortion on demand culture, but thankfully, we have the most prolife President in history.

This January, President Trump became the first sitting President to attend the annual March for Life rally in Washington. Hundreds of pro-life Oklahomans joined the President and tens of thousands of Americans to march. I had the chance to meet many of these Oklahomans, many of them extremely young—as young as high school. They asked me how to respond when the radical left attacks their views. I told them to be kind, but not to be afraid to voice their opinions—after all, they are right.

Under President Trump's leadership, we have protected the Hyde amendment, reinstated and expanded the Mexico City policy, and stripped abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from using title X funding for abortions.

The need to stand up for our babies is as important today as it was in 1992 and 1997. I am looking forward to building on our successes under President Trump to end the practice of abortion on demand and to ensure that we protect babies who survive abortions.

We will overcome evil with good by upholding and affirming the dignity and inherent worth of every human being. We will keep fighting.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise in opposition to S. 3275, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and S. 311, the Born-Alive Abortion Protection Act. These two dangerous bills infringe on the doctor-patient relationship and hinder women's constitutionally protected right to choose. Make no mistake, these bills are nothing more than a reminder that Republican discrimination toward women knows no boundaries. President Trump, his administration, and Senate Republicans think reproductive freedom is still up for discussion. It is not.

I am here to set the record straight for Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and my Republican colleagues. Women's reproductive health decisions should be left to women and their healthcare providers. That is it.

This time last year, the Born-Alive Abortion Protection Act failed to advance on the Senate floor. I was proud to vote against this bill then, and I hope more of my colleagues will join me in voting no on this bill now. Doing so will safeguard the right for an individual to make their own health choices, without interference from the Federal Government.

The Senate floor is not the only battleground for reproductive rights. Anti-Choice State legislators are continuing to assault reproductive freedom through the enactment of State laws restricting choice. Cases challenging these laws are working their way through the judicial system, including to the U.S. Supreme Court. There, the laws' supporters hope that the conservative justices will not only uphold these damaging laws but will go further and overturn Roe v. Wade, effectively ending this bedrock decision that ensures equality, privacy, and reproductive freedom.

Women across the Nation are facing imminent threats to their constitutional rights, to their personal liberty, and to economic freedom. Now more than ever, we must do everything in our power to raise our voices against this extreme, rightwing agenda of discrimination. This is more than a debate about access to safe abortion services. This is about fighting for gender equality. This is about continuing to ensure access to the opportunity that comes from quality, affordable healthcare. And this is about making sure that access to reproductive healthcare is never restricted.

Women's rights are not negotiable. Republicans may intend to continue advancing their radical anti-choice agenda, but I will never back away from the fight against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, before Senator SASSE leaves, I say to the Senator, I just can't thank you enough for the passion and the persuasion you bring to these issues. You speak from the heart. You speak with reason. You make a lot of sense, and over time, you will prevail. Just stick with it. Your day will come.

What he is saying is, if you try to abort a child, and the child survives the abortion, shouldn't the doctor and the nurses and everybody involved treat the child the same as if they came into the world some other way? I think the answer is yes.

Really, these two pieces of legislation are about us as a nation. This is 2020. Who are we as Americans? To me it is odd that we even need to have a discussion about this. I am just perplexed that this is even a problem.

Abortion is legal in the United States. There are certain restrictions on it, but I just can't believe we can't rally around the idea that if a baby survives the procedure and is alive and breathing and functioning, medical science doesn't kick in to save the baby. It is just—I don't know. I don't know what happened. What happened to our country that we are even talking about this? It is 2020, for God's sake. It is not 1020.

Anyway, just hang in there, Ben. Your day will come.

My legislation—I have been doing this for a few years now. We are one of seven nations in the world that allow abortion on demand at 20 weeks, along with North Korea, Vietnam, China, Singapore, the Netherlands, and Canada. What would this legislation do at 20 weeks? This is about the fifth month in the birthing process.

The bill is called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. Why do we call it that? Medical science has determined that a child at 20 weeks is capable of feeling excruciating pain. So if there is an operation to save a child's life or to repair a medical defect at 20 weeks, they provide anesthesia to the child because, during the surgery, the child feels pain. You can see that when a child is poked, they actually repel against the poking.

The bottom line is, I find it odd that medical science requires anesthesia to save the baby's life, but during that same period, you can dismember the child. That is what we are talking about here.

What kind of Nation are we if, at the fifth month—this is 20 weeks into the birthing process—we are one of seven nations that allow abortion on demand? There are exceptions for the life of the mother—that hard decision if the mother's life is impacted by the child, and we will leave that up to the family—and if the pregnancy is as a result of rape or incest. But beyond that, we want to eliminate abortion on demand at the 20-week period because, I would argue, that doesn't make us a better nation. It doesn't advance anybody's cause.

The bottom line is, based on medical science, we know that this child has nerve endings intact. Medical encyclopedias encourage young parents to sing to their unborn child during this period of development because they can begin to associate their voice and recognize who they are. I find it odd that we would encourage young parents to sing to their unborn child at 20 weeks; we require anesthesia to save the child's life; but we are also a country that allows the child to be dismembered. It makes no sense to me. They have exceptions that make sense: life of the mother, the result of rape or incest where there is no choice at all.

The bottom line is that these two pieces of legislation are going to continue to be advanced until they pass. It takes a while for America to kind of get focused on what we are saying here because abortion is an uncomfortable topic to talk about, particularly in the

early stages of the pregnancy. But what Senator SASSE is saying is that in the case of the child surviving an abortion, there is really not much to talk about. We should protect the life that is now a being. The baby survived. I don't know why the baby survived. I don't know how the baby survived. I just know that decent people would want to come to the child's aid once she does survive.

Just imagine what it must be like, after the baby survives the abortion, to be left unattended for 1½ to 3 hours. That says a lot about us as a nation. I just think we are better than that.

It is kind of odd that we even have to have this debate, but apparently we do because this happens more than you would ever think. Babies actually survive abortion, and the rules in this country are that you just let it die. There is no longer required care. That, to me, as Senator SASSE said, is barbaric. It doesn't make us a better people, and it really doesn't affect the abortion debate because the baby survived.

My legislation is about us as a nation too. How does abortion on demand in the fifth month advance the cause of America? I don't think it does.

We have exceptions in those instances where it is a tragic choice between the life of the mother and the unborn child and in the cases of rape or incest, which are tragic and criminal, but generally speaking, we would like to get ourselves out of a club of seven nations that allow abortion on demand at a time when the parents are encouraged to sing to the child and you have to provide anesthesia to save the child's life because you would not want to operate on a baby in a fashion to hurt the child.

I dare say that if you are a doctor and you try to save the baby's life at 20 weeks through surgery and you don't provide anesthesia, you are going to wind up getting yourself in trouble. I find it odd that the law would allow the dismemberment of the child even with anesthesia, but that is where we are.

To Senator SASSE, I say that you are an articulate spokesman for your legislation. One day, we will prevail. It took 15 years to pass the late-term abortion ban. It is going to take a while, but our day will come.

At the end of the day, the sooner America can get this right, the better off we will be.

With that, 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 bill 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Chuck Grassley, Marsha Blackburn, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Mike Lee, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Braun, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham.

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 motion to proceed to S. 3275, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Casey	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

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

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 bill 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Ben Sasse, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Braun, Mitch McConnell.

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 motion to proceed to S. 311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Bennet	Duckworth	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Leahy
Booker	Feinstein	Markey
Brown	Gillibrand	Menendez
Cantwell	Harris	Merkley
Cardin	Hassan	Murphy
Carper	Heinrich	Murray
Coons	Hirono	Peters

Reed	Sinema	Van Hollen
Rosen	Smith	Warner
Schatz	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Schumer	Tester	Wyden
Shaheen	Udall	

NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Sanders	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56 and the nays are 41.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), 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 result was announced—yeas 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Graham	Perdue
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blunt	Heinrich	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	King	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sinema
Cramer	Loeffler	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Gardner	Paul	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Feinstein	Rosen
Bennet	Gillibrand	Schatz
Blumenthal	Harris	Schumer
Booker	Hassan	Shaheen
Brown	Hirono	Smith
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Peters	Wyden
Durbin	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 senior assistant 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 Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

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 Travis Greaves of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Ex.]

YEAS—91

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

NAYS—5

Booker	Harris	Markey
Gillibrand	Hirono	

NOT VOTING—4

Jones	Sanders
Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 91, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I rise to have a dialogue. Let me start it this way. My brother and I did not always agree on things. I know that may be shocking that two brothers did not get along on everything. Maybe in your house you got along on everything, but my brother and I, growing up, did not agree on everything.

In fact, growing up, I distinctly remember the day we reached epic levels, and we actually got masking tape out in our room and put a line down the floor that ran from one wall across to the other wall. We had an old-school stereo record player in our room. The line ran up the record player so that on one side he had the tuning knob and on the other side I had the volume knob. We would have to reach some sort of detente to listen to anything. If he turned it to a station I didn't like, I could turn the volume all the way down. We would have to work things out. The line even went through our closet, with his clothes and my clothes on it, and we had a clear line of separation that you could not cross that line. The rules were very clear in our room. For whatever reason, our mom put up with it for quite a while as we had our ''Don't cross the line into my side'' kind of moment.

It is interesting that today in the Senate there was in some ways kind of a line-drawing moment to not draw a line but to try to figure out where are our lines, where are our boundaries on an issue that Americans talk about all the time, in many ways, but always get nervous in that dialogue. It is the issue about when is a child a child.

We have this weird dialogue as a nation because we have a great passion for children. We spend a tremendous amount of money, personally, on our families and in our communities and in nonprofits and Federal taxpayer dollars to walk alongside children to do everything we can to protect the lives of those children.

We have some in this body who have proposed Federal taxpayer dollars for children in their very first days of life to have childcare that is available for them, but literally 3 days before that, they have also proposed Federal tax dollars for abortion to take that life.

It begs the question: Where is your line on life? What is that moment? For me, I go with the science. It is conception. That is a dividing cell that has DNA that is different than the mom and different than the dad. That dividing cell is a uniquely different person. Every science textbook, every medical textbook that you look at would identify that DNA is different than any other DNA in the world. That is a different person. As those cells grow and divide and as that child grows and divides, whether they are 50 years old or whether they are only days old still in womb, the DNA is the same. All the building blocks are in that child from their earliest days.

Others will look at it and will ask the question—like the Supreme Court did in 1973, when they ruled on Roe v. Wade on the issue of viability. That is when the Supreme Court said, in 1973, that States can engage and try to make some laws dealing with abortion, which is based around this issue of viability. Viability, in 1973, is very different than it is now. We have many children who are born at 21, 22, 23, 24 weeks gestation who are prematurely delivered, spend months in a NICU facility, and thrive as adults. That viability question is different now than it was in 1973, but we also know more about the science now than we knew at that time as well.

We know that a child—some would say on the science side of it—as early as 12 weeks old of development, still in the womb, can feel and experience pain. Certainly, by 20 weeks, 21, 22 weeks, they have developed a brain and have developed a nervous system. The system of experiencing pain is all in place. If anything happens to that child, that child will experience the pain and the effects of that.

The New York Times had a really interesting article in October 2017, talking about a young man, Charley Royer. When he was just at 24 weeks development in the womb, the parents made a very difficult decision to have a surgery in utero. It is spina bifida. The child would be paralyzed. The New York Times writes about how they did this surgery—this very intricate surgery—that happened at Texas Children's Hospital at Baylor College of Medicine. They basically delivered the child, doing surgery on that child, reinserting the uterus and the child back into the mom's womb, and then stayed all the way through until full gestation and was delivered.

Charley is apparently doing very well. It was a remarkable surgery. During that surgery, they made sure they helped that child and gave him additional medications to protect him from pain because they were doing surgery on someone who felt the effects of the surgery at 24 weeks.

Today we had a vote in the Senate to ask Senators, if you don't agree with me on this that the line should be conception, to consider that child a child at conception, would you consider that child a child when they can experience pain? They have a beating heart. They have a functioning nervous system. They have 10 fingers, 10 toes.

This is not a tissue we are talking about. This is what a child looks like in the womb at 20 to 22 weeks. That is a child. The question is, Is your line when that child has a beating heart, has a functioning nervous system, can experience pain? Is that your line?

We had that vote today. Unfortunately, this Senate body said no. The line is not at conception, and the line is not even when they look like this and can experience pain. That bill was voted down.

There are only four countries in the world that allow abortion on demand at any time—four countries left in the world that still abort children who look like this, who experience pain, who are in late term. It is the United States, North Korea, China, and Vietnam. That is all that is left in the world that looks at this and says that is just tissue; that is not really a baby.

This Senate voted again today to affirm that same club that we are in with China, North Korea, and Vietnam. That is not a club I want our Nation to be in. They are some of the worst human rights violators in the world, and they don't recognize the value and the dignity of life. We do, or at least I thought we did, but that is not where our line is, apparently.

Today we took another vote in the Senate, and it was a very clear line as well to say: OK. If your line is not at conception, and if it is not when the child can experience pain, and it is not a late-term abortion when the child is actually viable, maybe your line is actually when they are delivered, when they are fully out of the womb. We took a vote on a bill called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It is a very straightforward bill. It is not about abortion at all. It is about a child who is fully delivered.

In medical practice, there are times when there is a late-term abortion that in the procedure itself to actually conduct the abortion, instead of the child being aborted and killed in the womb, it is a spontaneous birth that actually occurs, and the child is actually fully delivered. The intent was to destroy the child in the womb, but that is not what happened. What happened, instead, in a small percentage of abortions, was that child was actually delivered. Now the question is, the child is no longer in the womb. The child is literally fully delivered and is crying on the table in front of you. What do you do? We asked the question of this body: Where is your line? Is your line at delivery? Even if the intent was originally abortion, that didn't occur, is your line at delivery? Unfortunately, this body voted no. We could not get 60 Senators of 100 to say even if a child is fully delivered outside of the womb,

crying on the table, that is a child. That is a frightening statement about where we are in our culture.

I have had all kinds of folks say: Well, this is not about infanticide. Infanticide is already illegal.

I said: Yes, that is true.

In 2002, there was unanimous support in this body, in the Senate, to pass a bill saying that if a child is delivered, that would be infanticide. The problem was, it left no consequences at all and allowed what still happens today where if a child is fully delivered, there are no consequences for allowing them to die on the table.

A couple of years ago, Kermit Gosnell was fully delivering children in his abortion clinic. He was fully delivering them, and then he would take scissors, flip the child over, and snip their spinal cord to kill them. He is in prison right now for carrying out that act because that was considered infanticide. But what is still legal is allowing the child to just lie there on the table until they slowly die.

Jill Stanek is a nurse who has practiced for years in Illinois. She gave testimony in a hearing not long ago and testified multiple times about what is going on in some of these abortion facilities and what happens when a child is fully delivered and they are still alive. In her experience, what she has watched before, she has noticed that children will live outside the womb. These are viable children lying on the table, or in her particular hospital, they literally took the child to a linen closet and closed the door and left him there. They would live somewhere between an hour and, some children, as long as 8 hours, just waiting to die. Ladies and gentlemen, in ancient times, it was called exposure when you would take a child and set them outside to die without medical care.

Our vote today was, if a child is fully delivered, should they get medical care, or should we just allow medical facilities to just back off and allow them to slowly die? And today this Senate could not get 60 votes to say we should at least give medical care to that child instead of allowing them to slowly die on the table on their own—a child literally crying, kicking their feet, but ignored. I would hope we are better than that as a country, but apparently the line has still not been discovered for the value of a child. I am one who believes that a child has great value, a child has great worth. Whether that child is a kindergartner or in the womb, that child has value. As a culture, we should stand for the value of every child.

I am amazed, absolutely amazed when I think about the fact that 100 years ago, my wife, my mom, and my daughters would not have been able to vote. I can't even process that 100 years ago, my wife, my mom, and my daughters would not have been allowed to vote in America. What were we thinking as Americans that we did that?

I am amazed that there was a time in America not that long ago where if you were of Japanese descent, they rounded you up, put you in camps, and held you, as an American citizen, just because you were of Japanese descent. I can't even process the fact that we did that as Americans.

I cannot believe there was a time in America where we looked at African Americans and said: That is three-fifths of a man. I cannot even process that was in our law, that we declared a human being three-fifths of a person.

I am so grateful that we no longer round up people because they are of Japanese descent, that we allow women to vote, and that we consider all people equal. I am so grateful that time has passed. I long for the day, which I believe is coming, that we as a nation look back and say: What were we thinking that we allowed children to live or die based on our convenience? And if a child was inconvenient, we just killed them or we set them on the table and allowed them to slowly die from exposure because they were inconvenient in the moment. There will be a day when we will look back on this season in American history and we will say: What were we thinking that we considered some children more valuable than others, that we considered some lives worth living and some to just be thrown away?

What is your line? When is a life worth protecting? When does life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness actually apply to you in America? I wish it was conception or at least when they can experience pain or at least when they are fully born, but this body has not yet found the moment when we can agree that life is valuable. I long for the day that we do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today to once again call upon the Senate to take immediate and urgent action to prevent Russia or any other foreign power from interfering in our 2020 elections. Since the last time I came to the Senate floor to talk about this issue, it has become only more urgent. The clock is ticking, and each day that goes by without the Senate taking action, this body becomes more complicit in the hijacking of our democracy by Vladimir Putin or other foreign powers that try to interfere in our elections.

Just in the last week, we have seen significant new developments. We know that the intelligence community briefed the House Intelligence Committee about ongoing Russian interference in our current elections.

We also know that upon learning about that briefing, upon hearing that the intelligence community was doing its job in keeping Congress informed about election interference, President Trump erupted upon hearing the news. He did not want the House of Representatives to know what the Russians were up to.

We know that soon after that briefing, President Trump unceremoniously fired his Acting Director of National Security, Joseph Maguire, who is a military veteran and a career public servant of great integrity. All of that, we know. And we know that President Trump replaced Mr. Maguire with an Acting Director who has no prior experience in the intelligence community and whose only qualification appears to be to tell President Trump what President Trump wants to hear when it comes to intelligence information or other matters.

None of us should be surprised to learn that the Russians are interfering again in our elections. They did it in 2016. That was the unanimous verdict of all our U.S. intelligence agencies. In fact, that was the verdict by the head of agencies who had been appointed by President Trump. That was also the bipartisan finding of the Senate Intelligence Committee. They found that there was some level of Russian interference in the 2016 elections in every State in the country, all 50 States. It was also the well-documented conclusion in the Muller report that brought a number of indictments against Russian operatives of the GRU.

Just last November, the leaders of the intelligence agencies—again, leaders appointed by the current President—all warned the Congress and the American people that the Russians and other foreign powers would seek to interfere in our elections in 2020. Those agencies included the heads of the NSA, the CRA, the FBI, the DNI, and others. Last November, all of them warned us about expected Russian interference in our elections. So it really should be no surprise that we learned last week of a briefing in the House where the intelligence community said: We told you so.

We have determined that the Russians are interfering right now in the ongoing 2020 elections. That shouldn't be surprising. What is surprising and what is shocking is that the Congress has done virtually nothing to prevent it. Think about that. We were warned in 2016. We have been warned repeatedly since then that the Russians are going to interfere in our 2020 elections. We now have a briefing about ongoing interference and still nothing. What does the President do in response to that information? He fires the head of the intelligence community. He fires him because he doesn't want him to tell Congress what the Russians are doing.

Just last month, in February, the Senate Intelligence Committee issued another report. It was another bipartisan report. What they did was they went back to look at what happened in

the 2016 elections—specifically in the lead-up to the 2016 elections—and asked themselves the question: Why, when we learned that there was some Russian interference, did we not notify and alert the country?

Their findings were interesting. They found that there were various political reasons. People had concerns about making that information public. In fact, the Republican leader, the majority leader here, was one of those who said: No, we should not inform the American people about that interference.

The Senate Intelligence Committee drew lessons from that, saying: We shouldn't be caught once again unprepared. That is what they said in the report just last month, and now we are sitting here today with the intelligence community telling us the Russians are interfering right now as we speak, and we are doing nothing about it. Our democracy is under attack, and we are just pretending things are going on as normal. You would think we would all agree that when our democracy is under attack, we should unify immediately and take every action necessary to prevent that.

What could and should we do?

We should harden our election systems. We should make sure that voting systems around the country are harder to hack. We should make sure that voter registration information is harder to hack, and we have dedicated some additional resources to that. We haven't done enough, but we have taken some small steps in that direction, as we should.

This is a situation in which the best defense is a good offense, and as long as Vladimir Putin and the Russians don't pay any price at all for interfering in our elections, it should be no surprise that they are going to keep on doing it. It is cost-free to them. In fact, they are gaining major benefits, and we see them around the country. They are succeeding in helping to divide Americans against one another. They are succeeding in undermining public confidence in the democratic system. That is exactly what Vladimir Putin wants to do here in the United States and among our allies in Europe and elsewhere around the world.

What should we do about it?

After we learned of what happened in 2016, Senator RUBIO and I introduced a bipartisan bill. It is called the DETER Act. In addition to Senator RUBIO and me, we have Republican and Democratic cosponsors.

What does the bill do?

It is pretty straightforward. It says to Vladimir Putin and other foreign powers: If we catch you interfering in a future election, you will pay a price. That price will be immediate, and it will be severe. So, if you are thinking about what benefits you might gain from interfering in an American election, you will know there will also be a big price to pay.

That is the legislation that Senator RUBIO and I introduced back in 2017. It has not gotten a vote here in the U.S. Senate. It has not gotten it. It didn't have a vote in the last Congress, so we reintroduced it in this Congress.

Now, last fall, when we were taking up the National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA, the Senate agreed that part of our national defense meant defending our democracy and part of our defending our democracy meant defending the integrity of our elections. So we unanimously, by a voice vote here in the Senate, said that the Defense authorization bill should include a provision like the DETER Act, that it should include a provision that says to the Russians and other foreign powers: If we catch you interfering in an election, there will be a severe price to pay.

When I talk about a severe price, I mean sanctions on their economies, sanctions on their major banks, sanctions on the energy sectors—real economic pain, not imposing sanctions on a few oligarchs, but real pain. That is what the Senate said we should do as part of the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Guess what happened?

When the conferees—when the negotiators—went behind closed doors, the White House essentially told the Senate conferees: Huh-uh, we don't want you adopting these important protections—protections to defend the integrity of our democracy.

So, despite that unanimous Senate vote, it just disappeared in the middle of the night from the negotiations over the Defense authorization bill.

What do we do?

The clock is ticking, and it is time for the Senate to do now what it said it wanted to do when we unanimously passed that motion to instruct the conferees to pass something like the DETER Act as part of the Defense bill, and we are, right now, engaged in ongoing discussions with the chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee to try to finally get this bill—this bipartisan bill—out of the U.S. Senate. I hope we make progress because what appears to be the situation is that the White House is essentially putting up a massive roadblock to progress on this matter.

It is not our job in the U.S. Senate to simply do the bidding of this President or of any other President. It is the duty of this Senate to protect our democracy against what we know is an ongoing attack on the integrity of our elections.

That is why I am here on the floor right now, because we just got the news last week that everything we had been warned about in terms of expected Russian interference in our 2020 elections is coming true. So we have a missile aimed at the integrity of our elections, and the Senate is doing nothing about it. It is unbelievable and grossly negligent to know, in realtime, that our elections are being undermined and to take no action.

I just want to say to my colleagues that, if we don't move forward on the bipartisan DETER Act in the coming days and make progress in the coming days, I will be back here on the Senate floor next week, and I will ask for unanimous consent to bring it up. If Senators want to come down here in the light of day and say no—no to bipartisan legislation that protects our democracy—they can do that, but we are going to keep at this, and with every day that goes by, we learn more about what is happening now.

I close with what I said before: We should not be surprised that Vladimir Putin is interfering in our elections. He did it in 2016, and we have been told ever since then that he will do it again. What is surprising and shocking and grossly negligent is that this body has not taken action to date to protect our democratic process. We are going to keep fighting until we get that done.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Would the Senator accept a question?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, I would be delighted to entertain a question.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, just for the reference of everyone, I believe the majority leader is going to come in for his closing script. When he does, that will end whatever little colloquy we will have had here, and I will then do my ''Time to Wake Up'' speech.

In the time that it takes the majority leader to get here, I am interested in hearing the Senator from Maryland say that the White House—our White House—the President of the United States—is a massive roadblock to protecting the integrity of our upcoming election from foreign interference. How does that make sense? Why would it be an American President who doesn't want to defend the integrity of an American election from foreign interference?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the question.

All I can say is we have seen a pattern from this President. We saw this President, President Trump, in Helsinki a few years ago, standing next to Vladimir Putin, and our President was the one who threw our intelligence community under the bus. He said he trusted Vladimir Putin when Putin told him, Don't worry, President Trump. We didn't interfere in your elections.

President Trump said: OK. I think President Putin may be right about our intelligence community.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. He did say it very strongly.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. He did, and we have seen that pattern over and over again.

We just learned of this briefing that took place in the House of Representatives this week. The response from President Trump was not, Oh, my goodness. Let's pass this legislation. It was to fire the guy who was in charge of the intelligence community.

So what do you think?

It is a mystery to all of us as to why the President is taking this action other than the fact that, of course, he did call on Russia in the last election and welcomed its support. We all saw him on national television when he did that.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Yes.

In fact, even the Mueller report showed that there was considerable Russian activity and support in the election that made Donald Trump our President. They couldn't prove an ongoing conspiracy between the Trump campaign and the Russian election interference effort, but they confirmed that there was a Russian election interference effort. If I recall correctly, they confirmed that the Trump campaign was witting of it, just not conspiring with it, just not directly engaged with it.

So I don't know. Perhaps it is just the hope that, perhaps, he will get elected again with foreign interference and that he doesn't want to close off that option, but it is a little bit odd for the President of the United States not to take the protecting of the security of the American election more seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am glad Senator WHITEHOUSE made that distinction with respect to the Mueller report.

It is true that they did not find a criminal conspiracy, meaning they did not find some agreement between the Trump campaign and the Russians to interfere, but they found plenty of evidence of the Trump campaign's welcoming the intervention from the Russians.

Of course, we have more recently seen President Trump spreading the conspiracy theories that were launched by Vladimir Putin that it was not the Russians who interfered in the 2016 elections: Oh, my God. It was the Ukrainians who interfered in the 2016 elections.

There is this famous videotape now of Vladimir Putin's saying: Thank God, they are not blaming the Russians anymore. They are blaming the Ukrainians.

Translation: Thank God our propaganda is working, and even the President of the United States and some Members of the House of Representatives are parroting our conspiracy theory, the ones that we cooked up.

It is really alarming that a foreign government—someone like Vladimir Putin—is so successful in spreading its misinformation within our system.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Maryland on this, and I wish him success with his legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the Senator for his questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I come to again raise an alarm about the massive carbon pollution that we are dumping into our natural world and to tell the stories of two ocean creatures that are suffering from that pollution. Now, we may mock or ignore these creatures—these lesser creatures so far down the food chain from us—but we are fools to ignore the message of what is happening to them.

Matthew 25:41 admonishes, ''as you did it to one of the least of these . . . you did it to me.'' So we ought not mock and ignore these lesser species because they also have a lesson for us, a warning. If we keep up what we are doing to them, it will soon enough be we who suffer. As Pope Francis warned: Slap Mother Nature, and she will slap you back.

Let's start, before we get to the two species, with an overview.

First, it is not just these two species. Science writer Elizabeth Kolbert has warned that we have entered a sixth great extinction—the first and only great extinction in humans' time on the planet—and that this great extinction is driven by manmade pollution and climate change. Scientists from around the globe have just issued one of the most comprehensive reports ever on Earth's biodiversity, and the head of that panel, Sir Robert Watson, summarized its findings this way.

I quote him here:

> The overwhelming evidence . . . presents an ominous picture. The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.

The legendary David Attenborough warns that we face what he calls ''irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.''

He says: ''It may sound frightening, but the scientific evidence is that if we have not taken dramatic action within the next decade, we could face irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies.''

In all of this, we need to remember our oceans. Oceans are warming and acidifying and literally suffocating ocean species as oxygen dead zones expand. Earth's oceans warm at the rate of multiple Hiroshima explosions' worth of heat per second—per second. They acidify at the fastest rate in at least 50 million years. They are also fouled with our plastic garbage and polluted by runoff from farming and stormwater. Our oceans' warnings are loud and clear and measurable. They are chronicled by fishermen and sailors and measured with thermometers, tide gauges, and simple pH tests that measure acidification.

It is this acidification that takes me to these two species. The oceans are absorbing around 30 percent of our excess carbon dioxide emissions, and they do that in a chemical interaction that takes up the CO_2 but acidifies the seawater. Don't pretend there is any dispute about this. Acidification is a chemical phenomenon. You can demonstrate it in a middle school science lab. You can demonstrate it with your breath, an aquarium bubbler, a glass of water, and a pH strip. In fact, I have done so right at this desk.

Here is the first species pictured—the tiny pteropod. It is an oceanic snail about the size of a small pea. It is known as the sea butterfly because it has adapted two butterflylike wings that can propel it around in the ocean.

Acidifying waters make it harder for pteropods and a lot of other shelled creatures to grow their shells and develop from juveniles to adults. Researchers in the Pacific Northwest have reported what they called ''severe shell damage'' on more than half of the pteropods they collected from Central California to the Canadian border.

These images show the pteropod's shell when the creature's underwater environment becomes more acidic—not good for pteropods. Maintaining their shells against that acidity requires energy—energy that would otherwise go into growth or reproduction. So acidification makes it harder for species, such as the pteropods and other shell creatures at the base of the oceanic food chain, to survive.

Who cares? Who cares about the lowly, humble pteropod? Who cares about some stupid ocean snail? Well, for one, salmon do. Half the diet of some salmon species in the Pacific is pteropods. Salmon fisheries support coastal jobs and economies across our Pacific Northwest. Offshore fishing in the United States is a multibillion dollar industry connected to hundreds of thousands of livelihoods. If you care about our fisheries industry, you should care about the humble pteropod. An entire food chain stands on its tiny back, and we are in that food chain.

Move up the food chain a little, and you find another creature facing peril from acidification—the Dungeness crab. You see this crustacean on ice in your local fish market. It is an important commercial catch along our west coast. In 2014, the last year the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission did a comprehensive report, the Dungeness catch was worth $170 million. It is Oregon's most valuable fishery, and it is important also for Washington State and for California, where annual landings run between $40 and $95 million. Up north, in 2017, Alaska's commercial landings of Dungeness crabs totaled more than 2.1 million pounds.

Last month, marine scientists reported that acidified oceans are dissolving the delicate shells of Dungeness crab larvae. The acidic environment is not just damaging the shells but also damaging the larvae's mechanoreceptors, the hairlike sensory organs that crabs use to hear and feel and make their way around the sea. The damage to the crabs is bad news, but worse is that we are seeing it now. Scientists thought hardy Dungeness crabs wouldn't be affected by acidification for decades. Richard Feely, senior NOAA scientist and coauthor of the study, reports that these ''dissolution

impacts to the crab larvae . . . were not expected to occur until much later in this century.''

The sentinel implications for the entire ecosystem are grave. If the Dungeness are feeling the effects of ocean acidification now, what other creatures are feeling those effects too? Another lead author of this study said: ''If the crabs are affected already, we really need to make sure we start to pay much more attention to various components of the food chain before it is too late.''

These concerns about the Dungeness crab and its happening too soon echo what scientists actually said of early findings about the pteropod. Oceanographer William Peterson, who is the coauthor of an early study on the pteropod, said: ''We did not expect to see pteropods being affected to this extent in our coastal region for several decades.''

So we are way ahead of schedule in terms of what scientists have predicted for ocean acidification outcomes for these foundational creatures in our ocean ecosystem. Together, the pteropod and the Dungeness crab send a common message, one echoed by a Rhode Island fishing boat captain who told me: ''Sheldon, things are getting weird out there.''

And they are getting weird faster than expected. The rapid ocean acidification that we are measuring now and that we are causing now with further carbon pollution is nearly unprecedented in the geological record. Scientists look back to try to find historical analogs for what is happening. The closest historical analogs scientists can find for what they are seeing now in the oceans go back before humankind. There is no analog in human time. You have to go back before humans existed, back into the prehistoric record, back to the prehistoric great extinctions, back when marine species were wiped out and ocean ecosystems took millions of years to recover. That is the historical analog that best matches our current direction.

In his encyclical ''Laudato Si,'' Pope Francis, who is a trained scientist himself, reflected on what he called ''the mysterious network of relations between things'' in life. In that mysterious network of relations between things, the pteropod and the crab larva give their lives to transmit food energy from the microscopic plants they eat, which would be of no use to us, up to the fish that consume the pteropod and larva—fish, which we, in turn, consume—all in that great mysterious network of relations between things.

What is happening to these two species is more than just an event. It is a signal. It is a signal of a looming global ecological catastrophe. Lesser species, species that we may mock or ignore, can sometimes be sentinels for humans, like the legendary canaries taken down into coal mines. When the sentinels start to die, it is wise to pay attention.

What happens when, in our arrogance and pride, we refuse to heed the warnings from creatures so humble as the pteropods or crab larvae? Well, remember why Jesus was so angry with the Pharisees. What was their sin? Their arrogance and their pride blinded them to the truth. The Senate, this supposedly greatest deliberative body, has blinded itself to the devastation fossil fuels are unleashing on our Earth's mysterious network. We careen recklessly into the next great extinction.

Pope Francis says:

> Because of us, thousands of species will no longer give glory to God by their very existence, nor convey their message to us. We have no such right.

Indeed, we have no such right.

So I come here today to challenge us to see the damage we have done—the damage we are doing now, today, to this mysterious network of life, this mysterious God-given network of life that supports us. I challenge us also to turn away from dark forces of corruption and greed—specifically, the fossil fuel industry forces that have deliberately, on purpose, crippled our ability in Congress to stop their pollution.

I close by challenging us to heed the message of the humble creatures sharing this planet with us—the least of us, who share God's creation. They suffer at our hands, and in their suffering they send us a message, a warning, that we would do well to hear.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam 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 INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, when one looks at a largely unified and democratic Europe, today it is easy to forget just how different it was in Eastern Europe not that long ago. For half a century, millions lived under the tyranny and repression of the Soviet Union.

But in the late 1980s, things began to change, particularly in the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Who can forget when 2 million people joined hands across these three nations to form the 420-mile Baltic Chain of Freedom in August 1989? And not long after in February of the following year, Lithuania held its first free elections since World War II, voting for the country's first postwar non-Communist government. Immediately thereafter, the new Parliament voted to make Lithuania the first occupied Soviet republic to declare independence. Lithuania's bold move was followed later that year by Latvia and Estonia. These brave efforts culminated a year later in February 1991, when the Lithuania people overwhelmingly voted for independence—a historic move recognized by the US and Soviet Union that same year.

My first visit to Lithuania was nearly 40 years ago, but my ties reach back even further. One hundred years ago, my grandmother left her village of Jubarkas with her three small children to join my grandfather in America. In her arms, she carried a 2-year-old toddler—my mother, Ona Kutkaite.

Hidden in my grandmother's baggage was a small Catholic prayer book, printed in Vilnius in 1863, the last year before printing in Lithuanian was outlawed by the czars. That prayer book—the last, cherished relic of my family's life in their beautiful and ancient home—escaped the czars and was kept safe with our family in America during the brutal Soviet occupation. When I had the honor of addressing the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on the 20th anniversary of independence, I was proud to bring that prayer book home to a free Lithuania. Those brave Lithuanians 30 years ago—including my friend Vytautus Landsbergis, who served as Lithuanian's first post-independence head of state—led the country to a prosperous and democratic future.

Lithuania today is a vital member of the European Union, NATO, and the community of democracies. It held the presidency of the European Union earlier this decade and is a leading voice on the continent for standing up to Russia, defending Ukraine, and upholding key democratic values. And as it faces renewed threats from Russia, I have been a strong supporter of strengthening NATO operations and defenses in the Baltic nations. A few years ago, I visited the Lithuanian town of Rukla, where U.S. and German forces were rotating through as part of the European Reassurance Initiative aimed at keeping the Baltic safe.

As the cochair of the Senate Baltic Caucus, I will be introducing a resolution in the weeks ahead reaffirming this security cooperation and recognizing Lithuania's great achievements around its 30th anniversary of independence.

In February 1990, when I came to Lithuania as part of an American delegation to observe the historic elections, my friends took me inside the Seimas to show me the arsenal of the Lithuanian freedom fighters. In the corner stood a handful of old rifles—no

match for the Soviet war machine. But Lithuanians were armed with stronger weapons—faith, courage, and a burning desire to reclaim their independence. Because of the sacrifices of so many patriots, known and unknown, we can proudly and without fear proclaim here today on the 30th anniversary of these historic events: Laisva Lietuva. Free Lithuania. Now and always.

So let us use this historic anniversary to recommit to our continued support for our Baltic allies through economic and security cooperation and to reaffirm America's commitment to NATO and the enduring transatlantic alliance. Doing so will help ensure the next 30 years of the longstanding U.S.-Baltic friendship are equally strong and fruitful.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ERIE HOUSE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, Florence Hayden Towne dedicated her book, ''Neighbor: Stories of Neighborhood House Work in a Great City,'' to the Erie Neighborhood House. She wrote, it ''brought new hope and courage and a new way of life these whom we call 'neighbors.''' Throughout its 150-year history, the Erie House has consistently improved the lives of low-income, immigrant families in Chicago. Though the people, challenges, and times may have changed, the Erie House's mission has remained firm. Immigrant families have always found Erie House to be a place that empowers them and helps creates a more engaged community. Today, we celebrate the great work of Erie House and congratulate its staff and supporters on the 150th anniversary.

Erie Neighborhood House began as Holland Presbyterian Church on the corner of North Noble Street and West Erie Street in 1870. The congregation offered several programs, including kindergarten and Sunday school, to the new families arriving from Dutch, Scandinavian, and German countries to the West Chicago neighborhood. The congregation moved to 1347 West Erie Street and changed its name to Erie Chapel in 1886. In 1893, Erie Kindergarten became one of the 20 flagship programs in Chicago's Free Kindergarten Association initiative and expanded youth programs to include choirs for children and adults and industrial classes.

As the neighborhood immigrant population changed to include Catholic countries like Poland and Italy, Erie Chapel renamed itself the Erie Chapel Institute and continued to serve the community and advance the settlement house tradition. In 1936, the staff rechristened the 1347 building with a new name, the Erie Neighborhood House.

Erie Neighborhood House continued to meet the challenges of the time. In 1942, with the Second World War raging, Erie House began providing daycare services since many men were deployed overseas and many women had entered the workforce. In February 1945, Reverend Douglas Cedarleaf marched with members of Erie House to protest the treatment of the Strongs, a Black family that had recently moved into a White community and faced violence from their neighbors.

In 1957, volunteer physicians at Northwestern Memorial and Erie Neighborhood House founded the Erie Family Health Center to provide a variety of primary care, case management, and dental services to low-income, underinsured, and uninsured Chicagoans. Now, every year, nearly 38,000 patients receive high-quality healthcare at the center, regardless of their ability to pay.

With the crisis in housing growing in the late 1960s, Erie House founded the Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation to create affordable housing opportunities for members of the community. Since its founding, Bickerdike has developed more than 2,000 affordable homes for families.

Today, the West Town and Little Village neighborhoods are primarily Latino, and Erie Neighborhood House is helping people with the tools they need to build a foundation for greater well-being. Erie House has hosted me several times and has been an important ally in working toward comprehensive immigration reform and supporting Dreamers, providing legal consultation and representing people in immigration and asylum cases.

The blueprint created 150 years ago has evolved, but that mission has remained constant. Today, Erie House helps 18,000 people all across the city of Chicago annually. Young people and adults attend mentoring programs and learn about career opportunities. Families experiencing violence can find counseling. Erie House remains an essential ally as we work toward a just, inclusive society where we accept our new neighbors and help them achieve their potential.

Congratulations to Erie Neighborhood House on 150 years of good work, giving people hope and courage.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

ABORTION

● Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, today I would like to speak in opposition to two dangerous pieces of legislation that were considered in the Senate, both of which would severely undermine women's constitutional right to safe and legal abortions. One bill, S. 3275, the so-called Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act, would create a national 20-week abortion ban, while the other, S. 311, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, would attempt to scare providers who perform abortions out of business by subjecting them to penalties or even prison.

Let me be clear. These bills are not about protecting babies. These bills are about telling women what they can and cannot do with their own bodies and making their own medical decisions for them. Today in the United States, we have some of the highest maternal mortality rates and infant mortality rates in the developed world. This crisis is only worsened by the racial and economic disparities many women face in our country, in addition to the reality that some 87 million Americans are either uninsured or underinsured. Instead of helping our Nation make progress toward eliminating these disparities, such as by guaranteeing affordable healthcare, including abortion, as a right, this legislation would bring us back to the dark ages when women in America did not have the right to control their own bodies. It is a simple reality that, if the Senate votes to deny women access to safe and legal abortion, many of them will suffer and perhaps even die. I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 3275 and S. 311. Thank you.●

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in 1619, Africans were first brought to Virginia, against their will, to be enslaved. From that moment on, White Americans systematically and violently denied the rights of citizenship to Black Americans. The adoption of the 15th Amendment, ratified in February 1870, was a historic effort to correct course. It recognized the right of all male citizens, including Black men, to vote. This amendment was the first time that we promised to protect the right of African Americans to full and equal participation in our democracy.

In the 150 years since then, we have tried to expand on that promise many times, like when women of all races and ethnicities finally won the right to vote in 1920. Yet our promise remains elusively unfulfilled. Today, in honor of Black History Month, I would like to take a moment to discuss the trajectory of that broken promise, as well as its impact on our character as a nation.

We began to break our promise shortly after we made it. During the Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras, White men and women across the country developed a number of techniques—some obvious and brutal, some subtle and pernicious—to keep African Americans away from the polls and out of government.

The broader goal of these tactics was to hamper the Black population's ability to recover from slavery by blocking their access to education and the economic means of building wealth.

I believe that it is important to acknowledge that Maryland partook in these pernicious behaviors right alongside other States. Maryland residents and government officials engaged in ballot tampering, imposed literacy and property restrictions, stoked racist fears to galvanize the White vote, and intimidated Black voters using outright violence.

My intention here is not to condemn my home State. To the contrary, I am exceedingly proud of the struggles for justice that have bloomed in Maryland through abolitionists like Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglas and civil rights leaders like Thurgood Marshall. I draw inspiration from the lineage of African-American public servants in Maryland who overcame enormous obstacles in order to amplify the voices of their brothers and sisters.

These public servants include Verda Welcome, the first Black woman ever elected to any State's senate, as well as Adrienne Jones, the current speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates, who is the first African American and first woman to serve in that position.

They also include my friend and hero, Congressman Elijah Cummings, the son of sharecroppers who devoted his life to fighting for equality and fairness and lifting up our beloved community of Baltimore.

I am likewise grateful for all of the Marylanders whose names we might not know, but who nevertheless work every day to expand educational equity, reform our justice system, shrink the wealth gap, deliver healthcare, and otherwise make our society better. Thanks to brave and dedicated people like these in Maryland and across the country, we have made significant strides toward racial justice.

I began my remarks by discussing Maryland's bleaker moments in history for two reasons. First, to demonstrate that we must never take progress for granted—Maryland has not always been a tolerant, inclusive State, it did not become one by accident, and it will not continue to be one unless we work to make it so. Democracy and the rule of law do not just happen; we need to protect and nourish them every day.

Second, to illuminate how those injustices that still exist, of which there are many, are not new and are not incidental—they are not just disparate effects of forces beyond our control. They are deeply rooted in policies and systems intentionally designed to subjugate African Americans.

One of the strongest, most disheartening examples of this phenomenon is the ongoing assault on the right to vote. This is not ancient history. States all over the country continue to ''modernize'' strategies developed a century ago to suppress African-American voting power. Some of these strategies are blatant and recognizable, like mass purges of voter rolls; the gerrymandering of districts with ''surgical precision,'' according to one court; and intimidation of Black voters. Some of the strategies are disguised behind excuses or fear tactics, like obstructive voter ID laws and felony disenfranchisement.

Regardless, these tools of oppression are alive and operating as intended.

One in every 13 African Americans has lost his or her right to vote because of felony disenfranchisement. Seventy percent of the voters purged from one State's roll in 2018 were African Americans. Studies reveal that implementing strict voter ID laws widens the Black-White turnout gap by more than 400 percent.

So long as we allow these sorts of practices to continue under the exaggeration of voter ''fraud,'' we are denying African Americans their full right to vote and breaking the promise we made 150 years ago. This is a problem on principle, of course, but also for practical reasons; when we exclude people from fully participating in our democracy, we prevent them from achieving the social, economic, and civic reforms they need to strengthen their families and communities.

So what are we going to do about that? I know what I will do; I will fight for laws that will guarantee every American a voice in our democracy. That is why I have introduced bills to restore the Federal right to vote to ex-offenders and to penalize the voter intimidation and deception efforts so frequently aimed at people of color. These measures alone will not eliminate suppression of the Black vote, but they are steps in the right direction.

The racism that we vowed to root out a long time ago is still here. We may have reined it in, or it may have taken new forms that we do not recognize yet, but it is still here.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. remarked, ''It may be true that the law cannot make a man love me, but it can keep him from lynching me.'' It is true that we cannot legislate love, but we can and must legislate equality.

Until we guarantee the right to vote regardless of race, we fall short of the unique promise and potential of the United States of America. How can we be, at last, the Shining City on the Hill, while we continue to deny people their right to vote because of the color of their skin?

For the sake of our democracy and our common humanity, for the sake of those who have suffered and died, for the sake of those living and those yet to come, let us make good on our 150-year-old promise.

Let us build on the progress we have achieved, and let us stay vigilant about the threats that remain. Let us fulfill the right to vote.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, the country is deeply divided on multiple issues right now. The impeachment trial is both a symptom of our times and another example of our division. At the beginning of our Nation, we did not have an impeachment inquiry of a President for almost 100 years with the partisan impeachment of Andrew Johnson. After more than 100 years, another impeachment inquiry was conducted when the House began a formal impeachment inquiry into President Nixon in an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 410–4. Within a period of weeks, President Nixon resigned before he was formally impeached. Then, just over two decades later, President Clinton was impeached by the House, on another mostly partisan vote leading to a partisan acquittal in the Senate.

This season of our history has been referred to as the Age of Investigations and the Age of Impeachment. We have had multiple special counsels since 1974 over multiple topics. This is more than just oversight; it has been a unique time in American history when the politics of the moment have driven rapid calls for investigation and impeachment. Over the past 3 years, the House of Representatives has voted four times to open an impeachment inquiry: once in 2017, once in 2018, and twice in 2019. Only the second vote in 2019 actually passed and began a formal inquiry.

The Mueller investigation that consumed most of 2018 and 2019 answered many questions about Russian attacks on our voting systems—although no votes were changed—but it was also a $32 million investigation that took more than 2 years of America's attention. For the last 4 months the country has been consumed with impeachment hearings and investigations. The first rumors of issues with Ukraine arose August 28 when POLITICO published a story about U.S. foreign aid being slow-walked for Ukraine, and then on September 18 when the Washington Post published a story about a whistleblower report that claimed President Trump pressured an unnamed foreign head of state to do an investigation for his campaign.

Within days of the Washington Post story on September 24, Speaker PELOSI announced that the House would begin hearings to impeach the President, which led to the formal House vote to open the impeachment inquiry on October 31 and then a vote to impeach the President on December 18. But after the partisan vote to impeach the President, Speaker PELOSI held the Articles of Impeachment for a month before turning them over to the Senate, which began the formal trial of the President of the United States on January 16, 2020. After hearing hours of arguments from both House managers and the President's legal defense team and Senators asking 180 questions to both sides, the trial concluded February 5, 2020.

There are key dates to know:

April 21, 2019, President Zelensky is elected President of Ukraine.

May 21, President Zelensky sworn in. After the ceremony, President Zelensky abolishes Parliament and calls for quick snap elections on July 21.

July 21, Ukrainian Parliamentary elections. President Zelensky's party wins a huge majority.

July 25, President Trump calls President Zelensky to congratulate him and his party.

August 12, An unnamed whistleblower working in the U.S. intelligence

community filed a complaint that he had heard from others that the President of the United States had tried to pressure President Zelensky of Ukraine to investigate former Vice President Joe Biden on an official phone call July 25, 2019.

August 26, the Inspector General for the Intelligence Community declares the whistleblower report ''an urgent matter'' and asks for its release within 7 days. The Justice Department looks over the report and notes that although it was written by a person in the intelligence community, it is not related to intelligence matters, so it does not fall within the Inspector General's jurisdiction and it is forwarded on to the Department of Justice for review.

August 28, POLITICO publishes a story that the annual military aid for Ukraine is currently being slow-walked.

September 9, the Inspector General contacts the House Intelligence Committee to let them know that he has not been able to release the whistleblower report to their committee.

September 13, the House Intelligence Committee subpoenas the whistleblower report.

September 18, the Washington Post prints a story with ''unnamed sources'' that there is a whistleblower report about the President talking with a foreign leader about a campaign matter.

September 24, the House began an informal impeachment inquiry after Speaker Pelosi announced it at a press conference in the U.S. Capitol.

September 25, President Trump released the official unredacted ''read out'' of the phone call with President Zelensky from July 25.

September 26, the whistleblower report is declassified and released publicly.

October 31, the House formally votes along party lines for an impeachment inquiry.

December 18, the House votes to impeach the President with two articles—abuse of Power and obstruction of congress

January 15, Speaker PELOSI releases the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate.

January 16, Senate trial on impeachment begins.

February 5, Senate trial concludes with acquittal on both articles.

Ukraine became independent in 1991 when it broke away from the Soviet Union, but the Ukrainians have faced constant pressure from Russia ever since. In 2014 Ukraine forced out its pro-Russia President, and Moscow retaliated by taking over Crimea—and stealing the Ukrainian Navy—then rolling tanks into eastern Ukraine and taking all of eastern Ukraine by force. Russian and Ukrainian troops continue to fight every day in eastern Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine face an aggressive Russia on the east and pervasive Soviet era corruption throughout the government and the business community. President Trump met the previous President of Ukraine in 2017 to talk about other countries helping Ukraine with greater military support funds and to ask how Ukraine could address corruption on a wider scale. The two Presidents also spoke about lethal aid—allowing the Ukrainians to buy sniper rifles, anti-tank Javelin missiles, and other lethal supplies—to help them fight the invading Russians. The United States also started sending a couple hundred American troops to train Ukrainian soldiers in the far west of Ukraine.

On April 21, 2019, President Zelensky was overwhelmingly elected as the new President of Ukraine. He was a sitcom actor/comedian who had no political experience but was well known for his television show in which he played the part of a corruption-fighting teacher who was elected as President of Ukraine. His television popularity helped him win the election, but when he was sworn in on May 21, he was relatively unknown to most of the world.

On the same day as his inauguration, May 21, President Zelensky abolished Parliament and called for snap elections to put his party in power. With a new President in place and parliamentary elections in Ukraine coming, starting in June of 2019, the President ordered foreign aid to Ukraine to be held until the end of the fiscal year, but agencies were informed that they should do all the preliminary work needed before the aid was sent, so it would be ready to release at a moment's notice. The leadership in Ukraine was not notified that there was a hold on their foreign aid.

The new Parliament was elected on July 21, and President Zelensky's party won by a landslide. By mid-August, the new Parliament was working on anti-corruption efforts and trying to establish a high court on corruption, which they put in place September 5, 2019. There was a tremendous amount of uncertainty in the early days of the new administration, but by mid-August there was clear evidence of actual change in a country that desperately needed a new direction from its corrupt past.

On July 25, when President Trump called President Zelensky, the President congratulated President Zelensky for the big win in Parliament and talked about ''burden-sharing''—other nations also paying their share of support for Ukraine. The two Presidents talked about their disapproval of the previous mbassadors to each other's countries. But instead of following all the staff preparation notes written by Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, the National Security Council staffer assigned to Ukraine, and just talking about ''corruption'' in general, the President brought up a question about Ukraine and the 2016 election interference, which I will note below. President Zelensky also brought up to President Trump that his staff was planning to meet with Rudy Giuliani, President Trump's personal attorney, in the coming days, which led to a conversation about Joe Biden and the firing of the previous prosecutor in Ukraine.

After the call, Lieutenant Colonel Vindman contacted an attorney at the National Security Council to express his ''policy concerns'' about the call. It is interesting to note that Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's boss, Tim Morrison, was also on the call, but he did not see any problems or concerns with the call according to his own testimony in the House impeachment inquiry. Within a month, a whistleblower filed a report about the call, saying he heard about the call secondhand and was concerned about the implications of a conversation about elections on a head-of-state call. To keep the July 25th call in context with other news, the day before it took place July 24 Robert Mueller had testified before Congress as the last official act to close down the 2½ year Mueller investigation and clear the President and his campaign team of any further accusation of election interference.

During the impeachment trial in the Senate, the House managers repeated over and over that the President was planning to cheat ''again'' on the next election, but the final conclusion of the Mueller report was that ''ultimately, the investigation did not establish that the (Trump) Campaign coordinated or conspired with the Russian government in its election-interference activities.''

This is especially notable because for years a rumor circulated that Ukraine was part of the 2016 election interference and that someone in Ukraine was hiding the Democratic National Committee, DNC, server that was hacked by the Russians in 2016. As the conspiracy theory goes, it was actually the Ukrainians who hacked the DNC, not the Russians. This is the ''Crowdstrike'' theory that President Trump asked President Zelensky to help solve during the call.

Agencies of the U.S. intelligence community have stated over and over that they did not believe that Ukraine was involved in the Russian election interference from 2016. I personally agree with the intelligence community assessment but Rudy Giuliani and multiple others around President Trump believed there was a secret plan in 2016 to hurt President Trump's election from Ukraine. This accusation was amplified by bits of truth, including that the Ukrainian Ambassador to the United States wrote an editorial in support of Hillary Clinton in 2016 right before the election, and several other Ukrainian officials publicly spoke out against Candidate Trump in 2016.

There is nothing illegal about a foreign nation speaking out for or against a Presidential candidate, whether Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump in 2016 or anyone else in the future. It may not be wise to take sides before an election, but it is not illegal. Just because some Ukrainian officials took sides

does not mean that the whole Ukrainian Government worked on a cyber attack on our elections. But since this rumor had persisted, and it was a new administration now in Ukraine, President Trump asked President Zelensky to help clear up the facts if he could. That is certainly not illegal or improper, and it is certainly not something that could help the President in the 2020 election, especially since the 2016 Russian election accusation had just been closed the day before.

The 2016 ''Crowdstrike'' theory is the issue that President Trump asked President Zelensky to ''do us a favor'' about, not the Bidens or Burisma. During the July 25 call after the question about ''Crowdstrike,'' President Zelensky mentioned to President Trump that one of his advisers would be meeting with Rudy Giuliani soon. Then, President Trump affirmed that meeting and encouraged them to talk about the Biden investigation and the firing of the Ukrainian prosecutor.

That may seem out of the blue, but in Washington, D.C., that week, the city was buzzing about a Washington Post article that had been written 3 days before July 22, 2019—detailing Hunter Biden's giant salary—$83,000 per month—for doing essentially nothing for a corrupt Ukrainian natural gas company and how it undercut Vice President Biden's message on corruption.

It is important to get the context of that week to understand the context of the phone call that day. I have no doubt that the story was just as big of news in Kiev, Ukraine, as it was in Washington, D.C., that week. President Trump's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, had been in and out of Ukraine since November 2018, meeting with government officials and trying to find out more about the ''Crowdstrike'' theory or any other Ukrainian connection to the 2016 election. During that time, Rudy Giuliani met several former prosecutors from Ukraine who blamed their departure on Vice President Biden. It is clear that Rudy Giuliani was working to gain information about both of these issues in his capacity as President Trump's private attorney.

It is not criminal for Rudy Giuliani to work on opposition research for a Presidential campaign or to work on behalf of his client to clear his name from any issues related to the 2016 campaign, which he had done since November 2018. Some have stated that since this was ''foreign information,'' it is illegal. That is absolutely not true. In fact, Hillary Clinton and the Democratic National Committee in 2016 paid a British citizen, Christopher Steele, to work his contacts in Russia to create the now debunked ''Steele Dossier,'' which the FBI used to open its investigation into President Trump, leading directly to the appointment of Special Counsel Mueller. That dossier was opposition research done in Russia by a British citizen, paid for by the Clinton campaign team. Their opposition research was not illegal, but the use and abuse of that document by the FBI to start an investigation was certainly inappropriate and is most likely illegal. But the FBI warrant issue is still being investigated by the ongoing Durham probe.

During the July 25, 2019, call, President Zelensky brought up the issue of Rudy Giuliani, and President Trump replied to his statement. You can argue that President Trump should not have discussed the issue with President Zelensky when he brought it up, but it is certainly not illegal or impeachable to talk about it, especially when there are serious questions about Hunter Biden's work with Burisma. That is not a conservative conspiracy theory; the issue of Hunter Biden's employment in Ukraine was a problem for years at the State Department. It had been raised to Vice President Biden when he was still in office. Every State Department official interviewed for the Trump impeachment investigation noted that at best it was a clear conflict of interest, and it was the center of a huge story on corruption in the Washington Post on July 22, 2019. It had the appearance of high-level corruption by using a well-placed family member on the board of a known corrupt gas company in Ukraine to shelter it from prosecutors. Hunter Biden had only resigned from the Burisma board a few months before the July 25 phone call, just prior to when his dad announced his run for the Presidency in 2019.

After the July 25 phone call, Attorney General Barr did not have any followup meetings or calls with Ukrainian officials. Rudy Giuliani did have additional conversations with Ukrainian officials, which are legal to do since he is a private attorney representing the President.

TEXT OF JULY 25, 2019 PHONE CALL BETWEEN PRESIDENTS TRUMP AND ZELENSKY

The President: Congratulations on a great victory. We all watched from the United States and you did a terrific job. The way you came from behind, somebody who wasn't given much of a chance, and you ended up winning easily. It's a fantastic achievement. Congratulations.

President Zelensky: You are absolutely right Mr. President. We did win big and we worked hard for this. We worked a lot but I would like to confess to you that I had an opportunity to learn from you. We used quite a few of your skills and knowledge and were able to use it as an example for our elections and yes it is true that these were unique elections. We were in a unique situation that we were able to achieve a unique success. I'm able to tell you the following; the first time you called me to congratulate me when I won my presidential election, and the second time you are now calling me when my party won the parliamentary election. I think I should run more often so you can call me more often and we can talk over the phone more often.

The President: (laughter) That's a very good idea. I think your country is very happy about that.

President Zelensky: Well yes, to tell you the truth, we are trying to work hard because we wanted to drain the swamp here in our country. We brought in many many new people. Not the old politicians, not the typical politicians, because we want to have a new format and a new type of government. You are a great teacher for us and in that.

The President: Well it is very nice of you to say that. I will say that we do a lot for Ukraine. We spend a lot of effort and a lot of time. Much more than the European countries are doing and they should be helping you more than they are. Germany does almost nothing for you. All they do is talk and I think it's something that you should really ask them about. When I was speaking to Angela Merkel she talks Ukraine, but she doesn't do anything. A lot of the European countries are the same way so I think it's something you want to look at but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine. I wouldn't say that it's reciprocal necessarily because things are happening that are not good but the United States has been very very good to Ukraine.

President Zelensky: Yes you are absolutely right. Not only 100%, but actually 1000% and I can tell you the following; I did talk to Angela Merkel and I did meet with her I also met and talked with Macron and I told them that they are not doing quite as much as they need to be doing on the issues with the sanctions. They are not enforcing the sanctions. They are not working as much as they should work for Ukraine. It turns out that even though logically, the European Union should be our biggest partner but technically the United States is a much bigger partner than the European Union and I'm very grateful to you for that because the United States is doing quite a lot for Ukraine. Much more than the European Union especially when we are talking about sanctions against the Russian Federation. I would also like to thank you for your great support in the area of defense. We are ready to continue to cooperate for the next steps specifically we are almost. ready to buy more Javelins from the United States for defense purposes.

The President: I would like you to do us a favor though because our country has been through a lot and Ukraine knows a lot about it. I would like you to find out what happened with this whole situation with Ukraine, they say Crowdstrike. I guess you have one of your wealthy people . . . The server, they say Ukraine has it. There are a lot of things that went on, the whole situation. I think you're surrounding yourself with some of the same people. I would like to have the Attorney General call you or your people and I would like you to get to the bottom of it. As you saw yesterday, that whole nonsense ended with a very poor performance by a man named Robert Mueller, an incompetent performance, but they say a lot of it started with Ukraine. Whatever you can do, it's very important that you do it if that's possible.

President Zelensky: Yes it is very important for me and everything that you just mentioned earlier. For me as a President, it is very important and we are open for any future cooperation. We are ready to open a new page on cooperation in relations between the United States and Ukraine. For that purpose, I just recalled our ambassador from United States and he will be replaced by a very competent and very experienced ambassador who will work hard on making sure that our two nations are getting closer. I would also like and hope to see him having your trust and your confidence and have personal relations with you so we can cooperate even more so. I will personally tell you that one of my assistants spoke with Mr. Giuliani just recently and we are hoping very much that Mr. Giuliani will be able to travel to Ukraine and we will meet once he comes to Ukraine. I just wanted to assure you once again that you have nobody but friends

around us. I will make sure that I surround myself with the best and most experienced people. I also wanted to tell you that we are friends. We are great friends and you Mr. President have friends in our country so we can continue our strategic partnership. I also plan to surround myself with great people and in addition to that investigation, I guarantee as the President of Ukraine that all the investigations will be done openly and candidly. That I can assure you.

The President: Good because I heard you had a prosecutor who was very good and he was shut down and that's really unfair. A lot of people are talking about that, the way they shut your very good prosecutor down and you had some very bad people involved. Mr. Giuliani is a highly respected man. He was the mayor of New York City, a great mayor, and I would like him to call you. I will ask him to call you along with the Attorney General. Rudy very much knows what's happening and he is a very capable guy. If you could speak to him that would be great. The former ambassador from the United States, the woman, was bad news and the people she was dealing with in the Ukraine were bad news so I just want to let you know that. The other thing, There's a lot of talk about Biden's son, that Biden stopped the prosecution and a lot of people want to find out about that so whatever you can do with the Attorney General would be great. Biden went around bragging that he stopped the prosecution so if you can look into it . . . It sounds horrible to me.

President Zelensky: I wanted to tell you about the prosecutor. First of all, I understand and I'm knowledgeable about the situation. Since we have won the absolute majority in our Parliament, the next prosecutor general will be 100% my person, my candidate, who will be approved, by the parliament and will start as a new prosecutor in September. He or she will look into the situation, specifically to the company that you mentioned in this issue. The issue of the investigation of the case is actually the issue of making sure to restore the honesty so we will take care of that and will work on the investigation of the case. On top of that, I would kindly ask you if you have any additional information that you can provide to us, it would be very helpful for the investigation to make sure that we administer justice in our country with regard to the Ambassador to the United States from Ukraine as far as I recall her name was Ivanovich. It was great that you were the first one who told me that she was a bad ambassador because I agree with you 100%. Her attitude towards me was far from the best as she admired the previous President and she was on his side. She would not accept me as a new President well enough.

The President: Well, she's going to go through some things. I will have Mr. Giuliani give you a call and I am also going to have Attorney General Barr call and we will get to the bottom of it. I'm sure you will figure it out. I heard the prosecutor was treated very badly and he was a very fair prosecutor so good luck with everything. Your economy is going to get better and better I predict. You have a lot of assets. It's a great country. I have many Ukrainian friends, they're incredible people.

President Zelensky: I would like to tell you that I also have quite a few Ukrainian friends that live in the United States. Actually last time I traveled to the United States, I stayed in New York near Central Park and I stayed at the Trump Tower. I will talk to them and I hope to see them again in the future. I also wanted to thank you for your invitation to visit the United States, specifically Washington DC. On the other hand, I also want to ensure you that we will be very serious about the case and will work on the investigation. As to the economy, there is much potential for our two countries and one of the issues that is very important for Ukraine is energy independence. I believe we can be very successful and cooperating on energy independence with United States. We are already working on cooperation. We are buying American oil but I am very hopeful for a future meeting. We will have more time and more opportunities to discuss these opportunities and get to know each other better. I would like to thank you very much for your support.

The President: Good. Well, thank you very much and I appreciate that. I will tell Rudy and Attorney General Barr to call. Thank you. Whenever you would like to come to the White House, feel free to call. Give us a date and we'll work that out. I look forward to seeing you. President Zelensky: Thank you very much. I would be very happy to come and would be happy to meet with you personally and get to know you better. I am looking forward to our meeting and I also would like to invite you to visit Ukraine and come to the city of Kyiv which is a beautiful city. We have a beautiful country which would welcome you. On the other hand, I believe that on September 1 we will be in Poland and we can meet in Poland hopefully. After that, it might be a very good idea for you to travel to Ukraine. We can either take my plane and go to Ukraine or we can take your plane, which is probably much better than mine.

The President: Okay, we can work that out. I look forward to seeing you in Washington and maybe in Poland because I think we are going to be there at that time. President Zelensky: Thank you very much Mr. President.

The President: Congratulations on a fantastic job you've done. The whole world was watching. I'm not sure it was so much of an upset but congratulations.

President Zelensky: Thank you Mr. President bye-bye.

Based on a whistleblower report about the July 25 call, the House Intelligence Committee subpoenaed the report on September 13 and started its impeachment inquiry on September 24.

In the Senate impeachment trial, House managers stated their belief that the President had carried out a ''scheme to cheat in the 2020 election'' by withholding financial aid to Ukraine and withholding a White House meeting with the new President of Ukraine in exchange for Ukraine announcing it would investigate Joe Biden, Burisma, and 2016 election interference.

Let's discuss the facts of both.

WHITE HOUSE MEETING

There is no question that President Trump had offered a White House meeting to President Zelensky three times: once in May on a phone call after President Zelensky won his election, once in June in a letter, and finally in the July 25 call after President Zelensky's party won the parliamentary elections. But Tim Morrison—State Department official called as a witness by the House—also testified that they were working on heads-of-state meetings with 12 other heads of state during that same time period. Many nations were trying to line up meetings in the White House during the summer of 2019.

During the July 25 call, President Zelensky offered to instead move their meeting from a White House meeting to a face-to-face meeting in Warsaw, Poland, when they would both be there on September 1, 2019. The Presidents agreed, and planning began on the meeting in August. By August 22, the meeting planning was in full swing, as noted by emails in the House hearing's evidence. However, Hurricane Dorian slammed into the United States in the hours leading up to the September 1 meeting, causing a last-minute shift to the Vice President traveling to Poland so the President could stay in the United States to monitor hurricane relief.

We know that Vice President PENCE met face-to-face with President Zelensky, and they spoke about other nations paying their fair share to help Ukraine and the issue of corruption across Ukraine. We know from the preparation materials and the meeting notes themselves that during the meeting the Vice President did not bring up or discuss the issue of Burisma, Joe Biden, or any other campaign conversation with President Zelensky.

The White House found the next available time when President Trump and President Zelensky would both be in the same place at the same time to set up a face-to-face meeting: September 25 at the U.N. Assembly in New York. That meeting was set up, and it took place as scheduled.

In the Senate impeachment trial, the House managers maintained that only a White House meeting was sufficient and that it was being withheld, but the facts show that President Zelensky himself floated the idea of a meeting in Poland and that the meeting was not barred or withheld.

In the early months of President Zelensky's term, there was a great deal of concern about him, his staff, and his plans because he was an unknown political figure. Until more was known about him, it was entirely appropriate to show caution in coordinating a meeting, but once his nationwide anti-corruption efforts began in August, it was clear that face-to-face meetings were planned and carried out.

There was no withholding of a face-to-face meeting with President Trump and President Zelensky. There cannot be a quid pro quo if the meeting was not withheld from Ukrainian officials.

The House managers claimed that there was a secret plot to ''extort'' or ''bribe'' the leadership of Ukraine to investigate Hunter Biden in exchange for around $400 million of U.S. aid. The aid was State Department and foreign military aid that had been provided for the past 4 years, since Ukraine had been in a war with Russia.

After the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and its occupation of Crimea and the Donbas region in eastern Ukraine, the United States started sending aid to help the Ukrainian Government. Congress allowed lethal and non-lethal aid to support Ukraine, but during the previous administration, only non-lethal aid was sent. Under

President Trump's administration, it was determined that the United States would give the leadership of Ukraine lethal aid to help them fight off Russian tanks, which was President Zelensky's reference to ''javelins'' in the July 25 phone call and his gratitude to President Trump for allowing those tank killing rockets to flow to Ukraine.

To be clear, the theory of funds being withheld from Ukraine in exchange for an investigation does not originate from the July 25 call read-out. There is nothing in the text of the call that threatens the withholding of funds in exchange for an investigation.

The theory originates from the fact that aid was held back by the Office of Management and Budget, headed by the President's Acting Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, and the ''presumption'' of U.S. Ambassador to the European Union, Gordon Sondland, that the aid must have been held because of the President's desire to get the Biden investigation done, since the President's attorney, Rudy Giuliani, was working to find out more about the Biden investigation.

Ambassador Sondland told multiple people about his theory, but when he finally called President Trump and asked him directly about it, the President responded that he did not have any quid pro quo; he just wanted the President of Ukraine to do what he ran on and ''do the right thing.'' Obviously, people who assume the worst about President Trump take this as a secret message that there actually was a quid pro quo, but the most important fact is that Ambassador Sondland did not read it that way after his call with the President. Ambassador Sondland believed that the President was serious. Unfortunately, the White House Counsel was never allowed to cross examine Ambassador Sondland during the House investigation to get the facts about who he talked to and why he came to believe for a while that there was an effort to push for investigations in exchange for money.

During the Senate trial, I listened closely to the facts surrounding the withholding of aid money to Ukraine. This was by far the most serious charge against the President. Two key questions had to be answered for me: Why was the aid held, and why was the aid released? There was no question the aid was held for a of couple months. The question was why?

Statements from the House witnesses during the House impeachment inquiry answered the two key questions: The aid was held because there was a legitimate concern about the new President of Ukraine and his administration in the early days of his Presidency and the aid was released on time when the new Ukrainian Parliament starting passing anti-corruption laws in August and after Vice President PENCE sat down face to face with President Zelensky on September 1 in Poland to discuss their progress on corruption.

We should not lose track of what was happening in Ukraine in 2019. A new President was elected who was a TV actor with no political experience and no record on how he would handle Russia or the issue of widespread national corruption in Ukraine. He ran on a platform of anti-corruption at all levels, but no one knew how he would govern. His campaign was funded by a Ukrainian oligarch who owned a major media outlet, and one of his first advisers was the former attorney for that oligarch.

I personally spoke to many of the State Department officials in Ukraine in May of 2019 and heard their concerns about the new government. Then, newly elected President Zelensky used his power to dissolve their Parliament the day he was sworn in and called for ''snap elections'' in which the vast majority of the newly elected leaders were from his newly formed party. To our State Department and the White House, this was either a really a good sign or a really bad sign. Either Ukraine was about to take a major change for the better with new leadership, or this new young leader was about to assume real centralized power. No one knew for certain in May, June, and July of 2019. Within a few weeks in August, the new Parliament got to work passing anti-corruption laws and making significant changes in their accountability and for the country. This was a very good sign.

When Vice President PENCE met face to face with President Zelensky September 1, both sides had confidence the country was taking a new direction. On September 10 Vice President PENCE and Senator ROB PORTMAN met with President Trump to tell him about the progress that had been made, and both advised lifting the hold on aid. The aid was lifted the next day, September 11. No investigation into Hunter Biden or Burisma was ever done by Ukraine, and no part of the U.S. Department of Justice was ever involved in any investigation of Hunter Biden or Burisma.

Although the aid was frozen in June, there was no public announcement of the hold, as explained by the White House Counsel, to keep this from becoming a public issue while the White House monitored the progress and status of the transition in Ukraine.

On August 27, POLITICO published an article that noted that the foreign aid had been held by the United States. This caused President Zelensky's office to reach out to the State Department and ask why. During the House impeachment proceedings, four of the House witnesses—Ambassador Voelker, Ambassador Sondland, Ambassador Taylor, and Tim Morrison—all testified that the Ukrainian leadership learned about the temporary hold in aid after the POLITICO article was published.

The issue of the hold was also the first question from President Zelensky to Vice President PENCE when they met on September 1 in Poland. The idea that the leadership in Ukraine had pressure placed on them to do an investigation fails the most essential test. Did the leadership of Ukraine even know that the aid was being held? The answer from multiple American and Ukrainian leaders was no, they did not know there was a hold on the aid from the White House. You cannot have pressure to act on an investigation if they did not even know the aid was being held.

It is interesting to note, when I researched the records of past foreign aid payment dates and times to Ukraine, I found the 2019 aid was in line with the date the 2016, 2017, and 2018 aid was sent. The vast majority of the military aid to Ukraine was obligated in August or September for the past 4 years. Although the aid was ready to go out the door a couple months earlier in 2019, it was certainly not late, based on the record of the previous 3 years. In fact, the State Department aid was obligated September 30 in 2019, but it was obligated September 28 in 2018. As quoted by the Ukrainian Minister of Defense, ''The aid was held such a short time, we did not even notice.''

During the 2 days of question-and-answer time, I asked a specific question related to this issue because I felt it was important to get the context of the aid, since there had been so much made of the issue during the trial. Here is the full text of my question to the White House Counsel:

House Managers have described any delay in military aid and state department funds to Ukraine in 2019 as a cause to believe there was a secret scheme or quid pro quo by the President. In 2019, 86% of the DOD funds were obligated to Ukraine in September, but in 2018, 67% of the funds were obligated in September and in 2017, 73% of the funds were obligated in September. In the State Department, the funds were obligated September 30 in 2019, but they were obligated September 28 in 2018. Each year, the vast majority of the funds were obligated in the final month or days of the fiscal year. Question: Was there a national security risk to Ukraine or the United States from the funds going out late in September in the two previous years? Did it weaken our relationship with Ukraine because the vast majority of our aid was released in September each of the last three years?

In response to my question, White House Counsel detailed the fact that military aid from the United States was not for immediate use. It was designed to help the Ukrainian military buy materials for the next year, so it was common for the aid to be obligated at the end of the fiscal year—September 30—and it was also common for some money to be left unobligated and carried over into the next fiscal year, as it was in 2019.

While it is easy to create an intricate story on the hold placed on foreign aid to Ukraine, it is also clear that President Trump has temporarily held foreign aid from multiple countries over the past 2 years, including: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Lebanon, and others. There is no question that a President can withhold aid for a short period of

time, but it must be released by September 30, the end of the fiscal year, which it was in this instance.

Article I, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution grants the U.S. House of Representatives ''the sole power of impeachment,'' while article I, section 3 states that ''the Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.''

The Constitution is clear that the House does not control the Senate process and the Senate does not control the House process; however, during the impeachment trial of President Trump, the House tried repeatedly to dictate to the Senate how it should conduct its trial.

The ''sole power to try'' means laying out rules for the trial, including when and if to call additional witnesses or request more documents.

In addition to laying out roles and responsibilities for impeachment, our Constitution also provides basic rights for the accused. The Fifth Amendment ensures due process. However, the receipt of due process is not contingent upon waiving another right, like immunity or executive privilege. But that is exactly what the House tried to force President Trump to do.

The President is not above the law, but neither is the House of Representatives. If there was a question as to the scope and proper use of the President's right to assert immunity or executive privilege regarding conversations he had with his closest advisers, that question is proper for a court to determine, not Congress, and surely not the House on its own accord. To put this in constitutional terms, the legislative branch cannot prevent the executive branch from having access to the judicial branch. The House wanted to move quickly and prevent the President from ever going to court to resolve any issue. That has never been done for a good reason, the separation of powers. In previous legal battles with the President, it has taken months to resolve critical issues, like Bush v. Gore in 2000 or even in the Clinton impeachment trial, when the House took 2 months to resolve an issue with witnesses in court. It does not have to drag on for years.

The House also wanted the Chief Justice of the United States to ''rule on'' any issue quickly instead of allowing the President to go through the courts. This would have created a new judicial executive branch by putting all the judicial power of the nation in one person, not in the judicial branch, as is stated in the Constitution. It would have also ignored the text of the Constitution where it notes that the Chief Justice ''presides'' in the court of impeachment, not ''decides.'' The sole power of impeachment is in the Senate, not the Senate plus the one Justice. The Chief Justice keeps the trial moving along, based on the rules of the trial, but he or she is not a decider of fact; that is reserved to the Senate. The House managers wanted to ignore that part of the Constitution to move the trial faster for expedience. We cannot ignore the Constitution or create bad precedent, no matter which party is being tried for impeachment.

Further, the Sixth Amendment guarantees that the accused has the ability to both confront the witnesses against him and to have the assistance of counsel. The majority of the impeachment inquiry in the House was done without a meaningful opportunity for the President to participate, and administration witnesses were denied the ability to have counsel present for depositions.

The Constitution lays out a clear separation of powers but importantly also provides a system of checks and balances. For something as important as impeachment, it is imperative that the process be one that is squarely within the bounds of the Constitution and is one that the American people can trust. Unfortunately, the process undertaken by the House to impeach President Trump falls wildly short of the standards put in place by our Founders.

Article II, section 4 of the Constitution states that ''the President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.''

During the trial of President Trump, there was a lot of conversation about what constitutes a ''high crime'' or ''misdemeanor.'' Notably, the House did not charge the President with any crimes; rather, the House chose to impeach the President for ''abuse of power'' and ''obstruction of Congress.''

The House theoretically could have chosen to file Articles of Impeachment for crimes such as bribery, extortion, solicitation of interference in an election, or violations of the Impoundments Clause Act. For any of these crimes, the House would have had to prove specific elements of each. Since they couldn't prove any of those crimes, they chose to charge the President with abuse of power. As was noted in the trial, 40 Presidents have faced accusation of abuse of power, going back as far as George Washington.

The abuse of power charge for President Trump was based on allegations that he improperly withheld aid to Ukraine and conditioned a meeting with President Zelensky at the White House in exchange for an investigation into former Vice President Biden and his son Hunter. Over the course of the last 4 months, we heard the term ''quid pro quo'' used over and over again, but the facts do not show criminal quid pro quo. As previously mentioned, President Zelensky asked to meet with President Trump in Poland, and that meeting was set up. Further, while the aid to Ukraine was delayed, it wasn't delayed more than it had been the previous 2 years, and the aid was released without an investigation—or even an announcement of one—into the Biden's.

The second Article of Impeachment, obstruction of Congress, had an even weaker constitutional foundation. The investigation was announced September 24 did not officially begin until October 31. The impeachment vote in the House was December 18. This very short time table and the accusation that the President refused to follow the law, honor the courts, and that he acted like a ''King'' did not meet even the most basic constitutional standards for justice.

For example, during the Mueller investigation, the President's team fully cooperated with the investigation that included over 2,000 subpoenas and 500 witnesses, including the President's Chief of Staff, multiple Cabinet officials, and many lower level officials who were all made available. It was clear throughout the investigation that the President did not like or agree with the Mueller investigation, but he also fully cooperated with every subpoena, each witness, and every document. In fact, they released over a million pages of documents to the Mueller team.

President Trump also made his disagreement with the courts very clear on issues like the census, whether travel restrictions can be put in place to ensure national security, or whether particular funds can be used to secure our southern border. But each time the President lost in court, his administration complied with orders from the judiciary. That is how our system of government is supposed to work.

When disagreements happen between the legislative branch and the judicial branch, they usually lead to resolution, not impeachment. The Fast and Furious investigation, which lasted more than 3 years in the Obama administration, led to a vote in the House to hold then-Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt, but it never led to an impeachment inquiry, even though there was a clear and consistent refusal to cooperate with Congress or turn over key documents for 3 years.

In this case, the accusation that President Trump ignored subpoenas or refused to follow the law is not correct. The President's team made it very clear that they would cooperate during the impeachment inquiry with properly authorized and issued subpoenas, but the House refused to issue subpoenas that were consistent with the law to seek resolution for documents and witnesses. The House was focused on speed, not legal process.

The House, in a rush to impeachment last fall, issued multiple subpoenas for documents and testimony before the House had given authority to the committees to issue subpoenas for an impeachment inquiry, which happened October 31. Since there was no authority to issue the subpoenas, they were not duly authorized. The House also demanded testimony from the President's inner circle without working through the legal questions, and the House demanded executive agency witnesses appear without allowing them to bring agency counsel with them. All of those

issues created very real legal and constitutional problems. Agency individuals have always been allowed to have legal counsel with them when they are deposed, except this time.

As a Member of Congress, I cannot demand the President turn over documents or give testimony in any fashion that I would prefer just because I have oversight responsibilities. In the same way, the President or other executive branch officials cannot demand I turn over my notes or provide my staff for testimony without going through the courts and gaining a legal subpoena. Congress has vigorously and rightfully protected its rights from unwarranted investigations from any President and Presidents have done the same. But in all cases, the law must be followed and the proper process must be pursued to get the information in a legal way.

From the very first moments of the Senate trial, the House managers fought for additional witnesses and documents from the President. Their argument and justification for the second Article of Impeachment centered on the White House's refusal to turn over documents and make every witness available without going through the normal legal process.

Per the resolution adopted by the Senate, the House record was part of the trial record. The Senate had the testimony of the witnesses the House chose to question as part of the overall information of the trial. The House already had 28,000 pages of documents that were part of the evidence they submitted to the Senate, although, the House managers admitted during the Senate impeachment trial that they still have not released all of the documents and witness testimony that they had gathered in their investigation to the White House Counsel or to the Senate. We do not fully know why the House held back some of its witness testimony and released others.

The House witness testimony was used extensively in the Senate trial.

These are the witnesses who testified live or via video in the House and Senate Impeachment: David Holmes, Political Counselor, U.S. Embassy Ukraine, State Department; Dr. Fiona Hill, White House Advisor, National Security Council; David Hale, Under Secretary for Political Affairs, State Department; Laura Cooper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; Gordon Sondland, U.S. Ambassador to the European Union; Tim Morison, Former White House Adviser; Kurt Voelker, Former Special Envoy for Ukraine; LTC Alexander Vindman, National Security Council; Jennifer Williams, aide to the Vice President; Marie Yovanovitch, Former Ambassador to Ukraine; George Kent, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Bill Taylor, Former U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine.

The House managers repeated over and over that additional witnesses would only take a week to depose, which is a clearly false statement. New witnesses took longer than a week to depose in the House inquiry; clearly it would take just as long or longer in a Senate trial. The remaining ''wish list'' of witnesses all had clear issues that needed to be resolved in the courts, which would take a couple of months to resolve, which is why the House managers did not push for their testimony in the House impeachment process. They valued speed more than legal process.

House managers repeatedly stated that witnesses only took a week to depose in the Clinton Senate impeachment trial, but they know that during the Clinton Senate trial, all three called witnesses previously deposed in the House inquiry or in the grand jury investigation, and all issues of executive privilege had already been decided through the courts. There were no new witnesses in the Senate trial of President Clinton. Also, the Clinton White House had already had the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses or the investigators in the Clinton impeachment inquiry. This time, the Trump White House had been denied that right. So, if new witnesses would be added for the Senate trial, the White House should have the right to also cross-examine the previous House witnesses they had been denied the right to cross examine in the past. This would all take much longer than a week, and the House managers knew that.

During the Clinton impeachment trial in the Senate, there were no additional documents requested, only previously deposed witnesses. The House managers did not go through the legal process to get documents, like the Mueller investigation had done, so all of the new document requests from the House managers would take at least 3 to 5 weeks to complete, once a legal subpoena is delivered. It takes time to search all databases, review the documents for classified materials, determine any legal issues, and release them to the investigation. Once the documents are turned over, both legal teams need time to review the documents. Again, the House managers knew these facts, but they continued to repeat over and over that it would only take a week to get all the documents.

The first question for the Senate trial was, do we have enough evidence and testimony to answer the questions the House presented in their Articles of Impeachment? If the answer is yes, then we do not need additional witnesses or documents. If the answer is no, then we do need additional information. There were many leaks and newspaper stories during the trial designed to push the Senate to vote to ask for more testimony, but that did not change the primary question. We already knew from evidence that there was no quid pro quo, no Ukrainian investigations, and no withholding of a public meeting with President Trump.

The New York Times story on January 26 and again on January 31 are clear examples of an attempt to bring doubt on the information and witness testimony. Both stories stated that someone had read the pending John Bolton book manuscript and that in the book, Bolton stated that President Trump had talked about investigations in exchange for aid funding for Ukraine. The New York Times also wrote that the book would state that Acting Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney and White House Counsel Pat Cipollone were also a part of the scheme. I looked at both stories closely and noticed that the reporters had not read the manuscripts or quoted the manuscripts; they were reports from someone who stated that they had read the manuscripts. Both stories took significant liberties to describe the intent in the manuscripts, but the reporter had apparently also not spoken to John Bolton.

On January 23, 2020, the National Security Council lawyers sent a letter to the legal team handling the book publishing for John Bolton to inform him that the manuscript contained some classified information and it would need have some edits before publication in March. Then, on January 26, the New York Times published a story that someone had leaked some of the details of the book, but they had not released the actual manuscript. While I am interested in seeing the actual manuscript, I am also very aware that this selective leak was designed by the New York Times and whoever leaked the information to influence the ongoing trial.

It was clear from the earliest days of the trial that the House had a clear political strategy as well as a courtroom strategy. During the trial. I had the responsibility to hear the facts but also to separate the politics from the facts. Politically, it was best for the House to move as quickly as possible through impeachment so that vulnerable Democratic Members could vote for impeachment and then move quickly to other topics. But since the Presidential election is in full swing, it was politically better for Democrats to make the Senate trial move as slow as possible to hurt the President during the campaign. That explains why the House did not take the time to formally request documents or testimony from many individuals; they needed to move fast and try to force the Senate to move slowly. It also explained why the House passed impeachment on a party line vote, then held the Articles of Impeachment for a month before delivering them to the Senate to start the trial. The House managers said repeatedly that the evidence was clear and that they had proved their case, but if that was true, why would the Senate need to call additional witnesses? I think the reason is that the witness process was about delay, more than facts.

The facts do not support the accusation in the Trump impeachment, and it certainly did not need to come to this moment of national division. While it was clear that the House managers

wanted to drag the trial on for months in the Senate, through the primary election season, their case consisted of hypothetical story lines and ''presumptions'' more than facts that warrant the removal of a President. This does not meet what Alexander Hamilton in Federalist 65 described as the ''due weight'' for the arguments.

But impeachment has certainly created the division in our society that Alexander Hamilton predicted. Over 200 years ago he wrote, ''The prosecution [of impeachments], will seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused.'' This has been an incredibly divisive season in our Nation. It is not about one person; it is about all of us. We individually choose how we handle disagreements with family, friends, and people on the other side of particular issues. Our government represents us, so it is up to us to model for our government how to handle disagreements.

We are now past impeachment, and it is time to work on the issues that matter most to the American people. As we move forward, every American should speak out on the issues that are important to them and the voices that speak for their point of view. But we should remember that we have much more in common than we have that divides us. It is my hope that our Nation does not go through a season like this again for a very long time and that we can move past this age of impeachment to an age of oversight and accountability.

I appreciate all the engagement with our office during the impeachment proceedings. We had thousands of calls and emails over the past month. We had hundreds of thousands of views on the nightly Facebook Live updates each day during the trial. While not every Oklahoman agrees with every decision I make on behalf of our State, I am grateful most choose to be respectful in expressing their points of view. At the end of the day, we are Oklahomans. We may not all agree on each issue, but we can be respectful of each other in our disagreement.

I am honored to serve our State and Nation. We have many important issues to address in the coming days I pray we can work on them together for the future of our State and Nation.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, during the impeachment trial, this Chamber considered the evidence and heard the arguments presented by the House managers and White House Counsel. During the 12 days of the impeachment trial, the Senate heard from the House managers for nearly 22 hours, and we heard from the White House Counsel for nearly 12 hours. This was followed by 180 questions asked and answered over 2 days, concluding with closing arguments by the House managers and White House Counsel.

Ultimately, there were two questions the Senate had to answer when considering the Articles of Impeachment.

The first question, for the near-term, is should the President be removed from office?

The second question, for the long-term health of our Nation, is whether we should allow the impeachment process to be weaponized and used by a majority in the House to settle partisan political scores?

My answers to both questions are a resounding no.

That is why I voted against both Articles of Impeachment.

While my Democratic colleagues operated under the presumption of guilt, even if one is to assume the worst, the reality is the allegations against President Trump were neither criminal nor impeachable. They did not come close to meeting the standard of treason, bribery, or high crimes or misdemeanors set by our Founding Fathers.

It is remarkable to read the Federalist Papers and appreciate their clairvoyance. Federalist 65, written by Alexander Hamilton, was frequently quoted throughout these proceedings, and for good reason. Hamilton's warnings to this body of using impeachment as a partisan device were borne out. Hamilton wrote that impeachment:

> [W]ill seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with the pre-existing factions . . . and in such cases there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.

By placing the impeachment power within the House and Senate, Hamilton acknowledged that power may wind up in the hands of ''the leaders or tools of the most cunning or the most numerous faction,'' which may ''hardly be expected to possess the requisite neutrality towards those whose conduct may be the subject of scrutiny.'' It is because of this remarkable power that Hamilton argued the Senate had been granted the power to try impeachments because the Senate is more likely to preserve ''the necessary impartiality between the INDIVIDUAL accused, and the REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, HIS ACCUSERS?''

It is important to note that the Speaker of the House previously warned about the dangers of a politically motivated impeachment effort, stating in March 2019 that ''impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there's something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path, because it divides the country.''

History has proven that warning to be true. One only needs to compare the dramatically different outcomes between the Nixon impeachment inquiry, which resulted in resignation, and the Clinton impeachment process, which resulted in acquittal.

The Speaker's warning rings as true today as it did when she said it nearly 1 year ago. Unfortunately, the House majority ignored this warning, electing to lead a distinctly partisan process from beginning to end, based on a political timeline.

It began when the House majority refused to provide the President with basic due process rights for 71 of the 78 days of the formal House impeachment inquiry. The House majority also refused to provide proper rights to the minority, whose requests for an equal number of witnesses was denied.

It is no wonder why House Resolution 660, which permitted an impeachment inquiry, and House Resolution 755, the Articles of Impeachment against President Trump, failed to receive a single vote from the minority. In fact, the only thing that was bipartisan was the opposition to the articles.

The House majority presented a weak and completely partisan case for impeachment to the Senate. This is why the House managers attempted to convince the Senate to endorse its particular views of separation of powers, essentially asking the Senate to do the House's job where it failed: to make a compelling case for the President's removal.

This is yet another area Hamilton addressed. In Federalist 66, Hamilton outlined the differing roles and responsibilities between the House and Senate on impeachment, casting the House as the accusers and the Senate as the judges:

> The division of them between the two branches of the legislature, assigning to one the right of accusing, to the other the right of judging, avoids the inconvenience of making the same persons both accusers and judges; and guards against the danger of persecution, from the prevalency of a factious spirit in either of those branches. As the concurrence of two thirds of the Senate will be requisite to a condemnation, the security to innocence, from this additional circumstance, will be as complete as itself can desire.

By dividing the power to accuse and the power to judge, the Founding Founders further recognized the procedural nature of this process. Appropriate procedure would serve to protect the Executive from the designs of a partisan faction in the House and would ensure that removal was not just desirable, but truly necessary.

In this instance, removal was absolutely unnecessary, even if it was desirable to the whims of some in the House majority since the day the President was inaugurated in 2017.

This addresses the answer to the second question I posed on whether the Senate will allow the impeachment process to become the new normal.

It would create a dangerous precedent in which the House actively seeks opportunities to open impeachment inquires to politically weaken and potentially remove the President of the opposing party.

Impeachment is the most powerful tool the Founding Fathers gave to us to defend against Executive misconduct, but it should never be abused. It should never be used to settle political scores, and it should never be used

as an effort to deny the American people the right to decide the President's fate at the ballot box.

To transform impeachment into a partisan political weapon is to diminish and undermine its critical constitutional role.

Despite the factions which formed during this impeachment trial, I remain optimistic about the direction of our Nation. For all the bitter partisan emotions this impeachment process has enflamed, this Congress now has the opportunity to move on and focus on forging consensus to conduct the business of the American people. Congress has recently demonstrated this ability—enacting historic criminal justice reform, agreeing on reforms to improve the delivery of healthcare to our brave veterans, and approving a fair and free trade deal with America's two largest economic partners, producing a win for American workers and consumers.

I hope, when the record is written of this impeachment, that history will say that the Senate ultimately retained the high bar which must be met to remove a President, that the Senate rejected the temptation to normalize the impeachment process for partisan political gain, and that Congress turned the page following the President's acquittal to prioritize the needs of the American people and, in turn, solve the most pressing challenges facing our great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. JACKSON, JR.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to express my appreciation for the work of Securities and Exchange Commission: Robert J. Jackson, Jr. Commissioner Jackson stepped down earlier this month from the SEC, having served with distinction since December 2017. He returns to teaching, having made many valuable contributions to policy debates at the SEC and beyond.

Mr. Jackson is no stranger to public service. Prior to his work at the SEC, he served in the Treasury Department as the Nation emerged from the financial crisis. Mr. Jackson has led by example, working diligently to ensure the SEC fulfills its three-part mission, particularly the protection of investors in an increasingly complex marketplace. As an outspoken voice on behalf of investors, Mr. Jackson stressed the importance of clear and sensible rules that put investors first, combined with a pragmatic understanding of how markets work.

Mr. Jackson brought a law professor's analytical approach to his responsibilities as a Commissioner. His careful and thoughtful work digging through data, developing original research, and presenting it in a clear and insightful manner provided the SEC and other policymakers with critical information and a valuable perspective with which to consider some of the most difficult questions in securities laws.

Over the years, Commissioner Jackson has been a leader on the issue of corporate political spending disclosure. He has helped to focus the conversation on how to think about reasonable and material disclosure as our political system has become awash in dark money. Similarly, Mr. Jackson's study of trends in stock buybacks and the potential for abuse by corporate executives raised many issues that merit additional consideration by regulators and lawmakers.

I would like to lead my colleagues in wishing Mr. Jackson the best of luck as he returns to academia. I expect that he will continue his insightful research and scholarship to benefit investors and make markets more efficient. The SEC benefited from Commissioner Jackson's tenure, and we know his students will benefit, too.

TRIBUTE TO KIMBERLY HAZELGROVE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, today I rise to honor Kimberly Hazelgrove for her service and sacrifices for our country and her successful efforts to advocate for families like her own who lost loved ones serving our Nation.

Kimberly Hazelgrove is a former sergeant first class in the U.S. Army. In 2004, her husband, Chief Warrant Officer 2 Brian Hazelgrove was killed in a helicopter crash near Mosul, Iraq. That loss was devastating enough, but after his death, Ms. Hazelgrove also lost the military benefits her family earned serving the United States and that she needed to support her family. They lost those benefits because of a 1970s-era law that causes Gold Star families to lose out on financial benefits that their spouses paid into and earned.

For 16 years, Ms. Hazelgrove advocated on Capitol Hill for the repeal of that law, the Survivor Benefit Plan-Disability and Indemnity Compensation offset, while raising her family as a single mother. She said, ''I was angry . . . Very angry for the inequities that I was seeing, not only for myself, but for a lot of my friends going through it and it just lit a fire, and I found a stronger voice than I had before.''

My office and I met with Ms. Hazelgrove and took up her cause. Gold Star families like hers have sacrificed so much for this country and nothing should get in the way of providing them with benefits that they have paid into and earned. We worked together with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to write legislation that will fix this, and this past December, because she never gave up, we got it done. We passed a fix in the Senate, and the President signed it into law. Because of Ms. Hazelgrove's perseverance and strong advocacy, 67,000 military spouses will now get the benefits they have earned to support themselves and their families.

Thank you, Kimberly, for raising your voice and for all the work you do to fight for fellow Gold Star families. I am sure my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring Ms. Kimberly Hazelgrove for her exemplary efforts.

REMEMBERING JEFFREY HAMMOND LONG

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Jeffrey ''Jeff'' Hammond Long, an outstanding public servant and friend to many. Sadly, Jeff passed away on July 8, 2018. He was critically injured by a truck while riding his bike in Washington the previous day. Today, in honor of what would have been his 38th birthday, I wish to recognize Jeff's legacy of positivity.

Born in New York City, Jeff enrolled at Brunswick School in Greenwich, CT. Throughout his many years there, Jeff set an example for his fellow students. Not only did he mentor younger members of the community and cocaptain the lacrosse team, but he also served as president of the student body. Even after graduation, Jeff continued to serve the school as a result of the foundational experience he had at Brunswick.

Jeff studied at Hamilton College, where he was vice president of the student body and an Arthur Levitt Scholar. During his time at Hamilton, Jeff began his remarkable dedication to public service by interning for former President Clinton at the Clinton Foundation's New York office, as well as for Secretary Kerry's Presidential campaign and his U.S. Senate office.

I had the pleasure of first meeting Jeff in 2010. He worked in my Senate office for many years, serving as a legislative assistant on the energy, environment, and transportation portfolio. Jeff routinely demonstrated his extraordinary commitment to helping the people of Connecticut and the Nation. A diligent and bright member of my team, he always put the needs of others before his own, focusing on serving the people of Connecticut with tireless care and patience.

His incredible wife, Kaylie—another Connecticut native and devoted public servant—continues to honor his memory by doing acts of kindness on Jeff's birthday. She and their friends are guided by his motto: ''It's cool to be nice.''

Jeff's natural inclination to support others and bring smiles to people's faces touched countless lives from Connecticut to DC, and everywhere in between. He helped everyone around him find a positive side to any situation or take a moment to appreciate even the smallest parts of life.

I am grateful for the considerate and warm outlook Jeff brought wherever he went, and I know his memory will forever serve as a model of selflessness and unfailing devotion. My wife Cynthia and I extend our warmest thoughts to Kaylie, as well as to Jeff's parents, Nancy and David, and I hope my colleagues will join me in acknowledging Jeff's incredible impact.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. PHOEBE STEIN

● Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to thank and congratulate Dr. Phoebe Stein for her lifetime commitment to advancing the humanities. At the end of this week, Phoebe will leave her post as the executive director at Maryland Humanities, a position she has held for more than 11 years. But Maryland's loss is the Nation's gain. Effective May 1, Phoebe will succeed Esther Mackintosh as president of the Federation of State Humanities Councils. The federation is the national member association of the 56 State and jurisdictional humanities councils. The Federation's purpose is ''to provide leadership, advocacy, and information to help members advance programs that engage millions of citizens across diverse populations in community and civic life.'' I can't think of anyone better suited for the job.

Phoebe, a Maryland native, arrived at Maryland Humanities in 2008 after serving as the director of public affairs at the Illinois Humanities Council, now called Illinois Humanities. She received her B.A. in English from the University of Michigan and her M.A. and Ph.D. in English from Loyola University of Chicago.

Phoebe has effectively advocated for the humanities at the local, State, and Federal level for more than 20 years. Even though Phoebe became executive director at Maryland Humanities at the beginning of the Great Recession, she managed to expand the council's partnerships, programs, staff, financial support and other resources, and, most importantly, its reach. She hosted a radio spot, ''Humanities Connection,'' while advancing several of the council's flagship programs, including Maryland History Day, Museum on Main Street, and One Maryland One Book. The organization now offers more than 1,000 free events annually in partnership with more than 500 organizations in more than 150 communities statewide.

Phoebe has brought Maryland History Day winners to meet with their elected representatives at the Maryland State House and here at the U.S. Capitol. She helped to foster a responsive environment following the death of Freddie Gray in 2015 and launch a Humanities Fund for Baltimore. She introduced student authors to author Chimamanda Ngozi Adiche at One Maryland One Book events in 2017. Through it all, Phoebe has been a joyful and indefatigable advocate, coming up to the Hill or to Annapolis to lobby or traveling throughout Maryland to bring the humanities to the people. In 2016, ''The Daily Record'' rightfully recognized Phoebe as one of Maryland's Top 100 Women.

The National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH, provides funding to State humanities councils through NEH's Federal/State Partnership Office. The councils also receive funding from private donations, foundations, corporations, and from the States themselves. This year, we will celebrate the 55th anniversary of the NEH's creation. On September 29, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act into law. The act called for the creation of the NEH and the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA, as separate, independent agencies. More than 200 people filled the Rose Garden for the bill signing ceremony, including Gregory Peck, Dumas Malone, Ansel Adams, Ralph Ellison, Walter Gropius, and Paul Mellon.

President Trump's fiscal year 2021 budget request once again tendentiously proposes to terminate the NEH, the NEA, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. In previous years, Congress has ignored these proposals, and I am optimistic we will do so again this year. I would note that Federal funding for the NEH peaked in 1994 in nominal terms at $177.5 million; in inflation-adjusted terms—2019 dollars—Federal funding peaked in 1979 at nearly three times its current level.

On a per capita basis, Federal funding for the NEH amounts to less than the cost of a single postage stamp. That is a rather paltry investment since, as author and essayist Mark Slouka wrote in his book, ''Essays from the Nick of Time: Reflections and Refutations,'' ''[T]he humanities are a superb delivery mechanism for what we might call democratic values.'' He went on to say:

> The case for the humanities is not hard to make, though it can be difficult—to such an extent have we been marginalized, so long have we acceded to that marginalization—not to sound either defensive or naive. The humanities, done right, are the crucible in which our evolving notions of what it means to be fully human are put to the test; they teach us, incrementally, endlessly, not what to do, but how to be. Their method is confrontational, their domain unlimited, their ''product'' not truth but the reasoned search for truth, their ''success'' something very much like Frost's momentary stay against confusion.

Phoebe Stein understands how important the humanities are to our individual, collective, and civic well-being. While we Marylanders will miss her at Maryland Humanities, all Americans are fortunate that she will be heading the federation, where her passionate advocacy will extend beyond Baltimore, the Eastern Shore, and the Cumberland Narrows to redound to the benefit of people and communities across our Nation.●

REMEMBERING ANTHONY J. MAY

● Mr. CASEY. Madam President, today I wish to honor the distinguished life and career of Anthony J. May, who passed away on January 20, 2020.

Tony worked for more than 30 years as a political strategist and journalist, leaving his mark on Pennsylvania politics. He used his deep knowledge of Pennsylvania history to assist many in trying to find the best way forward, including during his time as executive director of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party. He served as the communications director and press secretary for my father, Governor Robert P. Casey, as well as press secretary for Governor Milton J, Shapp and as communications director under House Speakers K. Leroy Irvis and James J. Manderino. Most recently, he worked at Triad Strategies, a communications and public relations firm in Harrisburg, as Partner Emeritus.

Tony also served the public as a journalist and political analyst for various newspapers in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, and as an editor for the Associated Press. In these roles, in addition to being past chair of the Pennsylvania Public Television Network, he worked tirelessly to keep the public informed and to support journalists and journalism wherever and whenever he could.

Tony was a legend in Pennsylvania for decades, and his legacy will be felt for years to come. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Betsy; his children, Crispin, Amy, and Cybele; his five grandchildren and two great-grandchildren; and all of Tony's family and friends as they mourn his loss.●

RECOGNIZING THE WEST FARGO PACKATAHNAS

● Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, the West Fargo, ND, dance team, the Packatahnas, has returned home from the National Dance Team Competition in Florida as national high kick champions.

This comes after winning championship titles competing this year with the Class A Large Varsity schools in North Dakota. It is always cause for celebration when students bring home a championship title, but this year's award is one of several the team has won.

After more than eight high kick first place finishes at the State level in the past 25 years, the Packatahnas were back-to-back national champions in 2006 and 2007. Now 14 years later and after finishing ahead of 22 other national teams, it has been especially meaningful for these teammates to place another trophy in the school's award case.

The passion, dedication, and time the Packatahnas devote to their dance team season rival that of other high school student athletes. For several hours every day, they first work to develop their routines. Then it is practice, practice, and more practice until they are ready for competition.

At their side throughout this year was their coach, Shayla Pennick, whom they credit for her commitment to them in this successful season. Shayla knows the thrill they feel as champions because she competed with

the team when the Packatahnas finished at the top 14 years ago. She deserves recognition and thanks for sharing her time and talents to help another team go as far as her high school team did.

Madam President, I join the West Fargo High School, the city of West Fargo, and the rest of North Dakota in congratulating these talented Packatahnas for finishing their season as champions. They are an inspiration to all of us by demonstrating the good that can come from combining a passion for excellence with plenty of hard work.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN JEREMY WHITE

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, when you do nuclear theory research and classified national security work, you need a world-class protective security force to protect materials, facilities, information, and people. Fortunately, Idaho National Laboratory, INL, has a world-class protective force, Pro Force, as was recently affirmed through the presentation of the Colonel Sydnor Memorial Award.

Each year, the Colonel Sydnor Memorial Award recognizes an exceptional participant in the Composite Adversary Team—CAT—Program, which trains members of Pro Force teams across the Department of Energy's nuclear security complexes to act as attackers in simulated force-on-force exercises that test the strength of each lab's Pro Force team. This year, that recognition was given to INL Pro Force captain Jeremy White. White has an expansive career in law enforcement, including time as a juvenile detention officer and a deputy officer in adult corrections. Along with his duties as Pro Force captain, White also serves as Bingham County reserve deputy and is a member of the Special Tactics and Response—STAR—team, a multijurisdictional SWAT team. Before being presented the award, White was described as an individual who demonstrates ''excellence in the areas of character, ability to motivate others, physical fitness, tactical skills and teamwork'' by April Stephenson, Deputy Director for Department of Energy's Office of Enterprise Assessments.

As a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I am honored to represent people like Jeremy White who are so dedicated to protecting the energy resources of Idaho. Congratulations to Jeremy and to all the members of INL's Pro Force team. You make Idaho proud, and I wish for your continued success in the Pro Force field.●

RECOGNIZING TALLY MAC SHACK

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a Florida small business that not only creates a delicious product, but dedicates time, effort, and money to serving its community. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Tally Mac Shack of Tallahassee, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Despite having a graduate degree in criminology from Florida State University and a job with a State agency, when the opportunity arose, Justo Cruz jumped at the chance to pursue his entrepreneurial dream. After attending a mac-and-cheese fest in 2017, Justo was inspired to create comfort food with a gourmet twist. Creating social media accounts and a logo, Justo started Tally Mac Shack that same day. He traded in his 2006 Nissan Armada for an old Frito-Lay delivery truck, converting it into the original Tally Mac Shack food truck, where he experimented with his mac-and-cheese creations.

On October 1, 2017, Tally Mac Shack debuted at a food-tasting event and sold out within 2 hours. Two-and-a-half years later, Tally Mac Shack is 30 employees strong, boasts two food trucks, two brick-and-mortar locations, and has established a strong catering presence in the Tallahassee area. Partnering with his alma mater, Justo established a brick-and-mortar location on FSU's campus and a concession stand in its football stadium.

Since its inception, Tally Mac Shack has emphasized the importance of community service. The business has partnered with local agencies and organizations to support a variety of causes, including Hurricane Michael disaster relief and the Down Syndrome Association of Florida. They have also supported the Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare Cancer Center, the Kearney Center for the Homeless, and Fort Braden Middle School. During its summer nonprofit program, Tally Mac Shack donates a portion of its profit and a free visit from one of its food trucks to a local organization. Participating groups include Big Bend Hospice, Alzheimer's Project, Inc., Habitat for Humanity, and the local Humane Society. Additionally, Justo recently announced that Tally Mac Shack is an official On the Job Training partner with Leon High School's culinary program, providing mentorship and job training to local students.

Combined with community involvement, Tally Mac Shack's modern take on a culinary classic was a recipe for success and business continues to boom. Excelling on all fronts, Tally Mac Shack was recognized for its community service as an inaugural winner of the 2019 All in Tally Award for going ''above and beyond to make our community a better place to live.'' Within its first 18 months, Tally Mac Shack was also honored five times as Tallahassee's best food truck.

Tally Mac Shack is a great example of the pivotal role community-oriented small businesses play in the U.S. economy. I commend their efforts to provide a quality product, while simultaneously prioritizing local involvement and training to support local jobs. Congratulations to the entire team at Tally Mac Shack. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13660 ON MARCH 6, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—PM 47

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2020.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of

the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 2020*.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CUBA AND OF THE EMERGENCY AUTHORITY RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF THE ANCHORAGE AND MOVEMENT OF VESSELS, AS AMENDED—PM 48

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Cuba that was declared on March 1, 1996, in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757 on February 26, 2004, Proclamation 9398 on February 24, 2016, and Proclamation 9699 on February 22, 2018, is to continue in effect beyond March 1, 2020.

It continues to be United States policy that a mass migration from Cuba would endanger the security of the United States by posing a disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States. The Cuban government has not demonstrated that it will refrain from the use of excessive force against United States vessels or aircraft that may engage in memorial activities or peaceful protest north of Cuba. Further, the unauthorized entry of United States registered vessels into Cuban territorial waters continues to be detrimental to United States foreign policy and counter to the purpose of Executive Order 12807 of May 24, 1992, which is to ensure, among other things, safe, orderly, and legal migration. The possibility of large-scale unauthorized entries of United States-registered vessels would disturb the international relations of the United States by facilitating a possible mass migration of Cuban nationals. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Cuba and the emergency authority relating to the regulation of the anchorage and movement of vessels set out in Proclamation 6867, as amended by Proclamation 7757, Proclamation 9398, and Proclamation 9699.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 2020*.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 500. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1081. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2418. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to modify a definition and the disposition and authorized uses of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues under that Act and to exempt State and county payments under that Act from sequestration, to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

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 Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 3328. A bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Biliteracy programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 3329. A bill to establish an incubator network and startup success program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3330. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase certain royalty rates, minimum bid amounts, and rental rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3331. A bill to modify the boundary of the Rocky Mountain National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3332. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3333. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, and school personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 3334. A bill to require the publication of opinions issued by the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3335. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Federal property in the State of Ohio to the Friends of Barker House; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3336. A bill to reauthorize The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor and the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 3337. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require more accountability in the airline industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3338. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 259

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the

United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes.

S. 279

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 360

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) 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. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) 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. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Job Training Federal Pell Grants demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1331

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1331, a bill to provide additional protections for our veterans.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a ''Ghost Army'' that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1781

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1781, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2020 through 2022 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 2059

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) 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. 2097

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit immigration enforcement actions at sensitive locations, to clarify the powers of immigration officers at such locations, and for other purposes.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2300

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2300, a bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, and for other purposes.

S. 2321

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator

from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors 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. 2439

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2439, a bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide that the licensing of a mark for use by a related company may not be construed as establishing an employment relationship between the owner of the mark, or an authorizing person, and either that related company or the employees of that related company, and for other purposes.

S. 2669

At the request of Mr. TESTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2748

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2748, a bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2858, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to establish an advisory board focused on creating opportunities for women in the trucking industry, and for other purposes.

S. 2892

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2892, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis.

S. 2907

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2907, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program.

S. 2950

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) 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 Texas (Mr. CORNYN) 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. 2993

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2993, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to nursing facility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added 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.

S. 3054

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3054, a bill to establish that a State-based education loan program is excluded from certain requirements relating to a preferred lender arrangement.

S. 3152

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3152, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps.

S. 3167

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3167, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 3174

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3174, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the sale and marketing of tobacco products, and for other purposes.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3194

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3194, a bill to establish a program ensuring access to accredited continuing medical education for primary care physicians and other health care providers at Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics, to provide training and clinical support for primary care providers to practice at their full scope and improve access to care for patients in underserved areas.

S. 3196

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3196, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 3276

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3276, a bill to eliminate asset limits employed by certain federally funded means-tested public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3296

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes.

S. 3298

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3298, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to terminate the insured status of a depository institution that refuses to provide services to certain Federal contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 3310

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3310, a bill to permit visiting dignitaries and service members from Taiwan to display the flag of the Republic of China.

S. 3314

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3314, a bill to seek a diplomatic resolution to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 3319

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) 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. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3338. A bill to establish programs to improve family economic security by breaking the cycle of multigenerational poverty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from New Mexico, Senator HEINRICH, in introducing the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act. Our bipartisan bill would support an innovative approach to fighting poverty, one that focuses on addressing the needs of children and their parents—two-generations together—in order to help break the cycle of intergenerational poverty.

Many current conversations about lifting families out of poverty highlight record low unemployment and the booming U.S. economy as proof that we are finally headed in the right direction. I see many encouraging signs, such as the U.S. poverty rate finally in 2018 falling below the pre-recession level and Maine experiencing the largest decline in child poverty in the Nation from 2016 to 2017, but I also know far too many families still struggle financially. Over 38 million people, or about one in eight Americans, lived below the poverty line in 2018. This sadly includes nearly 13 million children, including 35,000 children in Maine. Despite recent progress, Maine's child poverty rate is still higher than all the other New England states.

In addition to recognizing the continued need to lift up families and provide a brighter future for our Nation's youth, the economic motivation for addressing intergenerational poverty points to one simple fact—we must do something different. It is estimated that child poverty costs the U.S. between $800 billion and $1.1 trillion a year. For a sense of scale, the high end estimate of $1.1 trillion annually is similar to the amount Congress appropriated in December to fund programs across the entire government.

Our legislation marks an important first step toward reevaluating our approach to poverty-reducing programs and encouraging innovative, more effective uses of taxpayer dollars. We support an approach that is aimed at equipping both parents and their children with the tools they need to succeed and become self-sufficient. Oftentimes, Federal programs intended to help low-income individuals address certain issues in silos, overlooking the fact that the needs of family members are usually interconnected. Our bill aims to change that. For example, helping a mother secure safe, high-quality child care can have a positive impact on her ability to succeed in the workforce, as well as improving her child's ability to be ready for school. While that child receives care and an education, her mother can be connecting with skills training to help her improve her income. Connecting various Federal programs that target both parents and children with supports aimed at increasing economic security, educational success, social capital, and health and wellbeing has the potential to lift whole families out of poverty.

Listen to the story of Ambrosia Ross, a mother of three from Washington County, Maine, who was part of the first cohort of participants at Family Futures Downeast, a two-generation program designed to improve economic outcomes for low-income families through post-secondary education for parents at the same time their children access high quality early childhood education. In a testimonial about her experience, Ambrosia says, ''Family Futures Downeast opened up a whole new world, not just for me but also for my children . . . . Both of my boys talk about going to ''Mama's school'' and assure me that they are going to go to college also! They watch me doing homework and ask to do theirs as well. It means so much to me to know that not only has FFD changed my life but also set my children on a brand new path.'' In addition to continuing to attend college full time, Ambrosia is putting her new skills and education into practice by serving as a WIC Breastfeeding Peer Support Counselor. Her sons are also both eager to continue learning and her young daughter is already a ''wanna-be reader.''

Family Futures Downeast is just one example of the great strides we have made in bringing communities and service providers together to implement two-generation strategies. By blending federal dollars with the help of the State of Maine, Family Futures Downeast has reached nearly 230 individuals in Maine's most impoverished county with astounding results. In 2015 when the program was just getting started, I was proud to support Family Future Downeast's application to participate in a federal demonstration project aimed at combatting rural child poverty, which provided critical technical assistance and, with additional support from the John T. Gorman Foundation in Portland, helped the program get off the ground. The legislation we are introducing today would build on efforts like Family Futures Downeast that are increasing opportunities for families in need across the country by funding projects that work.

Specifically, the Two-Generation Economic Empowerment Act would create an Interagency Council on Multigenerational Poverty and Economic Mobility to better coordinate federal efforts aimed at supporting vulnerable families and moving them out of poverty. The Council would also make recommendations to Congress on ways to improve coordination of anti-poverty programs and to identify best practices. While I applaud ongoing efforts across the federal government to implement two-generation strategies, this Council is needed to tackle logistical challenges, such as lack of coordination and communication across federal agencies—and in some cases different departments within a single agency—and improve the dissemination of information and best practices.

Our bill would also authorize a pilot program that would provide additional flexibility for states and local governments to improve the administration of programs using Two-Generation models. It would authorize five states to participate in Two-Generation Performance Partnerships, allowing states to achieve reductions in poverty by blending similarly purposed funds across multiple federal programs. Two-generation approaches are often created ''from the bottom up,'' meaning local organizations and states are at

the forefront of responding to local or regional needs. Therefore, our role as federal policymakers should be to give states and local organizations the flexibility they need to be creative in solving their unique challenges. For this reason, our legislation would reduce duplicative reporting and application requirements that may deter local agencies and organizations from making the most effective use of taxpayer dollars. To ensure accountability, the bill would require that these pilot programs be targeted at specific, poverty-reducing outcomes.

While federal programs have helped many of those living in poverty manage day-to-day hardships, they are falling short of breaking the cycle of poverty that has trapped too many families. With this bill, we have the chance to make a permanent difference in the lives of families and to break the multigenerational cycle of poverty. Just as a child's ZIP code should not determine his or her future success, so should the bureaucratic siloed approach to poverty not make it so difficult for families to get the help they need to escape poverty. The federal government can be an effective partner in providing opportunities for parents and their children, lifting up families, and in turn, building stronger communities. State and local governments can be at the forefront of these efforts, and the increased flexibility proposed by this bill would help reform practices across government.

In addition to strong support from national organizations like Ascend at the Aspen Institute, I want to thank the Maine Community Action Association and the Maine Head Start Directors Association for endorsing this important legislation. I also thank Senator HEINRICH for his continued leadership and urge my colleagues to support this innovative approach to moving families out of poverty by giving them the tools they need to succeed.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JONES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3339. A bill to restore military priorities, and for other purposes; read the first time.

S. 3339

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Restoring Military Priorities Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF REPROGRAMMED FUNDS.

All amounts transferred under the Department of Defense reprogramming action FY 20-01 RA, ''Support for DHS Counter-Drug Activity Reprogramming Action'', shall be restored to the appropriation accounts and the programs, projects, and activities for which such amounts were appropriated or otherwise made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116–93).

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116–93;) is amended by striking ''$4,000,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,798,000,000''.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 9002 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2020 (division A of Public Law 116–93;) is amended by striking ''$2,000,000,000'' and inserting ''$371,000,000''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Subcommittee on East Asia, The Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 25, 2020, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

CONGRATULATING THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LIV

On Thursday, February 13, 2020, the Senate passed S. Res. 490, as follows:

S. RES. 490

Whereas, on Sunday, February 2, 2020, the Kansas City Chiefs (in this preamble referred to as the ''Chiefs'') defeated the San Francisco 49ers by a score of 31 to 20 to win Super Bowl LIV in Miami, Florida;

Whereas the Chiefs, established on August 14, 1959, playing in their 60th season in the National Football League (referred to in this preamble as the ''NFL''), made their third Super Bowl appearance and their first Super Bowl appearance since Super Bowl IV;

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

Whereas the Chiefs overcame a 10-point deficit in the fourth quarter and scored 21 straight points in the final 6 minutes and 13 seconds of gameplay to earn the victory;

Whereas the victory in Super Bowl LIV earned the Chiefs their second Super Bowl victory, ending their 50-year Super Bowl drought that had lasted since the team last won Super Bowl IV on January 11, 1970;

Whereas the Chiefs were participants in the first ever Super Bowl and are now champions of the centennial season of the NFL;

Whereas the Chiefs began their championship season in another great Missouri city, St. Joseph, holding training camp on the campus of Missouri Western State University for the tenth straight year;

Whereas head coach Andy Reid earned his 222nd career win, placing him sixth on the all-time wins list of the NFL and earning his first Super Bowl title in his 21-year tenure as a head coach in the NFL;

Whereas Andy Reid is the 24th head coach of the NFL to appear in more than 1 Super Bowl;

Whereas in the 2019 NFL season, the Chiefs earned a playoff bid for the sixth time in 7 seasons under Andy Reid;

Whereas quarterback Patrick Mahomes completed 26 of 42 pass attempts for 286 yards and 2 touchdowns, rushed 9 times for 29 yards and 1 touchdown, and was named Most Valuable Player of Super Bowl LIV;

Whereas Patrick Mahomes became the youngest player in NFL history to earn both the NFL Most Valuable Player award and a Super Bowl title, while setting a playoff record for most touchdowns thrown before the first interception to start a player's playoff career;

Whereas in the American Football Conference Championship, Patrick Mahomes completed an iconic 27-yard scramble down the sideline for a touchdown to take the lead against the Tennessee Titans;

Whereas Patrick Mahomes became the first NFL quarterback with 3 double-digit comebacks in a single postseason;

Whereas Damien Williams rushed for 104 yards and scored 2 touchdowns, increasing his career playoff touchdown total to 11, tying Hall of Famer Terrell Davis for the

most touchdowns in an individual's first 6 playoff games;

Whereas Travis Kelce had 6 receptions for 43 yards and 1 touchdown;

Whereas Tyreek Hill had 9 receptions for 105 yards, including a crucial 44-yard reception on third-and-fifteen with only 7 minutes remaining in the fourth quarter;

Whereas Sammy Watkins had 5 receptions for 98 yards;

Whereas Bashaud Breeland led the team with 7 tackles and 1 interception;

Whereas Chris Jones was a disruptive force with 3 passes defended;

Whereas Frank Clark sacked the quarterback of the 49ers, Jimmy Garoppolo, on fourth-and-ten with fewer than 2 minutes remaining to seal the victory;

Whereas Harrison Butker was 1-for-1 in field goal attempts and 4-for-4 in point-after attempts;

Whereas Dustin Colquitt, the longest-tenured Chief, earned his first Super Bowl victory in his 15th season;

Whereas kick returner Mecole Hardman, tight end Travis Kelce, safety Tyrann Mathieu, and right tackle Mitchell Schwartz were named to the Associated Press All-Pro team for the 2019 season;

Whereas the Chiefs should be recognized for their tremendous resiliency in the face of adversity when trailing 24–0 against the Houston Texans in the American Football Conference Divisional Round, down by 10 against the Tennessee Titans in the American Football Conference Championship Round, and trailing 20–10 against the San Francisco 49ers in Super Bowl LIV;

Whereas the entire Chiefs roster contributed to the Super Bowl victory, including Nick Allegretti, Jackson Barton, Blake Bell, Bashaud Breeland, Alex Brown, Harrison Butker, Morris Claiborne, Frank Clark, Dustin Colquitt, Laurent Duvernay-Tardif, Cam Erving, Rashad Fenton, Eric Fisher, Kendall Fuller, Mecole Hardman, Demone Harris, Chad Henne, Tyreek Hill, Anthony Hitchens, Ryan Hunter, Chris Jones, Travis Kelce, Tanoh Kpassagnon, Darron Lee, Jordan Lucas, Patrick Mahomes, Tyrann Mathieu, LeSean McCoy, Matt Moore, Ben Niemann, Derrick Nnadi, Dorian O'Daniel, Mike Pennel, Byron Pringle, Reggie Ragland, Austin Reiter, Demarcus Robinson, Khalen Saunders, Mitchell Schwartz, Anthony Sherman, Daniel Sorensen, Terrell Suggs, Darwin Thompson, Charvarius Ward, Sammy Watkins, Armani Watts, Damien Williams, Xavier Williams, Damien Wilson, James Winchester, Stefen Wisniewski, Andrew Wylie, and Deon Yelder;

Whereas the victory of the Kansas City Chiefs in Super Bowl LIV instills an extraordinary sense of pride for fans in the States of Missouri and Kansas and across the Midwest; and

Whereas people all over the world are asking, ''How 'bout those Chiefs?'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Kansas City Chiefs and their entire staff, Mayor of Kansas City Quinton Lucas, Governor of Missouri Mike Parson, and loyal fans of the Kansas City Chiefs for their victory in Super Bowl LIV; and

(2) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Kansas City Chiefs, Clark Hunt;

(B) the president of the Kansas City Chiefs, Mark Donovan; and

(C) the head coach of the Kansas City Chiefs, Andy Reid.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the order of January 31 to allow Senators to have until Thursday, February 27, 2020, to have printed statements and opinions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they choose, explaining their votes and include those in the documentation of the impeachment proceedings; finally, I ask that the two-page rule be waived.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3339

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3339) to restore military priorities, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 27; 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, following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Greaves nomination, under the previous order.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:38 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 27, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM JORDAN GILLIS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT H. MCMAHON.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DOUGLAS BENEVENTO, OF COLORADO, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ANDREW WHEELER, RESIGNED.

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

MICHAEL PACK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ALEX NELSON WONG, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

ALEX NELSON WONG, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

ALDONA Z. WOS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CANADA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

ELIZABETH GLEASON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2020, VICE AARON PAUL DWORKIN, TERM EXPIRED.

JESSE MERRIAM, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024, VICE RAMON SALDIVAR, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT ANTHONY MOLLOY, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

SILVIA CARRENO-COLL, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

KATHARINE MACGREGOR, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.