

Chairman RUBIO, will report out the President's nominee to be the next Director of National Intelligence, and, last week, we reauthorized essential tools that our intelligence community needs to defend our homeland, track our enemies, and protect Americans.

But we didn't stop there.

Over the last several years, we have been painfully reminded that our Nation and our liberties are not only threatened from without. The fabric of our country is also hurt when tools and capabilities that are meant to keep us safe are abused in ways that are, at best, reckless, sloppy, and unaccountable—or, worse, polluted by political bias.

In 2016, the FBI embarked on a counterintelligence investigation against Donald Trump's campaign for the Presidency. Federal law enforcement used taxpayer money to scrutinize a political campaign in the middle of a democratic election. You would have thought such a radical step must have sprung from an air-tight justification. Certainly, you would think the outgoing Obama administration should only have used the awesome power of the Federal Government to pry into their political rivals if they had had a slam-dunk basis for doing so, but that is not what they had.

In one instance, the FBI got permission to surveil a Trump associate by telling half-truths, blurring evidence, and citing sketchy sources like a dossier of partisan opposition research that had been funded by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC.

Here is how even the New York Times explained the recent findings of the Justice Department's inspector general: "The FBI had cherry-picked and misstated evidence about the Trump adviser . . . when seeking permission to wiretap him."

That was from the New York Times.

So an American citizen's campaign for the American Presidency was treated like a hostile foreign power by our own law enforcement, in part, because the Democratic-led executive branch manipulated documents, hid contrary evidence, and made a DNC-funded dossier a launch pad for an investigation. The inspector general counted seven significant inaccuracies and omissions. Here is his report:

We identified multiple instances in which factual assertions relied upon in the [FBI's] FISA application were inaccurate, incomplete, or unsupported by appropriate documentation based upon information the FBI had in its possession at the time the application was filed.

Did you catch that last part? It was based upon information the FBI had in its possession at the time the application was filed. So we are either talking about gross incompetence or intentional bias. Does any Senator think it is acceptable for any Federal warrant application to include seven significant inaccuracies and omissions? But this wasn't just a run-of-the-mill warrant; it was a FISA warrant to snoop on a Presidential campaign.

This is just one of the realities that President Trump's Democratic critics spent years calling conspiracy theories or inventions of the President's mind. Yet here it is in black and white from exactly the kind of independent inspector general the Democrats rushed to embrace when convenient.

Sadly, this was no isolated incident. Just recently, Attorney General Barr has had to take the incredible step of unwinding the DOJ prosecution of another former Trump adviser because the government's case against him was unfair and distorted as well.

It was largely on the basis of these proceedings that the Democrats and the media spent years being fixated on wild theories of Russian collusion, but upon investigation, the Mueller investigation—remember that one?—it is those wild allegations that collapsed along with the credibility of several of these investigations that helped to create the cloud of suspicion in the first place.

In the words of our distinguished Attorney General:

The proper investigative and prosecutorial standards of the Department of Justice were abused. . . . We saw two different standards of justice emerge, one that applied to President Trump and his associates and the other that applied to everybody else. We can't allow this ever to happen again.

That is from the Attorney General.

Oh, and by the way, as if this debacle needed even more shocking behavior, I understand a Federal judge may try to continue prosecuting one of these cases even though the prosecution itself wants to drop it. The judge has taken it upon himself to go browsing for other hostile parties. Obviously, that subverts our constitutional order in which the executive alone decides whether to prosecute cases.

So, look, no matter what some Washington Democrats may try to claim, you are not crazy or a conspiracy theorist if you see a pattern of institutional unfairness toward this President. You would have to be blind not to see one.

All of this is why the Senate passed important FISA reforms in last week's bill—to help bring accountability and transparency into that flawed process—and we aren't nearly finished.

As soon as possible, the full Senate will vote on Mr. RATCLIFFE's nomination. The President will have a Senate-confirmed DNI who can pursue the vital national security work of our tireless intelligence community while he can also ensure that the IC stays out of politics and out of the papers.

Just yesterday, Chairman GRAHAM announced the Committee on the Judiciary will vote on a serious new set of subpoenas so the Senate can hear directly from key players like James Comey, Andrew McCabe, Loretta Lynch, and many others to continue getting to the bottom of this. Let me say that again. The Senate Republicans are taking steps to issue subpoenas to a wide variety of Obama administration officials who have some

relationship to the abuses I have just laid out. The American people deserve answers about how such abuses could happen, and we intend to get those answers.

I have been a strong supporter of law enforcement and the intelligence community during my career. The American people sleep safer because dedicated people are protecting our country and bringing our foes to justice. It is precisely because I support these missions that I feel so strongly this malpractice cannot be tolerated and must never be repeated.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE DiSILVESTRO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Madam President, on another matter, it is my honor to help bid farewell to a distinguished staff leader, who has himself handled sensitive security matters with great care and dedication.

For more than 30 years, this body has functioned more safely and smoothly because Mike DiSilvestro was on the clock as Director of the Office of Senate Security. Mike D.'s job is tough to describe. That is partially because long tenured all-stars like Mike have a way of carving out their own niche, but it is mostly because his work is literally classified. Mike has been in charge of the Office of Senate Security almost as long as I have been in the Senate.

He came on board as Acting Director in 1987. He took over a brandnew office with incredibly important and sensitive functions. The details are not for public consumption, but let's say there were two main missions.

First, Mike has managed, modernized, and expanded the secure facilities and systems that provide classified information in the Capitol to Senators and committees as we govern the country. He has simultaneously been a diplomatic liaison to the executive branch and has advocated for the Senate's prerogative, and he has been a skillful manager of people and logistics, who has made sure our secrets stay secret once they arrive here.

Second, Mike has been one of our top leaders on the security of the Senate itself. He helps to plan for contingencies and guard every facet of our institution, its people, and its systems from outside actors with bad intentions.

These are tall orders—even for a fellow graduate of the University of Louisville. Consider how much has changed in the 37 years since Mike first came to the Senate and in the 32 years he has held this job: major wars, terrorist strikes on the homeland, anthrax in the Hart Building, countless technological advances that have made his task radically more complex. Imagine guarding some of the Nation's most closely held secrets, planning for possible attacks on the institution, and still being unanimously described by your colleagues as calm, cool, and even-keeled.

Mike is no cheap people pleaser. His duties don't permit it. When you see

Mike outside his secure facility and heading our way, it does not mean a social call—it means bad news—and you had better believe this stoic sentinel has had to say no a lot more than yes. Just doing the job half as reliably and reassuringly as Mike is a herculean task by itself, but then factor in the fact that he is also one of the most personally well-liked and respected colleagues among the circle of folks with whom he has worked.

Mike D.'s reputation extends far outside the Senate. I have it on good authority that, when Secretary of Defense Esper—who served as national security adviser to a former majority leader—comes to Senate Security to brief us Members, he doesn't consider his visit complete until he has stopped in Mike D.'s office to check on his old colleague.

Yet, ironically, outside a select circle, most people in the Senate itself probably could not pick Mike D. out of a lineup. I guess, when everything you work on is strictly "need to know," you wind up on a need-to-know basis yourself. Even Mike's own teammates describe his approach as somewhat "stealth-like."

In short, even to his beloved Senate, Mike has remained somewhat mysterious. It is definitely a good sign for all of us that he has never become a household name, but some careful intelligence work on our own has turned up clues about Mike D.'s next assignment. His well-earned retirement will bring more hikes, more long runs, a lot more golf, and more time with the family he treasures. He may miss his colleagues and the importance of his job, but I don't think tears will be shed for the end of those heroically long commutes on I-95 which took place at all hours, day and night, whenever duty called.

I can't offer Mike any higher praise than to repeat what he actually already knows.

The Senate has been safe and secure for more than a generation because of you. Decades of Senators have gotten the information we need because of you. Some people spend their whole careers wondering if they have made a difference. You have not needed to ask that for almost 40 years, and you will never need to ask it again.

Mike, we are going to miss you, but old habits die hard, and we simply aren't willing to sever all ties.

So, this morning, the Senate will officially designate Mike as Senate Security's Director Emeritus. The Office's first-ever Director will become its first-ever Director Emeritus.

But don't worry, Mike. Your new job description will just be a little bit lighter. I hope the biggest mystery you have to tackle for a while will be whether to play 9 holes on Saturday or fit in 18. The Senate and your country thanks you for everything you have done.

DIRECTOR EMERITUS OF SENATE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 582, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 582) designating Michael P. DiSilvestro as Director Emeritus of Senate Security of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 582) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate Banking Committee this morning will hear testimony from Secretary Mnuchin and Federal Reserve Chairman Powell about the economic distress caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. This testimony from the Secretary and the Chairman of the Fed is one of the requirements that Senate Democrats secured in the CARES Act, and we have been pushing for it to happen for several weeks. The fact that it has taken so long is, once again, one more indication that our Republican Senate colleagues are not focused on the COVID crisis but on other diversionary issues, as witnessed by Leader MCCONNELL's speech, which I will have something to say about in a few minutes.

It could not be more urgent that they are testifying. The COVID-19 pandemic has thrown over 35 million people into sudden unemployment, the highest level since the Great Depression. Chairman Powell has said that further lay-

offs can continue for months. The anguish that so many people feel. Without further action, Powell said, we risk "prolonged recession and weak recovery," with unemployment reaching 20 percent or even 25 percent. In Chairman Powell's words, it may be that Congress has to do more, and the reason we have to do more is to avoid longer damage to the economy. Those are Chairman Powell's words, a non-political appointee by President Trump.

Mr. Powell's testimony this morning, hopefully, will jolt my Republican colleagues into action, finally. At the very least, his testimony should awaken them from their slumber and compel some understanding of the scope and urgency of the problem at hand. Maybe his speech will somehow galvanize our Republican colleagues into coming forward and talking about COVID, doing oversight of COVID, and coming up with the kinds of plans that we saw in COVID 4.0 in the House that are so well needed. Maybe they will talk about things like this. Are they for aiding State and local governments? Are they for so many of the things in the bill—more help for hospitals, more help for testing, more money for PPE, more help for those who have lost their jobs, or are they not? All we hear is silence from our Republican colleagues.

I sat on the House and Senate Banking Committees for decades. I may hold the record for attendance at hearings with Fed Chairs, so I can state that Chairs of the Federal Reserve, whether appointed by Democratic or Republican Presidents, do not frivolously suggest that more congressional action is taken—rarely, do they do that. They try to avoid it. That is another reason why Chairman Powell's comments are so important. If he feels the need to push this Congress, and particularly this Republican Senate, to act, problems must be deep and real, and most Americans know it, but our Republican Senate colleagues don't seem to.

We are looking at an economic situation "without modern precedent" in Powell's words. We can either take action to soften the blow to businesses, families, workers, and average folks or, through inaction, prolong the recession and hamstring our Nation's recovery. Up until now, it seems our Republican colleagues are, unfortunately, choosing the latter: no immediate need for urgent action. Amazing. This is the greatest crisis America has faced in decades and decades.

Now my colleagues like to point out the costs of the House Democratic bill to provide another round of emergency relief. Republican leadership has taken time to assail parts of the Democratic bill that account for 0.0003 percent of the bill. They are not expected to like every single piece, but they are expected by the American people to act, and, mark my words, the American people will force them to act.

There are so many costs to inaction, and none other than the Republican-