

by making the discussion about something that most Americans—the overwhelming majority of Americans—agree about, which is, regardless of how you feel about abortion, you don't necessarily want your government taking your taxpayer dollars and the taxpayer dollars of a whole lot of people who have very strong feelings against abortion and using those to fund organizations that either perform abortions or that engage in promoting or lobbying or counseling or referring in order to encourage abortions. The overwhelming majority of Americans don't want that regardless of how they feel about life.

This shouldn't be a controversial issue. It is a non sequitur. It is a straw man argument to suggest that this somehow limits anyone's options. It doesn't. In fact, it expands options of individuals by saying: We are not going to take your money at the point of a gun, which is what governments do at the end of the day when they take money, in order to spend it on something that—depending on how you phrase the question and which pollster you are talking to, it is either a sizable majority or a bare majority of Americans who find that morally problematic. But an overwhelming majority of Americans say that, no matter what, you shouldn't be taking all taxpayer money and then using that to fund abortion or abortion-related advocacy.

Last week, the Senate had a chance to adopt some measures that would protect the dignity of human life—not just unborn human life but also born human life, including babies who had been born alive following a failed abortion attempt. Unfortunately, due to a minority of this body, we lost the opportunity to enact those reforms.

Those colleagues opposed to these measures did so largely on the claims that they were, as they put them, anti-woman or anti-healthcare. They claim somehow that these measures interfered with what should be considered personal—the personal nature of healthcare between women and their doctors.

I could not agree more that healthcare is personal. It is, after all, about healing, preserving, and prolonging the life of a human being, the life of a person. In the case of a pregnant woman, it is about two persons, sometimes three. If it is a woman who is pregnant with a single baby, it is two persons with two beating hearts, two distinct sets of DNA, and two unique and eternally valuable, unrepeatable souls—two persons with equal dignity and worth. We ought to value both of them and provide opportunity and care and rights and protection to both.

In the spirit of our founding, we ought to affirm through our laws and through our taxpayer dollars the truth that every member of our society—every woman, every man, every unborn child—is entitled to the right to life and to the full protection of that right

under the laws of the United States. Our healthcare ought to heal, preserve, and protect those lives. Unfortunately, many of our laws themselves permit and subsidize exactly the opposite of life in our country and even, tragically, abroad.

Congress allows and helps fund the most radical abortion policy in the Western world, enabling procedures that impose barbaric violence upon women and unborn children and ending the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent babies in our Nation every single year. It allows our foreign aid money to go to organizations that fund and promote abortions overseas, taking the lives of thousands of innocent babies across the globe—especially, by the way, baby girls.

In some of these countries, abortions happen in much higher numbers to female babies precisely because they are female. Abortion is, in many cases, the knife's edge of sexism—the exact tool they use to denigrate women's equal dignity and value and worth and right to breathe.

In some of these countries, women don't even want the abortions. In some cases, these organizations force their own so-called enlightened values on them, pressuring these women to take their own children's lives whether or not they really want to. This form of cultural and imperialism is not pro-woman, it is not pro-child, and it is certainly not pro-healthcare. It is pro-sexism and pro-violence. And we must end it. Today, we can, through the passage of the Protecting Life in Foreign Assistance Act. This bill would permanently stop the use of our foreign aid money for funding or promoting abortions overseas.

We ought to uphold the equal dignity of women, whether born or unborn, in America and across the world, and we should treat their bodies with reverence and dignity and respect, the respect they deserve, not because any government decided to confer that respect upon them but because they exist. Today, we can choose that, too, through Senator BRAUN's bill, the Dignity for Aborted Children Act. That measure, as Senator BRAUN has explained, will ensure that aborted children's bodies are not treated simply as medical waste to be crudely disposed of and that they should instead receive a proper burial or cremation, just as we accord to all other human beings.

We have to support and value women and babies everywhere. In our laws and for our lives, we ought to uphold the dignity of each and every human person, regardless of race, sex, appearance, abilities, or age. The measures before us today—those I have outlined and those that have been proposed by Senator BRAUN—do just that, and we should support them for the very same reasons that we should pass them. They shouldn't be objectionable.

It is tragic that they have drawn an objection today. It is tragic that any American, much less any Member of

the Senate, which calls itself the world's greatest deliberative legislative body, would object to these measures. After all, it is difficult to fathom how someone wouldn't want to protect babies. It is difficult to fathom why someone wouldn't be in favor of something at least protecting the conscience rights of U.S. taxpayers who don't want to see their hard-earned taxpayer dollars going to fund an operation, a procedure that they know is designed to end a human life—a human life that in many cases is deliberately ended because of the sex of the person whose life is being taken. This is tragic, it is unacceptable, and it shouldn't happen—not here, not on this soil, not on our watch.

We are not going to give up. The fact that we have endured these setbacks today, the fact that these well-conceived, non-objectionable pieces of legislation have drawn an objection today, doesn't mean this issue is going to go away. It doesn't mean these proposals are going to go away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I want to talk to the Senate for a few minutes about refrigerators and air conditioners. Thank the Lord for both of them. They make our lives so much better, especially in the Presiding Officer's home State of Mississippi and, certainly, in my home State of Louisiana.

Refrigerators and air conditioners and the like are able to keep people and things cold by using coolants or refrigerants, I think some people call them. I am going to call them coolants. Basically, I will not go into the chemistry and/or the physics, but when a coolant in liquid form is converted to a gas, it is called phase conversion. It absorbs heat. That is why you will hear people, including but not limited to repair women and repair men, talking about coolant for an air conditioner or coolant for a refrigerator. It is that coolant that keeps us and our food cool.

Years ago, we used to use a coolant called Freon. You probably have heard that term. It is seldom used today. There are some small occasions when it is used, but for the most part, we have decided Freon is not a good coolant, not because it doesn't work but because it is very, very harmful to our environment. So a number of years ago, people the world over, including the U.S. Government, said: OK, we are not going to use Freon anymore. We are going to use another coolant, which we generally refer to as hydrofluorocarbons. If you hear me use the expression HFC or the acronym HFC, that is what I mean.

So we went along and, instead of using Freon, we started using HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons. Then we discovered—and by “we” I mean that most of the scientists throughout the world came to realize that

hydrofluorocarbons or HFCs are not very good for the environment either. The people who made this decision, many of whom were American scientists, decided we need to develop a third type of coolant other than Freon and other than HFCs to run our air conditioners and run our refrigerators and protect our environment at the same time.

A few years ago, most of the countries throughout the world made this decision. The representatives of these countries got together and said: OK, you remember we decided to stop using Freon, and now we have been using these HFCs. Yet we have discovered these HFCs are also harmful, so we are going to agree—all of these countries said—to develop a third type of coolant that is not as harmful to our environment.

That is the direction in which the world is headed. Within 5, 10, 15 years, not only will Freon be eliminated, but so will hydrofluorocarbons because the rest of the world is going to be using a third type of coolant, which has been developed and is being developed as we speak.

There is just one problem. The United States has not agreed with those other countries. That is OK. That is our right to do it our way. But that presents yet another problem because in 5 or 10 or 15 years, we are going to look up, and we are going to be the odd person out. The rest of the world is going to be using this new technology, and we are still going to be using hydrofluorocarbons. We are going to be isolated, and it is going to cost our business community a lot of business, and it is going to hurt us.

I and Senator TOM CARPER—a fine American and a good man—have a bill. It is called the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act—the Senator and I call it the AIM Act—and we have a lot of support. At last count, we had 32 cosponsors—half Republican, half Democrat—and that number is rising as we speak. That is a third of the U.S. Senate. You can't get a third of the U.S. Senate to agree on much of anything except that they like ice cream, but for this august body, having 32 cosponsors is a big deal.

Let me also say that we have a lot of support from the business community. For example—and I will not read all of the groups that are supporting it—the Air Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute is supporting this bill. It is in charge of our refrigerators and air conditioners, and it is saying: Yes, we want to do this. The environmental community supports this bill. It is rare that we get both the environmental community and the business community on the same page, but mainly through Senator CARPER's intellect and charm, we have been able to do that.

As you know, we are in the process of considering an energy bill, and that energy bill is really an amalgamation of a lot of other bills that deal with en-

ergy that are going to be put together in one bill, ably handled by Senator MURKOWSKI. Senator CARPER and I want to take our bill—the AIM Act, the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act, which is supported overwhelmingly by the business community and by the environmental community—and add it to Senator MURKOWSKI's bill as an amendment, and that amendment has already been submitted. We have a lot of support for the amendment. The last time I looked, we had 28 cosponsors to the amendment, and once again, the business community and the environmental community are supporting it.

The Presiding Officer is probably thinking, OK, KENNEDY. What is the problem? This is interesting, but what is the problem here?

How can I put this? The problem is the way we operate. One person in the Senate can stop the entire Senate from ever voting on something, as we all know, and I am not going to go into the details. In some cases, that is not necessarily a bad thing. Our Founders intended the Senate to move carefully and slowly, but it is a bad thing, in my judgment, when it is used routinely to keep the Senate from having an up-or-down vote on something that is important to the American people.

I mean, the logical approach would be, OK, you don't agree with the amendment. That is why God made rollcall votes. Let's vote. You can vote yea or you can vote nay or you can jump the rail, but everybody gets to weigh in. That is why I was sent up here. My people sent me up here to debate and decide. They didn't send me up here to participate and delay in stultification. So that is my message today: Let my people vote.

Once again, I understand there are rare occasions on which a Senator feels so strongly about something that he or she can and should exercise his or her right to prevent the whole body from considering something, but it has become a routine political weapon. That is one of the reasons, in my judgment, that we don't get more done in the Senate.

I am not criticizing anybody. I am part of this body. If I am criticizing this body, I am criticizing myself. But doing nothing is hard because you never know when you are finished. We can do a lot more in this body, and I think we all understand that, and I think we can all agree with that. I think one of the reasons the Senate polls right up there with skim milk among the American people is that we don't get more done, and one of the reasons we don't get more done is that we are not allowed to vote.

Once again, I am not telling anybody how to vote, for our votes are sacred, but you can vote yea on my ideas and Senator CARPER's ideas, or you can vote nay, or you can not vote at all—you can jump the rail—but please let us vote.

I am not criticizing anybody. I am really not. I know we are together a

lot, as the Presiding Officer knows, and we all know each other, and I can honestly say I like and respect every one of my colleagues in this body. I truly do. I may not agree with them, but I like and respect them, so my criticism is not personal. Yet our process here is a problem, which is my plea today to my colleagues: Please don't object to this amendment. Please. It doesn't mean you have to vote for it—you can vote against it—but please let the entire body have a vote because that is what democracy is supposed to be all about.

I yield the floor to my friend Senator CARPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana for his leadership and for his courage in not just helping to develop this proposal that we have offered in a legislative forum but in trying to make sure that it gets the debate it needs and the vote it needs on this floor.

For a couple of centuries, Members of the Senate would introduce legislation, and that legislation would be debated. Democrats and Republicans would have the opportunity to offer amendments to that legislation and to get votes on that legislation and on their amendments. We would hammer out a compromise in the Senate and eventually with the House and with whoever was President.

The Presiding Officer may remember an old movie called "The Way We Were." That is the way we were, and we need desperately to get back to the way we were when we were the world's greatest deliberative body. A good way to get started on that path is by supporting the legislation that my friend from Louisiana and I have coauthored with the support of a broad coalition of Senators and with the support of the business community and the environmental community as well.

Our amendment, as Senator KENNEDY has described today, is identical to legislation called the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act. I am not a really big one for acronyms, but the acronym that the Senator has used is AIM, the AIM Act. It is currently supported by a bipartisan group of 32 Senators—16 Republicans and 16 Democrats. I would describe this as Noah's Ark, whereby, for every Republican, we add a Democrat and on and on and on. Even today, we are continuing to add sponsors and cosponsors to our bill and to this amendment.

This amendment, like the stand-alone bill, would save consumers money; it would create jobs; it would support economic growth; and it would help us to address the climate crisis. This amendment would authorize the EPA to implement a phase-down of the production and consumption of something called hydrofluorocarbons, known as HFCs, over the next 15 years. HFCs are used as coolants in refrigerators and air conditioners. They are

substances that help to make sure our air conditioners work and our freezers work and our refrigerators work, among other things, and that our chillers work.

Unfortunately, what came before the HFCs was bad for our ozone and our planet, and it created a big hole in the ozone layer of our planet. We figured out that it was not good. It turned out to be the refrigerants that we were using that were causing it. Scientists came along and said: Let's replace them. Let's get rid of those CFCs and replace them with something that doesn't give us a hole in the ozone layer.

Guess what. HFCs work. They do. They do a really good job at that. That is the good news. The bad news is these hydrofluorocarbons are 1,000 times worse than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas—1,000 times worse. So they are good on the one hand and are bad on the other hand.

So the scientists go to work again. Scientists in this country and businesses in this country go to work and ask: What can we do about this? They have come up with a replacement to replace the HFCs—1,000 times worse as a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide.

We also have the opportunity, in using American technology, to put Americans to work in selling these products not just in America but around the world. American companies have invested literally billions of dollars to produce and sell the next-generation technology to replace HFCs. Our amendment protects those investments.

Again, the amendment is good for consumers, and I will explain why. The amendment drives the deployment of more efficient air-conditioning and refrigeration products and equipment. It reduces energy and upkeep costs as well. How much? What is it worth in terms of saving money for consumers? Apparently, the EPA has calculated it through its own economic analysis, and it has come up with a number that says that over the next 15 years, our legislation would save consumers \$3.7 billion—not millions but billions of dollars.

Our amendment is good for American jobs. The chamber of commerce expects our legislation to result in the creation of 150,000 additional direct and indirect jobs in this country in the years to come—150,000 additional, good-paying jobs. Our amendment is good for our economy.

Our legislation is expected to improve the trade imbalance in chemicals and equipment by \$12.5 billion, which is something we need to do, and it is expected to increase manufacturing output close to \$39 billion over the next 7 years.

Oh, by the way—P.S.—our amendment is good for the planet we live on and the people who inhabit it. We will end up joining the rest of the world to phase out HFCs, which will help to avoid an increase of up to a half a de-

gree Celsius in our climate, in our temperature on this planet.

All of these are win-wins. They are all win-wins. They are the reason that our legislation has such broad support from stakeholders. Our legislation is supported by an unlikely coalition. As Senator KENNEDY said, it is not every day that you find the lamb and the lion lying down together in their finding a common cause. Yet, in this case, there is a whole host of environmental groups, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other business groups, a lot of Democrats, a lot of Republicans, and maybe one or two Independents. I mean, it is a great coalition, and it is one that I am proud of in my having worked with Senator KENNEDY to create. We do all of this with the broad support of this unlikely coalition.

Our legislation doesn't preempt the roles of States. With that said, I know that some of our colleagues have called for adding to this amendment new pre-emption authorities that would prevent States from addressing HFCs. My response to them is that there are reasons this is not an issue to be addressed at this time.

And as we have seen with TSCA and the California waiver for vehicle standards, this administration doesn't seem keen on following the law, and there is no guarantee that if we require EPA to phase out HFCs that the Trump EPA will do so in a timely manner or in a legally defensible way.

Allowing the States to act helps hold the Federal Government accountable. However, once a strong Federal program is in place, States will not need to act and will spend their resources elsewhere. We have seen this happen before with programs similar to the one this amendment would create.

I would like to add that many of my colleagues in this Chamber have stated that they support innovation to help achieve our climate and clean energy goals.

The Federal Government has many tools to drive innovation—many tools to drive innovation—Federal funding, Federal procurement, and also regulation.

There is a reason we have broad support from the business community. Businesses know that regulation will further drive innovation and U.S. investments. Without the regulations that would be created if this amendment were adopted, the United States will continue to lose global leadership in the production of HFC alternative technologies.

And let me just add a P.S. I know some people think climate change is a hoax; it is not real. My wife and some of her colleagues from the DuPont Company that she worked with for years traveled to Antarctica earlier this year. They spent a couple weeks down there, an incredible trip, learned a lot, and they came back and I said: How warm was it down there? She said

it was in the thirties—rarely below, not above.

She came back about 5, 6 weeks ago. In the weeks since then, the record-high temperature in Antarctica, South Pole, hit 63 degrees. That record lasted for about a week, and it was replaced by a new record, 65. That lasted for about another week or two. That was broken by another record. I think it was 67 or 68 degrees—like that.

A piece of Antarctica about the size of the District of Columbia fell off into the ocean. Something is happening here. Something is happening here, and I think what it is, is getting to be pretty clear.

Here is the good news. The good news is we can address that concern, that problem, which is not a hoax, and we can do so in ways that create tens of thousands of jobs, billions of dollars in exports, all kinds of economic opportunity, innovation, and technology that we would celebrate, and we should celebrate.

We need to support this amendment. I just want to again thank my colleague for his leadership, for allowing me to be his wingman in this effort, and I look forward to garnering the support of a broad coalition of our colleagues. It is the right thing to do. Let's do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ABORTION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor tonight to briefly discuss a message from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice John Roberts.

As you know, Chief Justice Roberts recently sat in the very chair, Madam President, in which you are sitting right now as he ably oversaw the impeachment trial.

In a very rare admonition, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court this afternoon released a statement in response to statements made by the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, CHUCK SCHUMER.

The Senator, speaking outside the Court, across the street from this building, was at a protest while arguments were being heard inside the Court, and the comments made by Senator SCHUMER certainly appeared to threaten members of the Supreme Court.

The video clip shows Senator SCHUMER saying this. He said:

I want to tell you, Gorsuch. I want to tell you, Kavanaugh.

These are members of the Supreme Court, confirmed by the Senate. He said:

I want to tell you. . . You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price.

"You will pay the price."

Well, it can't be a political price because Justices serve for life. Either they die in office or they can resign, step down. There is no political price to be paid.

To me, this sounds like he is talking about a physical price, violence.