

though she filed her sexual harassment case in a New York State court, the company moved to compel forced arbitration on the grounds that Federal law supersedes New York State law that attempts to protect victims of harassment from being forced into arbitration. She said:

Because of forced arbitration and [confidentiality agreements], I may never know the extent to which [this perpetrator] sexually assaulted or harassed others, [and] if LVMH retaliated against others as they did me. . . . His sexual harassment, attempted assault, and assault made me feel scared, demeaned, and ashamed. I found myself constantly agitated, distressed, and hypervigilant, preoccupied with avoiding the trauma of encountering him.

Even with her legal expertise and experience as vice president of legal affairs, she was powerless in this system. She said the company convinced her “that . . . harassment was just a by-product of being an attractive woman who works at a company with a French culture.” That is the same company running the arbitration process. That is why this bill fixes the problem.

Survivors deserve a real chance at justice, and that is what this bill does.

This bipartisan, bicameral bill would amend the Federal Arbitration Act to void all forced arbitration provisions for sexual assault and harassment survivors. Removing those provisions would give survivors their day in court, allow them to discuss their case publicly, and end the days of institutional protection of harassers.

This legislation passed with bipartisan, broad support in the House, and I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this critical workplace reform in the Senate.

Again, I thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator GRAHAM.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me compliment my colleague from New York. Her persistence, her intelligence, her determination and passion to change the law so these injustices, which occur so many times that we don't know about, will no longer be there is so vital.

So thank you for a job well done.

Thanks to my colleague Senator GRAHAM, the lead Republican sponsor, who, when he gets behind something, it gets done. So I want him behind more things with us in the future.

And to Senator ERNST, who is not here, she has been a great leader on this as well. And when we met in my office with Senator GRAHAM, Senator ERNST was very amenable to getting this done.

It is an outrage, just an outrage, that women and men who are abused cannot seek justice, are forced to be quiet, are forced to keep the agony inside themselves. It is outrageous.

For decades, this forced arbitration has just deprived millions of people, almost all women, from basic rights to justice. We need justice in so many

areas, but when you can't seek justice when you are harassed, it is just one of the greatest marks of injustice, one of the greatest times of injustice.

The good news about this legislation is all the clauses that people already signed in their employment contracts, even when they didn't know about it, will no longer be valid. So it not only affects the future but affects those who signed in the past.

If you could ever say that any legislation is long overdue, this is it. It is time for a change. And moments from now, the Senate will finally act to make forced arbitration for sexual harassment and assault a thing of the past.

We are now going to voice vote this wonderful, needed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be real quick.

Senator SCHUMER, thank you for making this happen. You made sure it would come up today, we would get a voice vote.

Senator ERNST has been great.

Kirsten, it has been a hell of a ride. We talked to Microsoft about 3 or 4 years ago about this. They jumped on-board and started changing it internally.

I have heard from the Chamber. I am open-minded about making sure we don't hurt business. It does not hurt business to make sure that people who are harassed in the workplace get treated fairly. It is better for business.

I just want to say, this shows that we can function up here, that we are listening to the world as it is. So the days of taking sexual harassment and sexual assault claims and burying them in the basement of arbitration are over.

Arbitration has its place between business. It can be a good thing. But when you sign a document—multiple pages—just to get a job, you really don't know what you are signing. We are saying, you are not going to sign away your life in terms of having your day in court if somebody treats you poorly. You still have got to prove your case. The defendant has robust due process rights, which they should, but the abuse of arbitration that perpetuates sexual harassment and sexual assault in the workplace is soon to be done away with.

Thank you, Senator SCHUMER.

Thank you, Senator GILLIBRAND.

And to all of my colleagues on the Republican side, thank you.

This is not bad for business. This is good for America.

VOTE ON H.R. 4445

Mr. SCHUMER. Call the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 4445) was passed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Max Vekich, of Washington, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for a term expiring June 30, 2026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to support three extraordinarily qualified Department of Defense nominees: Melissa Dalton, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs; Dr. David Honey, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering; and Dr. Celeste Wallander, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

These three individuals have been nominated to serve in critical national security positions, and they are tasked with confronting those challenges of national security and securing U.S. interests at home and abroad.

As a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, I attended the committee nomination hearings for all three nominees, and I came away convinced that all three were qualified for their positions and deserving of swift confirmation.

Melissa Dalton previously served as a career civil servant in various positions at the Department of Defense—for a decade—under both President Bush and President Obama. So she had bipartisan support, clearly, in that position. She also was a senior fellow and director at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

If confirmed, one of Ms. Dalton's core responsibilities as Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense would be overseeing the Department's ability to operate through impacts to critical infrastructure, an area in which we have increasingly seen our adversaries are trying to exploit, particularly through cyber attacks. As Ms. Dalton has said, the resilience of our capabilities and infrastructure at home strengthens deterrence of aggression abroad, and DOD must be able to demonstrate its resilience.

The recent news of increased threats from Russia's cyber attacks, associated with their unprecedented troop buildup near Ukraine, underscores the need for this position to be filled as quickly as possible.

I also want to express my support for Dr. David Honey, who has dedicated a lifetime of service to the defense of this country. Dr. Honey has served in various research and development positions at the Department of Defense, including roles at the Defense Advanced

Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which is so important to our innovation. He has also served on the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research.

Today, more than ever, we need talented, qualified individuals like Dr. Honey at the forefront of DOD's innovation and technological efforts. Seemingly every few weeks we hear in the press about shocking technological breakthroughs made by the Chinese military that raise concerns about eroding our technological advantage. Former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hyten, described the Chinese test of a fractional orbital bombardment system last summer as "stunning."

Our technological advantage has been a foundational part of deterrence for decades, and if lost it would be enormously destabilizing for global security. But if we are truly committed to preserving our defense technological superiority, it is vital that we confirm Dr. Honey as quickly as possible.

Finally, I want to speak to support Dr. Celeste Wallander, who is the nominee to serve as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. And as part of that role, she is responsible for defense policy toward Europe, NATO, the Middle East, and Africa—all places right now which are hotbeds of potential conflict.

In light of the ongoing and unprecedented Russian threat to post-Cold War European stability and Ukrainian sovereignty, Dr. Wallander's nomination comes at a particularly critical time. Dr. Wallander has demonstrated a history of expertise on Russia. As former President of the U.S.-Russia Foundation, top Russia expert on the National Security Council, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, Dr. Wallander is highly respected on both sides of the aisle.

With a bipartisan delegation, I traveled to Ukraine several weeks ago. We met with Ukrainian President Zelenskyy and his national security team to discuss the Russian threat and how we can do everything possible to help our Ukrainian friends. You can't turn on the radio, read a paper, or watch the news at night without seeing the Russian troops that are massed on Ukraine's border.

The message from the Ukrainians was clear when we met with them. They see their future in partnership with the West. They share our democratic values, and the people are proud of their hard-won independence.

And every step that Putin takes toward escalating the situation at the border is a step closer to threatening not only Ukraine's future but the liberal democratic system that he fears and that we all have benefited from.

I can think of no one more qualified for this position at DOD at this time of immense instability than Dr. Wallander.

So, for these reasons, I believe we must move to confirm these three nominees as quickly as possible so they can fulfill the duties of these crucial positions that are so vital to our national security.

So with that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 476, 692, and 694; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, here we are 6 months since the last foreign policy disaster into which this administration led this country, the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan: 13 servicemembers killed, including 1 from my home State of Missouri; dozens more wounded; hundreds—hundreds—of civilians killed; hundreds more, maybe thousands, of American civilians left behind enemy lines to terrorists, to fend for themselves; still hundreds of Americans stranded there in Afghanistan as we speak.

And what accountability has there been in this time? Who has been relieved of duty? Who has been shown the door? What have we learned?

The answer is there has been no accountability. No one has been relieved of duty. No one has been shown the door.

And now this administration has bumbled to the brink of another foreign policy crisis that they have helped create, having denied Ukraine military aid, lethal aid, when it asked for it last spring; having stuffed dollars in Vladimir Putin's pockets by greenlighting the Nord Stream 2 energy pipeline. And now here they are, on the verge of another foreign policy crisis, and still we have no answers, still we have no accountability.

I will say this, though. We did learn a few interesting details this week about what happened in Afghanistan. And by the way, if you think that Vladimir Putin and the other dictators around this world weren't emboldened by this administration's weakness, by their utter failure in Afghanistan, then you have got another thing coming.

But what have we learned this week about Afghanistan? What have we learned? Actually, a couple of interesting things, a number of interesting things. We learned that, in fact, the White House and the State Department were warned for months on end—months on end—that their failure to evacuate civilians would result in disaster; that the Afghan Government was on the verge of collapse. They were told over and over.

One servicemember who was in Kabul told investigators "the writing was on the wall. The country and its government were actively collapsing," and "we should not have waited [to start evacuations] until every provincial capital had fallen except for Kabul."

Yet that is exactly what the administration did. Our top military commander in Kabul tried to get the Ambassador on the ground to see the security threat for what it was but to no avail. As one military official told investigators—we learned this week—"The Embassy needed to position for withdrawal." Yet they weren't doing it.

Why weren't they doing it? Why weren't civilians evacuated in a timely manner? Why wasn't the White House prepared? Because the White House wasn't taking it seriously.

According to Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Farrell Sullivan, as late as August 6, "the National Security Council was not seriously planning for an evacuation." Mind you, by this point, our military presence is gone. We have withdrawn militarily from the country. Here we are in August, and the National Security Council—the White House—was not seriously planning for an evacuation.

The State Department hadn't even put a team together that was responsible for informing individuals, including American citizens, that they were eligible for evacuation or started collecting the information they would need to put those Americans on flights to safety.

And it wasn't as if the White House and the State Department didn't know better. Our top military commander on the ground in Afghanistan warned as early as March—as early as March, he has testified—that he said the security situation in Afghanistan was dire and collapse could come quickly; when the United States withdrew, collapse could come quickly. He said it in March. By July, our troops were gone. In August, the administration still hadn't started planning.

Here is what the top commander in Kabul said. He said:

I think we could have been much better prepared to conduct a more orderly [civilian evacuation]—

That is what a NEO is—

if policy makers had paid attention to the indicators of what was happening on the ground, and the time lines associated with the Taliban advance, and the Taliban intent to conduct a military takeover.

That is what we learned this week: that the White House was told over and over and over again and did nothing; in fact—worse than that—rejected the counsel of military commanders on the ground, saying that the situation was urgent, saying that civilians needed to be evacuated, saying that there needed to be other steps taken, new measures taken. And the White House drug their feet, did nothing.

So what was the consequence of that? Well, we also learned this week that the consequence was a rapid, chaotic

rush for the exits once the White House suddenly and belatedly realized they had bumbled into a crisis—once they realized that they had left American civilians with nowhere to go, once they realized that they had a collapse on their hands that they had not planned for, despite being warned repeatedly.

As the CENTCOM found—Central Command found—and we learned this week, “Commanders at each gate [around the airport] exercised authority to open or close their respective gates, as they deemed appropriate, according to the situation on the ground. . . . However, there was tremendous pressure from the strategic level,” meaning the Combatant Command, the Joint Staff, and, yes, the White House, “to continue to process and evacuate civilians to the maximum extent possible, so gate closures were done rarely, locally, and temporarily.”

In other words, it was a rush—a mad rush—to the exits once the administration realized that, in fact, the government was collapsing; realized they hadn’t done the preparation they needed to do; realized that hundreds, if not thousands, of American civilians were in grave danger.

And we know the result of that. The result is 13 servicemembers were killed, hundreds of civilians were killed, and hundreds of Americans—maybe more—were left behind to the enemy.

Now, I said we learned all this this week. You might wonder, well, where did we learn it? I mean, maybe at least we are making some progress. We are getting some accountability. We learned something.

Did we learn it in an oversight hearing before this body? Did we learn it in sworn testimony given in public on the evacuation of Afghanistan? No, no. Oh, no. We learned it from a press report. We learned it because the Washington Post obtained what were previously confidential, unpublished, nonpublic reports from within the military—from within Central Command in particular—and the Washington Post published them.

In what has become an all-too-typical scenario, we learned nothing from any hearings this body is doing because they aren’t doing any in public. What we have learned is entirely from leaked reports, secondhand sources—the public having been shut out, having been denied access.

You know, we had multiple hearings, actually—or briefings—on Afghanistan and the security situations in Ukraine last week. Did that happen in public? No. Was there testimony taken in public? No. Were there questions asked by Senators in public? No.

I am willing to come to this floor as long as it takes and insist on regular order as long as it takes until there is accountability for what this administration has done in Afghanistan and now what it is bumbling towards in Ukraine. We have got to get answers.

Why is it that commanders on the ground warn over and over that dis-

aster is imminent and the White House does nothing? Why is it that the White House and the State Department denied a request for a civilian evacuation? Why is it that we are still here all these months later, and the only answers we can get are from leaked reports in the press? Why has not this body done its job to conduct rigorous and serious oversight hearings in public for the American people to see?

I will come to this floor and insist on regular order, insist that this body do its job and vote on Defense Department nominees until we get accountability, until there are public hearings, and until we can learn what actually happened in Afghanistan and who is responsible.

I will tell you this: I wasn’t alive for Vietnam, but I am not willing to participate in the kind of coverup that happened for years in the Vietnam war. I am not willing to kick this oversight responsibility off to some Commission that won’t report for years from now most of its findings, probably in a classified annex. And by that point, somebody will say: Oh, well, it is just too late to do anything about it.

The American public was lied to for years on the Vietnam war. It has been lied to for years on Afghanistan. It is time to get answers. So, yes, I will be here insisting on those answers, insisting on oversight, and insisting on accountability until we get it. Until that time, it is not too much to ask the Senate to do its job.

I believe the majority leader said just the other day that the Senate is here to vote; that is what the Senate is here to do. Well, that is an apt phrase, and for once, I agree very much with the Senate majority leader.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague’s grandstanding on Afghanistan when he knows that in the NDAA, we passed a provision to create a Commission to look at Afghanistan. And I want those answers just as much as he does. I stood up and said, when the President announced the withdrawal, that I didn’t support that withdrawal.

But that is beside the point that we are dealing with now because what we are dealing with now and what my colleague from Missouri is doing is making us less secure because he is holding nominees—he is complaining about the problems we have in Russia and Ukraine, and he is making it worse because he is not willing to allow those nominees who can help with that problem to go forward.

He is absolutely incorrect about Nord Stream 2. I opposed Nord Stream 2. I authored the legislation with Senator CRUZ to sanction Nord Stream 2. For the 4 years that the previous President was in office, they didn’t take any action to sanction Nord Stream 2 until the day Donald Trump left office.

The fact is, that pipeline is not operating now because it hasn’t been certified, and so Russia is not making any money from the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. So he needs to get his facts correct.

He sits on the Armed Services Committee with me, where he has access to the same information about our pressing national security challenges. Yet he is holding up these nominees. He is disregarding the threats that we face because he would rather stand here and grandstand on Afghanistan. Well, we do need to get answers, and I am willing to work with him on that, but this is not the way to do it.

So let’s remember that Senator HAWLEY declared China as the biggest threat to American security, and that is a quote. Yet he is blocking the confirmation of Dr. Honey, whose job would be to ensure that our defense research and development efforts are continuing on par with China’s. So if his goal is to ensure that China’s technological capabilities surpass ours, I can think of no better way to do that than to refuse to confirm Dr. Honey.

On Russia, my colleague has claimed that the Biden administration has coddled Russia. We heard him say it just now—that they failed to aid Ukraine. But in a recent op-ed, my colleague made his views clear on the current Russian-created crisis. In it, he suggests that the United States is better off closing NATO’s doors to Ukraine and stating that our Nation’s history of promoting and defending liberal democratic values across the globe has been a failure. Well, I am not going to agree to that.

We have an international order that developed after World War II that has had as a large part the containment first of the Soviet Union through NATO and now of Russia. Part of that world order says that a sovereign nation should be able to help determine their own future.

So I am not going to be part of some agreement that says we are going to turn our backs on NATO, we are going to turn our backs on Ukraine, and we are going to say to Russia: You go ahead; you go into Ukraine.

He argues that we should reduce our commitments to places like Europe because, he claims, Russia poses a greater threat to our European allies than to the United States. Well, the last time I looked, when the United States got attacked in 2001—and maybe he doesn’t remember 9/11 because he was too young—the countries that came to our aid were our NATO allies.

So, with all due respect, I find my colleague’s assessment both disturbing and shockingly uninformed. As members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, my colleague and I have been briefed on the multitude of evidence of Russia’s attempts to subvert democratic institutions—including right here in the United States, by the way—to attack our own infrastructure, and to compromise the sovereignty of our allies around the globe.

In 2018, Russian private military contractor forces even assaulted an outpost of Americans in Syria. They were forced to defend themselves, and, of course, they did, and they ultimately routed the Russian force.

So my colleague's stated sentiments do just what Vladimir Putin wants. He wants to divide the United States from our NATO allies and other democracies. He wants to diminish U.S. presence in Europe and to rewrite the European security order in a way that favors his authoritarian interests. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

I could not disagree with my colleague any more on how he has chosen to associate himself. Continuing to block qualified leaders such as Dr. Wallander, Dr. Honey, and Ms. Dalton does not make us stronger; it does not contribute to productive discourse over our national priorities, and it doesn't accomplish what he is trying to accomplish.

If what he wants is answers on Afghanistan, then work with us. Let's work together. Let's make this Commission that we passed in the NDAA—let's make it work. What he wants casts us an unreliable partner to our allies, and it forces the Department of Defense to operate with one hand tied behind their back.

So I am disappointed to hear my colleague—and he talks about regular order. Well, in the last 24 hours, we have confirmed three nominees by regular order. We held up the Senate to get cloture votes. Then we passed Alexandra Baker, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, 75 to 21. We passed Douglas Bush, Assistant Secretary of the Army, 95 to 2. I don't know if Senator HAWLEY was one of those two. I assume he was. We passed Patrick Coffey, general counsel for the Navy, 79 to 17. Then on February 2, by unanimous consent, we passed Gabriel Camarillo, Under Secretary of the Army, and Andrew Hunter, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, by unanimous consent.

So this is not about regular order; this is about trying to use the Senate process for his own personal ambitions, and that is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because it doesn't get us the individuals we need to get confirmed to make government run, and it is unfortunate because it doesn't accomplish what he says he wants.

So I am disappointed to hear that we are not going to move these nominees forward, and I hope at some point my colleague will reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15-minutes prior to the scheduled roll-call vote.

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

#### ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the average American household spent an esti-

mated \$3,500 more in expenses last year as a result of inflation—\$3,500. Now, that may not sound like much to a wealthy Democrat politician, but for most American families, that is a lot of money. For a lot of families, \$3,500 is the difference between putting something in savings or living paycheck to paycheck. An additional \$3,500 in expenses can mean having to forgo essential home repairs or needed car work. It can mean putting off braces for a child or forgoing needed medical care.

Now, the White House Chief of Staff may have the budget to regard inflation as a high-class problem, which is how she referred to it, described it, but for ordinary Americans, inflation is a very real problem—a problem that is eating up their wage increases and lowering their standard of living.

We are in the midst of an inflation crisis, a supply chain crisis, and as if those weren't enough, a border crisis. Huge numbers of illegal immigrants are pouring across our southern border and have been pouring across our southern border for months, creating a security, enforcement, and humanitarian nightmare.

So there is a lot for our country's leadership in Washington to be focused on right now. What is the majority party doing about these crises? Well, not much. In fact, most of the time, you can be forgiven for thinking that neither the President nor Democrat leaders even realize there is an inflation crisis or a supply chain crisis or a border crisis. The President, for one, seems to be hoping that if he ignores these crises for long enough, they will just go away.

So what are the President and congressional Democrats doing with their time if they are not addressing our border crisis or inflation crisis? Well, for one thing, they are attempting to double down on the strategy that helped get us into this mess in the first place. That is right. The inflation crisis Democrats would like to ignore is actually something they helped create by flooding the economy with excessive government spending in their so-called American Rescue Plan last March.

For months, they have tried to double down on that bill with another massive spending spree that would flood the economy with more government money and undoubtedly make the inflation crisis worse.

The President has attempted to justify this massive spending legislation by claiming that it will help inflation. Right. So the first massive spending spree helps push us into an inflation crisis, but a second massive spending spree will fix it? I am pretty sure that the definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.

But massive inflation concerns haven't stopped Democrats. After all, why deal with a boring inflation crisis when you could be thinking up new ways to expand the Federal Government and new ways of taxing Ameri-

cans to pay for it? Of course, Democrats' Build Back Better plan isn't all tax hikes. Democrats did manage to include a tax break in their tax-and-spending proposal—a tax break for blue State millionaires. If they succeed in passing it, I am sure wealthy Democrat donors will be grateful.

While an inflation crisis has raged, Democrats have pushed for new ways to spend taxpayer dollars and expand the reach of the Federal Government into Americans' lives: a huge expansion of government's involvement in childcare that would disadvantage the religious providers so many Americans choose for their children; a massive increase in the size of the IRS; a proposal to allow the IRS to examine the details of Americans' banking transactions; energy policies that would drive up the cost of electricity and gasoline for American families; billions for priorities like tree equity and environmental justice programs at well-funded colleges and universities. The list goes on.

But it would be unfair for me to suggest that Democrats have expended all their energy on tax-and-spending sprees. The administration has also found time to implement provisions of Democrats' original spending spree, the American Rescue Plan, including, apparently, until they got caught, free government crack pipes and other drug paraphernalia.

Democrats spent a lot of time pushing election legislation that they hope will give them an advantage come November.

On the COVID front, the administration struggled with testing, but it has found time for vaccine and mask mandates, some of which I believe have far exceeded the administration's authority. Fortunately, the courts have stepped in to check some of the administration's excesses, like the administration's attempt to impose a vaccine mandate on large private-sector employers or the administration's decision to impose a mask mandate for 2-year-olds—yes, for 2-year-olds.

Your Democratic government at work, ladies and gentlemen.

In November, the administration issued a mask mandate for Head Start programs requiring all children 2 years of age and up to be masked inside and outside—out on the playground. Now, is there scientific evidence to support this? Not really. The World Health Organization, in fact, recommends against masking for children aged 5 and under, but that hasn't stopped the administration. Democrats seem determined that nothing, including science, will pry their masks from them—or perhaps I should say pry our children's masks from them—since Democratic politicians have not always demonstrated the consistency of mask-wearing that they expect from our children.

Democrats wonder why Republicans think we should be careful how much power we give the Federal Government.