

said: We oppose what Alabama does. At the same time, they are rubberstamping judges who would do the same thing—repeal Roe. There is a direct contradiction here. There is hypocrisy. Republicans who say they don't like the Alabama decision and then vote for judges who would ratify and repeal Roe or cut back so dramatically on Roe that it hardly exists are engaged in subterfuge. They say: Watch this hand. I am saying that I am not that extreme. Don't watch this hand where I am putting extreme judges on the bench who will do exactly what I say I am opposed to.

It is outrageous. They will be caught. It is outrageous that they are on the bench.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on Huawei, there is positive news about an administrative action. I am in full support of what the Commerce Department did on Huawei, and I want to give a shout-out to Google for joining in and urge all other American companies to join as well. The administration issued an Executive order laying the groundwork to ban the purchase of telecommunications equipment from China's state-controlled firms. The decision, as I said, is having an impact because of Google. We are waiting for other companies to join in.

For years, China has prevented great American technology companies like Google, Facebook, and so many others from operating in China. They put barrier after barrier in the way because we are better, and they know American firms would capture the Chinese market. They put barriers in the way, they steal our technology and then develop it, and then even try to sell it back here. It has happened with computers. It has happened with so many other things that America and American know-how developed.

Huawei is a national security concern. It is a Chinese company that could pry into all of us. But it is also an excellent weapon to get China to finally start treating us fairly, which they haven't done for 30 years. We have lost tens of millions of good-paying American jobs and trillions of dollars because of what China has done to us. I have to say that both Democratic and Republican administrations in the past just sat there under some guise of free trade, which wasn't free or fair at all. And now we have some weapons.

A lot of these folks—these pundits, these critics, these editorial writers—say tariffs is the wrong way to go. Talking is the wrong way to go. It got us nowhere. But one other way to go is reciprocity.

China, we are going to treat some of your companies the way you treat our companies.

That is what we did with Huawei. It was the first time I have seen something very strong. I hope the President doesn't back off. He did with ZTE be-

cause President Xi asked him to. The head of China asked him to.

Don't back off, Mr. President.

This is the right thing to do, and I have been advocating for decades. I asked President Bush and President Obama to use reciprocity as a tool to stop China. It is another tool in our toolkit and an effective one.

If China won't let our most productive companies compete in its markets, we shouldn't let China's state-driven companies compete in ours. They get subsidies from the state.

We should not give Huawei—particularly Huawei, which is a security concern as well—free reign in the United States. China has to learn something. It has to open up its markets if it wants access to ours. They talk about, oh, we are an affront to China because we are asking for fairness? Give me a break. Give me a break. We know what fairness is.

I believe the administration's decision to put pressure on China to reform its economic policies was very smart, and I am really glad they did it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I rise to address the Chamber on an issue that is an issue of significant challenge and controversy now, and that is the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran. I want to make a couple of points, but let me summarize the points as I then address the current challenge.

First, I think it would be absolute lunacy for the United States to get involved in another war right now in the Middle East. I think it would be devastating if we were to be in a war with Iran. In particular, it would be not only devastating but also, in my view, unconstitutional for us to be in a war with Iran at a President's say-so if the President were unwilling to have Congress have the debate, pursuant to our article I war powers in this Chamber and in the Chambers of the House of Representatives.

If this body has a considered debate in view of the American public and determines that we need to be in a war with Iran—or anyone, for that matter—however I vote is irrelevant. The vote of the body would be the vote that would express a political consensus about what America should do. But if the Chamber is unwilling to have that debate or a vote or if the President is unwilling to come to Congress so that the debate can be had in front of the American public, that should tell us

something. If we are not willing to have the vote or if the President doesn't want to bring it to Congress, that should suggest that maybe it is not a good idea.

That is the theme of what I want to talk about today. Why are we in a time of escalated tension between the United States and Iran? There are a number of reasons, but, bluntly, I believe the path to the current level of tension began when President Trump unilaterally walked out of a diplomatic deal.

I think our country should always prefer diplomacy to war. A President backing out of a diplomatic deal that our allies, our security officials, and the International Atomic Energy Agency said was working, in my view, was a horrible mistake.

There is a story I have told before in the Chamber, and it is a story I love. It is about one of my two favorite Presidents. One of my favorite Presidents is a Republican, Abraham Lincoln, and my other favorite President is Harry Truman. This is a Truman story.

After World War II, at one point, President Truman invited the press corps into his office, the Oval Office, and said: I have made an interesting decision today.

They wondered what the decision was. President Truman showed them that he had redesigned the seal of the Presidency of the United States.

The seal of the President was very similar to our Nation's seal of an eagle clutching the arrows of war in one claw and the olive branch of peace in the other claw. Prior to the Truman administration, the eagle's face had been turned toward the arrows of war. In the aftermath of World War II, when the United States was trying to exercise the role of not just military victor but now of a great peacemaker by forming the United Nations and other institutions to ensure that the carnage of World War II wouldn't be repeated, Harry Truman said: We should redesign the seal of the Presidency so that the United States is represented by an eagle whose face is looking toward the olive branches of peace.

We would always prefer peace. We would always prefer diplomacy. The arrows of war are still grasped in the eagle's claw. We are a nation of might, and we will use that might if we need it. But let no one in the world doubt what the preference of the United States is; that is, diplomacy and peace if that is possible and if that is honorable.

You can walk around the Senate Chamber, you can walk around the Capitol, and you can actually see both versions of the seal. You can still find some in the Capitol that were created before Harry Truman was President where you will still see the eagle's face directed toward the arrows. Many of them have been changed in subsequent years. It is interesting trivia—like a treasure hunt contest—for our pages and others. You can still find the old version.