

officer. Today, I am speaking of a North Dakota peace officer who was killed in the line of duty—Rolette County deputy Colt Allery. He lost his life on January 18, 2017, during a high-speed chase that Colt was engaged in with several of his fellow officers that evening after a report and identification of a stolen vehicle. As the stolen vehicle was coming to a forced stop, shots were fired from the car and fired at Colt as he approached. Colt fell, and he never got back up that evening, succumbing to his injuries not far from the small community where he grew up.

He leaves behind five beautiful young children, including a stepdaughter, his fiancée Alexandria, the grandparents who raised him, family, friends, and a community that misses him and still grieves at the loss.

Growing up in St. John, ND, and as an enrolled member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Colt never strayed too far from home. He made a commitment to do more than just be part of his community. He decided to serve his community as a peace officer.

Colt started out as a corrections officer for Rolette County. After graduating from the North Dakota Law Enforcement Training Academy, he started working as an officer with the Rolla Police Department. He then went to work serving his fellow Tribal members as a Tribal police officer on Turtle Mountain before he recently moved back to the Rolette County Sheriff's Office.

The loss of this fine young peace officer and young dad was felt across the entire State of North Dakota. The impacts are still felt by his family, the Rolette County Sheriff's Office, and his Tribal community of Turtle Mountain. Colt made the ultimate sacrifice in service to his State and to Rolette County. He lost his life to a gunshot wound inflicted by an individual prepared to take even more lives. The brave action of this peace officer that night prevented that from happening.

Deputy Colt Allery's name is now etched on the wall of the peace officers memorial here in Washington, DC. He is no longer just a North Dakota fallen hero. He is a national fallen hero, as he is recognized with all of his fallen brothers and officers.

Colt Allery's name will now serve as an example, not just to North Dakotans but to people from all over the country and all over the world who visit that memorial every year. He is an example of the best that our State and our country has to offer. He is an example of what it means to have lived and died so that others may be safe. Quite simply, he is an example for everyone of what it means to be an everyday hero.

We must also remember the families of our peace officers, who sacrifice so much, not knowing if their loved ones will return each time they walk out the door. You have sacrificed and lost

so much, and no words today will replace the pain of losing a loved one.

We have a proud history in North Dakota of peace officers like Colt serving their State and local communities with distinction. I have had the extreme privilege over the years to work with law enforcement officials in my State who span the spectrum from highway patrol to State and local peace officers, various Federal officers, and certainly our Tribal police. Let me tell you again that these are some of the finest men and women I have ever met or worked with. These are men and women just like Colt who could have chosen a different path. They could have chosen a path that didn't involve putting themselves in harm's way. Instead they chose to take the oath to protect and serve. They chose to selflessly put themselves in harm's way so they could make North Dakota a safer place for each and every person that lives in our great State or even those who may be passing through. They chose to put the needs of others before their own. They chose a more difficult path to tread than most of us would ever be willing to follow.

So I stand here this evening not only to celebrate the life of Colt Allery but to celebrate and thank each and every peace officer working in my great State of North Dakota, working across the country, and, yes, across the world.

To all of our peace officers, especially those back home in North Dakota, I want to say thank you from the bottom of my heart for your sacrifice for your communities and the State of North Dakota. I beg you to stay safe. I beg you to take care of yourselves. Take care of your families. And God bless all of you.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I just had a very productive and informative meeting with the nominee to be the next CIA Director, Ms. Gina Haspel. I wanted to come down to the floor and say a few words. I was very impressed. I am going to certainly support her when she is voted on, I believe as early as tomorrow.

There has been a lot of discussion about her background. She is the first woman to lead the CIA, first career member of the CIA. That is all important, but I think what is most important is that the American people and this body know that she is very well qualified. She is a very impressive person.

First of all, she has been very highly decorated in her 30-plus year career at the Central Intelligence Agency. Her honors include the Intelligence Medal of Merit, a Presidential Rank Award, the Donovan Award, which is one of the highest awards in the CIA, and the George H.W. Bush Award for Excellence in Counterterrorism. She is thoughtful. She is honest.

In many ways, she has overcome numerous obstacles. Let me talk a little bit about her bio. She is one of five children. Her father served in the Air Force, having joined at the age of 17. She grew up on military bases, like tens of thousands of Americans. Her original goal in life was to be a soldier. She told her dad she wanted to go to West Point. At the time, her father had to break the news to her that West Point was not admitting women. I think West Point lost out on that one. She ended up as a contractor for the military 10th Special Forces Group. Later, she realized that if she couldn't join the military, she was going to join the CIA, and that is what she did.

She has done an outstanding job at the CIA. She began working at the CIA in 1985 during the closing days of the Cold War. She was stationed literally all over the world—in Africa, for example. She recruited and handled agents and survived a coup d'etat. She worked with government partners during the first gulf war. She ran different CIA stations around the world.

She started with the Counterterrorism Center at the CIA on September 11, 2001, and essentially has spent her life since that time focusing on keeping our country safe. She became the Chief of Staff to the Deputy Director of Operations and the Deputy Director for the National Clandestine Service. She is now the Deputy Director of the entire CIA—the first woman to rise from the ranks as an initial member of the Agency to that title. And if confirmed, as I mentioned, she will be the first career CIA official and female to lead the Agency. That is really historic, but again, more important than history and more important than these labels is that she is very qualified.

One thing that has been remarkable throughout this entire debate about her—and there has been a lot of debate in the Intelligence Committee—is the members of the military, members of the national security establishment, both Democrats and Republicans, and members of the Intel Committee who have come out and said: We support Gina Haspel. The list is extremely impressive. Let me give a couple examples: John Brennan, former Obama administration CIA Director; James Clapper, former Obama administration Director of National Intelligence; Senator Saxby Chambliss, former Senate Intelligence Committee vice chair; Representative Porter Goss, former CIA Director and House Intelligence Committee chairman; Gen. Michael Hayden, former Bush administration CIA Director; Senator Bob Kerrey,

Democratic Senator from Nebraska, who was on the Senate Intelligence Committee and was the vice chairman; Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State; Mike McConnell, former Obama administration Director of National Intelligence; ADM William McRaven, former commander of USSOCOM; Michael Morell, former Obama administration Acting and Deputy CIA Director; Michael Mukasey, former Bush administration Attorney General; Leon Panetta, former Obama administration CIA Director and Secretary of Defense; MIKE ROGERS, Republican Congressman and former House Intel Committee chairman; George Shultz, an incredible statesman and former Secretary of State under President Reagan; and George Tenet, former Clinton and Bush administrations CIA Director.

That is impressive. That is an impressive list. That is the who's who—Democrat and Republican—of who has been in charge of our intelligence services over the last two to three decades, and they are all supporting Ms. Haspel. She is qualified. She has the support of everybody.

I want to briefly talk about essentially where the nomination has been focused. In Washington, a lot of times you can have an issue that comes up, and everybody focuses on it, and you miss the broader picture. The broader picture is that she is very well qualified and has the confidence, literally, of every senior official in the intelligence agencies she has served under, but the focus has been in many ways consumed by her role, which was a very low-level role, in what became known as the enhanced interrogation program that the CIA enacted after 9/11.

It is hard not to say that in the discussion of this, seeing what some of my colleagues have said and what some former Members of the Senate and House have said, there seems to be a lot of amnesia going on here.

I think it is important to take us back to the day that Ms. Haspel started at the CIA's Counterterrorism Center, as I mentioned, on September 11, 2001. For those of us who remember, it was a very frightening time in our country. Almost 3,000 Americans were murdered and almost 8,000 were wounded.

I wasn't here then, but in Washington, DC, whether it was from the President or Members of Congress, there was one demand for the CIA: Find out who did this. Find out who was responsible, and make sure they don't do it again. Find out who did this. Find out who was responsible, and do everything in your power to make sure the United States of America and our citizens don't get attacked again.

That was the No. 1 focus from all the elected leaders in Federal Government to the CIA: Protect us. Find out where the next attack is coming from, and don't let us get hit again.

If what ended up happening during this period of U.S. history—and a lot of people forget about it. A lot of people

forget how scared we were. Very few people predicted that we weren't going to get hit again. As a matter of fact, everybody thought we would get hit again, maybe with a weapon of mass destruction.

During the course of this time, the CIA started a program—when they started capturing terrorists who they thought had information—called enhanced interrogation techniques.

There was a lot of worry about getting hit again. I won't go through all the examples, but there are members of the Intel Committee in the Senate and members of the Intel Committee in the House who were briefed on exactly what the CIA was doing—exactly what they were doing with these enhanced interrogation techniques. And that is where the amnesia comes in, because we have seen some Members of this body say: That was horrible. Yet they were briefed. As a matter of fact, there are reports that many Members of Congress said: Do more; find out who did this. That was the order that the CIA and the members of our clandestine services were given.

There are numerous quotes from that time. Let me give one from former Senator John D. Rockefeller, West Virginia, who was the ranking member on the Senate Intel Committee. In 2003, on CNN's "Late Edition," he was talking about how we had captured Khalid Shaikh Mohammed—KSM, as he was known—who was known to be the mastermind of 9/11. It was very clear that at least Senator Rockefeller was saying: Make sure that we get as much info as we can from this guy.

Here is what he said:

Happily, we don't know where [KSM] is.

Meaning he was offsite, not in the country.

He's in safekeeping under American protection. He'll be grilled by us. I'm sure we'll be proper with him, but I'm sure we'll be very, very tough with him.

There are presidential memorandums that prescribe and allow certain measures to be taken, but we have to be careful. On the other hand, he does have the information. Getting that information will save American lives. We have no business not getting that information.

This is a year and a half after 9/11, and this is the vice chairman of the Intel Committee saying: Get it. Press it.

The CIA used these techniques, but here is the important thing. At the time they were told to go do this, it was reviewed by the Justice Department, which said: This is legal. You are allowed to use these techniques to try to get additional information. This is legal. Go do this. The Government of the United States is telling you that you have the authority to do it. It is legal.

That is undisputed. As a matter of fact, the enhanced interrogation techniques were actually developed at our military training facilities that we have in different parts of the country, called SERE schools—"Survival, Eva-

sion, Resistance, and Escape" schools. That is where the techniques were developed.

There was another reason why people at the time thought that this could be legal, because these interrogation techniques and training are actually used on our own military. For years, members of the military had been going to SERE school, and they underwent these interrogations. They underwent waterboarding. It was our own citizens. As a recon marine, I went to SERE school, and these techniques were applied to me, including waterboarding.

The CIA was told: Make sure this doesn't happen. The Members of Congress were briefed. Intel committee members, like Senator Rockefeller, were saying: Do more. The Justice Department comes out and says: This is all legal. Go do it. Make sure we are not attacked again. Oh, by the way, you are using techniques that we use on our marines and soldiers.

And that is what they did.

Gina Haspel was not high up. She had nothing to do with this. She was a GS-15 when this was going on. Yet my colleagues who are looking for reasons to vote against her are using this as an episode, saying: Well, because she was involved at a low level, we are going to vote against her.

Think about that. Members of the clandestine service were going out and risking their lives, being told to do something by the government, being told it was legal to do something by the government, being encouraged by Members of this body and the House to go do it, and now that one of them has risen through the ranks, with a stellar career, we are going to have Members come to the floor and say: No, we are going to consider her not qualified because she was a GS-15 and didn't design the program during this very, very difficult and challenging time in American history. If you don't think that breeds cynicism or if you don't think that breeds distrust between the Congress and the intelligence service, well, it does. It does.

I even had a friend of mine, and I got recalled to Active Duty for a year and a half at the end of 2004. We were staff officers to the CENTCOM commander. So we were in the Middle East most of that time. He was an agency representative, and he actually predicted this was going to happen to me a long time ago. I don't think it is appropriate for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to somehow use this against Ms. Haspel, a low-level employee, who was told to go do it. Congress is aware. Some Members even said do more—legally justified, used it at SERE school with our military. Now we are going to hold that against this very well-qualified nominee.

Let me just add something because I know it is part of the discussion. In retrospect, over time, many Members look back on that period and say: Well, maybe we shouldn't have done that. Maybe these enhanced interrogation

techniques aren't legal. Maybe that is a bad reflection on our country.

So there was a debate on this. That is fine. That is the way it should be.

As a matter of fact, one of the Senators whom I have the most respect for in this entire body, Senator MCCAIN—who knows a lot about torture and a lot about interrogation and has been a hero and is well respected—led that debate on the Senate floor that said that these enhanced interrogation techniques—waterboarding—aren't what we should be doing in this country. So let's clarify this. Yes, a previous administration said this is legal. We do it to our own soldiers and marines and Navy SEALs, but we are going to look at a higher value on what we believe is right and what Americans should be doing or should not be doing.

So we actually had a debate in 2016 on this floor as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, where Senator MCCAIN led an effort with an amendment that said: From here on out, the techniques that our CIA operatives would be able to use and that should be approved are only those in the Army Field Manual. Those are OK—not the rest of what happened in terms of the enhanced interrogation techniques. Then this body passed that. As a matter of fact, I voted for the McCain amendment out of respect, appreciation, and the arguments that JOHN MCCAIN was making. So we clarified the law.

In many ways, that is how the system is supposed to work. In challenging times with a lot of turmoil, yes, these operatives were pushing the envelope, but it was legal. We should take a step back and say: Maybe that shouldn't be what we should be doing going forward. And we changed the system through debate on the floor, led by Senator MCCAIN.

Let me just end by saying that here is how it is not supposed to work. We have a very dangerous situation, like we had after 9/11. We asked our best and brightest to risk their lives to defend this country, to do really tough operations all around the world. We go tell them to do things. This body is briefed on it. We tell them it is legal, and then later, we said: Do you know what? Now we are going to hold that against you.

Not only is that unfair, but if we continue doing that, how hard do you think it is going to be to get the top people in our country to want to join the CIA or the special forces or the military? We tell them to go do this, to protect your Nation; it is legal. And then 10, 15 years later, we say: No, maybe it wasn't.

I want to thank Ms. Haspel for wanting to serve her country at the highest level, for her example, and all the other members of the CIA's clandestine services, who have been on the frontlines protecting this Nation. I certainly hope my colleagues who are looking at that period of history, looking to hold it against her, recognize the broader con-

text. Not only were she and the other members of the Agency asked to do that kind of work, but they were told it was important to protect the country and that it was legal.

When her nomination comes to the floor tomorrow, I certainly hope my colleagues keep this all in mind, look at her broad qualifications, and vote for her to be the next CIA Director.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Thursday, May 17, Senator PAUL or his designee be recognized to make a motion to proceed to S. Con. Res. 36; further, that there be up to 90 minutes of debate on the motion, with 45 minutes under the control of Senator PAUL or his designee and 45 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee; finally, that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 829; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

##### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant, United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 47:

*To be admiral*

Vice Adm. Charles W. Ray

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume 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.

#### NOTICES OF ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS

##### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, there will be an organizational meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing in S-219, U.S. Capitol, on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, at 3:30 P.M.

##### JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President there will be an organizational meeting of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library in S-219, U.S. Capitol, on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, at 3:45 P.M.

#### NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of Gina Haspel to be CIA Director.

Ms. Haspel played a central role in the CIA's rendition, detention, and interrogation program. This was one of the darkest chapters in our Nation's history, and it must not be repeated.

Since her nomination, I and my staff have reviewed thousands of classified documents detailing her role in the program.

The takeaway is this: Ms. Haspel was a strong supporter of the torture program.

While many CIA operatives expressed hesitation or outright opposition to the program, such as John Brennan, Ms. Haspel was not one of them.

As I said last week, this nomination is bigger than one person. This nomination is about reckoning with our history. It is about grappling with our country's mistakes and making clear to the world that we accept responsibility for our mistakes and they will never be repeated.

I was struck by Ms. Haspel's repeated insistence at her hearing that the torture program was "legal."

The torture program was illegal at the time based on international treaties the United States is signatory to, including the Convention Against Torture and Geneva Convention.

While the Office of Legal Counsel signed off on waterboarding and other "enhanced interrogation techniques," its flimsy legal analyses were withdrawn in 2003 and 2004 and should never have taken precedence over international law.

The bottom line is this: No one has ever been held accountable for the torture program, and I do not believe those who were intimately involved in it deserve to lead the agency.

What message does it send to the world if we reward people for presiding over what is considered to be one of the darkest chapters in our history?

Of course, supporters of the torture program are constantly trying to rewrite history, so I think it is important to revisit that history here today.

After a 5½ year review of the CIA's detention and interrogation program, the Senate Intelligence Committee released a 500-page declassified executive