

Roberts
Romney
Rounds
Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune

Tillis
Toomey
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—1
Gillibrand

DISAPPROVING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO TAKE AN ACTION RELATING TO THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

RIGHT TO LIFE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is amazing how much we talk about our kids. People talk about bipartisan things here all the time. There is a bipartisan conversation often about our families and about our kids and how proud of them we are and about sharing our lives with each other.

My two daughters are a remarkable part of my family, of who I am. I can't even process life without thinking about the two of them.

Our kids are some of the most valuable moments of our entire lives and our greatest memories. When they were little, we looked into their eyes and saw potential, and we dreamed for them. From our earliest days of pregnancy, Cindy and I talked about the future for our girls as we prayed for them, thought about them, prepared for them, and it had sunk in what an incredible responsibility they really were. Kids are that way. That is that earliest moment that we talk about all the time.

What is remarkable about this photo is thinking about just exactly what this moment could be like because, in this moment, there are really two directions that it could go in America. This little one was born several weeks early. For that little one, life could have gone in two different directions. This group of doctors is gathered around this little one, delivering this child, and watching him take his very first breath. Only seconds before that, that same little one we see there with this same group of doctors could have been destroyed—that life in the womb—and it would have been OK.

You see, in America, this moment could go two different directions at any time. This life could be there, and we could watch the decades ahead of him or, seconds before this picture was taken, when that child was still in the womb, that life could have been destroyed, and no one would have paid attention because the determination of whether this is a child or whether this is just a little lump of tissue is deter-

mined by a few seconds in a delivery room. If it is still inside the womb, it is not a child; it is just tissue. A few seconds later, when he is delivered, everyone smiles and looks at the face of this baby and says: What a beautiful child, and what a remarkable miracle that is.

How do we do that in America? How do we decide what is life and what is just tissue?

Some people would say it is only a child if we believe it is a child. If we don't believe it is a child, it is not a child; it is only tissue.

Some people say it has incredible value, and we should prepare for his or her college, and we should think and pray about his future and his spouse and what he is going to do. Some people would say it is meaningless—just flesh that can literally be put into a bag and taken to the curb. The determination is really by the mom and the dad there. They get to choose whether that is a child or whether that is tissue.

I honestly don't understand that conversation because when I look at this child with fingers and toes and hair and unique DNA, there is nothing different about that child right there than this child. You see, that child whom we saw in the picture before is the same age as this one, but, this time, this is a 3D ultrasound taken inside the womb, but there is no difference between the two. Both of them have faces and fingers and toes and nervous systems and functioning brains and lungs. They have DNA that is different from their moms and their dads—DNA that is unique to those people. Whether you can see him or not, that heartbeat and that DNA is a child.

In America, we still have this ongoing dialogue: When is ‘life’ life?

I heard someone earlier jokingly say that if this life were discovered on Mars, we would say Mars had life on it, but we are still discussing whether this life is a life on Earth. What do we do with that?

Here is what we continue to debate and continue to have a conversation about. On January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court ruled on what is now the infamous Roe v. Wade decision. It was supposed to have settled the issue about life. It was supposed to have settled the issue that every single State has to allow abortion and that life, according to the Supreme Court in 1973, was about viability. When can this child live on his own outside the womb—viability?

Viability in 1973 was very different than viability now, thankfully. When we think about viability now, there are people born at 21 or 22 weeks—extremely early—who would have never survived in 1973 but who regularly survive now because of great medical care. Viability really doesn't determine life, though. Life is something that begins much earlier, and for some reason in our culture, we are still having a conversation about what to do with that tissue.

As Americans, we spend a lot of time trying to work on very difficult issues, but for some reason, this has become a partisan issue that is exceptionally divisive in this culture. This life and this child shouldn't be a partisan issue. This shouldn't be a Republican child or a Democratic child. This should just be a child, and we should be able to pause for a moment and determine what we are going to do about her and determine: Is she valuable?

As a culture, we spend billions of dollars caring for the homeless because we believe that every single life matters and that no life can just be thrown away just because one struggles with life. We spend billions of dollars caring for the oldest and the weakest in our society because they need 24-hour care and because we respect that life and the dignity that it carries. We demand equal protection for women and men of all races, all ages, all sexual orientations, all faiths. We demand that as a culture because we believe, as a culture, that every person should have respect and every person should have opportunity because of one's great potential.

We pat ourselves on the back when we adopt abused animals, when we stand up against human trafficking worldwide, when we help clean up ocean trash, or when we plant trees to beautify our communities. Yet we are having a tough time considering that child as a child.

We even require that cigarettes, alcohol, theme park rides, medicines, and many other products have warning labels on them to warn pregnant moms not to use the product because it could harm the child because, as a culture, we acknowledge that a mom's smoking hurts a child. Yet, for some reason, we can't seem to acknowledge that a child could be hurt by an abortion and that it really would end a life.

It is my guess that anyone who disagrees with this has already tuned me out because, as a culture, we don't want to think about this life because if, for a moment, we pause and consider that maybe she is really alive and has purpose and value, we would have to swallow hard and acknowledge the millions of little girls just like her who have died in abortions in America—millions. To fight against having to deal with that, we just don't want to think about it, and we just tune it out. Yet, if you are one of the folks who has actually stuck with me through the dialogue, let me walk through a couple of things just to think about.

Let's start with a few things—the science. This little girl has DNA that is different than her mom's and dad's. It has cell division. It has something that we would look at in normal embryonic development called the Carnegie stages of embryonic development.

For years and years, every medical school teaches the Carnegie stages of embryonic development. They look at cell division at the beginning point and acknowledge, as they go through the

process, that this is a child from the earliest moments and that it is a stage of life. Every single person who can hear me right now has gone through the Carnegie stages of embryonic development, just like this little one has. Every person has because we understand that it is a natural part of life, that it is a stage of life, that it is an acknowledgment of life.

It is something that we acknowledge in the animal world because this Congress has passed laws to deal with endangered species, including a \$100,000 fine if you damage a golden eagle's egg, a bald eagle's egg, if you go to marine turtles' nesting spots to destroy or to even disturb the nests of marine turtles. In Oklahoma, we deal with barn swallows that will build their nests in the springtime in construction areas. All construction has to stop if a barn swallow builds a nest in a construction area, because those eggs are important, not so much because of the barn swallow but because there is a common understanding in this Congress that those eagle eggs, turtle eggs, and barn swallow eggs are future barn swallows, turtles, and eagles. We acknowledge that it is a life that is in process. So we protect it, but we can't seem to make the simple, logical step that that eagle egg becomes an eagle and she is a little girl.

The science screams at us in this area, but for many people, they just don't want to think about it because, at this stage, she is in the womb. She is invisible. She hasn't reached the stage at which you can see her. For many people, they say: She is only alive when I can see her. If I can't see her, she is not real.

The problem is that the science doesn't prove that out.

The second issue that we have to deal with is where we are as a culture and where we are as a country compared to other countries on this simple issue about looking at this little one and asking: Is that a child or is that just tissue? Where is the rest of the world on this?

It is interesting to note that the rest of the world is in a very different spot than is the United States on this. This is a simple map of the world. Most of the world—and you will see it in gray here—says that abortion should stop at 12 weeks. That is 3 months. After 3 months, you can't have an abortion anymore.

There are seven countries in the world that will allow abortion all the way up to 24 weeks. They are the countries that are here in black—Canada, the United States, China, North Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, and the Netherlands. They allow abortions up to 24 weeks.

At 24 weeks and on, in the third trimester, there are only four countries in the world that allow late-term abortions—only four—China, North Korea, Vietnam, and the United States. Everywhere else in the world looks at that child and says that the child is a

child—fully viable—except the United States, China, North Korea, and Vietnam. Now, that is not a club I really want us to be in.

All of Europe has banned late-term abortion—all of it. All of Africa, most of Asia, and all of Central and South America have looked at this, and as separate cultures, they have said no to a late-term abortion—that he is a fully viable child.

Interestingly enough, there was a survey that just came out today—a nationwide survey—that asked Americans' opinions on this issue about life. There were 75 percent of Americans who said there should not be abortion after 12 weeks of pregnancy—that is 3 months—except to protect the life of the mom. This was 75 percent of Americans. They are with this part of the world. This part of the world all says that same thing. That is most of Europe, and most of that area says OK to 12 weeks, but that after 12 weeks, you have to stop because the child has a functioning nervous system and brain and is developing in all of those areas.

Even if you don't acknowledge where I am, where I believe that life begins—at conception—why can't you at least acknowledge that at 12 weeks, which is where most of the rest of the world is, he is a child that should be protected?

At what point do we, as Americans, slow down enough to look at what we don't want to look at and at what the rest of the world has done, except for Vietnam, North Korea, and China? Why do we want to be in that group when we deal with the issue of life? Those are some of the worst human rights violators in the world. Why are we in that club?

Folks have recently said to me: You know, I understand this is a legislative issue, but it is really a faith issue. This is really about your faith, and your faith should not legislate who I am.

I would only tell you that a culture makes decisions, including our culture, not just about its faith but about its values as a culture.

Stealing is also a religious issue. It is in the Ten Commandments. So maybe, as a culture, we shouldn't ban stealing because the Ten Commandments say you shouldn't steal. No one would really say that because, as a culture, we all look at it and say that theft is a problem, that you shouldn't be able to do that.

A culture makes its decisions based on its own personal values. So it is not just a religious issue, but our faith does impact our personal lives and decisions. It does affect who we are.

In China, where most faith is banned, they allow abortion at any stage. In fact, in China the state is the most important thing. Everything is about building up the state. The individual has no value. The state has the greatest value. China determines it has too many people. So it forces women to have abortions. It compels them. Some can only have one child, and some can have two children, but every child after

that has to be aborted because the state chooses that. Its greatest value is the state.

Our greatest value is the individual. That is why our documents begin with things like "we the people," because the individual has value. We look at the senior adults who are in the nursing homes and provide care for them. We look at the homeless person, the child who is in need of food, and that little girl who is still in the womb, and we say they all have value because the individual has importance.

I had someone who caught me and said: You know, your faith has this whole verse in the Bible that says: "I was knit together in my mother's womb." So this is a religious issue. You have a belief that each child was knit together by God in their mother's womb.

Then they paused and said: That is fine for you to have that belief, but I have the belief that they were knit together, but it is when they are not done. They are not fully knit together. They are not really a shirt. They are only a sleeve, and if they are still in development, then, they are not fully developed. They are not really a child yet.

I smile at that and say: Actually, although this child was born premature, you are right. She is not fully developed. It is not just a sleeve. It is just a smaller shirt, but she will get there because everything about your life's development—your hair color, your height, your health—is all bound up in those first cells as they start dividing in your own unique DNA.

This is not about a religious conviction. This is about a child and who we are as a culture.

Let me say this: I understand there is a lot of conversation about this. As I mentioned before, this has become a partisan, divisive issue. This is not trying to be a Republican or Democrat. I have met Republicans and Democrats who both can look at this picture and say that is a child, not tissue.

This shouldn't be a divisive or political issue, neither should this be an attacking and condemning issue of the moms and dads who have walked through abortion. Quite frankly, I have great compassion for them. For those moms who have had an abortion, that memory never goes away for them. Years later, they sit in the food court at the mall and watch a small child playing nearby and think: That is how old my child would be right now if they were still alive. I have not met a mom, ever, who wasn't affected by abortion and the memories that come back to them on that.

This is not a flippant issue for any person who goes through an abortion. I grieve for those folks and the struggle they have, but I also grieve for us as a nation in the devaluing of something so obvious as a child. We can do better as a country, but the first thing we have to do is stop and look.

As a nation, we have been through some moments that we are not proud

of, but as a nation, we are proud of who we can become. As a nation, we are not proud that at one point, we declared African-American men and women as three-fifths of a man. As a nation, we are not proud of that. As a nation, we are not proud that we once told women they could not vote. As Americans, we are not proud that at one point, we took Japanese-Americans and interned them in camps because we were afraid of them. As Americans, we are not proud of those moments.

I pray there is a day that we are not proud that we looked away from little girls and little boys and said: You are not human enough yet. Your life can be ended because I don't want to look at you.

The beginning for us, really, is to stop and look at what is obvious. That is a child. What are you going to do about that child?

One of the great books of the 20th century was written by a man named Ralph Ellison, who, by the way, was an Oklahoman. Ralph Ellison was a tremendous African-American author. In the early 20th century, he wrote a book called "Invisible Man." It is a remarkable journey to look into that time period. The author, who is really writing as the narrator of the book, is telling his story.

In the prologue of the book, there is a section I want to read to you because I think it is powerful, just thinking about the philosophy that Ralph Ellison put out. He said this:

I am a man of substance, of flesh and bone, fiber and liquids—and I might even be said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus sideshows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distorting glass. When they approach me they only see my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination—indeed, everything and anything except me.

Nor is my invisibility exactly a matter of biochemical accident to my epidermis. That invisibility to which I refer occurs because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I come in contact. A matter of the construction of the inner eyes, those eyes with which they look through their physical eyes upon reality.

Ralph Ellison was saying in the early 20th century that White America, when they ran into Black America, refused to look and ignored them as if they were invisible and just walked on.

As a culture, I am grateful that Americans are opening their eyes to each other as friends and as neighbors and as Americans. I wonder, one day, when the peculiar eyes that choose to pretend that this child is invisible, simply because she looks like this, when our peculiar eyes choose to look at what we have chosen to say is invisible and to turn away and to say: Let's see what we do as a culture. Let's march for life. Let's speak out for what is obvious, and let's determine what to do in the next step.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to spend a few minutes talking about the partial government shutdown, which is happening right now, and, more importantly, related to it, the men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard who are working today, like every other member of the military, risking their lives here, in my State of Alaska, and overseas in the Middle East, and are not getting paid to do so. They are the only branch of the U.S. military not getting paid to risk their lives for their country. They missed their first paycheck today, but here is the good news. We are offering a solution—a solution that is working through the Federal Government that has a lot of potential.

Before I get to that, I want to talk a little bit about the partial government shutdown itself and make clear that I believe the Trump administration's effort to secure the border should be part of the solution. Every nation has the right and has the responsibility to protect its citizens and to protect its sovereignty. In my view, this is something that should not be controversial. Every nation has the right and responsibility to do this, and that is what the citizens of each country expect. It should not be controversial.

In fact, over the past 25 years, every single President of the United States—Democrat and Republican—has attempted to secure the southern border and has come before the Congress and said: I am going to secure the southern border. They have campaigned on securing the southern border. They have all said this. Even the Members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans—year after year have come to the floor of both Houses and said: We need to do it.

In a big speech in 2014, President Obama called the situation on the southern border a crisis. That was 4 years ago. He called it a crisis—the previous President, President Obama. I agreed with his assessment then, and I agree with President Trump's assessment now, which is the same assessment.

That is why the President is asking for \$5.7 billion to secure our border. It is not an unreasonable request, particularly, when Members of this body, just last spring, when we were debating immigration reform, voted for dollar amounts that were much greater than that. Again, Democrats and Republicans, last spring, debating on the floor of this body immigration reform and border security, voted way north of \$5.7 billion.

This is just one of the many solutions we need to grapple with in order to have a functional immigration sys-

tem that secures our border, enforces the law, helps to grow our economy, and, importantly, keeps families together. Securing the border is an important goal.

I am hoping that as we all work on this, Speaker PELOSI, Minority Leader SCHUMER, the President, and my Republican colleagues could get to a compromise on this issue soon. We all need to come together.

The good news, as I mentioned, is that we might be on the verge of coming together—those parties that I just mentioned—on one of the issues that relate to securing our border, that relate to this broader challenge on the partial government shutdown involving the U.S. Coast Guard. I am hopeful that this could be a template for getting out of the broader partial government shutdown.

As you know, the partial government shutdown is negatively impacting Federal workers, but none—none—more so than the brave men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard. As I mentioned, they are currently the only members of the U.S. military who are not getting paid during this partial government shutdown. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines are all out there risking their lives for our Nation. We greatly appreciate that. And guess what. They are getting paid to do it, as they should be, but the Coast Guard members are also out there risking their lives, especially in my State, the great State of Alaska. They are out on the Bering Seas, some of the roughest and most dangerous oceans in the world, keeping our fishermen safe and doing rescues. They are deployed overseas. They are deployed in the Middle East. They have been in Florida and Texas helping with natural disasters, hurricanes—all heroic service. There have been many shutdowns before in the Federal Government, unfortunately, dating back decades, but this might be the first time ever that you have every branch of the military being paid during the shutdown, with the exception of one.

Let me read a letter from the commandant of the Coast Guard, ADM Karl Schultz, to the men and women of the Coast Guard.

To the Men and Women of the United States Coast Guard,

Today you will not be receiving your regularly scheduled mid-month paycheck. To the best of my knowledge, this marks the first time in our Nation's history that service-members in a U.S. Armed Force have not been paid during a lapse in government appropriations.

That is the first paragraph in the Commandant's letter to all the members of the U.S. Coast Guard. It is the first time in the U.S. history we are doing this to members of the military.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

TO THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, Today you will not be

receiving your regularly scheduled mid-month paycheck. To the best of my knowledge, this marks the first time in our Nation's history that servicemembers in a U.S. Armed Force have not been paid during a lapse in government appropriations.

Your senior leadership, including Secretary Nielsen, remains fully engaged and we will maintain a steady flow of communications to keep you updated on developments.

I recognize the anxiety and uncertainty this situation places on you and your family, and we are working closely with service organizations on your behalf. To this end, I am encouraged to share that Coast Guard Mutual Assistance (CGMA) has received a \$15 million donation from USAA to support our people in need. In partnership with CGMA, the American Red Cross will assist in the distribution of these funds to our military and civilian workforce requiring assistance.

I am grateful for the outpouring of support across the country, particularly in local communities, for our men and women. It is a direct reflection of the American public's sentiment towards their United States Coast Guard; they recognize the sacrifice that you and your family make in service to your country.

It is also not lost on me that our dedicated civilians are already adjusting to a missed paycheck—we are confronting this challenge together.

The strength of our Service has, and always will be, our people. You have proven time and again the ability to rise above adversity. Stay the course, stand the watch, and serve with pride. You are not, and will not, be forgotten.

Semper Paratus.

ADMIRAL KARL L. SCHULTZ,
Commandant.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Nobody thinks this is a good idea. Nobody thinks this is a good idea. So last week, a number of us in this body, Democrats and Republicans, put forward a bill that simply says we should pay the men and women of the Coast Guard, even if we are in a partial government shutdown, just like paying the men and women of the other branches of the military. They are risking their lives daily. They can't just quit their job. By the way, if they want to just go quit, they are going to be court-martialed. That is different than other Federal service. So that is what we said we were going to do.

When the President came to the Senate last week, I had the opportunity to raise this issue with the President and his team and highlighted the fact that this is very different, and we need to work together. We have a bill. If we get the President's support and signature on it, that would be a good way to move it forward, and I have been in communication with his administration ever since the lunch—working with us.

I am hopeful we are on the verge of a breakthrough because the White House has said the President recognizes this is a rather unique situation—very unique—so he has now said he is going to support this bill. We have Democrats, Republicans, the White House, and the President of the United States all saying, all right, we are not there yet, but this is a good start, and this is an important issue.

What is going on right now in this body is we are trying to UC this. We

are trying to get unanimous consent from Democrats and Republicans on this bill. Again, leadership on the Democratic side and on the Republican side have all supported this bill: pay the Coast Guard like the other military servicemembers. The White House is now supportive. Hopefully, tonight we are going to get this cleared, and we are going to get it over to the House; Speaker PELOSI and her team will recognize how dire and important this is—just like Democrats, Republicans, the President, and Secretary Nielsen Secretary of Homeland Security all recognize this—and we get to a solution. It is not going to end everything, but it will be a solution.

I am asking my colleagues tonight, as this bill is being moved through the hotline for unanimous consent—and I thank all the Republicans who have already said they will support it. We get my colleagues on the Democratic side—again, there are a number of Democratic cosponsors on this bill. The President said he would sign it. We get it over to the House, and we start to get solutions as opposed to just roadblocks.

There are just two broader issues I want to raise. As I am indicating, this kind of work can be a template to getting to a broader solution with regard to the partial government shutdown—Democrats and Republicans in this body working together, the White House working with us, the Trump administration working with us, and, hopefully, the House will see the wisdom of this when the bill comes over to them, and we will get a bill signed that takes care of almost 50,000 Active-Duty patriots—men and women—risking their lives, right now as we speak, with no pay. I am hopeful that is a template.

Another broader issue that this matter actually raises—that we need to focus on a lot more in the Senate—is a problem I have seen in the last 4 years during my time here: that sometimes the Coast Guard gets short shrift relative to other members of the military. It is wrong, and we need to work on it together.

Why has that happened? Certainly not because they are not as heroic and dedicated and patriotic as the rest of the military. I don't think it is intentional. It is more bureaucratic. The Coast Guard falls under the Commerce Committee. The Coast Guard falls under the Homeland Security Secretary. The Marines, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are under the Armed Services Committee and under the Pentagon. Sometimes things just happen, whether it is retirement pay, whether it is the example of paying the military, where the Coast Guard gets treated in an unequal manner. They shouldn't. They shouldn't. We need to treat all members of the military, all five branches, the same: pay, retirement, shutdowns. Again, I don't think it is intentional, but it does happen.

I am the chairman of the subcommittee in the Commerce Com-

mittee in charge of the Coast Guard. I sit on the Armed Services Committee. I know a lot of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, have recognized this is a problem. The chairman of the Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have. I think we are all focused—again, bipartisan—to address some of these challenges where the Coast Guard is not treated equally among the other services, and that is just wrong. We need to start working on that, and I am going to continue to focus on that issue.

The best way we can start working on that is tonight: Fix this pay problem, which every single American knows is inequitable, knows is not fair to the men and women of the Coast Guard, but we are on the verge of a solution. Let's UC this bill tonight—we have the White House's support—and get it over to the House. At least we will take care of one issue where there is an inequality between the men and women in the other branches of the services and the Coast Guard, and then we will work to fix all the others. I am hopeful we are going to get there tonight and hopefully will solve this problem in the next 24 to 48 hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, it has been an interesting start to this new Congress 2 weeks ago today, I believe—almost 2 weeks ago, this week. We are in a shutdown, and then we had a vote here a few minutes ago to disapprove of a decision made by the administration.

A lot of people would look at that, and they would say that is a sign of weakness and division. Most certainly, I don't like this shutdown. I hope we can figure a way out of it quickly. A lot of people who had nothing to do with it are being hurt. My feelings about that are strong as well. I don't think what the President is requesting is unreasonable, but the reason we have a shutdown is because, at the end of the day, everyone involved—no matter how long and how strongly they disagree—is willing to live by the Constitution, and the Constitution says, the only way you can fund the government is if the House and the Senate pass a spending bill and the President signs it into law.

Likewise, we had a vote a few minutes ago about a decision made by the administration to delist a Russian company after some changes were made to the ownership structure. You may disagree with it or agree with it, but the bottom line is, that the reason the vote happened is we passed a law that said within 30 days of it being enacted, the Congress could act to disapprove. That is the way our constitutional system works.

So despite our sharp disagreements, despite our arguments, despite what appears outwardly to the country and many in the world as a sign of division and weakness, the result may not be

anything we support—or maybe it is—but at its core, let's remind ourselves that the reason this is happening is because everyone involved, no matter how much they appear to dislike each other or how much they disagree, they are willing to live within the letter and the law of the Constitution of the United States of America.

VENEZUELA

Imagine an alternative for a moment. Imagine if the President, frustrated by Congress's continuing unwillingness to fund one of his priorities on border security, frustrated by a decision in Congress to disapprove of a decision he made regarding sanctions, decided not only was he going to ignore Congress, but he was going to stop paying them, he was going to jail its Members, and he was going to create an alternative Congress, which he handpicked and controlled.

That sounds farfetched. That sounds clearly unconstitutional, but there are parts of this world where those kinds of things are happening, and one of them is in our hemisphere. What I have just described to you is exactly what has happened in the nation of Venezuela beginning as early as 2013.

What has happened there is that the supposed President—actual dictator—of the country, frustrated that the democratically elected national assembly would not support his initiatives to control the country, decided to create an alternative—what they call a constituent assembly—an alternative congress. They no longer pay the national assembly members at all. They have no staffing; they have no budget; they are hardly allowed to meet; and several of them have been jailed.

As part of this process of replacing the national assembly or at least ignoring them and giving no force of law to what they vote on and creating this alternative national assembly called the constituent assembly, completely outside their Constitution, with no basis in law—that entity, that organism, called for an election, a new election for President. It was a snap election designed to not allow the opposition to organize in time, an election in which they control all the television stations, in which people had to show an ID card in order to vote, and that ID card also happened to be the card that got your family food and medicine—the limited amounts people are getting—not a fair election in any way.

The result is, last May, Maduro “wins” this “fraudulent” election, and the first day of the term of this fraudulent Presidency was last week.

Rightfully, the President of the United States, along with leaders from multiple other countries—including Colombia, Brazil, Canada, and dozens of countries around the world—have said Maduro is an illegitimate President under the Constitution of Venezuela: The election you held isn't free and fair. The election you held was authorized by an organism that is not recognized under the Constitution. You

are not the real President. You are a fraud, and the only reason why you are in office is because you are threatening to jail or kill the people who are willing to raise this point against you.

The administration went further, and they said the national assembly of Venezuela is the only constitutionally, democratically elected government in the country.

The statements we have made in the last week are entirely rooted in the rule of law and entirely rooted in the Venezuelan Constitution, and they are not unilateral actions. These statements have been supported by other countries in the region, including Venezuela's neighbors.

If, in fact, we are basing our public policy on the Constitution of Venezuela, there is one more provision we cannot ignore; that is, a provision in the Constitution that says that when there is a vacancy in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, the President of Venezuela is the President of the national assembly.

We have a similar line of secession in the United States. In the absence of the President or the Vice President, the Speaker of the House automatically becomes the President of the United States. They might have a swearing-in ceremony, but by law that absence triggers the Presidency of the Speaker of the House—third in the line, followed by No. 4 in line, the President *pro tempore* of the Senate.

They have a similar outline in Venezuela under their Constitution. So it stands to reason that if our policy is that Maduro and his Vice President are illegitimate because they were elected in an extra-constitutional, fraudulent election, then clearly the Presidency of Venezuela is vacant. And if we are rooting our support for the National Assembly as the only constitutionally and legitimately elected body in the country, then we must respect the fact that that Constitution automatically passes the title of “President” to the President of the National Assembly.

What I come to the floor today to ask is that the administration—hopefully in concert with Brazil and Canada and Columbia and other countries around the world—simply recognize what the Venezuelan Constitution clearly lays out. There is no President in Venezuela right now that has been democratically elected, and via their own Constitution, the current President of Venezuela, pending a new election, is Juan Guaido, the President of the National Assembly.

This is entirely rooted, as I said, in rule of law and under the Venezuelan Constitution. It doesn't even require Mr. Guaido to assume the office; it automatically is bestowed upon him. It is a critical thing for us to do in order to begin to build a better future for Venezuela, along with our partners in the region.

I think the next actions that should be followed after that happens is that Mr. Guaido name a cabinet and name leaders to run the military.

From the perspective of the United States, since we have recognized the legitimate Presidency of the National Assembly's President, pending a new election, I think the time has come to expel the Maduro-appointed Ambassadors and allow the new constitutional President to appoint replacements.

The frozen assets of the Venezuelan Government should be put at the disposal of legitimate government so they can use them to conduct a free and fair election and also use them to begin to rebuild the country.

The opportunity exists now to work with the new President, pending the new election, to begin laying out plans to deliver humanitarian aid right now, along with our partners in the region in the world, but also to help put together a package of assistance to help Venezuela rebuild a country decimated by the current dictatorship.

These are bold moves, but they are entirely rooted in the rule of law, entirely justified under the Venezuelan Constitution, and will be clear evidence that we will not stand by idly as democracy in the region is wiped out by this growing trend around the world of authoritarians assuming the vestiges of democracy—holding elections that aren't real elections, having parliamentary bodies that aren't real—in essence, dressing the part of democrats but behaving like dictators.

I strongly urge this administration publicly—and I have done so privately—to move quickly to recognize the President of the National Assembly of Venezuela, Juan Guaido, as the interim President of that country pending a transition to a new, free and fair election, and I hope this is an action we will take in concert with our partners in the region who recognize the exact same thing.

There is a window of opportunity here to shine the light of freedom and liberty through our actions, and I hope we move expeditiously in pursuit of that goal. And to the Venezuelan people—that they may know that we are standing with them, that we have been given a concrete opportunity to defend their aspirations for freedom and a better future but also to defend their Constitution.

To military officers in Venezuela who swore to uphold and defend their Constitution, now is the opportunity for you to abandon the current direction of the country and assume your responsibility that you have sworn to uphold, and that is the constitutional provisions of that country.

I believe with all my heart and I have every reason to believe without any doubt that this administration and this government, along with this Congress, stand ready to work hand in hand with the people of Venezuela to restore a rightful democracy and empower that country to head in the right direction. I urge the administration to move quickly to take the first step on our part to facilitate that. It is, as I said,

the last, best chance we have before it potentially becomes too late and the dark cloud of tyranny settles upon Venezuela the way it has over Cuba and increasingly over Nicaragua now for over two generations.

I urge the President and his administration to do what only they are empowered to do under our Constitution; that is, recognize the rightful heads of state of other nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I know you are not allowed to respond to me, but allow me to welcome you to the Chair as a new Member of the Senate.

With a new year come a lot of changes. This month, a Democratic majority was sworn in to the House of Representatives. That new majority has heard the call from Americans to make tackling climate change one of our top priorities, and what a change that will make from the last Congress.

Young voters who helped propel this change are urgently concerned about climate change. More than three-fourths of millennials agree on the need for climate action. Even a majority of Republican millennials agree on the need for action in face of our climate crisis. Indeed, a former Republican Congressman just wrote about climate change: “My party will never earn the votes of millennials unless it gets serious about finding solutions.”

Of course, it is not just younger voters; polling shows that Americans of all ages and political stripes favor policy solutions that scientists and economists say are needed to tackle climate change. A recent survey of more than 10,000 registered voters showed that nearly two-thirds of Americans believe that investing in renewable energy will create more jobs than investing in fossil fuel. Among Republicans—here—52 percent of Republican voters think that focusing on renewables will create more jobs than fossil fuel—52 percent to 29 percent—and that is with the non-stop saturation, indoctrination of the Republican Party by the fossil fuel industry, with all of its propaganda and nonsense.

Of course, the facts bear out that renewable energy will create more jobs. It is already happening. Over 3 million Americans are employed in the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries, compared to just over 1 million in fossil fuels. There is far more job growth in the renewable sector than in the declining, decrepit fossil fuel industry.

Solid majorities of Americans say they want more emphasis on renewable energy. Seventy-one percent want more solar, 64 percent want more wind, and 56 percent want more hydropower. By contrast, only 40 percent want more natural gas, only 25 percent want more oil, and only 18 percent want more coal. Seventy-one percent want solar,

and 18 percent want coal. I think the Trump administration would do well to pay attention to those numbers—if it were, indeed, about the numbers, anyway.

So make the question harder. Go all in. Ask Americans about a full transition to a 100-percent renewable energy system, and most say that the transition to a 100-percent renewable energy system for America will be good for working families—better than continuing on our fossil fuel path.

If you look at what Republicans say, by 2 to 1, Republican voters say that going to renewables will have a positive impact on working families, versus only 23.5 percent who say it will have a negative impact. The rest—“don’t know” or “no impact either way.” But the people who favor 100 percent renewables as a good thing for working families—even among Republican voters, it is 2 to 1 over fossil fuel.

When Americans are told about a Green New Deal to reduce carbon pollution and create clean energy jobs by investing in infrastructure and renewable energy and efficient buildings and transportation systems, almost 70 percent are supportive, and that includes almost 60 percent of Republicans—20 percent strongly support, and 36.8 percent support. So even the Green New Deal is a winner among Republican voters.

Ask about putting a price on carbon pollution. Why would you want to do that? Because right now, the costs of carbon pollution are put on the public. They are put on all of us. They are put on our constituents. Polluters get away with polluting for free, and the rest of us pay for the added drought and wildfire and storm damage costs. Well, more than 60 percent of registered voters support pricing carbon to reduce emissions. And if you look at Republicans, a majority of Republicans under the age of 45 also support a carbon price.

This new polling matches other polling that is on its way out or recently out that shows solid support for pricing carbon and making polluters pay for the damage they are causing—which, by the way, is also economics 101, but never mind that. We are talking about polling today.

A Monmouth University poll showed that 64 percent of Republicans now accept climate change as a problem, and a majority of Republicans support government action to combat climate change—a majority of Republicans.

An ABC News poll showed that 81 percent of Americans support cutting greenhouse gas emissions, two-thirds supported a carbon tax, and 81 percent supported tax breaks for renewable power.

These are big, strong, national majorities in favor of the kind of action we need and could do to stem the climate crisis.

A poll for Yale and George Mason Universities showed that 70 percent of registered voters, including over half of

Republicans, support reducing greenhouse gas emissions regardless of what other countries do.

This poll also found majority support across both parties for U.S. participation in the Paris Agreement and overwhelming support for renewal energy among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents.

What is more, this poll found that almost three-quarters of registered voters, including a majority of Republicans, support setting strict limits on carbon pollution from coal-fired powerplants, and a majority of Republicans, Independents, and Democrats support imposing a revenue neutral carbon tax on fossil fuel companies. A majority of Republicans support imposing a revenue neutral carbon tax on fossil fuel companies.

Well, I have had a bill with Senator SCHATZ in the last several Congresses to do just that—charge a fee on the polluters for their carbon emissions and then return all the revenue raised to the American people. Several bills on the House side also price carbon pollution, and a few even had Republican cosponsors.

These bills went nowhere under Republican leadership, notwithstanding these numbers and notwithstanding public support. Why? Because the fossil fuel industry opposes them—so no hearings, no vote, no nothing.

What did get a vote in the House last year under Republican leadership? A resolution condemning carbon pricing—condemning the carbon pricing that a majority of Republican voters support—backed, of course, by the fossil fuel industry. Virtually every expert, economist, and scientist who has studied the question says that putting a price on carbon pollution is not only the right thing to do morally and economically but is necessary to keep global temperatures from climbing 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial norms, as the scientific consensus makes clear we must do at a minimum—at a minimum. If we blow past 2 degrees, all bets are off, and the consequences of climate change may become irreversible. Even at 1.5 degrees, we are taking chances, but dozens of industry-backed front groups—this is hard to see, but this is the usual array of web-of-denial, phony-baloney front groups that have been supported, funded, and created by the fossil fuel industry so people don’t think it is the fossil fuel industry committing this nonsense. They have groups with names such as ALEC, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Americans for Tax Reform, Heartland Institute, and Institute for Liberty. These groups clean up their propaganda for them.

So here come these letters. These industry-backed front groups had one important thing going for them that the Nobel Prize-winning economists on the other side couldn’t match, and that is big political money and the fossil fuel industry behind them. Groups behind this letter to Speaker RYAN received at

least \$54 million from Big Oil and the Koch brothers' political network—at least \$54 million. We don't know for sure because of their clandestine, dark money funding network. Likely, it is far more.

The minimum \$54 million that the fossil fuel industry funded these groups with may likely be far more because so much of the fossil fuel industry's funding is obscured through dark money channels to hide their hand.

What did they achieve? Well, they got a vote. Unlike the carbon pricing bills, they got a vote on the House floor. Speaker RYAN brought the fossil fuel-funded resolution to a vote, and with the Republican caucus largely a wholly owned subsidiary of the fossil fuel industry, the resolution passed.

There is a whole case study in corruption here, as the Founding Fathers would define it, but the simple lesson for today's purposes: Money talks and big fossil fuel money commands.

This situation stinks. The polls I just went through and others show what Americans want. Americans want jobs, Americans want clean air, Americans want a healthy climate, and Americans want to be safe from extreme weather, wildfires, and rising seas, and Americans know clean energy solutions will get them there.

Americans are ready for bipartisan action, and before the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United came along, we had bipartisan action in the Senate on climate. We had lots of bipartisan action in the Senate on climate, but with Citizens United, unlimited money launched into our politics and things changed, and now the strings are pulled by Big Oil, Big Coal, and a couple of creepy fossil fuel industry billionaires.

Special interest money has infected almost everything we do in Congress, and it is the flagrant fact of our non-response to the climate crisis. The warnings have been coming for decades—first from the scientists, then from the economists, now from practically everywhere.

I went to the capital city of the Presiding Officer's State and was told there that the staffing requirements for police and fire were going to have to change because Phoenix, AZ, was becoming so hot that to get people to work outside, responding to emergencies, responding to fires and so forth, you had to build in a whole new staffing regime because it was so hard to work in the new levels of heat that the city of Phoenix is experiencing. You have to be able to rotate people much faster through crime scenes and through fire scenes and you had to have other people willing to stand by and cool them off after they were exposed to superheating.

So it is everywhere now. If you live on the coast, it is sea level; if you live out West, it is wildfires, and it includes Republican voters and particularly younger Republican voters.

Remember what the recently departed Republican Member of Congress

said: "My party will never earn the votes of millennials unless it gets serious about finding solutions."

Well, clean energy is a solution. The fact of all this Republican voter support on the one hand is a sign of hope for the new year—of hope that elected Republicans will hear their voters and will take action and support the clean energy solutions that can avert the climate crisis. At the same time, the voters on the Republican side who are saying what they want are also being ignored. Therefore, these numbers are equally telling of the secretive political forces at work in Congress to bottle us up and to prevent what even Republican voters want.

There is a rot in our politics, and our failure on climate change is a telling indicator of that rot. The whole world is watching. America is supposed to be "a City upon a Hill," an example for the world. They don't stop looking when we are a bad example. We have to get serious about this. Time is running out. It is time to wake up, and it is time to clean up.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MR. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Rhode Island.

CLOTURE MOTION

MR. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for S.J. Res. 2.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Todd Young, John Cornyn, Jerry Moran, John Boozman, Deb Fischer, John Hoeven, Susan M. Collins, Cory Gardner, Dan Sullivan, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Roger F. Wicker, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitch McConnell.

MR. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

MR. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in 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.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE RULES OF PROCEDURE

MR. BURR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's Rules of Procedure be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULE 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1.1. The regular meeting day of the Select Committee on Intelligence for the transaction of Committee business shall be every Tuesday of each month that the Senate is in session, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

1.2. The Chairman shall have authority, upon notice, to call such additional meetings of the Committee as the Chairman may deem necessary and may delegate such authority to any other member of the Committee.

1.3. A special meeting of the Committee may be called at any time upon the written request of five or more members of the Committee filed with the Clerk of the Committee.

1.4. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify every member of the Committee of the time and place of the meeting and shall give reasonable notice which, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall be at least 24 hours in advance of any meeting held in Washington, D.C. and at least 48 hours in the case of any meeting held outside Washington, D.C.

1.5. If five members of the Committee have made a request in writing to the Chairman to call a meeting of the Committee, and the Chairman fails to call such a meeting within seven calendar days thereafter, including the day on which the written notice is submitted, these members may call a meeting by filing a written notice with the Clerk of the Committee who shall promptly notify each member of the Committee in writing of the date and time of the meeting.

RULE 2. MEETING PROCEDURES

2.1. Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except as provided in paragraph 5(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2.2. It shall be the duty of the Staff Director to keep or cause to be kept a record of all Committee proceedings.

2.3. The Chairman of the Committee, or if the Chairman is not present the Vice Chairman, shall preside over all meetings of the Committee. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman at any meeting, the ranking majority member, or if no majority member is present, the ranking minority member present, shall preside.

2.4. Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, decisions of the Committee shall be by a majority vote of the members present and voting. A quorum for the transaction of Committee business, including the conduct of executive sessions, shall consist of no less than one third of the Committee members, except that for the purpose of hearing witnesses, taking sworn testimony, and receiving evidence under oath, a quorum may consist of one Senator.

2.5. A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any measure or matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization (1) is in writing; (2) designates the member of the Committee who is to exercise the proxy;