EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this now–early morning, on a new day, to talk about this nomination, which has been the subject of so much debate, so much contention and, I believe, so much concern across the country and in my home State of Pennsylvania.

I spoke earlier today of some of the basic history of my State that principally involves public education. In the late 1800s–the early 1800s, to be exact—a debate started in Pennsylvania about public education, the culmination of which led to the enactment under State law of the Free School Act in 1834 in Pennsylvania. We have had a bedrock foundation of free public education all these generations. It is part of who we are as a State.

In our Commonwealth, even today with all of the changes in education and all of the change in policy over time, we are still a State where 92 percent of our schoolchildren are educated in public schools. That is the State we are. We don’t have any for-profit charter schools, and that has been the subject of debate in this nomination.

We have, by law, public nonprofit entities as charter schools. It is a significant point of difference between what is law in Pennsylvania and what is part of our education traditions and what the nominee has stood for in her time as a private citizen. We will get to that a little bit later.

I wanted to start tonight with a basic assessment, and then I will go through a series of issues. The basic assessment and determination that I have made is that I should vote against the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be the next U.S. Secretary of Education. The principle reason for that is her views on public education—what I believe to be a lack of total commitment to public education and what that would mean for the country.

I have heard from people across my State—urban and rural, suburban, Democrats and Republicans, all kinds of people—who have spoken with one voice against this nomination. That is one of the factors that I have to consider when making a decision, but even I could not have imagined the scope of that response from people across Pennsylvania.

I know we still have a number of hours left before the vote, but, to date, if you count all of the contacts that have been made with my office—or I should say offices in Pennsylvania and here in Washington—it is over 100,000 contacts, whether made by telephone or email or by letter or otherwise.

I have been in the U.S. Senate for more than 10 years now. This is my 11th year. No nomination has even approached that number of contacts from individuals who felt that they had to speak up and speak out, literally, in the context of a nomination.

I wanted to start with one particular issue and develop it rather fully; that is, the issue of sexual assault on our campuses. This is the line of questioning that I pursued with Mrs. DeVos when she came before the HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—just a couple of days ago.

I want to start with the stark reality of sexual assault on college and university campuses across the country. Here is what the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention tell us: One in five women on college campuses experience attempted or completed sexual assault—one in five. That is an abomination. That is a stain on our country. That is something we should not allow to continue.

In the last couple of years, we have just begun to tackle that horrific problem, that insult, that outrage for young women and their families all across the country. We passed legislation that I will talk about in a moment, but this is a matter, I believe, of basic justice.

Hundreds of years ago, St. Augustine said: “Without justice, what are kingdoms but great bands of robbers?” If we don’t get serious about this problem—the problem of sexual assault and what happens to young women on our college campuses—we are robbing them of basic justice. We are robbing them of an opportunity to get a higher education.

In many instances, because of that assault, that young woman’s life is destroyed or largely compromised or harmed in some fashion. Sometimes she cannot finish her higher education, so she is robbed of that opportunity because the rest of us didn’t do enough to prevent that assault.

When we remember those words of Augustine about a basic definition of justice, we should remember and decide whether we are doing enough to prevent her from being robbed of her dignity, robbed of her safety, robbed of the ability to move forward with public education, and, of course, robbed from her basic pursuit of happiness as a young person on a college campus who should have a reasonable expectation of safety and security.

Too often, the college or the university has failed her. Often—too often, I should say—our society has failed her. This is a serious issue. As I said, some young women never recover, and others struggle for the rest of their lives.

Let me say this about the young men who engage in this kind of conduct: Any young man who engages in this kind of conduct on a college campus is a coward, and we should call them on it. They are cowards. They should be brought to justice—swift and certain justice—when they engage in this kind of a crime. It is happening too often on our college campuses.
As we seek to hold these young men fully accountable for sexual assault on college campuses, we better have a Secretary of Education who is fully committed—fully committed—to making sure that we are holding these students accountable. That is the least we can expect of Secretaries of Education and from a President and an executive branch and a Congress of both parties and both Houses that are committed to protecting young women on our campuses.

What have we done about it? First of all, we haven’t done enough. That is the basic foundation of what I will say, but we have made some progress the last couple of years. I introduced legislation a couple of years ago, the Campus SaVe Act, known more fully as the "Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act." That became law in 2013 as part of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

As the process works around here, you can look at 2013 and the regulatory process starts. The regulations didn’t go into effect until the summer of 2015. We are into our second college school year of those regulations being part of our law.

Here is what they do, and I will summarize my legislation in short order. Basically, what Campus SaVe does is two or three things: One is make sure that we are taking steps—and colleges and universities are required to take steps pursuant to this law—to bring about strategies of prevention so that we are doing everything we can on that campus to prevent these kinds of assaults.

Second, we want to make sure that those who commit crimes and the administration are aware of the problem. It is everyone’s problem. It is not just the problem of that victim, it is the problem not just the problem for young women. It is everybody’s problem. If you are a young man on that campus, you might not just be a bystander. You have to be something about this problem. If you are in the college administration or otherwise, you have to be part of the solution.

We passed legislation, got the regulations in effect, and now colleges and universities have to abide by them. This act is now helping improve how people prevent these kinds of crimes.

The fourth category is stalking. All of those circumstances are covered. All of that behavior by a college student is covered. We want to make sure that institutions have clearly defined policies and that they let the victim know way ahead of time that she has not just rights but she also has opportunities to pursue justice in more ways than one. She can leave that campus and seek the help of local law enforcement.

She has to be informed of her right to do that. If she wants to go to a court and seek a protective order, not only must the college tell her about that right, but the college or university has to help her do it. Also, of course, there are the procedures for conducting hearings in a fair and appropriate manner.

We have a long way to go to hold perpetrators accountable. There is still too much on our campuses. Too many young men over many generations have been protected in one way or another. Some institution, some individual on the campus or off the campus has protected them and swept these issues and these crimes under the rug. We are going to continue to work on this issue, but that leads me to the nominee for Secretary of Education. I asked Betsy DeVos in the hearing if she would commit to upholding Title IX, which is a nondiscrimination statute that includes important protections against sexual assault. Specifically, I asked her to uphold the guidance from 2011 of the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, which advises institutions of higher education to adopt the preponderance of the evidence standard for campus conduct proceedings.

Some people know the difference between one level of evidentiary standards versus others. They made a determination that preponderance of the evidence was the right standard. I asked her a very specific question as to whether she would uphold that basic evidentiary standard, and she said it was "premature to make such a commitment."

I also asked her whether she would enforce the law as it relates to sexual assault, and she didn’t seem to believe that she had to answer that question in a manner that would give us confidence that she would uphold the law.

To say that it is premature to answer questions like that, instead of saying, "Yes, it is the Secretary of Education to uphold the law, to enforce the law, to hold perpetrators accountable, to protect victims,"—if she had said that, and then said "Well, but I will have to review some of these policies," that would be different. She just said that it was premature to make a commitment.

She has a duty—not a duty that she can escape if she were to be Secretary of Education—to uphold the law to protect victims. I believe that the Secretary of Education must not only comply with the law, but the Secretary of Education as it relates to those victims on college campuses or potential victims has to be, in my judgment, not just an advocate but an unyielding advocate, a determined advocate, a champion for those students to substantially reduce the likelihood that we are going to continue to see one in five women being victims of sexual assault on our college campuses.

To say that her answer alarmed both survivors and the great advocates who have been in the trenches helping those survivors for years is an understatement. I will just read two reactions.

One survivor, Jess Davidson, wrote an open letter to Mrs. DeVos as part of a "Dear Betsy" campaign. She said:

I haven’t always felt that I had the space or safety to tell my story and stand up for survivors. However, I was lucky enough to attend college under the administration that fought for survivors of sexual assault.

It was only because committed government leaders believed it was for the questions of those individuals who fought for survivors to uphold Title IX and address campus sexual violence that I was able to overcome what happened to me.

Later in her letter, Jess Davidson said:

Ms. DeVos, certainly my education, if not my life, was saved by committed leaders standing up and fighting for the rights of survivors of sexual assault. So today I am writing you to ask, that if confirmed, you do the same.

Jess goes on from there. She says:

Because if survivors do not feel their government is fighting for them, they won’t speak up. I almost didn’t.

That is one survivor telling us how difficult it was for her to speak out or to speak up about this issue because of the pain and the horror that she lived through. Mrs. DeVos may not have to answer my questions fully, as much as I pursue an answer, but she does have to answer the questions of those survivors like Jess and so many others because if she is confirmed as Secretary of Education, she is not some independent operator. She is a servant of the people. The people are her boss. Jess is her boss. If she is confirmed, she better understand that she is a public servant. The private sector would be in the rear-view mirror. You can’t treat people the way that she might have treated people up to this point in time.

She is a servant of the people if she is confirmed, and she better have an answer for Jess every day that she is on the job if she is confirmed.

Another survivor, Sofie, works for an organization called End Rape on Campus. She wrote:

Our country has finally begun to shatter the silence on sexual violence, and survivors nationwide are refusing to go back to how things were before. Students, parents, and survivors nationwide deserve to know whether Betsy DeVos is truly committed to keeping all students safe in school. Betsy, we are counting on you.

Betsy DeVos, if she is confirmed as Secretary of Education, has to answer those questions posed to her by Senators or by the media, but she has a sacred duty that she cannot escape to give answers to these survivors and to the advocates who so bravely support them day in and day out, year in and year out. It is about time the Congress of the United States did a lot more to support these victims as well.

Maintaining protections for victims of campus sexual assault is not part of some negotiation. This has to be mandatory work that we do together. In reference to her answer to my question
about it being premature to commit to enforcing a law on sexual assault and fully embracing the guidance that the Department put forth in 2011—and by the way, the same guidance put forth in the Bush administration—if she is going to change that guidance on the evidentiary standard, thereby making it harder for victims and better for the perpetrator, by the way, when you raise the standard of evidence, she better have a good explanation for that.

She has a good explanation for the victims and the survivors as to why she changed a policy that has been in place for two administrations, not just one, two—a Republican administration and a Democratic administration.

I would apply the same test to the entire administration. Now the Trump administration has an obligation, as well, not just Mrs. DeVos if she were to be confirmed as Secretary of Education to turn back the clock and allow young men to continue to prey upon young women with impunity and without consequence as they often have been able to do over the years.

Let me move to a second issue—students with disabilities. It is often overlooked in our debates about education. We have debates about funding, debates about philosophy, debates about who has the best idea, and sometimes we forget students with disabilities, who have a right under Federal law to have the opportunity to clarify her answer, Mrs. DeVos continued to insist that States should be able to determine whether they provide services to students with disabilities.

Let me say it plainly. That is dead wrong.

That is unambiguously, definitively wrong. States can’t decide not to comply with the IDEA—the law that 4 years ago enshrined that basic right for students with disabilities to have an appropriate education. I hope by now, on the eve of her confirmation vote, that she has done some studying and learned that IDEA is the law of the land. If she wants to change it, she better line up the votes in the Senate to overturn the law that made sure that students with disabilities have those basic guarantees.

Once again, the best words are from people like Kristin, to make sure she contacts us and contact us about these issues.

Kristin, who is from Southeastern Pennsylvania, wrote the following with regard to her son:

Being parents of a high-functioning autistic child, we value and cherish our public school system. In fact, our public school experience has been life changing for our son. He’s getting a great education, and has made remarkable strides. He not only benefits from the resources, caring attention provided by teachers, administrators, assistants and school staff and an Individualized Education Plan—accommodations afforded by IDEA that private schools can simply ignore, and charter schools do a poor job of meeting—but he has also had the opportunity to meet all kinds of kids. I am proud and thrilled that his small group of friends include kids whose parents were born in other countries or who practice other religions. This is the benefit of a quality, well-funded, public school education; an informed citizenry and an introduction to the cultures and perspectives beyond our own neighborhoods.

No one has said it better, in my judgment, than Kristin, about the value of public education; the value of that public school to her son who has autism, but he is a high-functioning autistic child. The vistas of opportunities for learning that have been opened to that child because of that school and because of the IDEA that helps that child with his disability—to get an appropriate education under our system—and a lot of that started way back in the 1830s in Pennsylvania when the Free Schools Act was passed.

So, again, I say very directly to Mrs. DeVos as a nominee and if she is confirmed as the Secretary of Education, that Mrs. DeVos must guarantee Kristin and her son that she will support public schools and children with disabilities without exceptions, not with equivocation, but with some bizarre, erroneous argument about what States might want to do but full commitment, full compliance with the IDEA, full compliance with the law as it relates to any child with a disability. She has an obligation, as a servant of taxpayers, as a servant of those parents like Kristin, to make sure she meets Kristin’s expectations, not the expectations of a President and not the expectations of insiders here in Washington. She has to answer to the expectations of Kristin and taxpayers like her and her son. So she has a heavy burden of proof based upon her testimony to date.

Mr. President, I am going to move to another topic, a topic that has been the subject of much attention lately, but frankly not enough attention over many years. It is an issue that affects all kinds of children in our schools at various ages and at various circumstances. I am talking about bullying. Something that happened to me in my generation somehow concludes has always been a problem and is just a continuing problem from one generation to the next. They are wrong on the facts. It is a much worse problem than it seems to be and that is largely caused by the failure to deal with it. It is also caused by the ability of the bully to follow the bullied student home and to torment them and sometimes to aggravate other bullies around them to torment them all day long in school and at home all through the night, day after day, week after week.

In addition to ensuring equal protection of students with disabilities as we just talked about, I am also concerned that Mrs. DeVos will not be fully committed to enforcing civil rights protections for students, including those who identify as LGBTQ.

This is obviously connected as well to the issue of bullying, because often the most likely victims of bullying, we know, are LGBT students and students with disabilities. There is no question about that. But there are too many stories and too many newspaper stories, in particular,
about someone who was bullied persistently over time. That has led to suicides and lead to some terribly tragic outcomes for students and their families.

Bullying, when you think about it—or I would say bullying and the tolerance we have built up, I guess, over years to allow bullying to continue—in many ways is the ultimate betrayal of our kids. We say to our kids: Go to school. You have to go to school and stay in class and pay attention to your homework and stay hard for quizzes and tests. If you do that, you are going to progress and you are going to be a person who has opportunities in the world. But you have to stay in school and you have to concentrate on your work.

It is the ultimate betrayal for us as parents, as a society, to tell that to a child, and then we put them in schools where the efforts against bullying are not a priority. So it is a real betrayal of our kids, and we send them to schools and then not protect so many of them from bullying. So in so many ways, as adults, we fail our kids when we allow that to happen.

For many LGBTQ students, schools are a cruel but safe. The Centers for Disease Control in 2016 put out a report called the “Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance” annual report, which looks at the health and well-being of our 9th through 12th grade students. Students who identify as gay are almost three times more likely to have been threatened or injured by a knife or a weapon on school property-twice as likely.

Students who identify as gay are almost three times more likely to stay home from school because of safety concerns. Sixty percent of students identifying as gay had felt so sad and hopeless almost every day for 2 or more weeks in a row that they had stopped doing usual activities.

Finally, the most sobering of all, the rate of suicide attempts is four times greater. Let me say that again. Suicide attempts are four times greater for young people who happen to be gay, and two times greater for young people that are questioning than that of a straight young person. With the advent of text messaging and social media and social networking, many children find they cannot escape the harassment even as they go home at night.

It follows then from the moment they get off the school bus to the moment they go to sleep. I will give you one example from Pennsylvania, right in the heartland of our State, Snyder County. You can’t get much more small town and emblematic of the rural and smalltown communities but a county than a county like Snyder County.

The story of Brandon Bitner, a teenager from that part of the State, in central Pennsylvania, is a chilling reminder of the horror—the absolute horror—of bullying. This is what one news account wrote:

Brandon Bitner, 14 years old, of Mount Pleasant Mills, PA, walked 13 miles from his home early Friday morning in November of 2010 to a business intersection and threw himself in front of an oncoming tractor-trailer, after leaving a suicide note at his home. There was no reason to put in doubt in students’ mind why Brandon did what he did.

“It was because of bullying,” this friend wrote to the Daily Item, a paper in central Pennsylvania, in his writing. “It was not about race or gender, but they bullied him for his sexual preferences, the way he dressed. Which,” she said, “they wrongly accused him of.

We know that Brandon’s suicide note reportedly explained that he was constantly bullied at Middle-West High School in Middleburg, which is also Snyder County, where he was a freshman. Bullies allegedly called Brandon names. He stated in the note that a humiliating event in school this past week was “the straw that broke the camel’s back.” Brandon was an accomplished violinist, having been a member of the Susquehanna Youth Orchestra in 2009.

That is small-town Pennsylvania, Snyder County, right in the middle of our State. So you have a 14-year-old who is driven to suicide because of bullying—persistent, pernicious, violent, evil bullying. I love him to throw himself in front of a tractor-trailer 13 miles from his home.

Now, we know that laws cannot wipe out human behavior or the darkness of human nature sometimes. While we do have Federal laws that promote school safety, it is crucial to nothing in place to comprehensively address issues of bullying and harassment. It is critical that anti-bullying and harassment laws and policies enumerate or list characteristics that are most frequently the subject of bullying and harassment, such as race, color, natural origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability and religion—sometimes known in the law as protected classes.

It is important of the top bullying policies, those categories are so enumerated. This is the most effective strategy for preventing and prohibiting both bullying and harassment. Research shows the effectiveness of these policies, and even the American Bar Association agreed, passing a resolution unanimously in 2011 supporting enumerated protections, not vague references to protecting young people from bullying but very specific enumerated protections.

Now, we have made progress in developing legislation, but we have not gotten the support we need to get it passed. We tried this during the debate on the Every Student Succeeds Act, which, as many of you know, is the reauthorizations. We did. We did. We made to the No Child Left Behind legislation. But we did not get this policy as part of that. So we have a ways to go.

Now, I had hoped that the next Secretary of Education would be interested in tackling these issues. While Mrs. DeVos has expressed a desire to work on preventing bullying, her record and financial giving seem to suggest otherwise, especially as it relates to LGBTQ students.

Mrs. DeVos and her family’s foundations have given millions of dollars to organizations that are expressly opposed to this work—much of the funding coming from the Edgar and Eliza Prince Foundation, which is one of her family foundations. So, in other words, she is supporting groups that do not want to pass anti-bullying legislation that enumerates the protected groups of students.

I think that is a big mistake. I think it is wrong. We will continue to fight them. But I hope that those donations that the family foundations have made will not prohibit her from taking strong action against bullying as Secretary of Education. Once again, I will say it: When she becomes Secretary of Education—if she is confirmed—she is no longer a private citizen engaged in fights about ideology or fights about politics. She is a servant of the people if she is going to be Secretary of Education.

So I would hope she would rethink that original predisposition to be against those policies. I will move on because I know we are limited in our time.

Now, I wanted to conclude with a couple of remarks about questions regarding ethics and potential conflicts of interest, because that seems to be a persistent concern. Mrs. DeVos is part of the tradition in our State that we opt on the side of more transparency for candidates and for public officials about disclosure of information, especially information that could compromise an individual in public office—tax returns, for example, when people run for office. Providing Mrs. DeVos’s tax returns would be a small price to pay to become Secretary of Education as part of that transparency. It would also go a long way to ease the public’s discomfort around some of the potential conflicts of interest in the assets and family trusts that DeVos will be retaining if she were to be confirmed.

The letter of agreement between Betsy DeVos and the Office of Government Ethics is necessary but not sufficient to alleviate her and her family’s financial conflicts of interest. The HELP Committee has always used its own requirements for vetting a nominee, which are and always have been a step beyond those gathered by the Office of Government Ethics.

The committee requires full disclosure of all assets over $1,000 in the two-
part committee questionnaire required by the committee rules. So there is a lot more to do. I know we are running out of time. There is a lot more to do, I believe, in terms of her fully disclosing information about her family’s or her financiers’ stakes, which they must maintain in some of these entities if she were to be confirmed.

This is not about probing someone who has a lot of personal assets and is wealthy. This is about the taxpayers’ right to know what their Secretary of Education, or even a nominee for this job, has in her portfolio and her family. So I will conclude with this. Our children and our families and our taxpayers deserve a Secretary of Education who is fully committed to being a champion for public schools and public education.

I will harken back to what Kristin said in part of the letter I read: Their public school experience has been “life-changing.” They “value and cherish our public school system.” I hope that Betsy DeVos, if she were to be confirmed, would value and cherish public education. I make it a live-changing experience for every student in those public schools.

For the many reasons I have outlined, I will vote against her nomination tonight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the time.

I think we have had a very interesting debate on Betsy DeVos and frankly on public education. Listening to my friends on the left, I have been encouraged, encouraged because I am excited that for the first time in a very long time, we are actually having a conversation about the important role of public education in America. This is a necessary component to success in life.

I have been inspired, inspired by Senators who have spoken eloquently and passionately about the importance of our public education system, the challenges they fear might come with the secretary of education, and that is good news.

The third issue I have heard is that the Secretary of Education and the President has a fresh set of eyes; that, yes, she has no preconceived notions about the importance of quality education. I call it the opportunity agenda.

The opportunity agenda, which has been my focus for the last 4 years, focuses first on education, making sure that every single ZIP Code in America has a quality choice for education. This is so important to me. As a poor kid growing up in a single-parent household, I was not doing very well. From 7 to 14, I drifted in the wrong direction. I basically flunked out. I failed world geography. I may be the first Senator to fail civics. I even failed Spanish and English. When you fail Spanish and English, no one considers explaining to you by the way, “bi-ignant” because I could not speak in any language, and that is where I found my unhappy self.

I have two major blessings in my life: a wonderful mother who believed in my future, who encouraged me who inspired me, who did everything necessary to try to keep me on the right track, and I had a powerful mentor.

I am so thankful that during the hardest times of my life, I found myself in the position to receive a quality education, and I learned from my sophomore year forward to take advantage of that strong opportunity for a quality education, but that was not always the case.

Reminding you of the time I was in the fourth grade, I had gone to four different elementary schools because there is something transient about poverty. So we moved around some. Picking the right school was difficult, challenging. So, for me, when I think about this topic, when I hear my friends on the left, when I think about the debate around the Nation, this is simply a clear debate and discussion around education. It changed my life for the better.

I will tell you, this is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. Both Republicans and Democrats around this Nation—maybe not in this Chamber but around this Nation—support Betsy DeVos to be the next Secretary of Education, and that is good news.

I tell you, she brings with her an opportunity agenda, which has been my focus for the last 4 years. I spent the last 28 years in public education. I spent the last 28 years in public education. She supports charter schools. She supports quality public education. She agrees with many on our side of the aisle, when she said very clearly, as a champion for public schools. She supports quality public education. She supports charter schools. She supports school choice, and accountability equally for charter schools and other public schools.

I had a chance to talk to Betsy DeVos, and I would not support her if she was not going to treat all the same schools the same. I think the same accountability. That is important, and that is a place where she has been crystal-clear, from my perspective.

The third issue I have heard is that supporting Betsy DeVos will somehow ruin public education. I will tell you, I have had the chance to sit down and chat with her about the role of public education. She agrees with many on our side of the aisle, when she said very clearly, she supports public education. She supports quality public education. She supports charter schools. She supports school choice.

I do not believe there is a binary choice between public education and school choice. I think that is not an accurate description that we face. I think she will help to improve public education.

One of my friends on the left said that public education is a right, but for too many of our children quality public education is not. It is simply not happening.

I will tell you, as I think about the numbers around this concept, I look at those schools around the Nation that
meet or exceed our national standard in the area of English or language arts.

In my home State, in the county where I was born, Charleston County, if you break it down—and this is a debate that has become a debate so often about education and what we need to do to look at, to understand our communities—all over this Nation and for the students and for our communities all over the country.

Philadelphia is another place. For 53 percent—barely half of the majority students—meet or exceed the standards; 24 percent of African-American students and 23 percent of Hispanic students meet or exceed the standards. That means that while we are having a debate about education, while we are having a debate about Betsy DeVos, maybe it is not about Betsy DeVos. Maybe it is not about the great teachers I have had and others have had. We should all celebrate quality public education. I do. I am a tremendous supporter of it, but there is a place in this Nation—from Appalachia, the rural areas in West Virginia, the rural areas of South Carolina, inner cities that I have just named—where a quality education is not the norm. As a matter of fact, the exact opposite is the norm, and that means we all will pay a hefty price, not financially because that is secondary. We lose human potential when it is not developed and that is a travesty, one that we can ill afford as a nation.

Well, in Detroit, only 13 percent of our White kids are doing just fine in meeting and/or exceeding those national standards, and, unfortunately, only 24.4 percent of our Black students meet or exceed those standards. I heard that of the students in Charleston County, only 27.7 percent meet or exceed those standards.

I will tell you that if you think about where we are, as a nation, on the issue of public education and if you drive into other cities, like other cities, like Chicago or Detroit or Philadelphia, you have to ask yourself: What is the experience of that child in public education? Because I think this is the central debate for our country. It is around education because a poor education has a strong correlation with our incarceration rates. A poor education has a strong correlation with high unemployment rates. A poor education has a correlation with low lifetime income.

So the importance of the issue of quality education—particularly in those places in our country that seem to be under tremendous stress—we should drill into the numbers so we can appreciate what the future looks like for those kids. This is such an important issue.

In Chicago, 65 percent of our majority students meet or exceed the standard in language arts and only 22 percent of our African-American kids meet or exceed the standards; 29 percent of our Hispanic kids in Chicago meet or exceed the standards.

What are the numbers in Detroit? Well, in Detroit, only 13 percent of our majority students meet or exceed English standards; 9 percent—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine percent—of the African-American kids meet or exceed those standards. Just correlate those numbers to the incarceration rates, to the employment rates, to the lifetime income rates, and to the rate of hopelessness in those communities.

I know we are having a debate about the Secretary of Education. It is an important debate, but a more important debate centers around the educational experience of our students all over this Nation and what that means long term for this Nation and for the students and for our communities all over the country.

In my home State, in the county where I was born, Charleston County, if you break it down—and this is a debate that has become a debate so often about education and what we need to do to look at, to understand our communities—all over this Nation and for the students and for our communities all over the country.
looking at their performance, 94 percent in math, 92 percent in English, 99 percent in science. To break those numbers down as I did earlier with the African-American and Hispanic students, in math, here is how you reverse the achievement gap: 93 percent of African-American Success Academy scholars outperform the majority of students in New York City. Eighty percent of them are African Americans and 80 percent of them are Hispanic. They are at 80 percent.

The right focus, with the right emphasis, with options like a cafeteria, when parents have a choice, the students have a chance not just in education but a better chance in life.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, the hour is late, or early in the morning, and my colleague from Hawaii is here. Before I leave the floor, I want to say how pleased I am to see the Senate actually debating the state of education in America.

I said earlier today when I was here that if you are born poor in this country, most people graduating now from colleges in America are people who are 16 or 17 years of age; that there is a class of people in the United States, in the land of opportunity, who because they are unlucky enough to be born poor, are unlucky enough to go to schools that nobody in this Chamber would ever be content sending their kid or their grandkid to.

In fact, if we had the results that we have for poor children in America for the children and grandchildren of the Members of this body, I am sure we would all leave and go back home and think we aren’t enough. So the answer to the question about the State of public education in this country. We almost don’t talk about it at all.

We just had a Presidential election in this country where the issue didn’t come up. At all. And I am glad we are having the debate, and I strongly believe that this person President Trump has nominated is ill-equipped to help the country overcome the challenges we face in public education and put us on the path that says that we are going to provide in the United States robust, high-quality early childhood education for every family in America that wants it.

We are going to have a system of public education in this country that provides a K-12 school for every single child in America that is a school that any Senator would be proud to send their kid. We are going to make sure that those kids are in the United States, and maybe even people who aren’t so young, has the ability to graduate from college or acquire the skills and knowledge they need to compete in the 21st century and do that without acquiring a mountain of debt that requires them—in the case of people graduating now from colleges in Colorado—to take 22 years of their lives to pay that debt back. It doesn’t make any sense.

This is a kind of opportunity. The gateway to opportunity is a high-quality education, and too many of our kids in this country in the 21st century don’t have access to it. My hope is that when we get through this debate, we can focus on the work that is happening in places like Denver, CO, where we have seen, in just a 10-year period, a 60-percent increase in the number of kids who are graduating from high school.

I also think that we have a long way to go in Denver in terms of making sure that a kid’s ZIP Code doesn’t determine the education they get. I said earlier tonight and I believe if we could say that every single city in America, every single urban district and every single rural district where there are poor children and kids of color going to school that we had increased the graduation rate over the last 10 years by 60 percent, I think we would all feel a lot better about where we are headed as a country.

That is a fundamental challenge for this country. It is the most important domestic issue we face, and I hope this debate tonight, this 24 hours we are spending on this nominee, is not the end of our debate.

As I said the other day in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, I think it would be a useful exercise for that committee to spend the next year studying what is going on in public education in this country, what is working well, what is not working well, and figure out how we can work—

The Federal Government can work—with States, local governments, and local school districts to provide the kind of opportunity that every kid in America deserves.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I wish to tell a story about Evelyn, a young woman I met from Molokai, who is a small rural island in the State of Hawaii. It is the kind of place that has one radio station, one high school, and everybody knows everybody. Of course, everyone in town knows Evelyn. They were all so proud of her when she invented a pH sensor that can detect even small changes in the ocean’s environment. Her device is nothing short of groundbreaking. It is actually more accurate than the devices that marine scientists at our Federal agencies have been using, and it is way less expensive. It is an estimated 1/20th of the price, and it requires half the maintenance.

This invention makes Evelyn an accomplished scientist, an innovator, an entrepreneur, and a passionate ocean steward, but she is also a junior in public high school, Molokai High School. She is proof that our public school students can compete and innovate at the highest levels and that public schools can be a path to just about anything, which is why public schools and public education are to be held up and supported and understood as the great equalizer, the bedrock of our democracy, our civil society, our country.

You can trace the history of public education in America from the Original Thirteen Colonies. In 1635, boys in Boston could get a free education, and by 1647, the Massachusetts Bay Colony...
required every town to provide boys a basic education.

Some 340 years later, our public education system has come a long way, but some things don’t change. Our communities still understand how public education lays a foundation for success. It gives kids across America the chance to pursue their dreams. But the nominee for Secretary of Education doesn’t seem to understand that, which is why we see constituents flooding the phone lines, Facebook and Twitter, faxes and the in-boxes of U.S. Senators.

In terms of pure volume, this last week has been the highest point for American interaction with the U.S. Congress in our history. Think about that. Think about what we have been through as a country together, and yet, this week and last, more people have called their Members of the Senate than literally ever before because that is the level of passion people feel for public education and because Americans across the country are concerned and worried about what will happen to public education under Betsy DeVos.

My office alone has received thousands of messages about her nomination.

I just want to be clear about this. There are certainly advocacy organizations that make it easy for you to contact your Member of Congress. They have form letters. They have Web forms. They make it easy. They populate the thing. They pop off an email, and you just sign at the bottom. That isn’t what I am talking about. These are organically generated, individual letters from across the State of Hawaii.

Talking with colleagues, that is what is happening. People are, on their own, calling because everybody has a story about public education. Everybody has a reason to be passionate about public education. Let me share a few of these concerns.

A parent on the Big Island of Hawaii wrote:

As a mother of two, and as a woman who went back to graduate school in her 50s, I understand the importance of free education in public schools as a fundamental American right, one which can create a lifelong love of education and learning.

A constituent from Kihei, Maui, wrote:

Public schools are not failing. We, as in our American culture, are failing them.

Another one from Kahului, Maui, wrote:

Children are not a business, they are not a commodity. Public education has its issues (of course it does), but privatizing teachers and turning education into an opportunity for the rich to get richer on one of the last social services we provide to everyone in this country is not the answer.

Here is one from a teacher on the island of Molokai:

The nominee for Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, has zero experience serving in public schools and is not qualified for the job. I do not believe she understands the needs and what effort has taken to move our schools as far along as we have. Public education is a great responsibility and cannot be left to those who have never worked directly with children in need.

These are children who experience school as a safe place when they are valued, fed and educated. This serious responsibility of public education in no way can be left or replaced by a voucher system.

Here is another message from a constituent on the Big Island:

My family has very strong ties to the educational community—many of which are or were educators. My husband is an English as a second language teacher, and my mother-in-law is currently a third grade teacher, so this is a very personal conversation. We at a minimum deserve a leader with some experience and who knows at least some of the laws already in place as well as how to enforce them.

Mrs. DeVos has never known what a child from Milolii has to do just to get a good education. She has never had to make the choice to go to college or to stay home, try to save money while also helping to support her household. Neither her nor her children had to question if she can afford out of state tuition. She does not represent our plight and she does not know our challenges.

I ask you from the pureness of my heart as a mom who was forced to work for not only my child, but for every mother’s child, to please demand an educational representative with experience and our values in mind.

Here is a message from another parent:

This is not about which side of the political arena you fall upon. I believe there are many Republicans and Democrats who are far more qualified and knowledgeable than Mrs. DeVos. On the other hand...

She is right—our kids do deserve better. But right now, not all of them are getting the education they deserve. A 2016 report found that half a million 15-year-old students in the United States haven’t mastered the basics in any subject—not math, not reading, not science—and more than a million scored below the baseline level in science.

U.S. News and World Report noted that if we could pull those kids up to a basic level, our Big Island economy could grow by an estimated $27 trillion over the time period that these students are in the workforce. Set aside the human impact for a moment. Set aside the family impact. If all you care about is economic development, we are leaving $27 trillion on the table because we are not lifting up every child to learn as much as they possibly can and reach their potential.

In too many places, we are failing these kids. Failure is both negative and far reaching. Our failure impacts their ability to go to college or learn a trade, to make a decent paycheck, to provide for their family, and to pursue the American dream. But we don’t have to fail these children. Congress can make choices that will improve education for all. We can make, instead of break, the future for our kids. We can decide to increase funding for disadvantaged students. We can decide to protect our students from bullying and violence. We can decide to set up children for success with universal access to early childhood education.

There is abundant brain science now that confirms every parent’s instinct, which is that the first 5 years of a child’s life—of an infant’s life into being a toddler, then to being a little kid—those first 5 years are the most important years for a child. Now we are here to just say this because there is abundant brain science and data that have come in that have shown, in terms of the efficacy of a Federal dollar spent, there is nothing that has a greater impact in terms of educational outcomes, in terms of economic development, than investing in early childhood education.

We can decide to adhere to commonsense accountability standards to ensure a high-quality education to all children, regardless of who your parents are or where you live. We can decide to invest in wage-boosting apprenticeship careers and technical education. We can make college more affordable so our students can access higher education without taking on crushing debt.

But to accomplish these goals, we need an excellent Department of Education to make it happen because the agency is responsible for implementing Congress’s decisions. It is up to the executive branch to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the Nation. That is literally the mission statement of the U.S. DOE—to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence. That is the way I look at the Secretary nominee. Is she committed to ensuring access—equal access to education and promoting educational excellence?

The Secretary of Education is responsible for the mission of overseeing a $36 billion budget in K–12 and about $76 billion in higher education funding. This person is responsible for enforcing key civil rights protections for our students. This person advises the President on all things education in the United States, whether it is a policy that will affect a local public school or a policy that will impact millions of student borrowers.

Up until this moment, every Secretary of Education who has served in the President’s Cabinet has had the requisite to take on these responsibilities.

Shirley Hufstedler was the first Secretary of Education to be in the Cabinet, serving under President Carter. As the daughter of a schoolteacher and a part-time teacher herself, she was also a trailblazing lawyer who is considered a favorite to be the first woman nominated to the Supreme Court.

Terrel Bell was a teacher, a professor, and then a superintendent of a school district in Utah before he served under President Reagan.

William Bennett was a professor at the University of Chicago, who released research about higher education curriculums before heading the Department to serve under President Reagan.
Laurel Cavaness was dean of Tufts Medical School before becoming president of Texas Tech University. He would go on to be the first Secretary of Education for President George H.W. Bush.

The esteemed Senator Alexander served as Governor of Tennessee and president of the University of Tennessee before becoming President Bush’s Secretary of Education.

Richard Riley championed funding and support for education as Governor of South Carolina before leading the Department of Education under President Clinton.

Rod Paige was a professor, a dean, an innovator in education, and the superintendent of the Houston school district before he served under President George W. Bush.

Margaret Spellings advised then-Governor George Bush on education in Texas before becoming his second Secretary of Education.

Arne Duncan served as the CEO for Chicago’s public school system before joining the Obama administration as Secretary of Education.

John King, Jr., was the commissioner of education for New York and Deputy Secretary of Education before he led the Department as Secretary for President Obama.

Every Secretary who has led the Department came to the job with a history in government or in the classroom. They served as elected officials or as policy advisors in the executive branch or worked as administrators or educators. But now this administration is asking us to make an exception by confirming someone who really doesn’t have any relevant experience. She has never served in the government, never taught in the classroom, never managed a school district.

One woman from Oahu wrote me to say:

She is supremely unqualified to lead the department. A public school teacher—30 years both in regular and special education—I am aghast that she is even being considered. When one is being nominated to uphold federal education laws and is “confused” by what IDEA entails, it becomes very apparent that this person is a poor choice for this position.

Another letter I got from an educator reads:

I taught in both public and private schools for 10 years on the mainland before moving to Hawaii and teaching for more than 15 additional years. Watching video clips on the news of her Senate hearings, it is appalling to see how little she knows about the topic of education. I worry for all of our children. I worry for our country. Please, if you can, do what you can to see that we get one more qualified to help guide our children and our country. HELP!

Everything that has happened since Mrs. DeVos has been nominated has unfortunately only confirmed the concerns I heard from constituents. Because her hearing was so short, Senators followed up with written questions, and in some cases, her responses lifted language from other sources without citing them. In one response, she wrote, “Every child deserves to attend school in a safe, supportive environment, where they can learn, thrive and grow.” Fine. Well, an Obama official used the exact same language in a press release regarding the rights of transgender students. She did not cite that official or the press release.

In another example, she answered a question about title IX investigations in the following way: “Opening a complaint is a complicated process that means the Office for Civil Rights has made a determination about the merits of that complaint.” That is the exact language the Department of Education uses in its own guidance. There is nothing wrong with citing a source, especially when that source is the Department you want to run, but it has to be cited. That is one of the first things you teach a child in seventh and eighth grade when they are trying to learn how to do research—cite your sources.

But the most disturbing is the lack of a serious purpose during the hearings and in the questions for the record, although I think that was what caused my Nation to kind of wake up and rise up about the challenge in front of us when it comes to upholding Federal laws and is “confused” by what IDEA entails, it becomes very apparent that this person is a poor choice for this position.

What happened is that we have the wrong person in charge of public education policy at the Federal level. So you have people right, and center. You can ask the Senate Republicans whether they are getting phone calls too. They are getting phone calls too. This is not a Democratic strategy. What is happening is that we have the wrong person who may be confirmed as the Secretary of Education.

The central issue is that there remain concerns around Mrs. DeVos’s basic understanding of education policy. During her confirmation hearings, there were several moments when she didn’t seem to fully grasp the important parts of Federal law on education.

The Washington Post actually published an article called “Six astonishing things Betsy DeVos said—and refused to say—at her confirmation hearing.”

DeVos refused to agree with a Democrat that schools are no place for guns, citing one school that needs one to protect against grizzlies.

DeVos denied that schools are no place for guns, citing one school that needs one to protect against grizzlies.

This would be hilarious if it weren’t so serious. This would be hysterically funny if this weren’t the person who is about to become our Secretary of Education.

When asked whether she would support President Trump if he, as promised, moved to end gun-free zones around schools, she said: “I will support whatever the President does.”

That meant funneling guns into schools, allowing guns in schools. She added: “If the question is around gun violence and the results of that, please know that my heart bleeds and is broken for those families that have lost any individual to gun violence.”

DeVos refused to agree with Senator Tim Kaine that all schools that receive public Federal funds—traditional public, charter, or private schools that receive voucher money—should be held to the same standards of accountability.

A little background on this issue. I have a great charter school movement in the State of Hawaii, but the deal we have struck—and it is imperfect, and there are always arguments over fixed costs and capital costs and all the rest of it, but the basic bargain when charters work is that they are legitimately a public school. What does that mean? That means they are held to the same standards as traditional public schools because to the extent that you have two categories of public schools with different metrics, then you are basically playing a game, trying to divert money from one to the other.

OK, so Tim Kaine’s question was exactly right. If public money is involved—whether it is vouchers to a private school, school choice to a charter school, or a traditional public school—shouldn’t we measure each school’s success in the same way, just to be fair?

Kaine: If confirmed, will you insist upon equal accountability in any K–12 school or educational program that receives taxpayer funding—whether it is a public charter, or private?

DeVos: I support accountability.

Kaine: Is that a yes or a no?

DeVos: I support accountability.

Kaine: Do you not want to answer my question?

DeVos: I support accountability. There is someone who either did not prepare for the hearing or is basically walking into this hearing saying: I have the votes. I don’t have to answer your questions. I don’t have to reassure the parents, teachers, and students who are desperately worried about what is going to happen to public education because I have the votes.

Kaine: Let me ask you this. I think all schools that receive taxpayer funding should be equally accountable. Sounds simple, he is nice, he is also very lawyerly. So he asked the question 14 different ways, trying to get the answer.
Do you agree?

DeVos: Well, they don’t. They are not today.

Kaine: Well, I think they should. Do you agree with me?

Well, no. It’s interrupting her, said: You don’t not agree with me. And then he moved on to another topic.

DeVos appeared to have no idea what AT FRANKEN was talking about when he referred to the accountability debate about whether to use test scores to measure student proficiency or student growth.

I mean, there is a debate about student proficiency and student growth, and I won’t bore you with the details except to say that I don’t expect regular folks out there to be into the weeds about the difference between proficiency and growth. I get how wonky that is. I absolutely expect the Secretary of Education nominee to know where to turn.

I mean, even if you are brand new to the topic, if you just have smart people in the room who briefed you on—it—10 hours maybe—you would be ready to talk about proficiency and growth. This is what I am talking about when I talk about a lack of preparation, a lack of humility around what advice and consent means, and the Senate has an obligation to take every nomination seriously.

FRANKEN noted that the subject has been debated in the education community for many years and said, when she didn’t weigh in and just looked at him without much of an expression on her face: It surprises me that you don’t know this issue.

But it is not just issues like accountability or guns in schools that concern me. On a whole host of issues, Mrs. DeVos’s views are far out of the mainstream of education policy.

I want to highlight four policy areas where Mrs. DeVos’s views are beyond my line in the sand. Let’s start with K–12 education. I think we can all agree that this country has work to do when it comes to public education. But I am worried that Mrs. DeVos would prefer to privatize our public schools instead of improving them.

Take a look at her track record. She has fought to strip away protections around K–12 education and introduce a profit motive into our education system.

She has lobbied for vouchers and for-for-profit schools. She has been relatively successful in her lobbying efforts. In her home State of Michigan, she had an enormous influence on the State’s approach to education.

Now, I would point any Senator on the fence about her nomination to look at this case study because it speaks volumes. In 2000, Michigan fourth and fifth grade students had higher than average test scores in math and English.

Fifteen years later, students now perform below average. Last spring, the Atlantic published a fascinating article about Detroit’s education system, which has been most influenced by the policies that Mrs. DeVos champions. I would like to read a few excerpts from it.

Three months into her son’s first pass at third grade, Ariyssa Heard had a breakdown. Judah was bright, but had begun calling himself stupid. The chaos of Detroit’s precarious education landscape had forced him to switch schools every few months, leaving him further and further behind.

There was no central system to transfer Judah’s records when he moved, and according to Heard the school where he started the 2014–15 academic year had a single teacher assigned to 43 fourth-graders. Heard was virtually alone in trying to deal with the fact that her boy, then 5, could write only the first two letters of his name.

 Heard says she was one of the parents Detroit Public Schools turned to when it needed advocates to rally a community members to serve on a task force. She was running for the Detroit School Board. But when she needed help, she had no one to turn to.

"Here I was this advocate for education, and I couldn’t find a place for my son," she says. "I was crying in the principal’s office, and I said, ‘I don’t know what to do.’ The principal said, ‘I don’t either.’"

The scope of the problems plaguing Detroit schools—both traditional district schools and charters—continues to increase. According to the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress, only 4 percent of Detroit’s eighth grade students can read and perform math at grade level, the lowest rate among the nation’s big cities.

Schools aren’t located where families need them.

Think about this—and campuses open and close with no coordination or notice. Over the last six years, most schools in the city have either opened or closed—or both. In one neighborhood in the city’s southeast quadrant, home to a large Latino population and a number of industrial zones, a dozen schools opened or closed in the span of 18 months. And when a parent shows up to find a child’s classroom abandoned, good luck finding a new one.

There are more than 200 schools with roughly 50 different enrollment processes and almost no standardization.

Some 44 percent of the Detroit students are enrolled in charter schools, the second-highest rate in the Nation, behind New Orleans. One of the Detroit Leadership Academy, which two years ago was solidly at the back of a flagging pack. Abutting a crumbling freeway access road in the city’s working-class Castle Rouge neighborhood, several grades at the school’s elementary campus did not boast a single student reading or performing math at grade level.

During the 2012–13 school year, the paper found, traditional Detroit public schools spent an average of $11,703 per student in the classroom. Charter schools spent about $2,000 less per pupil.

They are getting the same amount of money, and they are spending $2,000 less per kid. Yet they spent double that rate on per-pupil funding on administrative costs. That is their skin. That is their profit.

Meanwhile, the oversupply of seats in for-profit schools has arguably kept nonprofit charter networks with better track records out of the market.

So they really are operating like a business, like an airline; right? They are operating like a credit card company, a financial services company. I mean, this is the private sector at work in public education. There are some private sector models where I think: Hey, let’s have a partnership with the Department of Education to try to see how much clean energy we can allocate to certain segments of students.

That is school choice for you. That is the charter school movement for you—not in every instance, but this is how it manifested itself in the State of Michigan, where Betsy DeVos played a major role.

And the higher-education institutions that authorize them, often have financial incentives to keep the schools open; charter networks give authors a percentage of the funding.

So the agency, which is often a university or some other institution, actually gets a cut of the revenue for authorizing. So they have a problem saying: This charter must be shut down—because that costs tool much to do more innovation, fine. If the point is to try to suck as much revenue out of the taxpayer as we possibly can and deliver a minimal service, you know, I don’t think we should run public education system like that kind of a business. In this case, it is not running it like a business; it is running a business with Federal and State tax dollars.

The private businesses aren’t required to disclose their earnings, but a 2014 investigation by the Detroit Free Press suggests profits are huge. During the 2012–13 school year, the paper found, traditional Detroit public schools spent an average of $11,703 per student in the classroom. Charter schools spent about $2,000 less per pupil.

They are getting the same amount of money, and they are spending $2,000 less per kid. Yet they spent double that rate on per-pupil funding on administrative costs. That is their skin. That is their profit.
is one of them. This is not some ideological test. It is just not working.

We are ripping off our taxpayers, and we are giving a bad value to the students who deserve better.

The Senate bill under consideration at the Michigan House would have failed a Detroit commission with the power to change all of that. The leaders of the Michigan Association of Public School Academies, the main charter lobby association, and some of Michigan’s for-profit management companies have long lobbied against policies that would have tightened accountability. The most influential of them is Betsy DeVos, a major player in Michigan’s Republican Party and in the efforts to widen the for-profit sector.

They have argued that proposals such as that put forward by the Senate bill disregard the needs of Detroit’s children. “Legislators should not give in to this anti-choice, anti-parent, and anti-student agenda aimed at protecting and maintaining the status quo for deeply entrenched adult interest groups,” Betsy DeVos opined in the Detroit News.

“After all, since DPS has lost 75 percent of their enrollment in the past decade, haven’t Detroit parents already voted resoundingly by fleeing for higher quality and safer schools elsewhere?”

But critics, including Stephen Henderson, the Detroit Free Press’s editorial page editor, say it’s groups such as the DeVos foundations that have an agenda.

“House Republicans, for instance, are also standing in the way of [a bill] which would, quite simply, slow the spread of mediocre or failing schools.”

The article ends with a few paragraphs about Arlyssa Heard, the advocate described in the beginning of the story.

After enrolling her son in two more schools that didn’t work, she found a small startup school that has strategies for helping Judah compensate for his ADHD. He had to repeat the third grade, but has rocketed ahead. Now he talks about becoming a scientist.

The realization that better is possible has redoubled Heard’s willingness to make the trek to a new school—often as parents with the needs to be heard. “Who are these people who are making the decisions and why aren’t they in the schools,” she asks. “Why can’t we know how just be accountable to the people you are serving?”

Now, during the confirmation hearing, Senator BENNET, whom I greatly admire, and who is a former superintendent of the Denver Public Schools, asked Mrs. DeVos how the policy failures in Detroit might inform her leadership at the DOE.

She replied: I think there is a lot of that has gone right.

Senator Pat MURRAY, a former school board president, asked if Mrs. DeVos would promise not to privatize public education or cut funding. A pretty straightforward question, right? I mean, you get sort of a mainstream Republican nominee for Secretary of Education, they know how to answer this question. They may have a different view of common core. They may have a different view of the teachers’ unions. They may have a different view on curricular choice. But everybody knows it is the third rail; you do not talk about privatizing public education.

Here is her response: I look forward, if confirmed, to working with you to talk about how we address the needs of all parents and all students. We acknowledge today that not all schools are working for the students that are assigned to them. I'm hopeful that we can work together to find common ground in ways that we can solve these issues and empower parents to make choices on behalf of their children that are right for them.

I don't know what that means, it is not a complicated question, right? I mean, certainly in the United States Senate there are complicated questions, right, on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the Education Committee. I happen to be the ranking member of the Communications Subcommittee on the Commerce Committee, and half of what I say is pretty straightforward question. A pretty mainstream question, right? I do not promise. I mean, it is a word salad, but it doesn’t mean anything. And she was given a very easy opportunity to disavow her intent to privatize public education. Private education? Private school. What should be the funding private school money into unregulated and unaccountable private schools.

We need to champion access to public education and the accountability measures that are of all of our students a chance to succeed.

But in Michigan, Mrs. DeVos lobbied to block accountability standards for charter schools and lift the cap on charter schools. These actions pushed the number of unlicensed, for-profit operators of charter schools from 255 to 805.

Now, this doesn’t mean that charter schools are the boogeyman here, right? I mean, there may be some disagreements between those who support charter schools and people who support traditional public schools, but at the end of the day, the legitimate, mainstream charter school proponents will always want to be able to look in the eye and say: Look, this is not about vouchers, and this is not about privatization. This is about the flexibility to innovate. They understand the basic bargain in the charter movement has to be: OK. It is public education dollars, and there are a couple of things that are mandatory, right? You have to comply with Federal and State law. You have to be subject to the same accountability standards, and you have to take all comers. So it is very important to the mainstream charter people—

I was interested to know because I have a good relationship with education reformers and with the charter movement, so when I heard about Mrs. DeVos, I was interested to hear what they had to say. They were in a lot of ways, more alarmed than anyone because they believed this would be the death knell for real charters because, to the extent that charters are just cover for privatizing public education, well, now it is going to be a fight. Now it is going to be a fight.

We have some great charter schools in my home State of Hawaii. They are doing innovative things for their students, and that is something we should all support, but when Mrs. DeVos talks about charter schools, she is not talking about those schools. She is talking about privatization.

The rallying cry behind privatization is school choice, but choice doesn’t work as a practical matter in many places across the country. In a lot of communities, particularly in rural areas, school choice is not a practical response to the problems. There is no school down the road, right? There is no little Catholic school. There is no public charter school. There is no public school. There is just the school, right? Because the town is too small to have multiple options.

So when you talk about taking—and I heard a figure of $20 billion out of the K-12 budget which is not that—I mean, it is $20 billion out of $36 billion—and providing it for school choice for charter schools, well, what about Alaska, right? What about Nebraska? What about the Dakotas? What about parts of Hawaii, where if you give a parent and a student a voucher, and they say: Well, I have this voucher for private education, for charter schools, and yet there is only one school left, all you have is a voucher for the only school in your neighborhood. That is how this is going to work as a practical matter.

I don't know if that is the intent or not. I honestly don't know if that is the intent or not, but that is how it would end up working. To drain money from traditional public education hurts people in small communities, in rural communities, and places where there is no possibility of multiple schools.

To reduce choice to resources. When a charter school opens up, the public school has to divert resources from its students, and that is something I have heard about from people in Hawaii.

One teacher whom I heard from who has worked for two decades in both Hawaii and Michigan wrote this to me: Ms. DeVos would be a disaster for public education. She has never been a teacher to the extent that current educational practices consist of.

Her advocacy for more unaccountable (often for-profit) charter schools and greater use of vouchers so that students could attend private or religious schools would take needed resources away from local public schools.

Her mission, in short, is to privatize public education. I've witnessed firsthand in Michigan what happens when schools privatize.

DeVos should be opposed not only for what she could do, if confirmed, but for what she's done in Michigan.

The DeVos family set up the Great Lakes Education Project, which has played a leading role in thwarting efforts to regulate charter schools in Michigan. For the most part, failed to deliver on their promises of a better education for students.
I just want to pause for a moment and thank all of the people who write my office every day but in particular the people who have been writing my office on all of these nominees because it wasn't that difficult to pull these incredibly insightful, passionate, individually, and this is happening across the country.

You know, you get the pundits as you leave the Senate. If it is the middle of the day and not 2:30 in the morning, the media kind of comes to you, and they call you on your face, and they ask you about: Is there a new tea party on the left?

All I can tell you is, there are millions and millions and millions of people who are rising up. I don't think they are all on the left. I mean, when I saw those marches, there were lots of progressives, lots of people who believe in liberal and progressive causes, but I also saw some people who have never marched in their lives. I also saw some people who were about public education. They don't even know what their politics are, except they saw Betsy Devos, and they said: No, this is not what I voted for. This is not what I want for my son or for my daughter or for my nieces or nephews. This is not what I want for the country's future, which brings me to the second policy area that I think we ought to consider and that is for-profit colleges. What is happening with some for-profit institutions is nothing less than a national scandal. Students are being hurt, and we are wasting tens of billions of dollars. So here are the facts:

Almost 2 million students are enrolled in for-profit programs, and they have collectively taken on $200 billion in debt to attend, but they often leave with little to show for it. More than half drop out within a few months. At some colleges, fewer than 5 percent of their students ever graduate.

For those who leave without a degree, repaying loans is an incredible struggle. Students at for-profit colleges default on student loans at double the rate of students at nonprofit colleges. This is morally outrageous on its own, but it is particularly egregious to the American taxpayer because these substandard programs are financed almost entirely by the Federal Government, and the amount is staggering.

In total, for-profits receive over $32 billion a year in Federal financial aid. That is 14 percent of the total aid, and they serve 12 percent of the students—20 percent of the aid, 12 percent of the students, $32 billion in Federal funding.

There are several for-profit companies that each take in more than $1 billion in Federal aid a year and graduate fewer than 10 percent of their students. Think about that. We taxpayers are paying most of the bill a year, and these kids are not graduating. They take in more than $1 billion, and they are graduating fewer than 10 percent of their kids.

Not only are the education metrics on student performance awful, but many of these for-profit colleges are also under investigation for fraud and deception. Essentially, they have been lying to students and to State and Federal agencies to cover up how bad their record is.

Even while prosecutors go after these schools for fraud, they remain accredited, and they continue to rake in Federal funds.

Here are a few examples. Education Management Corporation faces charges of fraud and deception brought by prosecutors in 13 States and the Department of Justice and was facing a lawsuit to recover $12 billion in Federal and State funds. Yet EMC is still accredited and still received $1.25 billion from the U.S. DOE last year.

Ultimately, the Department of Justice secured a $100 million settlement, and a separate coalition of State attorneys general reached another settlement for $102 million in student loan debt relief for former students.

ITT Educational Services was investigated and sued by 19 States, the SEC, the CFPB, and the DOJ. It is also under scrutiny from the GAO for failure to meet financial responsibility standards. They remained accredited until the day they shut their doors. Think about that. They were still accredited by the U.S. DOE, right, until they were shut down by the GAO.

The year before, they received just under $600 million. Their closure has left thousands of students in the lurch, with hundreds of thousands of dollars in student loan debt.

Another 151 schools are under investigation by a working group of 37 State attorneys general. They too are still accredited. Collectively, they received $8 billion in Federal financial aid last year.

So what do these schools have in common? They never lose their accreditation, even when there are ongoing investigations of fraud and deceptive practices that harm students.

Accreditation is the key to opening the castle for accessing the spigot of Federal financial aid. It is supposed to signify that a program provides a quality education for its students, but here is the thing. This accreditation doesn't mean much. The Government Accountability Office released a study on accreditation in 2014, and its findings were shocking. Over a 4-year period, the GAO found that accreditors sanction only 8 percent of the institutions they oversee, while the Federal government found that for just 1 percent. They revoked accreditation for just 1 percent. So 99 percent of them, even if there is nothing wrong, they keep those Federal funds flowing in.

Even more troubling, GAO found that there was no correlation between accreditor sanctions and educational quality. In other words, schools with bad student outcomes were no more likely to be sanctioned by their accreditor than schools with good student outcomes.

Our accreditation system is totally broken. According to the Higher Education Act, accreditation agencies are supposed to be the “reliable authorities as to the quality of education or training offered” by institutions of higher education. That is the reason for making accreditation a core criteria for receiving Federal funds.

Here is the problem—money. Incentives are lined up against being critical and against setting high standards. The problem can be traced back to the funding and the governance of the accreditation agencies themselves.

First, accrediting agencies are funded by the same institutions they accredit. Colleges pay an additional fee to become accredited and annual dues after that. They pay for site visits and other services.

Second, accrediting agencies are run by and are overseen by the institutions they accredit. The member institutions elect their own academics and administrators to serve on the board of the accreditation agency that is in charge of it.

We have a system that is dysfunctional, if not corrupt, in which it is far too easy to become and remain accredited.

This is a very similar system to what we had with S&P and Moody's and all of these rating agencies that had financial incentives to determine that all of these derivatives and credit default swaps and crazy financial instruments that were clearly not creditworthy were getting AAA ratings. Why? Because the financial incentives over time had emmeshed the accreditors with the accrediting. This is supposed to be a sort of independent relationship because they are supposed to be certifying to the consumer that everything is all good, right? And what happened? The system came crashing down.

I don't think the system will come crashing down, except that the system is already coming crashing down on the students who are getting ripped off. You ask schools that are taking in more than $1 billion of Federal funds. There are several schools, every year with Federal funds in excess of $1 billion, and 5 percent of the kids are graduating. For the sake of students and taxpayers, the Department has to make this a top priority, but I am not convinced that Mrs. Devos will do that.

She has no experience in higher education, a fact that does not bode well for the 6,000 colleges and universities in this country. When Senator Warren questioned her about this in her confirmation hearing, her response was concerning. This is what the transcript says:

Ms. Warren. How do you plan to protect taxpayer dollars from waste, fraud, and...
abuse from colleges that take in millions of dollars in Federal student aid?

Ms. WARREN. Senator, if confirmed, I will certainly be very vigilant.

Mr. CASEY. I call the order of the day.

There are already rules in place. There is a Department of Education grant program. There are already rules in place. 

Ms. WARREN. You will review it? You will not commit to enforce it?

Mrs. DEVOS. I want to make sure we don’t have problems with that as well. If confirmed, I will work diligently to ensure that we are addressing any of those issues.

Ms. WARREN. Well, let me make a suggestion on this. It actually turns out there are a whole group of rules that are already written and are there, and all you have to do is enforce them. What I want to know is, will you commit to enforcing those rules?

Mrs. DEVOS. Senator, if confirmed, I will commit to ensuring that institutions which receive Federal funds are actually serving their students well.

Ms. WARREN. So you will enforce the gainful employment rule to make sure that these career colleges are not cheating students?

Mrs. DEVOS. We will certainly review that rule.

Again, this goes back to somebody who is kind of walking into a hearing saying: Look, I got the vote. I don’t have to learn about public education. I don’t have to listen to Democrats’ concerns. I don’t have to listen to teachers, or students, or parents, or students’ concerns or the concerns of experts in education. I don’t have to learn about higher education, which is, by money spent, about three-quarters of all other consumer goods—twice as fast as health care costs. It is impossible to get ahead nowadays without a college degree, but the growing cost of college is preventing some from getting a degree in the first place and leaving others with unmanageable levels of debt. It is clear that our system isn’t working.

If we are subsidizing higher education with Federal dollars, we have a responsibility to incentivize institutions of higher education to become more affordable, provide access to lower income students, and deliver quality education. We want to reward those schools that are focused on affordability and give incentives for the rest to make affordability part of the mission. But based on Mrs. DeVos’s testimony, it is unclear whether or not she agrees.

In 2011, the Department of Education sent colleges and universities a letter that made clear that sexual assault is prohibited under title IX. It advised schools to be responsive to reports of sexual violence and gave guidelines on how schools should process those reports. But during Mrs. DeVos’s hearing, she had an exchange with Senator Casey that indicates she would roll back this progress. Let’s take a look at the transcript.

Mr. CASEY. Would you agree with me that the problem, the problem of sexual assault on college campuses is a significant one that we should take action on? Mrs. DeVOS. You are for that question. I agree with you that sexual assault in any form or in any place is a problem.

Mr. CASEY. I ask you, would you uphold the 2011 Title IX guidance as it relates to sexual assault on campus?

Mrs. DEVOS. Senator, I know that there’s a lot of conflicting ideas and opinions around that guidance, and if confirmed I would work with you.

And so on.

My concerns about Mrs. DeVos go to the Department of Education. There is a whole group of rules that are already in place. There is a Department of Education grant program. But of all those rules, the one that concerns me the most is college affordability because higher education is the straightest line for us to develop the workforce we need and for people to move up the economic ladder. But with that $140 billion, we need to be making college more affordable, and we are actually getting the opposite result. Both in raw dollars and inflation-adjusted dollars, we are spending more in Federal grants and Pell grants, and yet, as I sit here today, the cost of college has increased by almost 20 percent in the past 10 years. In the same period, Pell grants covered 25 percent less.

We are officially paying more and getting less. This is because college costs are growing faster than the cost of all other consumer goods—twice as fast as health care costs. It is impossible to get ahead nowadays without a college degree, but the growing cost of college is preventing some from getting a degree in the first place and leaving others with unmanageable levels of debt. It is clear that our system isn’t working.

If we are subsidizing higher education with Federal dollars, we have a responsibility to incentivize institutions of higher education to become more affordable, provide access to lower income students, and deliver quality education. We want to reward those schools that are focused on affordability and give incentives for the rest to make affordability part of the mission. But based on Mrs. DeVos’s testimony, it is unclear whether or not she agrees.

In 2011, the Department of Education sent colleges and universities a letter that made clear that sexual assault is prohibited under title IX. It advised schools to be responsive to reports of sexual violence and gave guidelines on how schools should process those reports. But during Mrs. DeVos’s hearing, she had an exchange with Senator Casey that indicates she would roll back this progress. Let’s take a look at the transcript.

Mr. CASEY. Would you agree with me that the problem, the problem of sexual assault on college campuses is a significant one that we should take action on? Mrs. DEVOS. You are for that question. I agree with you that sexual assault in any form or in any place is a problem.

Mr. CASEY. I ask you, would you uphold the 2011 Title IX guidance as it relates to sexual assault on campus?

Mrs. DEVOS. Senator, I know that there’s a lot of conflicting ideas and opinions around that guidance, and if confirmed I would work with you.

And so on.

My concerns about Mrs. DeVos go to the policy, to preparation, but most of all to a basic understanding of what public education is about. It goes to a basic commitment to the mission of public education.

Every Senator’s office has phones ringing off the hook with people telling us that Mrs. DeVos is not the right choice. Of what public education, you don’t have to take my word for it; you don’t have to take the word of the other 49 Senators who know that Mrs. DeVos will not be the leader of the Department of Education that we all need. You only have to take the word of the people in your own State and the groups whom we look to and trust when it comes to our country’s education system. These are the parents, the grandparents, the teachers, the faculty, the school board members, and the students who count on us to make the right decision.

I may not agree on who would make the perfect Secretary of Education, but we can agree that people across the country are speaking out against Mrs. DeVos, and it is up to us to listen. I will be voting no on her nomination, and I ask Republicans to follow the advice of their constituents and join me.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed.

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

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise this evening, along with many of my colleagues, to speak in opposition to the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be U.S. Secretary of Education.

I oppose Mrs. DeVos, whom I had the chance to see at her confirmation hearing before the HELP Committee, for three basic reasons. I think the children and parents and teachers of this country are entitled to a Secretary of Education who is a champion for public education. They can be a supporter of choice, charters, vouchers, home schooling, but 90 percent of our kids go to public schools and they need a champion.

Second, I want a Secretary of Education who is pro-accountability and has the idea and view that if any school, whether public or private, receives taxpayer funding, they should be held to the same accountability standards for their students.

And third, very particularly, I am deeply concerned about Mrs. DeVos’s commitment to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act which, in my view, is one of the best pieces of legislation that Congress ever passed.

In my 4-plus years in the Senate, I have not had a single issue that has generated so much effort to contact my office as the nomination of Betsy DeVos last week. We passed 25,000 contacts by constituents—letters, emails, phone calls—and those have continued to ratchet up over the weekend with voice mails and more letters in our system and more emails coming into the office, and we have dealt with some contentious issues over the last 4 years.

For example, we shut the government down in October of 2013 because...
of the inability of the House and the Senate to sit down at a conference table and work out a budget. That is a hugely important issue to the Nation, and especially in Virginia, where we have nearly 200,000 Federal employees. Even if the government for 13 days didn’t lead to as much conflict in my office as the DeVos nomination.

I want to spend some time on these three reasons for which I will oppose her, but before I do, I wish to speak about education; education is personally so important to me because of the Commonwealth I represent. It is important to me because of the personal histories of my wife and I and our kids in the public schools of Kansas, where I grew up, and in the Commonwealth of Virginia. It is important to me because of my previous public service as a mayor and Governor, where education was the largest line item in the budgets of my city and my Commonwealth. Finally, it is important to me because I have recently been added as a member of the HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee—that shepherded this nomination through a challenging but very illuminating confirmation hearing a couple of weeks ago.

So let me start there. Why does this matter a lot to me? I will begin with Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson, when he was Ambassador to Paris in the early 1780s, wrote one of the great early works of American literature: “Notes on the State of Virginia.” It was an effort to describe the Virginia of the day but also his dreams for Virginia—his dreams for the Virginia economy and the Virginia society, even looking into the future. Jefferson became the first person to really lay out a vision for compulsory public education in the United States. He had a very detailed plan for the division of the State into small school districts and that education would be compulsory at least for young people—men and women—who were White.

He used the phrase to promote his educational plan that is still—a paraphrase of it is still in the Virginia Constitution, talking about why public education was so important. He said: “Progress in government and all else depends upon the broadest possible diffusion of knowledge among the general population.” If you want to have a great government, if you want to have a great economy, if you want to have great happiness, what you should do is diffuse knowledge among the general population. It was for that reason that he said we needed a public education system.

Jefferson wouldn’t have imagined an Internet and search engines, where all knowledge would be digitized and at the fingertips of people all around the planet, but that is kind of what he was talking about. If you diffuse knowledge among the general population, that is the best guarantee of the success of society, and so he laid out this very ambitious plan in the 1780s.

Sadly, Virginia didn’t adopt it. The first early adopter of a compulsory public education I think was Massachusetts, and other States did as well. Jefferson personally saw education not just through his proposal for a K–12 system, but he also hatched the idea for the University of Virginia—one of the three things on his tombstone at Monticello: Author of the statute of religious freedom, author of the Declaration of Independence, founder of the University of Virginia. He did not even see fit to put that he was President of the United States or Governor of Virginia on his tombstone. Education was what he was passionate about and he founded the University of Virginia.

So we had some great educational thinkers in our Commonwealth who understood from our earliest days that education would be the key to our success. Sadly, the great ideas weren’t carried into practice, and Virginia, as was the case with many States in the country, ran a very segregated education system. When I was born in 1958—I am 58 years old right now; I turn 59 in 2½ weeks. I went to school in Virginia with somebody whose skin color was different. Women couldn’t go to the University of Virginia, and many of our major universities were segregated on the grounds of sex. So women had a truce that recognized the power of education, but even though our great Founders did, we really thwarted the dreams and achievements of our students by not allowing them to be all they could be.

In 1951, a young high school student by the name of Barbara Johns was attending a segregated public high school in Prince Edward County, VA. She was 16 years old. Her school was overcrowded. It was poorly heated. She saw White kids being given a great new high school built for them. Some kids in her high school, because of poor transportation, were killed in a bus accident, and in April of 1951 she said: I am tired of this. I am a kid, but I am not going to accept second-class citizenship, and I am encouraged, you know, with a fake note to the principal of her school to go to the administrative office—and then she gathered all the students in the auditorium at Mahone High School in Farmville... VA, and said: We are going to walk out. We are going to walk out of our high school because we are tired of being treated as second-class citizens, and we are tired of being called Black and we are tired of being treated as second-class citizens, and we are going to call civil rights lawyers and ask them to represent us.

Barbara Johns and her classmates did that, and the Virginia case became part of Brown v. Board of Education that in 1954 led to the Supreme Court ruling saying that all children were entitled to an education; we couldn’t segregate kids based on the color of their skin. It was the only one of these civil rights cases that was actually led by schoolkids advocating for themselves.

Barbara Johns shared the same vision that Thomas Jefferson did: Progress in government and all else depends upon the broadest possible diffusion of knowledge among the general population. And she stood up and said: I have the right to it just like everybody else does, and I am not going to take second-class status. Well, the Prince Edward story is one of the most powerful stories in American educational history. After the Brown v. Board decision was resolved, many Southern States fought against integration for a number of years. In 1959, finally, 5 years after Brown, Federal courts ruled that you have to integrate your schools. If you have public schools, you have to integrate them, and Prince Edward County did something that no other jurisdiction in the United States did. They decided, OK, if we have public schools, we are required to treat kids equally based on the color of their skin. I have an idea: We will close all of our public schools. So Prince Edward County, for a period of 5 years, shut down all of their public schools. What did they do? They used county funds and State funds to support vouchers to private schools, and they gave those vouchers to students who were White so they could go to private schools. They called them segregation academies and they set them up all over Virginia. In Prince Edward County, White students, if they were wealthy enough, could go to these academies with some State support, but poor White students and African-American students were deprived of education for 5 years.

I think you can start to see why supporting public education today is very important in Virginia because in my lifetime, we didn’t. In my lifetime, we closed down public schools rather than let kids learn together if their skin colors were different. In my lifetime, we put State dollars into private schools so that it would be easier to segregation to go forward and avoid the law of the land that kids could learn together because of the color of their skin.

This was Virginia at the time I was born. It will not surprise you that a State that didn’t want kids to learn together because their skin colors were different and a State that allowed schools to close down was a State with very poor educational performance. The Virginia in the 1950s, forget about test scores, forget about SAT scores, forget about AP exams, we were one of the worst States in the country in the percentage of our kids that attended school. It will not surprise you to know that in addition to having a poor percentage of attending school, the economy was bad. Those things are directly connected. If you don’t value education, if you say kids can’t learn together if their skin colors are different, if you say women can’t go to major universities if their skin colors are different, the economy is going to be very strong. So Virginia was a low-education, low-income State when I was born.
Today, it is very different. The officials in Virginia continued to battle to try to resist the integration of schools. My father-in-law, my wife’s dad, was the first elected Republican Governor in the history of the Commonwealth, elected in January of 1970. The previous Governor, who had been Democrats, had fought against integration, had used all kinds of tricks and strategies to avoid integrating schools, and my father-in-law, as Governor, took a historic stand. He said: In this Commonwealth, we are putting segregation behind us. We are now going to be an aristocracy of merit, regardless of race or creed, and he embraced a court busing order in the fall of 1970. He escorted my wife’s sister into what had been a primarily African-American high school in downtown Richmond, and his wife, the First Lady, escorted my wife into a similar middle school. The picture of my five children’s House, the courageous Republican Governor, and my sister-in-law Tayloe walking into the school on that day was the front page of the New York Times. It was the front page of the New York Times because in the civil rights era, there were so many pictures of Southern Governors standing in a schoolhouse door blocking kids who were African American from coming into schools with White students. That was a common picture. There is only one picture of a Southern Governor’s mansion and integrating Vir ginia’s cities and counties to make sure I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I should have gone to a school in every one of Virginia’s cities and counties to make sure I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I should have visited one of the schools before I made that pledge, and after I did it, I can understand why nobody would ever make that pledge again. But I wanted to make sure that I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I am not aware of anybody who has made that pledge, and after I did it, I can understand why nobody would ever make that pledge again. But I wanted to make sure that I understood public education in the Richmond public schools. They have had wonderful careers. I wrote a piece a few years ago when my daughter, my youngest, graduated called “Forty Years as a Public School Parent” because my three children spent a combined 40 years in the Richmond public schools.

The Richmond public schools are like a lot of school systems. There are 25,000 kids or so in an urban environment. It is a high-poverty school district; probably nearly 80 to 90 percent of the children in the school system are on free or reduced lunch. It is overwhelmingly a minority school system; three quarters or more of the students are minority. But my kids got a fantastic public education in these public schools of Virginia—here in Richmond, and Fairfax County—as were her siblings. We have been married for 32 years. Our three children have all graduated from Richmond public schools. They have had wonderful careers. If it was the biggest line item, that pledge again. But I wanted to make sure that I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I have not been mayor, Governor, or a U.S. Senator. There have been a lot of Governors who are Senators, but being mayor will kill you. That is why there are so few who can do all three. But when you are a mayor, as I was—the biggest line item was public schools. At the time I was mayor, we had about 53 public schools. I had a goal when I was mayor: I would go to a school every week. On a Thursday morning, I would go visit one of our schools to see what is being done. I would look at the biggest issue that means it was the most important thing. I wanted to make sure I understood not just my schools’ but the schools that all the kids in our city went to. I wanted to know what was working, what was not working.

Then I got elected to statewide office as Lieutenant Governor and Governor. I made a vow when I was Lieutenant Governor. Just like I went to school a week when I was mayor until I visited them all. I made a vow when I was Lieutenant Governor that I would go to a school in every one of Virginia’s cities and counties to make sure I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I should have visited every one of our cities and counties to understand public education in my Commonwealth. I am not aware of anybody who has made that pledge, and after I did it, I can understand why nobody would ever make that pledge again. But I wanted to make sure that I understood public education in the Richmond public schools. One to graduate from George Washington, an infantry commander in the Marine Corps; one to graduate from Carleton College, a visual artist; and one is about to graduate from New York University—all built on the foundation of a great public education in the public schools of my city.

I told you about my wife being part of the generation of kids who integrated the public schools of Virginia. Then, in the wonderful arc of history, she went from a kid living in the Governor’s mansion and integrating Virginia’s public schools to a First Lady working on foster care reform and recently stepped down as Secretary of Education in Virginia. I watched my wife grapple with exactly the same kinds of challenges at a State level that the current Secretary of Education will grapple with at the Federal level. I think I know a little bit about what it takes to do this job and to do it well.

In addition to our personal connections in the history of our State, let me talk about my professional connections to our schools and why I view this job as such an important position. I mentioned that I have been a mayor and I have been a Governor. I am a little bit unusual. There have only been 30 people in the history of the United States who have been a mayor, a Governor, and a U.S. Senator. There have been a lot of Governors who are Senators, but being mayor will kill you. That is why there are so few who can do all three. But when you are a mayor, as I was—the biggest line item was public schools. At the time I was mayor, we had about 53 public schools. I had a goal when I was mayor: I would go to a school every week. On a Thursday morning, I would go visit one of our schools to see what is being done. I would look at the biggest issue that means it was the most important thing. I wanted to make sure I understood not just my schools’ schools but the schools that all the kids in our city went to. I wanted to know what was working, what was not working.

Then I got elected to statewide office as Lieutenant Governor and Governor. I made a vow when I was Lieutenant Governor. Just like I went to school a week when I was mayor until I visited them all. I made a vow when I was Lieutenant Governor that I would go to a school in every one of Virginia’s cities and counties to make sure I understood public education in my Commonwealth. I should have visited every one of our cities and counties to understand public education in my Commonwealth. I am not aware of anybody who has made that pledge, and after I did it, I can understand why nobody would ever make that pledge again. But I wanted to make sure that I understood not just our schools’ own kids went to but the schools that all the kids went to all around our Commonwealth.

Northern Virginia and its high-tech suburbs, Wise County, where my wife is from, the coalfields of Appalachia, the tobacco-growing regions of Southside Virginia, manufacturing regions south of Richmond, oystermen and watermen and tourism on the Eastern Shore of Virginia—I wanted to see the schools in every part of my Commonwealth. I wanted to see them because I was writing budgets. The biggest line item in the education budget. The biggest line item in the city was for education. I didn’t want to know our schools just from a budget or just from
a newspaper article. I wanted to know them from seeing them. I wanted to know them from seeing what came out of my kids’ backpacks every day in terms of the curricula requirements and other things my kids would do in the Virginia schools.

I am saying all this first because I am just trying to convey why this is so important. There is nothing that we do as a society that is more important to our future than the way we educate our young people. As a constitutional resource in the world today is not oil, it is not water; it is talent. The cities or States or countries that know how to raise talent, grow talent, attract talent, reward talent, encourage talent, and celebrate talent are going to be the most successful because they will attract and grow and reward their own talent and bring other people here, but they will also attract the institutions that want to be around talent—great companies, great think tanks, great universities.

There is an inextricable causal link between your commitment to a system of public education and the success of your city or your State or your country. This is why we do it in the House or in the Senate or in the Federal Government that will be more likely to affect our economic outcome than the care with which we direct attention to our education system.

The reason it is important to me is because of my new membership on the HELP Committee. I have had my family background. I care deeply about my State. I professionally worked on education, and my wife has too. But now I have a platform in the Senate. I tried to get on the committee right when I got here. I wasn’t able to. I couldn’t complain because I got great committees. I am on the Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Budget Committees. But I really wanted to be on the HELP Committee because education has been at the core of what both my wife and I have tried to do in Virginia for the last 32 years. Now I am fortunate enough to be on the committee.

In one of my first meetings on the committee, we had a confirmation hearing for Betsy DeVos for Secretary of Education. We didn’t have all the information at the time we had the hearing for Mrs. DeVos, but we had done our homework. I have a wonderful staffer, Krishna Merchant, who had helped prepare me. We had done our homework. We were put under some pretty tight time constraints: We each only got 5 minutes to ask questions. Five minutes isn’t a lot of time when you are talking about something as important as the educational mission of the Federal Government to help our society succeed in educating our kids. I decided that in my 5 minutes, I wanted to ask Mrs. DeVos about three things. I wanted to ask her whether she believed in equal accountability for all schools if they receive taxpayer dollars. I wanted to ask her about her thoughts on the education of kids with disabilities because I care deeply about that topic but also because I believe that the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, the future of American public education, and I wanted to see what she thought about it. I had three test questions. I had three test questions for our nominee, and she did not satisfy me on any of them. Let me start with the first one.

Can you be a champion for our public schools?

There are 1.2 million kids in Virginia. Ninety percent of the children who are educated in this country are educated in public schools.

I am a huge supporter of private schools. I went to Catholic schools for 6 years. When I was Governor, I did a lot of great work with kids and their parents through vouchers as an option. I like options. But just as a matter of fact, 90 percent of the kids in this country go to public schools, and it is going to be at that number or near it for as long as we can see.

In Richmond, there are some great private schools. Richmond has 1 million people, and so private schools can set up and find enough students. But there are corners of my Commonwealth where it is very hard to start a private school because there just not enough students. That is not just the case for Virginia; my colleagues on the HELP Committee from Alaska or from Maine share this. There are parts of their States where, talking about vouchers for private schools, you might as well be talking Esperanto. That is just not going to happen in some of these very rural communities. So you have to have a champion for public schools.

In my research on Betsy DeVos, she gave a speech in 2015 that troubled me. It was a speech about the state of American public education. Here are two direct quotes, one of which is not the greatest language for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but she said that when it comes to education, “government really sucks.” She also said public schools are a “dead end.” This is not something she said 10 or 20 years ago; this is something she said about a year and a half ago. This is her view of public schools and it is a dead end when you have hundreds of thousands of great teachers and counselors and bus drivers and cafeteria workers and people going to work every day. They are not going there because their salaries are great; they are going there because they care deeply about students, and they want to either teach them or in other ways impress life lessons upon them so their kids can have happy lives.

On the first test I found Betsy DeVos wanting in my examination of her in the HELP Committee was that simple one. If you cannot be a champion for public schools, you should not be Secretary of Education.

When we were having a discussion in the committee, some of the colleagues who were kind of coming back at us a little bit were saying: Well, OK, we get it. You are against charters, or you are against vouchers, or you are against Betsy DeVos because she wants to expand public education.

But most of us are from States that have significant choice. I pointed out that Virginia doesn’t do vouchers, but...
we have a very robust homeschooling network. I have been a huge supporter of it. Choice is fine, but you have to be a champion for public schools, and if you are not, you shouldn’t be Secretary of Education. That is reason No. 1.

Second, I wanted to interview Betsy DeVos about accountability. Accountability. Should schools be accountable for the success of their students, for outcomes? This is very important, and it is very important to get this right. Sometimes my wife, as secretary of education in a State, would sometimes tear her hair out about the Federal mandates and strings and regulations and rules. The HELP Committee did a good job last year before I was on the committee rewriting No Child Left Behind—the Every Student Succeeds Act—to try to rethink the balance a little bit to allow cities, counties, and States more flexibility in trying to determine how to educate their students, while still holding them accountable for your outcomes. I wanted to ask Betsy DeVos: Will you hold all schools accountable for outcomes—particularly because when he was a candidate, President Trump said some things about what he wanted to do with public education. President Trump as a candidate said that he wanted to take $20 billion of Federal money and give it to private schools to allow them to run voucher programs of the kind that Mrs. DeVos has promoted in Michigan, Indiana, and that is a lot of money, $20 billion. That is money that is taken out of the allocation for public schools. If you take $20 billion out of public schools, especially in some rural areas—in my view, having done a lot of budgets and worked on this as a mayor and Governor—you are potentially going to weaken the public schools.

(Mrs. ERNST assumed the Chair.) I wanted to understand from Mrs. DeVos what they are going to do with that money to take the $20 billion out of the public schools: I think that is going to weaken public schools. I want to ask her is, When you give the $20 billion to private schools, as President Trump wants to do—and I asked her this question over and over again. I think I asked her four times. If you give Federal taxpayer dollars to private schools, will you hold them equally accountable to the public schools that are getting this money, equally accountable for the outcomes of the students, for the need to report disciplinary incidents, for working on important issues like education and kids with disabilities? Will you hold any school that gets Federal money equally accountable? I asked her this.

She said: I believe in accountability. I said: That is not my question. I believe in accountability too. But I am asking you. Should you hold all schools equally accountable if they receive Federal money? Well, I believe in accountability. I asked her again. Should you hold schools equally accountable?

Well, they are not all held equally accountable now. I am not asking about what you think about the situation right now. I am asking you what you think is the right policy. Is it the right policy, if we are going to give $20 billion to private schools, to hold all schools equally accountable?

Well, I believe in accountability.

She wouldn’t answer my question.

I phrased it a different way. I said: Let me tell you this, Mrs. DeVos. I believe all schools that get Federal money should be held equally accountable. Do you agree with me?

She said: No.

She doesn’t believe that schools that get Federal money should be held equally accountable. I have a big problem with that. The whole goal of the choice movement is to provide choices so that students can learn in environments that are best suited to them. Choice is a way to promote some competition that will encourage everybody to up their game.

If you hold the public schools accountable while you are taking some of their money away and you give that money to private schools and you don’t hold them accountable, you are not promoting fair competition. You are not promoting student outcomes. You are basically taking money away from public schools and giving it to private schools.

Again, in Virginia, we had a painful experience with that—closing schools down, defunding public schools, and giving money to private schools. That is a second reason that is very, very important to me. I don’t think that she supports the notion of equal accountability for both public and private schools that receive taxpayer funding.

If we are going to do the proposal that President Trump says—we haven’t seen a budget yet, but we may see one in the next few days. If we are going to suddenly start taking billions and billions of dollars away from public schools and giving them to private schools, I want to know they are going to be equally accountable.

I asked Mrs. DeVos about was education and kids with disabilities. Let me tell you why this one is so important to me. It is important because it is right. It is also important because it points a path to the future of education in this country.

Before the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was passed in 1975, we had hundreds of thousands of children with a gap between their potential and what they were doing because schools were very spotty, communities were very spotty. States were very spotty in providing meaningful educational opportunities to kids who had disabilities.

Generation after generation of kids were going to school, but they wouldn’t get an education that was tailored to their needs. They would finish their education not having the skills they needed to have all they could be. If you think about that collective delta between what these kids could do and what they could have done had they had the best education, it is tragic. That was the genesis behind the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 1975.

It is as if we have all these children who are capable of so much more if this society will only work to help them achieve, and the core of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a simple thing. If a student is identified as having a disability of some kind, the student gets an IEP, an individualized education plan. If you have a diagnosed disability, then you are entitled under Federal law to an IEP where you get an education that is tailored to your particular circumstance.

My three kids went through the Richmond Public Schools. One had an IEP for a couple of years. That is prettier classes where the expectations for you that you get an IEP, and with a tailored education, you don’t need it for your whole 13 years of K–12 education. You need it for a couple of years of speech therapy or a couple of years of something else. Then, within a few years, you are completely mainstreamed, and you don’t need IEP anymore. The individualized attention helps you climb up and then be completely competitive with your colleagues and with your peers.

There are other students who need an IEP for their entire educational career, and that is fine too. They are entitled to it under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

What it has meant from 1975 to today—it is 40-plus years—is that this massive cohort of kids with special needs are not in the shadows. They are not shunted aside. They are not pushed into classes where the expectations for them are low. Instead, they are challenged to be all they can be, and they are happier, and their families are happier, and society is better off as a result. This is a very important thing, and I know this to be true.

Every family in this country has somebody in the family with a disability—or will at some point in the life of a family—and every person in this country has a friend with a disability. The issues dealing with the education of students with disabilities are important morally, but they are important because this is about our friends and our family and our neighbors.

The other thing about the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act that I find so powerful is I think it has been the best single idea about K–12 education we have come up with. It is better than testing. It is better than choice. It is better than all the other strategies because the rub of the idea is you should have an individualized education. It raises the question, Why do you have to have a diagnosed disability to get an individualized education?

With computer technology and so many other tools that a teacher can...
use in a class of 20 or even 30 students, there is an awful lot that you can do to tailor the education to each individual student. I was a teacher. I ran a vocational school in Honduras that taught kids to be welders and carpenters. We individualized education. We got a list of 60 carpentry projects from the simplest one to the most complicated one, and all the students started on the same project the first day of school, but then they proceeded at their own pace when they felt ready. That was what the IDEA basically is: Education should be individualized to the student, and more and more, that is what we are doing in education all around the country.

I asked Mrs. DeVos questions about the law of the land. We believe in States’ rights. We don’t have to follow the Supreme Court. We don’t have to follow States’ rights thing. We don’t have to follow the law. You can’t segregate the public schools are a dead end and government is soft. I didn’t know what her position would be on the IDEA. When she told me that a Federal civil rights law should be a State decision, I was very, very troubled. I was surprised.

I blurted out: Well, what do you mean it should be a State decision? If you are a parent and you have kids with disabilities and the State isn’t treating them right, you are supposed to move around the country until you find a State that treats your kids well? You are not entitled to have the law apply to you in the community where you live and you are going to have to move somewhere. Some State that is going to treat your kid OK?

I think it should be a State decision. Later on in the hearing, one of my other colleagues, MAGGIE HASSAN, the Senator from New Hampshire, who has a child with cerebral palsy, followed up on this, and Mrs. DeVos tried to back out of it: Well, I wasn’t sure we were talking about a Federal or State law.

I was very, very troubled by this. I was troubled again because of the peculiar history we have had in Virginia and other States where people have used States’ rights arguments to try to trump Federal civil rights statutes.

I would say that the answers to the questions about students with disabilities became kind of a pivotal part of that hearing because both Senators COLLINS and MURKOWSKI, who have since said they are going to vote against the nominee, at that hearing and then in a Hagel up session we had last week talked about that as one of the things that they found troubling.

Another member of our committee, who is supporting Mrs. DeVos, Senator ISAKSON of Georgia, also found it of enough concern that he had a written exchange with her. He wrote her a letter and asked her a question: Do you really understand what the IDEA is? She wrote a letter back, which I have had the opportunity to review, but I still don’t believe that the letter she wrote demonstrates a real understanding for this issue of the rights of kids with disabilities.

This is a really important point. Some of the States that have voucher programs—we don’t have these programs in Virginia for the reasons I have described, but there are States that do—Indiana, Florida. Some of the States that have voucher programs and receive public money for kids make children sign away their rights under the IDEA. You only get admissible to the school. You want to come to our private school and you want to use voucher money to do it?

We will let you in, but you have to sign saying you will never take us to court for violating your rights, for not treating you fairly under the IDEA, and only if you sign such a waiver, will we allow you to come to our school. I just don’t think that is fair. I don’t think that is right. Especially now going to give $20 billion of Federal money to private schools, I think they should have to follow the law.

Many private school principals in Richmond—I talked to this issue long before the hearing on Mrs. DeVos, and they are pretty candid often with parents of kids with disabilities. My longtime secretary in my office—who has worked for me for nearly 30 years—has a daughter with disability. She was going to parochial schools for a while in the early grades, but as she was progressing up into late elementary school, there just weren’t the programs in the parochial school that she needed to meet her particular dollar situation, partly because the school was just too small. In a really small school, it is tough to do education of kids with disabilities. You have to have some particular training to do it.

The difference of a small K-8 parochial school and a larger county school is pretty big. The principal was candid and honest in a way that my secretary appreciated and I did too. ‘We just don’t have the kind of educational program for somebody of your daughter’s special needs that the public high school has. You really should think about that.” My secretary agreed and made the change to the public school. It was actually the better environment because the resources—which are not cheap—the resources to help do disability-specific education were there.

Imagine now what would happen if we start to invest money in private schools, and we don’t make them follow the disabilities law. Follow this through. We take $20 billion away from public schools. That is weakening public schools’ ability to do a lot of things, including educating kids with disabilities. We give the money to private schools. We don’t require them to follow the Disabilities Act. So families—like many we know—say, I might try to go to private school, but there is not enough appropriate education, so I am not going to. I am going to stay with the public school. So we have just taken the dollars away from the public school, but all the kids with the special needs, the needs that are really costly to deal with, are going to stay in the public school. It is a spiral that is a bad spiral.

We will defund you, but all the kids with the significant needs that are costly to deal with are going to stay with the public school. That will dilute and hurt the quality of the education they will get, while the private school is getting the money and not having to follow the requirements of the IDEA. They get the money. They don’t have to follow the requirements of the IDEA. This is very troubling stuff.
Those were the three questions I got to ask her in 5 minutes. Can you be a champion of public schools, do you believe that any school receiving Federal taxpayer dollars should be equally accountable for student outcomes, and should receiving Federal taxpayer dollars have to follow the requirements of the IDEA? With each of those questions, I was prepared to get an answer I liked, but I got an answer I didn’t like.

I don’t think Mrs. DeVos can be a champion of public schools. She has told me she doesn’t think all schools should be equally accountable to receive Federal taxpayer dollars, and she is not committed to schools that are receiving Federal moneys following the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This explains to me why the volume of calls into my office over this have been so high—higher than the government shutdown, higher than any other issue other than any other issue. We have been at war with ISIS for two and a half years. I have been trying to make the case that we shouldn’t be at war without a vote of Congress. I get a lot of calls in my office about it, but it is not ringing off the hook as it has been ringing off the hook with respect to the DeVos nomination. While I credit Mrs. DeVos for being philanthropic, and I credit her for caring about kids—that is very sincere. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I think that is more used to being the front and center issue in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconsciousness. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconsciousness. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconscionable. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconscionable. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconscionable. I see that in her philanthropy and her care. I don’t see in her an unconscionable. I see that in her philanthropy and her care.

I mentioned the volume of calls we are receiving. We all asked ourselves in the office, what has explained this volume? I think the thing that explains the volume is the disability issue. Because a lot of folks with disabilities are not used to their issues ever being made front and center in anything. It matters so much to them. As we said, every family has somebody with a disability or who will have a disability. People know folks with disabilities. But the disability community—which are Democrats, Republicans, Independents and every ZIP Code in this country—they are not used to their issue being made front and center in anything. They are more used to being ignored or being marginalized.

At this hearing, when the disability issue became front and center—I think that is one of the reasons the uptick of concern has been so significant, because people who otherwise are not that into politics or otherwise not that into who is the Cabinet Secretary going to be, there is one thing they do know, which is they want Americans with disabilities to receive equal treatment. Then to them it is a big deal. It can be. It is good for their happiness and good for our economy and good for our society.

I was honored last week to write an op-ed about this issue with a former member of this body, Senator Harkin of Iowa, somebody the Presiding Officer knows very well. Senator Harkin was one of the congressional authors of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Senator Harkin was a champion of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. All the issues surrounding Americans with disabilities were very close to his heart. We really miss that because we want a champion, and I am not sure anybody can really fill his shoes on that issue. But we wrote an op-ed about this disabilities point in Time magazine that has gotten a lot of attention because it touches every family.

I will start to recap a little bit now as I await my colleague who is going to be following me. I will just go back to where I started. This is not a minor matter. It is a little bit unusual to be on the floor at 10 to 4 in the morning. It is a little unusual to be doing 30 hours in a row. I had some folks ask me: Why would you do 30 hours of speeches on this? I said: Well, don’t you think the Secretary of Education is important enough—education in our country? Congress is supposed to spend a day and a half, a day and a quarter talking about it?

I go back to that Jeffersonian vision: Progress in government and all else depends upon the broadest possible diffusion of knowledge among the general population. The United States, beginning in the early 1900s—then after the GI bill it really accelerated. We became the educational leader in the world. We weren’t necessarily that during the 1800s—Germany, other nations. England were—but we really became the educational leader. We made education available to all. The GI bill helped democratize higher education and make it available to many more.

Our education system is still one of our crown jewels. The number of foreign students who come to our country to go to college, compared to the reverse, is still a tribute to the fact our education system is so strong. I haven’t really talked about higher education at all. That is also within the province of the Secretary of Education. The basic point I am making is, of anything we do that is about whether we will be successful as a country tomorrow, education is key. That is why we are taking 30 hours to dig into issues of concern.

I put three questions on the table. The three I put on the table are all about K-12 education. I had colleagues at the hearing who asked searching questions about higher education, the cost of higher education, student loan debt, what is the right way to deal with debt, how do we make college less expensive. These are critical issues too. I am very passionate about a career in technology. My great-uncle was a welder, and I ran a school in Honduras that taught kids to be carpenters and welders. This is a big and important job. It is such a big and important job, it would be wrong to expect any person to be an expert on all of it. That would not be a fair hurdle to set for somebody. You are going to have to come in and bring expertise in and hire good people to work with you, but I think the three I put on the table are some threshold questions: Can you support and be a champion for public education? That seems fundamental. Do you believe in equal accountability for everybody that gets Federal dollars? That seems fundamental. Do you believe that kids with disabilities should be able to get this kind of education? That seems fundamental. And in those areas, Mrs. DeVos did not succeed.

I voted for a number of the Cabinet nominees of President Trump. I am not standing here taking the position that I am voting against all of them. In fact, I voted for quite a few because even if they would not be people who I would nominate, President Trump is the President. He is entitled to his own team, but the advice and consent function of the Senate means, in certain cases, if people do not seem to meet the threshold criteria for being able to do the job and do it well—that is how you exercise advice and consent and express opposition to a nominee. That is what I am going to do in this case.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, let me just express my thanks to all of them who have kept this floor staying open through the evening. We still have a ways to go. I know that puts a lot of pressure on staff here and on all of the folks who make this place operate. We thank you for that. These are, in the minds of many of my constituents, very exceptional times and they call for exceptional tactics and probably a few more exceptional moments on the floor of the Senate. I appreciate everyone here staying through this long evening.

When I was a kid, I took an art class at a little one-room schoolhouse on Wells Road in my hometown, where I grew up, of Wethersfield, CT. That little one-room schoolhouse is still there. It is iconic. It is a part of Wethersfield’s history. The town is really proud of it. There is not a lot that happens in that one-room schoolhouse any longer.

But once upon a time there was a lot that happened in that one-room schoolhouse. I tell the story where I started. This is not a minor issue. This is how you exercise advice and consent and express opposition to a nominee. That is what I am going to do in this case.
My kids go to public school today. So schools in Wethersfield, CT. My wife went to public schools in Wethersfield, CT. They met in public schools in Wethersfield, CT. My mother went to public schools in Wethersfield, CT. My father went to public schools in Wethersfield, CT. The system that he helped create is the one in which many of us grew up.
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So when presented with a nominee for the Department of Education who says that public education is a “dead end” for students in this country, people take it personally. It feels different than when they listen to the nominee for Secretary of the Treasury talk about banks or when they hear the nominee for Secretary of Human Services talking about health insurance.

When you say that public schools are a dead end, and then, as Mrs. DeVos has, spend your entire career trying to get public schools to fail and put kids into private schools, it hurts. It hurts because, well, we all know public schools can be better. We all have our critiques of the public education we got or the public education our kids have got. We know it is not a dead end.

Public education wasn’t a dead end for me. I get to be a U.S. Senator because of the public education I got. It wasn’t a dead end for my mother, who grew up in the housing projects of New Britain, CT. Because of the public schools that challenged her as a very poor little girl growing up in New Britain, she got to be the first woman in her family to go to college. It wasn’t a dead end for my father, who went to public schools and ended up running one of the biggest companies in Hartford, CT. And I hope it won’t be a dead end for my kids, who are getting smarter and smarter every single day they go to public schools.

Public schools aren’t a dead end. They can always get better. But to have someone in the Department of Education who doesn’t believe in the way that most public school parents, most public school products believe in public education, it is offensive, and that is why our offices have received this unprecedented volume of correspondence.

I represent a pretty small State. Connecticut isn’t that big. But I got 13,000 letters and emails opposing Mrs. DeVos’s nomination in a short period of time. She was only nominated a couple months ago. I don’t know that there is any other subject in the entire time that I have been in government in which I received more correspondence than on Mrs. DeVos’s nomination. In that period, I received 13,000 pieces of correspondence, and almost all of them are in opposition to it.
That is the other thing. There were a few people who called who support her nomination, but almost without exception, people are calling in to my office and to Republican offices telling us that she is not the right fit.

I am writing to you as the mother of two children in kindergarten and first grade. My son is 5 and is autistic. I watched the recent nomination hearing on Betsy DeVos, and I am left sick to my stomach. I implore you to not support this woman for Secretary of Education.

I am beyond worried at what this might mean for our school systems, and particularly what this would mean for the education and development of my son. We fight every single day for my son. We work for the services he needs. I have no phone yesterday with health insurance companies trying to get his occupational therapy covered. With Betsy DeVos in charge of the public schools, I can’t even imagine the roadblocks we would face.

As a parent, all I want is for my son to grow and develop and thrive like any other child. It is hard enough doing this with his disabilities, knowing our President openly mocks those who are disabled. Please, please, do not support his nominee. I fear for my son.

Another piece of correspondence from a college student from Old Lyme, CT:

I strongly urge you to oppose the Secretary of Education nominee Betsy DeVos, whose confirmation hearing proved that she lacks both the expertise and qualifications to lead the Department of Education.

Mrs. DeVos has had no experience in public schools, an educator, an administrator, or even as a parent. Further, she admittedly has no experience with higher education or student loans.

I am a student about to earn my undergraduate degree this spring. I highly suspect that Mrs. DeVos has no interest in repairing or mending my or my fellow students’ colossal debt problems, nor does she have the intention to alleviate the strain of other costs on parents and guardians.

I might read some more of these letters, but they are sort of endless, and they come in from different places in my state. I have about Mrs. DeVos’s commitment to public education. So let me talk a little bit about why they are concerned.

They are right to point out that this nominee has really no personal experience in our public school system. She didn’t go to public schools. Her kids didn’t go to public schools. That is not disqualifying in and of itself. I mean, all of us work on policy in which we deal with personal experience. It is the fact that she has spent her entire career and much of her family’s enormous fortune trying to undermine public education that is so concerning.

Mrs. DeVos, as it has been repeated over and over on this floor, is a big fan—perhaps the biggest fan in the country—of vouchers, which is a means of giving students a handful of money so that they can go to a private school or a nonpublic school.

In theory, there is an attraction to this idea that you should be able to take that amount of money that we generally allocate to your education and bring it to a school of your choice. But in practice, vouchers are a disaster for our kids. Why? Well, first and foremost, it is because, contrary to what Betsy DeVos and her family believe, the free market doesn’t work the same way in education as it does for the breakfast cereal industry, right? Kids are not free actors in the way that other consumers are. So what happens is that the parents and the families who have the means and the income to go find and afford them so. They take that voucher and then they bring it into the private sector, and the kids and the families who don’t have the means to do that get left behind in underperforming schools, and the imperative to fix those underperforming schools gradually disappears.

Well, vouchers are never going to equal the amount of money that it costs to send a student to most private schools. It may cover the cost of the cheapest private schools, but families of means that voucher holders supplement it with money that they already have and send their kids to private schools. So vouchers just end up taking wealthier families and moving those kids into private schools, while leaving behind kids who don’t have parents who can supplement the amount of money in the voucher to allow those kids to go to private schools. So vouchers become a means of both economic and racial segregation. Those with higher economic means take the vouchers and they send their kids to private schools and families with kids of lower economic means get left behind in lower performing public schools.

Vouchers are a wonderful way to guarantee that you have very little mixing of kids of different backgrounds or races and incomes, and that is what the evidence bears out. But vouchers have been used in even more insidious ways over the years. Think about what has happened to disabled kids.

In many States, kids with disabilities will be offered a voucher to go to a private school that may have a basket of services that is more appropriate for them, but they have to make a deal with the school district in order to get that voucher. They have to renounce their legal rights to contest an appropriate education in order to get that voucher. That voucher is a shiny object that looks like their salvation, but then, when they get to that voucher school and find out they are in fact not getting the services they thought they were going to get for their child, maybe because that school is being run by a for-profit company and they don’t have that child’s education in their best interests, and they have profit motives as their driving imperative—the parent can’t exercise their rights under Federal law because they signed away in order to get the voucher.

In States like Florida, this happens tens of thousands of times over, where low-income, disabled kids sign away their right to contest services that are guaranteed to them in order to get a voucher, only to find that when they get to that school, the services they were promised aren’t there and now they have no legal ability to try to get those services. The rug is pulled out from under them. They are left with no protection. So vouchers have been used in terribly insidious ways to take from students and families rights that voucher families that don’t need to rely on the voucher would never sign away.

So it is not that Democrats oppose Mrs. DeVos’s nomination because we don’t like charter schools. Frankly, it is not because many of us don’t support school choice. I don’t have any problem with public school choice done right. I don’t have any problem with charter schools. In fact, I have a long history of supporting high quality charter school systems. What we oppose is a voucher system that dramatically underfunds education and that requires students to lose or sign away their right to get a quality education.

Further, we oppose voucher systems that just end up taking public dollars and putting them in the hands of Wall Street. What is exceptional about Mrs. DeVos’s experience in Michigan, what makes it different, frankly, from the experience of charter schools in Connecticut, is that in Michigan charter schools are by and large run by for-profit companies. Let me tell you, the operators of for-profit charters, I am sure, have the best interests of those kids in mind, but the investors in those for-profit charter schools have profit as their primary motivation. The people telling those administrators what to do have investor returns first on their mind and educational returns for the kids second, because if they didn’t, they would be a nonprofit charter school. If your primary goal was to run schools for the benefit of kids, you would be a nonprofit. The reason you set yourself up as a for-profit is so you could make money. I don’t know why any school is operated on a for-profit basis. But in Michigan, 80 percent of charters are owned by for-profit operators. We have seen what has happened in the higher education States. We have seen the fraud that is perpetuated on students because for-profit colleges make money. Those who profit make as much money as possible, not the education of kids. So vouchers, underfunded, tied to the denial of rights for disabled kids, and established as a means of enrichment for investors in for-profit companies are a terrible idea.

Many of the teachers and parents in Connecticut are concerned about Mrs. DeVos’s nomination for other reasons as well. I wish that every minority kid and every disabled kid and every poor kid in this country got a fair chance, but that in Michigan education is played out. The Federal Government is involved in education for one primary reason and that is civil rights.
The whole reason that the Federal Government got into the business of education is because children—primarily minority children, primarily black children—were being denied an equal education. So in Brown v. Board of Education, it was held that separate education is unequal education, and in a series of civil rights acts following that decision, the Federal Government established laws to protect children and their parents from that kind of unjustifiable racial discrimination.

It happened in schools all over this country. Black kids were not given an equal education. Even after the schools were desegregated, States and municipalities found ways around the legal requirements to give an unequal education to minority kids.

Here is a news flash for you. Racism hasn't vanished in this country. Discrimination has not been defeated. We are watching the President today pry on people's prejudices as a means of dividing this country to his benefit. All across this country you can see examples of sometimes intentional discrimination and other times unintentional subconscious discrimination that continues to happen all over the United States, like what happens in school discipline. If you are an African-American boy in this country and you goof off at school, you are twice as likely, right now as we speak, to be suspended or expelled than if a White student engages in the same behavior. Disabled students all across this country are discriminated against.

I will give you an example from not so long ago in Texas. In Texas, an investigation by the Houston Chronicle discovered that the Texas Education Agency had arbitrarily decided that only 8.5 percent of students would get special education services. No matter if the school district had a higher percentage of kids with disabilities, the Texas Education Agency said that only 8.5 percent of students in any particular school district can get special education services. What happened? Kids all across the State who were disabled were denied the services that they needed. In Kentucky, just 2 years ago, an autistic 16-year-old named Brennen was severely injured, with both his legs broken when he was restrained at school. An investigation found that he suffered from fractures, a partially collapsed lung, and blood loss. He spent 8 days in an intensive care unit. An investigation found out that over the past 2 years, nearly 8,000 students in one county in Kentucky had been physically restrained, and 150 of them in this one county had been badly injured. That is just one example of what happens to disabled students all across this country. They get secluded and locked into chains and ropes, literally, as a means of trying to control their behavior. That not only doesn't work. That is by and large illegal, but it happens because still today minority kids, disabled kids, and poor kids don't have the political power that other school children have. Their parents might not be as loud as other parents are, and so they get intentionally or unintentionally discriminatory treatment.

That is why, at the Federal level, we have a history of requiring that States provide equal education to minority kids, disabled kids, and poor kids. That was a bipartisan commitment in the No Child Left Behind law. It continues to be a bipartisan commitment in the new equal-education law passed by Republicans and Democrats. The new law requires that every State have an accountability program. Republicans and Democrats both voted for it. I sponsored the amendment with Senator PORTMAN that put that accountability into the bill.

Another reason that parents and students in Connecticut are deeply worried about Mrs. DeVos's nomination is because she has a history of fighting accountability. In Michigan, she fought a State law that would have made all schools in that State—whether they be public, private, charter, or traditional—accountable for their results. When questioned before the Education Committee about her position on accountability by Senator KAINES, who just finished speaking, her answers were bizarre.

Senator KAINES: "Will you insist upon equal accountability in any K-12 school or educational program that receives Federal funding—whether public, public charter, or private?"

Here is the easy answer to that question: Yes.

That is not a gotcha question. I know folks have said that the Democrats were trying to embarrass Mrs. DeVos in the hearing, but that is an easy question.

Will you support equal accountability in any K-12 school that receives Federal funding?” asks Senator KAINES.

"I support accountability," she says. Senator KAINES is sort of figuring out that there might be an evasion rather than an answer. He says: "Is that a yes or no?"

"I support accountability." Senator KAINES: "Do you not want to answer that question?"

"I support accountability." "OK, let me ask you this. I think all schools that receive taxpayer funding should be equally accountable. Do you agree with me or not?"

"Well, they're not today."

"But I think they should. Do you agree with me or not?"

"Well, no."

So at the end of that line of questioning, Senator KAINES finally gets his answer—that Betsy DeVos does not support equal accountability for public, public charter, or private schools. That isn't surprising because she didn't support equal accountability when she was pushing for private charter schools in Michigan.

(MR. JOHNSON assumed the Chair.) Mr. President, that has devastating consequences for our children, to have a Secretary of Education who is not going to require accountability for results in schools, regardless of how they are established. It has devastating consequences for poor kids, Black kids, Hispanic kids, and disabled kids who too often are victims of a Secretary of Education who is not going to fight for accountability in our schools.

Frankly, I am friends with some of the operators of charter schools who are trying to establish accountability for their schools, and I have said that that has tended to be the loudest champions of accountability for many charter school proponents, they go hand in hand. Accountability gives you sort of a subconscious sense of the operators of public schools, which for charter school advocates tends to be an advertisement for an alternative way of education.

So charter schools, even those that are regularly critical of the public schools, like Mrs. DeVos, normally argue for accountability, but not Betsy DeVos. She has a long career of opposing accountability. And if you look at an examination of the charter schools that she has supported, you can figure out what the priority is. Charter schools aren't very good. If they had to be measured on equal footing with public schools in Michigan, the results would not be an advertisement for her or for her nomination to be Secretary of Education.

In Michigan, they have set up a Byzantine system in which there are like 30 different regulators of charter schools, all with a confusing array of different ways that they measure performance. There is no way in Michigan to get out data on what disabled students are doing on a school-by-school basis. They intentionally obfuscate the results of charter schools. Why? Because many of them—many of those associated with Mrs. DeVos—are not getting good results for their kids. That isn't what a Secretary of Education should do.

So many of the parents in my State are very concerned about Betsy DeVos...
commitment to protect these kids, but at the very least you have to know what the Federal laws are that provide those protections. Over and over again, she was given the chance to show that moral commitment; she did not. And in the face of that, the next thing I would want is accountability for the lack of knowledge about the statutes that protect those children. The Secretary of Education, more than anybody else in this country, is responsible for delivering results for our kids. The Federal Government is not in education except for the cause of civil rights.

Finally, I wish to speak about what was, to me, maybe the most troubling answer she gave in that hearing. We had 5 minutes to question this witness. We had 5 minutes. I worked pretty hard to become a U.S. Senator. My constituents think this is a pretty important job. I was given 5 minutes to ask questions of the next Secretary of the Department of Education—the person who is going to be in charge of the education of the tens of thousands upon of public schools in this country. There is no precedent in this committee—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—for Senators being denied questions when they have them.

We spent a lot of time in the committee hearing arguing over how much time we were going to get to question Mrs. DeVos, and it became pretty apparent that Senator Alexander was restricting questioning as the hearing went on. This was a nominee who was simply not qualified. This was a nominee who was not ready for this hearing, who is not ready to be Secretary of Education. I had a wonderful meeting with Mrs. DeVos. She is a nice person, but she is not qualified to be Secretary of Education. Senator Alexander knew that. What I gather is that Senator Alexander sat down with her, figured out that she was not qualified, knew that she was not going to perform well, and came into that hearing with the specific intention of limiting our questions, because as the hearing went on, it got worse and worse.

...I really wanted to ask questions about protecting disabled kids and low-income kids, so I had planned to ask all of my questions about whether she was prepared to stick up for those kids. She gave very short answers to my questions that, at their core, didn’t give me any confidence that she is going to stand up for those children.

When I looked down at my clock, I still had 30 seconds left. I only had 5 minutes, so I better use all of my time. So I asked her what I thought was a no-brainer. I asked her whether she thought guns should be in schools. She probably should have known that question was coming from me. I wasn’t intending on asking it, but my public service is defined by what happened in Sandy Hook. Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a general prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. We had a lot of time in the committee hearing arguing over how much time we were going to get to question Mrs. DeVos, and it became pretty apparent that Senator Alexander was restricting questioning as the hearing went on. This was a nominee who was simply not qualified. This was a nominee who was not ready for this hearing, who is not ready to be Secretary of Education. I had a wonderful meeting with Mrs. DeVos. She is a nice person, but she is not qualified to be Secretary of Education. Senator Alexander knew that. What I gather is that Senator Alexander sat down with her, figured out that she was not qualified, knew that she was not going to perform well, and came into that hearing with the specific intention of limiting our questions, because as the hearing went on, it got worse and worse.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.

Parents in Sandy Hook, CT, can’t understand—can’t understand—how a Secretary of Education could think that the proper way to make our schools safer is to arm ourselves as to whether they want guns in schools, would you support it? She said: I would support whatever he did, whatever he asked me to do.

So on the one hand, she says it should be up to States and local school districts whether they have guns in the classroom, and then on the other hand, she says that she would support a Federal prohibition on gun-free school zones. You can’t have it both ways. Much of the outpouring of opposition from Connecticut is due to the answer she gave to that question.
arm principals and administrators and teachers with high-powered weapons so they can engage in a shoot out inside a school.

Even that school in Wyoming that she referenced noted within 24 hours that they didn’t feel like they needed a gun to protect against grizzly bears. They had a fence and they had bear spray and that was good enough.

I admit, she has gotten probably a little bit of a little bit of a particular answer, but it capped off her performance in that hearing that was disqualifying; that showed a lack of interest in protecting vulnerable kids—poor kids, Black kids, Hispanic kids, disabled kids; showed a lack of putting that unfamiliarity with the laws that govern education; demonstrated an enthusiasm for market-based principles in public education that simply don’t work; showed a disregard for the danger of profit motivation driving decisions in education; and uncovered some incredibly dangerous positions that we had not previously known about, like her enthusiasm for putting guns in schools. That is why 13,000 people in my little State of Connecticut sent letters and emails and made phone calls in opposition to her nomination.

I had a really nice meeting with Mrs. DeVos in my office. I concede that she could have spent her time for that time—she has a lot of money—on something other than trying to make schools better.

So I give her credit. I give her a lot of credit for the fact that she spent much, much more time into making kids’ education better. But that is not a qualification alone. Being rich and spending your money for a good cause doesn’t automatically qualify you to be in the Cabinet.

Despite those good intentions, over and over again, Mrs. DeVos has shown she is willing, with her time and money and with her advocacy, to make good on her promise that public schools will never be a dead end, to empty out our public schools of money and students, to use taxpayer funds to enrich for-profit investors, and to leave behind millions and millions of vulnerable kids who need a champion in the Department of Education.

Public schools were not a dead end for me. Public schools were not a dead end for my parents. Public schools were not a dead end for my wife. I am sure, having only watched my kids progress through second grade and pre-K, that public schools will not be a dead end for my children. But to have a Secretary of Education who doesn’t believe the public schools that are going to have that change can lead to results for our kids like they have for generations is unacceptable. It is why this body in a bipartisan way should rise up and say no to her nomination and ask this President to appoint someone who is going to be a daily champion of our public schools and not use the Department of Education to undermine them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this morning and last night, the Senate has been considering the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be the next Secretary of Education. My colleagues have come down here to the floor, and I appreciate my colleague, who just completed his comments, for his knowledge and his insights on public education and his passion for a system of education that provides opportunity to every child in America.

We are down here speaking through the night to think about why this nominee for Secretary of Education is so completely inappropriate. We see the passion that has arisen across America, ordinary citizens calling us up on the phone, inundating our phones with hundreds of calls—I had more phone calls in a single day than I normally get in a couple of weeks—inundating us with thousands of emails and letters.

Why is there so much public passion about this nomination? The short answer is that public education is a cherished institution in the United States of America. Public schools are a vital pathway through which our children have the opportunity to gain the knowledge that allows them to thrive in our society. We don’t want to see that system of public education, that gateway for a successful life, destroyed by Betsy DeVos. That is why the American people are sending us so many letters and emails and making so many phone calls. Betsy DeVos has no education experience, no public school experience.

Our students, teachers, communities, and our Nation deserve leadership that does have public education experience, someone who does have a passion for the success of every child, not someone who is simply dedicated to trying to tear down public schools so she can run private profit institutions and put money in the bank.

What do we really care about in the United States of America? Do we care about the education of our children or about an entrepreneur hijacking the public education system for personal profit? That is why the citizens of this country are so outraged by this nomination and outraged that Senators on this floor are planning to vote for her later today.

I had the chance to go to school starting in first grade down in Roseburg, OR. Roseburg is a timber town. My mother showed me the path that was somewhere between a quarter of a mile and half a mile long. I walked that path over to the first grade school. It had classrooms that did not have hallways; they opened to the outside. The school ground was a magical place for me to go in the first grade.

I still remember vividly Mrs. Matthews. Mrs. Matthews was a very stern public school teacher. I probably about 20 people in her classroom, 20 little kids. She was determined that by the end of the first grade, we would all read at the third grade level. That was her mission in life. And we would do math at the third grade level. Thus, every moment in that classroom we were working.

She was a senior teacher. I thought of her as quite old at the time. I don’t know if she was in her fifties or sixties. Suddenly that age doesn’t seem so old to me now. She was very experienced, and she had her system of working with little kids. She would divide us into groups of about four to five kids, and we would travel from one cluster to another keeping us on track, making sure we were progressing as we were reading to each other, as we were doing our math assignments. By the end of the school year, everybody read at the third-grade level. We were afraid of Mrs. Matthews because she was a very stern teacher, but we all thrived in that classroom because we had a person dedicated to the success of children.

One of the things that helped Mrs. Matthews was that there were 20 students in her classroom. When I went to my son’s first grade classroom, there were 34 kids in that class. I don’t know that Mrs. Matthews’ strategy could have worked with 34 children. I don’t know if she could have taken 34 kids and gotten them to the third grade level at the end of first grade. And I am unfortunate that we are not providing for our children the same quality of education that our parents provided for us. Yet we are living in a knowledge economy world where public education is much more important than ever for success in generation after generation. So it is more important, but we are funding it less. Certainly we have growing national wealth. Why aren’t we making the investment in our public schools?

Here is an economic opportunity for me to make even more money and convert these public schools to private schools, private for-profit schools. That brings a lot of money into my economic well-being because I want to see the resources not go into the bank accounts of wealthy, ambitious entrepreneurs; I want to see those resources go into our public classrooms, which, quite frankly, don’t have enough resources.
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house outside of Portland and moved to the David Douglas High School system, where I was from third grade through graduation. That grade school and high school system provided the foundation on which I could pursue virtually any path I might choose to.

Isn't that the goal in America, that every child should have the opportunity to pursue their dreams, not to have that opportunity cut short by somebody who wants to drain the resources out of our public education system?

When I was in grade school, my father said to me: Son, if you go through the doors of that school and you work hard, you can do just about anything here in America.

I thought that was pretty cool because I lived in a blue-collar community. I knew there were fabulously more affluent communities in different parts of Portland, and our community was not one of them. We were a working-class community. The idea then, if I went through those doors and worked hard, I could pursue just about anything was a really cool notion. It gave me a lot of pride in the United States of America, and it gave me a lot of pride in one generation. I'm sure they were providing public schools to enable every child to have this opportunity to thrive.

That is what we want to have—not a system for the elite, not a system in which the rich get their education over here and they are therefore destined to seize the best jobs in society and generationally build wealth upon wealth upon wealth while the rest of our Nation is left out in the cold—no, a system where every child has the opportunity to thrive. That is the great foundation for a nation that says we are going to dedicate our resources so that all families are lifted up. But that is not the vision of Betsy DeVos. That is why I am on the floor today at 5 a.m. speaking about my concerns about her nomination and what it represents for public schools.

We need, plain and simple, an Education Secretary who actually has experience with public education. Betsy DeVos has none. She did not attend public school. She did not send her children to a public school. She did not volunteer in a public school. She did not get a degree and teach in a public school. I don't know if she has ever set foot in a public school. The process—the journey of becoming a teacher—is one that requires substantial education so you are prepared to convey and to find the pathway with which children can learn, absorb knowledge, move forward, and be inspired. But Betsy DeVos likes the idea of schools in which there is no accountability for the preparation of the teachers.

What undermines the success of our children for personal profit? For a moment, think about the type of backgrounds previous Secretaries of Education have had. They have been prepared to understand our school systems and issues before, here in America.

John King was our 10th U.S. Secretary of Education from March of 2016 through January of 2017, just recently. He had a J.D. and a Doctor of Education from Columbia University. He taught in the Massachusetts school system. He had been Commissioner of Education in the State of New York from June 2011 until January 2015. He had been the Deputy Secretary of Education for a little bit more than a year. He had a lifetime of study about our public education system, a lifetime of dedication to that system, a lifetime of experience in that system brought to bear to make that system work for our children.

How about Arne Duncan, who preceded him? He was the ninth U.S. Secretary of Education, serving from the time President Obama came into the office through December 2015. Arne Duncan graduated from college with a bachelor's degree in sociology. He was superintendent of Chicago Public Schools for 8 years—almost 8 years—from June 2001 to January 2009. Duncan had background, breadth, extensive experience and an understanding of the issues and how to address them in America.

Let's go back to a Republican administration and Margaret Spellings, our 7th U.S. Secretary of Education, serving for 4 years, from January 2005 through January 2009. She worked on the Education Reform Commission under Texas Governor William Clements. She was executive director for the Texas Association of School Boards.

We can keep going back and see the type of experience that has been brought to bear on this important position. Rod Paige was a son of public schools. Rod Paige was our seventh U.S. Secretary of Education. Rod Paige taught at Texas Southern University. He was Dean of the College of Education at Texas Southern University. He was a trustee of the board of education of the Houston Independent School District. He was a superintendent of the Houston Independent School District. In other words, as we work backward through his career, he was involved in education in one role after another. Betsy DeVos has none of that background. She has a background, and she certainly has things she knows well and is very good at, but education—public education—is not one of them.

She was chairwoman of the Windquest Group, a private technology and manufacturing investment firm. She was a Republican National Committee member for Michigan from 1992 through 1997. She worked at that point to divert children from our public education system and to divert resources from that system.

Michigan's charter school system, which she has backed, has most of them run by private-for-profit companies—80 percent, the largest percentage of the country—companies driven by making a buck and squeezing every dollar out of the system they can rather than squeezing every ability out of our children.

Public education being converted into a private profit company is the experience that she brings. She likes the idea of those schools having no accountability because if you have no accountability, you don't have to spend the money or put the money and you make more money for yourself.

That sort of self-serving, for-profit depletion of our public schools should not be represented or advocated for by the Secretary of Education.

She has other experience. That experience has to do with being very involved in one party of the United States—the Republican Party—serving as the Michigan Republican Party chairwoman from 1996 through 2000 and through 2006. That party of the Republican Party chair is different than gaining experience in public education.

She wanted to further press the case to convert public schools over to for-profit, a strategy that she was benefiting from so much in the 2000 ballot measure, and the people of Michigan rejected it. She also put a lot of money into a PAC but, again, putting money into an advocacy group—an advocacy group dedicated to depleting our public schools—was not a foundation for running public schools. It is a foundation for not running public schools.

During her confirmation hearing, it became so incredibly evident that she knows nothing about public schools. It makes sense that she has no background because she didn't attend public schools. It makes sense that she didn't learn anything about public schools by teaching; she didn't teach. Or volunteering in ones—she didn't volunteer. It makes sense that she didn't learn about public schools from her children going to public schools because they didn't go to public schools.

You might have thought for all her dedication to converting our public schools over to for-profit schools, she might have learned something along the way, but we found out during her confirmation hearing that she knows literally nothing about public schools.

If she knew she was going to have a confirmation hearing, she would also correlate it to competency or students' proficiency and how that reflects on the teacher.

When asked by Senator Franken about her views in this dialogue on proficiency versus growth as a tool of measurement, Betsy DeVos said: I think if we understand your question correctly about proficiency, I would also correlate it to competency and mastery so that each student is
measured according to the advancement they are making in each subject area.

FRANKEN said: That is growth. That is not proficiency. I am talking about the debate between proficiency and growth, and what are your thoughts on that?

She was unable to respond to that question because she was unfamiliar with the issue. That is a fundamental debate that is going on as we try to make sure that we have accountability in our public schools. Perhaps she was not familiar with the issue because she opposes accountability in her for-profit operations, because the less you spend on a student, the more you can put in the bank.

That is a very sad point of view—to put profit over people, and those people are children. Another major issue in our school system is how to address the education of students with disabilities. We have an act called IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. She was asked by Senator KAIN about IDEA and said that is a matter best left to the States.

Her response worries educators and those with disabled family members because before IDEA passed in 1975, it has been with us for 42 years now—only one in five students with disabilities received a public education. I will put it differently. Four out of five or 80 percent of students with disabilities were left in the cold. They didn’t get the benefit of a public education. Our goal from 1975 forward as a nation has been to make sure students with disabilities also receive the best education that their circumstances enable them to have.

Before 1975, many States had laws on the books that specifically excluded disabled students. That began to change with a series of court cases and the eventual passage of IDEA, a vision in which four out of five students with disabilities were not provided a pathway. Let’s leave it to a State. Maybe they will get an opportunity, maybe not, and that is OK with her.

It is not OK with me. It is not OK to the parents of the thousands of children who wrestle with a disability in my home State of Oregon. It is not OK to the parents across this Nation that their children be tossed aside in the vision of Betsy DeVos. Betsy DeVos has little constructive or helpful things to say on how she would protect students in our schools and on college campuses if she became Secretary of Education. Sexual assault on campuses is a very significant issue. It is estimated that roughly one-fifth of women on campuses are victimized by sexual assault, and many of them know the offender; that of every 1,000 women attending a college or university, there are 35 incidents of rape each academic year. Only a small portion of those are reported to law enforcement.

So Senator CASEY asked her if she would commit to maintaining President Obama’s attempts to curtail sexual assaults, and the answer didn’t leave confidence in either the Department of Education or the IEP determined that it is in the best interests of the child.

The IEP lays out the accommodations the student may get in the classroom and any related services the school will pay for, such as occupational therapy or speech pathology and services. IEP can even be used to pay for certain kinds of private school education in the event a family requests it and the IEP determines that it is in the best interests of the child.

To facilitate these rights, each student with disabilities and their family, the student, the school officials, and experts gather around a table referred to as an IEP, a legal document that lays out how public education will be tailored to their needs. Once a year, the IEP is updated, and any changes are submitted to the Department of Education, the State, and the IEP determines that it is in the best interests of the child.

That means out of 100 schools, it was the worst. But its charter was renewed under this vision of no accountability. How about Woodward Academy? It is a charter boasting more than a decade of abysmal school shootings. There were 64 school shootings in 2015. In Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, CT—the Senator from Connecticut was speaking during the previous hour—there was an assault that killed 20 first grade children and killed six adults. And this vision to create a secure environment is one that any nominee for public education should have a deep understanding of.

Betsy DeVos has a questionable history in terms of her interest and concern about LGBTQ rights for students, so that is a concern as well.

She does have this history of this war against public schools in Michigan, and if we had a department for a war against public schools, maybe she would be the right person to lead it. It would be a mission I would disagree with because I am here to tell you that this vision of public schools—every child has the opportunity to thrive is a vision we have embraced in America and should continue to embrace. If we believe in the American dream, if we believe in opportunity for all, then we should not have millionaire Senators voting to confirm a billionaire Secretary who knows nothing about our public education and the struggle for education among working Americans and Americans with modest means. That is the concern—Senators living in a bubble confirming a Secretary who lives in an ultra-rich bubble and knows nothing about our public schools.

We can take a look at some of the schools that Betsy DeVos has promoted with her vision of no accountability. Seventy-nine percent of Michigan charter schools are located in Detroit. Very few perform in the top tier of schools. There is a school in Brightmoor, a charter boasting more than a decade of abysmal test scores—not good test scores, not outstanding test scores, but terrible test scores.

That school is not alone. Another charter school, Hope Academy—serving the community around Ground River for 20 years—test scores have been among the lowest in the State through the previous hour—there was an assault that killed 20 first grade children and killed 6 adults. And this vision to create a secure environment is one that any nominee for public education should have a deep understanding of.

Betsy DeVos has a questionable history in terms of her interest and concern about LGBTQ rights for students, so that is a concern as well.

She does have this history of this war against public schools in Michigan, and if we had a department for a war against public schools, maybe she would be the right person to lead it. It would be a mission I would disagree with because I am here to tell you that this vision of public schools—every child has the opportunity to thrive is a vision we have embraced in America and should continue to embrace. If we believe in the American dream, if we believe in opportunity for all, then we should not have millionaire Senators voting to confirm a billionaire Secretary who knows nothing about our public education and the struggle for education among working Americans and Americans with modest means. That is the concern—Senators living in a bubble confirming a Secretary who lives in an ultra-rich bubble and knows nothing about our public schools.

We can take a look at some of the schools that Betsy DeVos has promoted with her vision of no accountability. Seventy-nine percent of Michigan charter schools are located in Detroit. Very few perform in the top tier of schools. There is a school in Brightmoor, a charter boasting more than a decade of abysmal test scores—not good test scores, not outstanding test scores, but terrible test scores.

That school is not alone. Another charter school, Hope Academy—serving the community around Ground River for 20 years—test scores have been among the lowest in the State through
to squeeze as much money out of that school as you possibly can at the expense of our children?

Stephen Henderson, an editor with the Detroit Free Press, summed up the carnage in Michigan—Betsy DeVos’s destruction of the state’s public schools in the following: “Largely as a result of the DeVos lobbying, Michigan tolerates more low-performing charter schools than just about any other State, and it lacks any effective mechanism for shutting down or even improving failing charters. This is a powerful testament, that DeVos’s assault on public schools—converting them to charters with no mechanism for shutting down poorly run charter schools, no mechanism for improving failing charter schools—Betsy DeVos’s vision of zero accountability—producing falling schools—is an assault on the opportunity for the success of our children. And it should not be entertained, and she should not be within a thousand miles of control of our public education system.

A columnist, an editor with the Detroit Free Press, went on to summarize that “as a result of DeVos’s interference and destruction of the schools in Michigan, we are a laughingstock in national educational circles, and a pariah among reputable charter school operators, who have not opened schools in Detroit because of the wild West nature of the educational landscape here.

Often what we see with this strategy from the very rich who want to masquerade as helping our children and challenging communities is what they really want: They want the government to pay for their elite education in private schools. Take the money out of the public system and help the wealthy in America be even wealthier by subsidizing or paying for their children to go to elite schools.

The strategies that Betsy DeVos implemented to destroy the falling schools in Michigan that has become “a laughingstock in national educational circles, with no accountability for improving the schools, and no accountability for shutting them down.”

If anyone was running a private business with no accountability, that business would fail. But when it comes to squeezing money out of the public system, there are opportunists who say: Here is something. Don’t care much about public education, but I see an opportunity and an opportunity for profit right here. I can squeeze that school, and I can make a lot of money.

That person belongs nowhere near our public education system.

There are other things that concern folks. In 1983, Betsy DeVos’s family funded the creation of the Family Research Council. FRC is known for its incendiary anti-LGBT agenda. It is known for its promotion of junk science, claiming a connection between homosexuality and pedophilia. The FRC thanks on its website the DeVos and Prince families of Michigan for establishing its DC base. And FRC advocated for conversion or reparative therapy.

Well, in all those ways, it sends a message that as the Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos is not going to watch out for LGBTQ students, who have been fighting for their life and a pathway to life in the world in which they don’t necessarily find support in many places. And their concern is amplified by her opposition to nondiscrimination protections for the LGBTQ community. In fact, she has donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to defeat marriage equality—an opportunity for opportunity in our Nation. Funding these anti-LGBTQ causes is plenty of concern for students and their parents across America.

Well, why is she nominated to be Secretary of Education? I think an objective observer would say that she has been a massive donor to the party of the President, and that objective observer would be right. Some $300 million was donated to the President’s party.

When discussing her contributions in 1997, DeVos said the following: “I have decided to stop taking offense at the suggestion that we are buying influence, because I see now that that is exactly what I am doing.” She continued: “They are right. We do expect something in return.” She concluded: “We expect a return on our investment.” Well, she is seeking a return on her investment by seeking the nomination to Secretary of Education, but pay-to-play politics has no place in our public schools. Let me repeat that once more. Pay-to-play politics has no place in our public schools. Our children’s education is not for sale. That is why we are here tonight on the floor of the Senate conveying our passionate dis
sent against this nomination.

The Secretaries in the Cabinet—their position—should not be sold to the highest bidder. The Secretary certainly one should have a small modicum of experience to bring to the post, particularly when it comes to the education of our children. Throw on top of that this pay-to-play politics. Throw on top of that a determination to destroy our public schools and to turn them into for-profit operations for the benefit of the rich, to squeeze profits out of these schools that are investing in our children, and this person is uniquely unqualified, the most un
qualified candidate to be a Secretary of Education. This decision has been widely viewed as controversial. With Trump’s decision, it is apparent that education policy will focus on the privatization of public education. DeVos is not a suitable candidate for the position. The consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consideration should be taken into who has offered such a significant role in our government and society. DeVos would not be actively supporting our public schools, and would not commit to advancing our consider
types of schools. DeVos never worked in a public school and will struggle to empathize with public school students and teachers. In order to hold the position of Secretary of Education, an individual should have a teaching license or have some experience working within the field of education. I guess that is kind of the point here, is someone should have some experience working within the field of education. This Register-Guard editorial said:

The morning after Election Day, a Register-Guard editor asked University of Oregon President Michael Schill what he knew about President-elect Donald Trump’s views on higher education. Schill’s answer: hardly anything.

It goes on to say: DeVos is a longtime advocate of charter schools and school vouchers, but the Chronicle of Higher Education and other publications have turned up few grains of information after sifting through her positions on issues affecting colleges and universities. DeVos’s home State of Michigan has more charter schools run by private companies than any other State, she is expected to be friendly to for-profit colleges. Maybe, maybe not-whose.

So the point is that the Secretary of Education should also have experience related to higher education. Let me speak a little bit to that. Our public K–12 system, which has now become sometimes a preschool through community college system, or a K–20 system, has expanded vision.

We have started to understand that just as we said at some point that the equivalent of a high school education is essential for a pathway for opportunity in our country, so now is the ability for many visions of what you will do with your life, to attend school after high school; that is, higher education. Not just as we said at some point that the high cost of college then reverberates back to the way they treat not only the opportunity after high school, it affects how children feel about schools when they are in school.

We see this, for example, in the DREAMS Program, where children are sponsored from grade school, and they are told: Listen, you have been the beneficiary of an individual who is going to be able to afford your college and for a scholarship might be available, I just always assumed it would be possible to go. We need a system of higher education in which people can afford to go to college without massive debt. What is important to understand is this affects not only the opportunity after high school, it affects how children feel about schools when they are in school.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to hand over the reins of our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.

So that is an issue we need to have an advocate for, as Secretary of Education, as well as an advocate for our education system to a person who wants to help their child go to college. Then that concern has many folks saying to parents that they are not sure that pathway that has been paved for them is one more corporation, one more education system to a person who wants to destroy a system that is the foundation of the American dream, the foundation of the vision for every child to thrive. We are a society to make sure that the pathway of opportunity is there for each and every child, including children who are English language learners, including children who have disabilities, including children who come from blue collar communities, as I do. Every child. That is the vision we are fighting for.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the nomination of Betsy DeVos has triggered an outcry of deep public opposition. It has also inspired an outpouring of popular support for public schools.

Public education is what has made America great. It is at the heart of the American dream. Our schools are much more than just a collection of classrooms. They are expressions of our communities and our values.

This is a lesson I learned from my parents. My father was the school custodian in a public school. He was proud of his position and took tremendous pride in ensuring that the school was clean, in good repair, safe, and welcoming to the students. He was part of the public school team that our community’s children needed.

He, along with other teachers, principals, and every staff member at the school were deeply committed to public education. We saw that commitment each and every day. He spoke of that commitment when he came home in the evening. The teachers would do much more than what was asked of them to ensure that students got the best opportunities and best education. Everyone in our school was pulling for our children. That is the way it should be, and that is the way it must be. This was free public education, the hallmark of America, and perhaps one of the most important contributions that we have made to progress, prosperity, and economic growth, not only here in the United States but around the globe.

That is what we are talking about today—the future of public education.

It is that kind of commitment to public education, going in early, working hard—I can remember of course in the winter time, when the storms would rage through Rhode Island, it was not uncommon for my father and his colleagues to be out there on a Sunday afternoon, if the storm was bad enough, shoveling all night long so that the schools could be open for the children, the teachers could get there, and the food could be prepared. That is the type of commitment that has been evidenced throughout our history when it comes to public education. That investment of effort but also a trying to understand and trying to improve public education has been at the heart of what we have all done.

Indeed, I believe it is that kind of commitment to public education that has made millions of Americans to speak up about the nomination of Betsy DeVos. Teachers, parents, and community members have been calling across the country, writing, emailing, urging the Senate to reject her nomination. I have received over 12,500 calls and messages from Rhode Islanders, an unprecedented negative response to a Presidential nominee.

We are the smallest State in the Union. We have a population of just over 1 million people, and we understand that even for the most challenging and publicized issues, we rarely get this type of response. It is because this nom is deep. It touches a nerve. It touches a nerve with people who are products of public schools because they honor the success of public schools, but it also touches the nerves of people who may not have attended public in Rhode Island, and they have determined the value, the necessity, the need for good public education. Without it, we can’t move forward as a nation; without it there is no alternative except typically very expensive private arrangements to educate our children.

Once again, free public education has been a hallmark of this country. It might have been one of the most dominant factors in ensuring equality. Our country is based on equality, and before the law. But without a good education, how can one be equal? How can one understand their rights and use their rights, understand their abilities and use their abilities?

Our constituents want across the country want a champion for public education at the helm of the Department of Education. They want someone committed to public schools, someone knowledgeable about the Federal role in education, and they have determined that Betsy DeVos is not that person.

Having looked at her record and viewed her performance during the confirmation hearings, they are telling us that she is the wrong choice to lead the Department of Education, and we should heed their pleas. Of the thousands of Rhode Islanders who have contacted me to express their opposition to Mrs. DeVos’s nomination, I would like to share the sentiments of a few who exemplify the deep concerns I am hearing.

One teacher wrote:

Mrs. DeVos is not versed on the real concerns of families and their children, and does not know the issues and concerns educators face in our schools. As a teacher in a public school, I believe she is completely unqualified to lead the Department of Education. This child how out of touch she is and not held to these same standards?

I think many Americans agree with the sentiment that Mrs. DeVos is out of touch and out of step with American families. Neither she nor the President seems to have much, if any, experience with public schools, as students, parents, educators, or administrators.

Another theme that Rhode Islanders wrote about was the double standard of this nomination. One vice principal wrote:

We as administrators are required to be highly qualified in order to run our schools through an evaluation process. We also require this of our teachers as well. How can we support someone in a position to lead the educational process who is not held to these same standards?

That is a fair question that neither Mrs. DeVos nor the Trump administration has answered.

But again, it is not purely about her resume. Another theme I heard about from many Rhode Islanders was their fear of the empathy gap from this administration. Here is an example from a letter written by a public school principal:

[My heart is sinking. I have worked as an educator in urban public schools for the past 19 years, as a teacher and, now, as a principal. I was an attorney before I was a teacher—I came to the profession as a second career choice, with a passion for righting the inequities our students face. I have worked all of my career with our most needy populations, a group whom I believe also to be the most brilliant, and before the law. But without a good education, how can one be equal? How can one understand their rights and use their rights, understand their abilities and use their abilities?]

Our constituents want across the country want a champion for public education at the helm of the Department of Education. They want someone committed to public schools, someone knowledgeable about the Federal role in education, and they have determined that Betsy DeVos is not that person.

Having looked at her record and viewed her performance during the confirmation hearings, they are telling us that she is the wrong choice to lead the Department of Education, and we should heed their pleas. Of the thousands of Rhode Islanders who have contacted me to express their opposition to Mrs. DeVos’s nomination, I would like to share the sentiments of a few who exemplify the deep concerns I am hearing.

One teacher wrote:

Mrs. DeVos is not versed on the real concerns of families and their children, and does not know the issues and concerns educators face in our schools. As a teacher in a public school, I believe she is completely unqualified to lead the Department of Education. This child how out of touch she is and not held to these same standards? We as administrators are required to be highly qualified in order to run our schools through an evaluation process. We also require this of our teachers as well. How can we support someone in a position to lead the educational process who is not held to these same standards?

That is a fair question that neither Mrs. DeVos nor the Trump administration has answered.

But again, it is not purely about her resume. Another theme I heard about from many Rhode Islanders was their fear of the empathy gap from this administration. Here is an example from a letter written by a public school principal:

[My heart is sinking. I have worked as an educator in urban public schools for the past 19 years, as a teacher and, now, as a principal. I was an attorney before I was a teacher—I came to the profession as a second career choice, with a passion for righting the inequities our students face. I have worked all of my career with our most needy populations, a group whom I believe also to be the most brilliant, and before the law. But without a good education, how can one be equal? How can one understand their rights and use their rights, understand their abilities and use their abilities?

Our constituents want across the country want a champion for public education at the helm of the Department of Education. They want someone committed to public schools, someone knowledgeable about the Federal role in education, and they have determined that Betsy DeVos is not that person.

Having looked at her record and viewed her performance during the confirmation hearings, they are telling us that she is the wrong choice to lead the Department of Education, and we should heed their pleas. Of the thousands of Rhode Islanders who have contacted me to express their opposition to Mrs. DeVos’s nomination, I would like to share the sentiments of a few who exemplify the deep concerns I am hearing.

One teacher wrote:

Mrs. DeVos is not versed on the real concerns of families and their children, and does not know the issues and concerns educators face in our schools. As a teacher in a public school, I believe she is completely unqualified to lead the Department of Education. This child how out of touch she is and not held to these same standards?

I think many Americans agree with the sentiment that Mrs. DeVos is out of touch and out of step with American families. Neither she nor the President seems to have much, if any, experience with public schools, as students, parents, educators, or administrators.

Another theme that Rhode Islanders wrote about was the double standard of this nomination. One vice principal wrote:

We as administrators are required to be highly qualified in order to run our schools through an evaluation process. We also require this of our teachers as well. How can we support someone in a position to lead the educational process who is not held to these same standards?

That is a fair question that neither Mrs. DeVos nor the Trump administration has answered.

But again, it is not purely about her resume. Another theme I heard about from many Rhode Islanders was their fear of the empathy gap from this administration. Here is an example from a letter written by a public school principal:

[My heart is sinking. I have worked as an educator in urban public schools for the past 19 years, as a teacher and, now, as a principal. I was an attorney before I was a teacher—I came to the profession as a second career choice, with a passion for righting the inequities our students face. I have worked all of my career with our most needy populations, a group whom I believe also to be the most brilliant, and before the law. But without a good education, how can one be equal? How can one understand their rights and use their rights, understand their abilities and use their abilities?

Our constituents want across the country want a champion for public education at the helm of the Department of Education. They want someone committed to public schools, someone knowledgeable about the Federal role in education, and they have determined that Betsy DeVos is not that person.

Having looked at her record and viewed her performance during the confirmation hearings, they are telling us that she is the wrong choice to lead the Department of Education, and we should heed their pleas. Of the thousands of Rhode Islanders who have contacted me to express their opposition to Mrs. DeVos’s nomination, I would like to share the sentiments of a few who exemplify the deep concerns I am hearing.

One teacher wrote:

Mrs. DeVos is not versed on the real concerns of families and their children, and does not know the issues and concerns educators face in our schools. As a teacher in a public school, I believe she is completely unqualified to lead the Department of Education. This child how out of touch she is and not held to these same standards?

I think many Americans agree with the sentiment that Mrs. DeVos is out of touch and out of step with American families. Neither she nor the President seems to have much, if any, experience with public schools, as students, parents, educators, or administrators.
that to be who we are. Our families work incredibly hard and want the very best for their children. To say, “everything in life isn’t free,” when it has been for Mrs. DeVos’s family, is hypocritical and mean. We need a champion. Please vote against her confirmation.

This next letter I want to share is from the mother of a special needs child. Like many Rhode Islanders, she is distressed by the fact that Mrs. DeVos said that a landmark civil rights law should be left up to the States. She writes:

I have grave concerns about the nomination of Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education. As a parent of a special needs child, it would not be an understatement to say that I was horrified at Ms. DeVos’ answers to the questions about the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act during her recent hearing. The one thing we rely on the Department of Education to do is to vigorously enforce and uphold the landmark civil rights law to protect all children, our children will fall through the cracks. It is extremely difficult to navigate the system and make sure your child gets the support he or she needs. That is why we have been doing it for a long time. I’ve served on both state and local special ed advisory committees, school committee, taken special ed training, even mentoring, and I STILL do not completely understand all of the nuances of the IDEA laws. For someone to be appointed to the highest office in the land in charge of enforcing laws and not be aware of them, is unacceptable. It’s too big of a learning curve. Surely there are more qualified candidates.

Last Congress, we came together to rewrite the No Child Left Behind Act. We passed the Every Student Succeeds Act on a strong bipartisan vote—85 to 12.

We moved toward giving States and school districts more flexibility in designing their accountability systems, especially regarding how they identify and intervene in schools that are struggling to serve their students as well. We strengthened transparency, including resource equity. We agreed to maintain greater transparency about recruiting partners who are committed to strengthening public schools, a partner who is committed to strengthening public schools. Mrs. DeVos is not that partner. Her life’s work has been to divert taxpayer dollars to fund alternatives to public schools.

Some on the other side of the aisle have argued that private school vouchers are no different from Pell grants or GI Bill benefits. This claim is another one of those alternative facts that the new administration is so fond of. Public elementary and secondary education is enshrined in our States’ constitutions. Attendance is compulsory. Public schools do not charge tuition, and they must accept all students. Pell grants and GI Bill benefits support postsecondary education, which is voluntary. Schools do not have to accept all students required to attend. Individuals must pay to go to college.

We do not want a system of elementary and secondary education where public schools must pay and schools can choose which students they serve. That is not the universal system of public education that has made our Nation great.

Our constituents understand that, which is why we have seen the public outcry against this nomination. And with this public outcry, they reaffirm our commitment to public education, recognizing that it has been the force that has pulled this country forward over generations; indeed, generation after generation. With that understanding, we have just, in fact, on a bipartisan basis, provided more flexibility and more discretion to the Department of Education. We need a Secretary who will take that discretion and responsibility in the spirit of public education with a fundamental and primary commitment to American public education, with a desire to see American public education succeed, not fail. We need that type of Secretary. Unfortunately, Mrs. DeVos is not that type of Secretary.

So I urge my colleagues to heed the call of all of our constituents in an unprecedented outpouring of messages and phone calls and text messages and rallsies, and join me in voting no against this nomination.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we gather on the floor of the Senate at an unusually early hour. In fact, the Senate has been in session all night. The question before us is the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be Secretary of Education. It is possibly the most controversial nomination made by our new President Trump.

This is an office which doesn’t usually attract this kind of controversy. Former Secretaries of Education have included Arne Duncan, who ran the Chicago Public Schools system. He was the first to be appointed in the first term of President Obama. Senator Lamar Alexander of Tennessee—who was Secretary of Education when I have served with—before his service in the Senate, was also the Secretary of Education.

The choice is usually one that is bipartisan and largely supported by not only teachers but parents and administrators and education officials from across the United States. In this case, though, we have in Betsy DeVos of Michigan another person against. Saturday, I spoke to the Illinois Education Association, a group of about 150 teachers who had gathered in Springfield, IL. They have been my friends for many years. Cinda Klicina, who is the President of the organization, said we have a real winner that goes back to the days when she was a classroom teacher—she now has risen through the ranks and heads up one of the major teachers organizations in our State.

Cinda is a true teacher at heart and really cares for students, cares for schools. She has devoted her life to it. She brought together 150 of her best teachers from around the State, preparing them to become more active politically in our State and in our Nation.

Naturally, they were tuned into this nomination of Betsy DeVos. They have a lot on their minds these days with the selection of the new President. Nearly all of them have written me, sent me an email, or contacted me personally opposing the nomination of Betsy DeVos.

I have not met Betsy DeVos. We tried to set up our schedules so I could, but it didn’t work. I take as much blame as anybody for that happening. I have studied her background. I have paid close attention to what she has said since she has been nominated and tried to understand where she comes from.

It is true that she is a person of wealth. The Prince family, which she was born into, is well known in the Midwest and in Michigan for its success in the automotive industry and many other endeavors. Then, she married into the Devoeses of Amway, another legendary business, where she has been able to accumulate some money.

There is nothing wrong with that in America. In fact, many people aspire to it and reach that goal and are admired for reaching it. It doesn’t disqualify her for anything in life as far as I am concerned, but it does not necessarily qualify her for certain things in life.

It is not clear to me from her record, which comes to me now, that she is prepared to serve this Nation as our next Secretary of Education. I don’t find in her background qualifications for the job that I found when the Presiding Officer was chosen as Secretary of Education or when my friend Arne Duncan of Chicago, whom I had breakfast with yesterday, was chosen for the same position.

Ms. DeVos’s experience in education is limited to using her family’s substantial wealth to push for a so-called school voucher agenda in her home State of Michigan. Ms. DeVos has never been a teacher. She has never been an administrator. In fact, she has never held any
job in public education. Neither she nor her children have attended public school. That is not a disqualification. I attended Catholic schools. My children attended both. She has never been a professor or college president. She has never had anything to do with the financial aid I understand it. She has never been involved in a loan program—least of all as large and complex as the Department of Education’s Direct Loan Program.

She is taken out a Federal student loan, nor have her children. Admittedly, that is not a requirement to be Secretary of Education, to have had any of these experiences, but had she had even one or two of these, we could point to real-life experiences which would prepare her for this awesome administrative responsibility.

I think these gaps in her life experience are fair to raise when a nominee to be the Nation’s top authority in education has shown a lack of familiarity with even basic educational policy issues, as Ms. DeVos did in her testimony before the Senate HELP Committee.

She could not articulate the difference between proficiency and growth in the context of K-12 accountability. I can tell you that Saturday at the Illinois Education Association meeting, everyone in the room knew those terms well. They knew the central role they had played in the national debate on education since the election of President George W. Bush and the creation of No Child Left Behind.

Ms. DeVos also said in her testimony that States should be able to decide whether to enforce the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. She apparently didn’t know that IDEA is already a Federal law and has been for more than 40 years. As a nominee, Ms. DeVos did not do her homework.

Is it the position we want as Secretary of Education? The experience Ms. DeVos has is limited to using her considerable wealth in favor of an agenda for so-called school choice. Ms. DeVos has spent years supporting school vouchers, which funnel tax-payers’ money from public schools into private schools.

I am familiar with that model, as it was implemented here in the District of Columbia years ago. It started with an amendment in the Appropriations Committee by a friend of mine. Mike DeWine was the Senator from Ohio and offered an amendment to create a voucher program in the District of Columbia. It was a surprise because a markup of the Senate Appropriations Committee is not usually the place you tackle something of that moment, but he offered it, and I offered some amendments. The notion behind it was that the District of Columbia would provide vouchers for the parents of children so they could choose the schools for the kids. They wouldn’t be forced to attend public schools. They might not attend charter schools. They might choose instead to use their voucher to send their kids to a private school.

I offered three amendments that day in the Appropriations Committee. The fate of those amendments told a pretty graphic story. The voucher program in the District of Columbia, and it also reflects on the candidacy of Betsy DeVos to be Secretary of Education.

The three amendments were, No. 1, that the teachers in the voucher schools had to have college degrees. That to me did not sound like a radical idea. Most of us assume that if you are going to teach in a school, you have a college diploma. It turns out my requirement was rejected with the DC voucher program that day when it was offered. The argument was made they needed more flexibility in terms of who would teach in these schools. That was wrong.

The second amendment I offered said that the schools themselves, the students, had to have the same test—achievement test—as students in public schools in DC so we could measure against that. That amendment was also rejected. They wanted to have the right in the so-called voucher schools to have their own set of tests that they would approve, not necessarily the same test as the kids in public school, but the amendment failed.

The third amendment I was sure would pass, but it failed as well. The third amendment said the actual school buildings used for DC voucher schools had to pass the fire safety code requirements of the District of Columbia, and that was defeated too.

I voted against the DC voucher program for those reasons. I couldn’t understand how you could push for a voucher program not guaranteeing that the teachers had diplomas from colleges, that they had schools in safe buildings, and that the students would be tested against the same public school test that DC Public School students faced.

That raised questions in my mind about the true intent and motive of those who were pushing voucher schools. Ms. DeVos, in Michigan, has been a proponent of voucher schools. She has pushed the expansion of charter schools and used her extraordinary wealth to insulate them from common-sense oversight and accountability in her State.

Even as the schools failed to deliver on the promises made to children of parents, Ms. DeVos continued to protect them from the same accountability standards as public schools. In 2015, a Federal review found “an unreasonably high percentage of charter schools on the list of Michigan’s lowest performing schools.

Today, for-profit companies operate almost 80 percent of charters in Michigan, more than any other State, and are underperforming compared to public school counterparts.

Let me be clear. I believe some charter schools can be effective. I have visited so many schools in my State, public schools, Catholic schools, charter schools, every imaginable school. I have supported high-performing successful charter programs.

I think about the KIPP program here in the District of Columbia, in Chicago, and other places, consistently producing some of the highest results, the best results, and the highest standards for students. Is there a lesson to be learned from the KIPP model for all schools? Of course there is. You have to believe in it.

But on average, charter schools don’t perform any better than public schools—on average. To say that this is a model that we should embrace regardless is unfair to students. If we are going to exalt performance and results, let’s do it in an honest fashion.

These schools that receive Federal and State taxpayer funding should be held accountable, as all schools. Ms. DeVos doesn’t agree. Senator Tim Kaine from Virginia asked Ms. DeVos at her confirmation hearing if she agreed with equal accountability for any K-12 school that receives taxpayer funding, whether that school is public, charter, or private. She refused to answer at one point even said “no”.

Ms. DeVos also seems unwilling to acknowledge that many private and charter schools are not equipped to support students with disabilities and other special needs in the way the public schools are. These students, along with many low-income and minority students, would certainly be left behind in Ms. DeVos’s ideal education world.

Last year—and the Presiding Officer was a major part of this decision—Congress did what seemed unimaginable. We came together and passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA. ESSA makes important improvements to our elementary and secondary education laws. It requires States to set academic standards, measure student achievement, and develop accountability plans for all schools receiving Federal money.

Giving Illinois parents, teachers, and principals a replacement to No Child Left Behind was a great bipartisan achievement. I do want to call out in a favorable way, my colleague, the Presiding Officer, Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee, and my colleague Senator BURR of the State of Washington. They did a great job.

While ESSA provides more authority to States and local school districts, it also included important Federal guardrails to ensure key civil rights protections and hold States and school districts accountable. Federal rules to carry out that important Federal task are now in doubt and in jeopardy.

I don’t have confidence that, as Secretary, Ms. DeVos will appropriately carry out the Federal Government’s responsibilities under the law to ensure that all students—regardless of income, race, gender, or disability—are achieving.
For me, it all boils down to this. I do not believe Betsy DeVos will keep the promise we made more than 50 years ago when Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which guaranteed in the United States of America a free and equal quality public education to every child.

I am not going to give up on that promise, which really is a bedrock principle of America. There is more work to be done, but I believe we can improve America’s public schools.

Let me also say that I couldn’t disagree more with what Ms. DeVos has said about guns in schools.

My colleague Senator CHRIS MURPHY represents the State of Connecticut. Both he and Senator BLUMENTHAL have told us many times, in heartbreaking and graphic detail, what happened that day at Sandy Hook Elementary—what they went through just as observers—what they saw in the eyes of the parents who came to realize that their children had been killed—brutally killed in the classroom at that elementary school. I have had the responsibility to meet with the parents of those kids, and to try to make some sense out of a tragedy which is just nonsensical.

Ms. DeVos was asked by Senator MURPHY about guns in schools. Ms. DeVos said she would not commit to opposing efforts to repeal Federal law that brings guns to our schools. When we put guns in the hands of the children who are already responsible for their own survival—when it becomes a deadly game of tag. That kind of statement is reckless and dangerous. We should expect more of someone who wants to be our Nation’s top education authority.

I am also concerned when it comes to higher education policy. Betsy DeVos has a tendency of siding with corporate and for-profit interests over students when it comes to education. Take for-profit colleges as an example. Despite years of fraud and abuse by for-profit colleges, the extent of which is unparalleled in other sectors of higher education, Ms. DeVos does not see the connection between the business model of for-profit colleges and these abuses.

When she was asked by Senator MURRAY if she believes different types of corporate-controlled structures result in different decisions and behaviors by for-profit colleges versus comparable nonprofit institutions, Ms. DeVos simply answered: “No.”

Even for-profit industry insiders have acknowledged that the business model indeed encourages abuse. In a 2015 interview with Deseret News, John Murphy, the founder of the University of Phoenix, admitted that the company experienced a shift in priorities that led to diminished student outcomes when it became a publicly traded company. He says the new focus became increasing the return on the investment at any cost, including “lowering its admission standards,” and “jettisoning the academic model” it had previously relied on. Other companies soon followed the University of Phoenix’s corporate example. As John Murphy said, “Phoenix was the one that got it rolling, then all the other for-profits followed them in.”

What resulted was an entire industry built on defrauding students and fleecing taxpayers. For-profit colleges and universities in America today are the most heavily subsidized private for-profit businesses in our country. These are not corporations. These are not for-profit colleges. They are crony capitalist ventures that have found a way to tap into the Federal Treasury at the expense not only of taxpayers but of unwitting students and their families. Nearly every major for-profit college has been investigated or sued by one or more State or Federal agency for unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices.

The numbers tell the story, and I have told them many times. Some 10 percent of college students go for-profit. And 20 percent of all the Federal education aid goes to the same schools. That is 10 percent of the students and 20 percent of the Federal aid. The schools are extraordinarily expensive. And 40 percent of the Federal education aid in America are students from for-profit colleges and universities.

Corinthis may be one of the worst and well-known examples, though it’s not unique. Corinthian, a for-profit college, falsified and inflated job placement rates to entice more students to sign up for their worthless programs. One of the tricks they used was to pay employers to hire their graduates for a couple of months so they could count them as successfully off to work after they graduated. It was a fraud, and they were caught red-handed. The company’s predatory practices, once exposed, led to its bankruptcy. But tens of thousands of students were left with huge amounts of student debt and a worthless education.

Shame on us in the United States of America for the Department of Education’s giving the green light to these schools to do business in America and to defraud these students, their families, and, ultimately, the taxpayers.

This embarrassing episode at Corinthian led the Department of Education to create an interagency task force to coordinate Federal oversight efforts of the for-profit college enforcement unit within the Department to investigate allegations against schools participating in the Federal title IV program. Unfortunately, at her hearing, Ms. DeVos would not commit to maintaining this important office, signaling she is ready to take the cops off the beat at the Department when it comes to for-profit colleges and universities. I am afraid that is consistent with what she has done in Michigan, where she leans toward the for-profit model of education that many of these for-profit schools in her State are worthless. For-profit colleges, the most heavily subsidized private entities in America already, have friends in high places in Washington.

We know what happened to their stock prices over the years, as students and families realized how terrible they were and stopped attending them. Enrollments went down in the schools. Guess what happened the day after President Trump was elected? The stocks of for-profit colleges and universities started to rise again. They saw new opportunities. They were other words, if Ms. DeVos is appointed to the Department of Education that would stop enforcing the law to stop the fraud that they have been guilty of.

At her hearing Ms. DeVos gave us no hope for any different outcome. We know from recent data released by the Obama Department of Education that many for-profit colleges actually receive nearly 100 percent of their revenue from Federal taxpayers in the form of title IV funds, Department of Defense tuition assistance, and Department of Veterans Affairs. If I don’t know how a good business-oriented Republican could overlook the fact that these so-called for-profit schools are thinly veined operations, gleaning every available Federal tax dollar to keep their afloat. Annually, they take in nearly $25 billion in title IV Federal funds alone.

The Department has a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer funding isn’t wasted by enriching investors and executives at institutions that prey on students and don’t deliver on their promises. In keeping with that responsibility, the Obama administration created new Federal regulations to ensure that career training programs are meeting the statutory requirement and that they prepare students for gainful employment. The gainful employment rule cuts off title IV funding for programs where graduates’ ratio of student debt to earnings is too high. In other words, if they sink them deep in debt and they can’t end up with a job that is worth at least as much as they need to earn to pay off their debt, then something is wrong with the program.

Ms. DeVos would not commit to maintaining this protection for students and taxpayers. Proactive oversight and enforcement is one thing, but when fraud and abuse do occur, Ms. DeVos would not even commit to make it right. We had a student who went to a for-profit school, she was defrauded, and she refused to say that she would ensure defrauded students received the Federal student loan discharges to which they are entitled under the law.

Maybe this shouldn’t surprise us. For one, Ms. DeVos’s would-be boss, the President of the United States, Donald Trump, operated his own for-profit college that defrauded students. And as it turns out, Ms. DeVos, a billionaire, has financial connections to the for-profit college industry. She has disclosed investments in for-profit companies linked to for-profit colleges, including Apollo Investment Corporation, which is connected to one of the organizations that
just bought the University of Phoenix. Apollo invests in another for-profit college chain that has several programs that are in danger of losing Federal funding because of the gainful employment rule. These colleges also happen to be accredited by the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools, or ACICS, which put its stamp of approval on the likes of Corinthian, ITT Tech, and the notorious Westwood College. Last year, the Obama Education Department revoked ACICS Federal recognition, and the accreditor is now actively suing the Department over this decision. Now Ms. DeVos wants to take over the Department, and she is supposed to defend against the lawsuit when she has a financial interest in the schools that are involved?

For-profit colleges aren’t the only ones who may be given free rein to prey on students under a Secretary DeVos. The private student loan industry is also licking its chops. A recent Chicago Tribune article entitled “Student Loan Lenders May See Opportunities with Trump in The White House” told the story. It noted that, since the election, stocks of major private student loan issuers have also gone up. The article quotes a report by financial analyst Bob Napoli that says: “There could be substantial growth potential in the student lending business as we believe the Trump administration is likely to reduce government involvement in the student lending business.”

What is government involvement in the student lending business? Well, it is an effort to have oversight so that students and their parents aren’t exploited by student loans. The fear is that with Secretary DeVos, that oversight would disappear. This government involvement in student lending, which Napoli speaks about, also includes Department of Education direct loans, which help millions of low-income students attend college each year with lower interest rates for loans. These loans have fixed interest rates, strong consumer protection, and flexible repayment. In addition to loans, Federal Pell grants provide much needed financial support to thousands of low-income students across the country—financial support they don’t have to repay.

On the other hand, private student loans often have variable interest rates that can easily exceed 20 percent, origination fees, few consumer protections, and no alternative repayment option. Unlike nearly all other private debt, private student loans are not dischargeable in bankruptcy. That is a debt they will take to the grave. A greater role for private student lenders, without strong new protections and oversight by critical agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, would be a “sentence to debt” for many college students across our country.

I have deep concerns about Ms. DeVos’s ability to hold this job as Secretary of Education. This morning or perhaps early this afternoon, we may see history made on the floor of the Senate. It is quite possible that the only way Betsy DeVos can become Secretary of Education is if the Vice President of the United States will come to the floor of the Senate and cast the breaking vote so that she can become a member of President Trump’s Cabinet. I understand from news reports that this will be the first time in history that someone has had to rely on the Vice President to vote to become a part of a President’s Cabinet. Doesn’t it say a lot about the controversy surrounding Ms. DeVos that it has reached this point, that she has to pull out all the stops—literally, all the stops—to become part of the Cabinet?

She was asked at one point—I believe by Senator SANDERS of Vermont—how much money she had actually contributed to the Republican Party over the years. She said she just didn’t know. Well, it is not against the law to contribute money under most circumstances. It shouldn’t be held against people because many folks who receive political appointments give a lot of money to the President who makes the appointments. That is not unusual. It has happened with both political parties, but it is seldom a person with such a thin resume—and such a big wallet—who is given such an important job. This goes too far. For Ms. DeVos to be the Ambassador to Aruba, or wherever she might be, that is a good political reward. To be placed in charge of the public education system of the United States of America, I think, is a step too far.

I have deep concerns about Ms. DeVos’s ability to hold this job and her commitment to public education and interests that seek to exploit them. Like tens of thousands of Illinois parents, teachers, and principals who call my office—as well as national education civil rights organizations—I oppose Betsy DeVos’s nomination as Secretary of Education.

Two of my Republican colleagues have shown extraordinary courage in announcing their opposition to Ms. DeVos. I want to salute Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine. I am sure it wasn’t easy for them to come out publicly against Ms. DeVos. That means right now that there are 50 “no” votes and 50 “yes” votes, by rough calculation. We need, at this moment in time, one more Republican to stand up and do what is right for America’s children and America’s students.

Who will it be? Who will join these two women from Alaska and Maine and the Democrats in saying to President Trump: We can do better. To my Republican colleagues, I say: Parents, students, teachers in your States are counting on you to stop this dangerous nomination. Please don’t let them down.

I would also like to note some excerpts from mail I have received about Ms. DeVos’s nomination from my home State of Illinois. Hannah is a graduate student at the University of Illinois in a K–12 librarian program. She writes:

I am a student who benefitted from IDEA. . . . Without this Federal protection it is unkind. I know many students with special needs and they need help the most will not be helped.

Barbara, mother of two Chicago public school high school students writes:

Please do not support Betsy DeVos for Education Secretary. She knows nothing about public education. We need strong support for public education.

Hanan, a certified and licensed speech pathology specialist writes:

As . . . a Mother with three children who received therapy while two current years. I beg you to vote no on Betsy DeVos. I am afraid of what will become of my children, as well as my students if therapy services are not provided through the special education system. Many of my student families cannot afford private therapy. They rely on getting their therapy through the school they attend.

Michelle, a teacher from Chicago writes:

I fear the impact [Betsy DeVos] will have on the lives of our students. My greatest concern is her sheer lack of understanding of education in the U.S. For myself and my colleagues, many of the questions she was asked during the hearing were topics we share a variety of opinions and could talk about at length. The fact that she answered very few questions, did not know what IDEA is and devotion seems slight should the concerns of having guns in schools does not qualify her to be in this position.

Alejandra, middle schooler from Bellwood, IL. She writes:

I do not believe that Mrs. DeVos is a suitable choice for the position of Secretary of Education for the United States. One of the many reasons for this is because she lacks experience. Another reason . . . is because she has no plans and the few plans that she does [have] may result in harm to the public school system. I believe that Mrs. DeVos does not understand how public schools function and I also believe that she should be replaced with someone with more knowledge and understanding on this subject. Mrs. DeVos does not understand that public schools have the same impact on students as private schools and should be treated fairly. This affects my community because many cannot afford to attend private schools and are their only option. If Mrs. DeVos were to become Secretary [of Education] she would most likely harm the public school system and leave many students without an education.

From Loves Park, IL, Lisa writes:

While my own child attended Catholic school, I am opposed to vouchers. I do not complain about paying education taxes. It is not my money and my heart stands with my child to a private school. It was our choice. But as my immigrant grandmother
I ask unanimous consent that this several-page document, which includes a list of letters of opposition to the nomination of Betsy DeVos, be printed in the RECORD. There are some 322 letters in opposition. To spare the Government Printing Office, I will not have that part of the entire document printed, but it is a voluminous list of opposition to Betsy DeVos.

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

LETTERS OF OPPOSITION TO THE NOMINATION OF BETSY DEVOS FOR SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

Includes:

National Women’s Law Center; People for the American Way; National Council of Jewish Women; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Education Association; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; The Leadership Conference; Legal Aid At Work; YouthCare; American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; National Urban League; NCRC; Freedom From Religion Foundation; Tri-Caucus; NASSP; YouthCare; Outright Vermont; National Organization of Women; American Federation of Teachers; Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Diversity; American Association of People with Disabilities; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Center for Public Representation; Children’s Mental Health Network; Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; Education and Defense Fund; Education Law Center-PA; Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.

American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees; OCA—Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Diversity; National Women’s Law Center; People for the American Way; National Council of Jewish Women; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Education Association; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; The Leadership Conference; Legal Aid At Work; YouthCare; American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees; OCA—Asian Pacific American Advocates; National Urban League; NCRC; Freedom From Religion Foundation; Tri-Caucus; NASSP; YouthCare; Outright Vermont; National Organization of Women; American Federation of Teachers; Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Diversity; American Association of People with Disabilities; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Center for Public Representation; Children’s Mental Health Network; Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; Education and Defense Fund; Education Law Center-PA; Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.
Supervisors Association; The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Organizations; Utah Association of Elementary School Principals; Vermont Principals' Association; Association of School Business Officials; Association of Secondary School Principals; West Virginia Association of Elementary and Middle School Principals; Wyoming Association of Elementary & Middle School Principals; Young Invincibles; Professors across the country; LCCR; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Advocacy Institute, African American Leadership Action Network (AALAN); Our Children's National Network; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Federation for Clinical Research; Therapy Association; The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Friends Service Committee; Religious Mutual Aid Cooperative; National Pacific American Labor Alliance, APL-CIO (APALA); Black Women’s Blueprint; The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at UCLA’s Civil Rights Project; Center for Law and Education; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my great colleague, the qualifications, and the experience of Illinois, and to address this body of the President should have taken the time and the President should have taken the time to yield to him—to a New York Times article, which was published on June 28, 2016, entitled “A Sea of Charter Schools in Detroit Leaves Students Adrift,” by Kate Zernike. Let me close by saying, this is rare. It is rare that we have a nomination for the position of Secretary of Education which has drawn such controversy. There were many things that Ms. DeVos could have been given as a reward for her loyal support of Republicans and all of the things she has done in her life, but to be entrusted with the responsibility of running America’s public education system at this critical moment in our history certainly is not one of them, as far as I am concerned.

We should have taken the time and the President should have taken the time to find a person who had the resume, the qualifications, and the expertise in education policy for this important responsibility. We owe our children nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. DURBIN). Mr. President, I am honored to follow my great colleague and a champion of education and consumer rights, Senator Durbin of Illinois, and to address this body and, most particularly, the Presiding Officer, who has contributed so much to the cause of education. We know, better than anyone, how important the Federal commitment to quality education is—not just a C or D education but excellence in education.

The American people deserve a Secretary of Education who embodies and exemplifies that commitment to excellence. Unfortunately, the nominee before us, Betsy DeVos, falls on every
count to meet that standard. So I am here today to voice my continuing concern about this nomination, which is antithetical to the very mission of the Department she has been selected to lead.

She is unquestionably unqualified, unknowable, unprepared for this job. She is unfit to run the Department of Education. As hard and as unkind as that verdict sounds, we have an obligation to speak truth here and speak that truth to power, even when it is the President of the United States, even when it is a job as critically important as Secretary of Education—especially when it is as important as this job.

She is wealthy. She is a billionaire. She has committed her career to pushing for private school vouchers and unregulated charter schools. Having reviewed her full record, including her confirmation hearing and her responses and lack of responses to followup questions that my colleagues sent to her, I respect my colleagues: We should not approve this person.

She has committed her career to pushing for private school vouchers and unregulated charter schools, not to the public education our students deserve. The Secretary of Education will face a myriad of challenging and constantly evolving problems that will demand a high level of leadership and guidance, from soaring student debt to faltering school and unemployment rates across the country, to the pervasive school violence and bullying that threatens so many of our students, to unscrupulous for-profit schools, profiteering off students and veterans.

Clearly, the problems and others, require a Secretary who will not just rubberstamp or approve the policies of special interests or delegate systematic problems to private schools.

The Secretary of Education is responsible for overseeing a budget of Federal spending over $36 billion—that is K-12 education funding—and $150 billion in higher education funding each year. In addition, there is a portfolio of more than $1.2 trillion in outstanding Federal loans. That is the largest consumer debt in this country other than mortgage loans.

The leader of this Department is responsible for determining policies that affect our neighborhood public schools. She is responsible, if she is confirmed, for enforcing key protections under a number of civil rights laws designed to ensure every child access to education. This job requires a singular level of intellect and energy, preparation, devotion to the welfare of students, parents, and, yes, educators and teachers. Our educators and teachers are the real heroes of our educational system. Our public school teachers are second to none in the world for their commitment to the dreams, and enabling students to achieve those dreams, and those dreams will be in peril if Betsy DeVos is our Secretary of Education because she has demonstrated her disrespect for the enterprise of public education.

From implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act, improving education quality, protecting Pell Grant recipients, reducing student debt in higher education, to policing the epidemic of campus sexual assault and protecting students’ civil rights at schools across the country, clearly our Nation’s chief education executive needs to be immensely qualified—not just qualified, but un challengingly prepared and well versed in these complicated issues.

The fact is, Mrs. DeVos has no relevant experience as a teacher or as a leader of a public school. She has said that neither she nor her children have ever received a student loan or a Pell grant. She has no direct experience with our public education system that would enable her to lead it.

In addition to her lack of knowledge of higher education, Mrs. DeVos has demonstrated a profound animosity, an antipathy to them. She has spent her career systematically privatizing and dismantling public schools instead of working to build them up.

For decades, Mrs. DeVos spent millions of her fortune advocating for the diversion of public money to unacceptable private schools and unaccountable private schools, especially in her home State of Michigan. She helped to design an ineffective charter school system with little accountability for results in Detroit. However, the systems that she helped to design and promote actually siphoned money from Michigan’s already underfunded public school system and caused achievement rates there to drastically plummet.

Despite her rhetoric, school privatization schemes are plagued with severe problems. They often strip students and their families of their rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This point underscores a fundamental theme for Mrs. DeVos’s record, indicating how she would pose a threat—in fact, an unprecedented danger to students’ civil rights across the board.

When asked during her confirmation hearing about the IDEA, Mrs. DeVos admitted that she was “confused” and thought that States were best positioned to oversee the IDEA. That answer exposed not only her lack of knowledge but her lack of caring. Someone who cares about students with disabilities would have known that this landmark education law depends on Federal enforcement for its effect, and that as the Nation’s Secretary, would be the one to do that enforcement.

Before the passage of the 1975 law that later became the IDEA, when decisions about students with disabilities were left to the States, only one in five students with disabilities received an education. Does she believe that we ought to go back to a time when States were able to openly discriminate against students with disabilities, that States should be again delegated that responsibility, which they failed to enforce effectively?

Whatever her answer, clearly her blatant disregard for the IDEA threatens students with disabilities and already underfunded disability programs.

Mrs. DeVos also threatens students’ rights and campus safety under title IX, including rights that are designed to protect student campus sexual assault and other violence. This issue has concerned me. I have held roundtables around the State of Connecticut and have submitted a measured bill that would help address this problem at the college level. But Mrs. DeVos has advocated for legislation that would actually increase the difficulty for victims of sexual assault to receive support.

During her hearing, Mrs. DeVos told Senator Casey, my colleague, that she could not commit to the Obama administration’s title IX guidance that requires schools to have procedures in place to investigate and address instances of campus sexual assault or risk losing Federal funding.

I believe title IX comes to the core of the Federal responsibility to protect students against sexual assault. We can agree or disagree on the detail, but this blatant disregard for title IX responsibilities goes to the essence of her commitment to education in this Nation and to protecting students against the scourge of sexual assault, which we know is all too pervasive still on many of our campuses.

Even worse, according to tax records, Mrs. DeVos has spent millions of dollars funding ultraconservative organizations that promote anti-choice, anti-Muslim, and anti-LGBT policies like conversion therapy. I never would have thought that I would be on the floor of the Senate considering a candidate who supported anti-LGBT policies or anti-choice or anti-Muslim policies. They don’t belong in our schools. They certainly should not be supported by our Nation’s Secretary of Education.

On the issue of for-profit education, again, it is a source of great concern because it has given rise to so many abusive tactics directed often against our veterans. During her Senate hearing, Mrs. DeVos did little to allay my concerns about her record as a school choice advocate amusing herself, avariciousness, and unqualified arse protection against the abuses of for-profit.

We know there are for-profit schools and colleges that do great work. They contribute vitally, but unfortunately, for-profit schools have been plagued by abuses that need to be fought and overcome.

Mrs. DeVos successfully lobbied to expand even failing schools in Michigan and to protect those for-profits from scrutiny and oversight. This record of enabling for-profits and her own self-dealing in a for-profit preschool herself does not bode well—that
is an understatement—for the hundreds of thousands of students who have been neglected, deceived, and scammed in recent years by predatory for-profit college institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Tech. They left in their wake, when their collapsed and failed to protect, a myriad of tragic stories, tragedies not just for the loss of money but for the loss of future opportunities, and that is far from the kind of record that we want replicated under our next Secretary of Education. In her hearing, Senator MURRAY asked Mrs. DeVos about 17 specific bad actor for-profit higher education institutions, including Corinthian and ITT. They have been accused of using exotic dancers to recruit students, falsifying job placement rates, or stealing Federal financial aid. Mrs. DeVos would not confirm whether she believes that those practices and misuse of taxpayer funds at any of those 17 schools are, in fact, unacceptable. She simply would not respond definitively to that question.

The Secretary of Education is responsible for policies that could either lift or exacerbate the crushing burden of student debt at those for-profit schools. Mrs. DeVos evaded that burden, yet she refused to commit to protecting any current student loan repayment options or benefits or even helping severely disabled borrowers receive loan discharges that they qualify for.

She refused to commit to protecting the Pell grant, the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, or maintaining the existing transparency information on the college scorecard or Federal student aid data center.

Mrs. DeVos refused to commit to keep private banks out of the student loan system or ensure that taxpayers do not subsidize career education programs that consistently leave students with high-quality degrees without meaningful prospects in the job market.

Her record and her responses to Senate questioning reveal that putting her in charge of the Department of Education would be akin to putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. I realize that analogy is overused, particularly in this town, where there are so many instances of it. But her lack of appropriate, definitive responses are as telling as her silence on questions about her commitment to protecting, rather than endangering, the individuals and institutions that will be her mission if this body confirms her.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I have a special interest in protecting our Nation’s servicemembers and veterans from insidious and pernicious predatory for-profit colleges. It is a paramount concern. It ought to be a paramount concern for our Nation because all too often those are the same predatory for-profit colleges who lure them even while they are still in the military. They lure them with promises and images that create expectations never to be fulfilled, and so many veterans emerge from these colleges with mounds of debt but no degree.

Yet Mrs. DeVos refused to say whether she understands that Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense student loan and assistance programs are even federally funded or whether she would commit to closing the 90-10 loophole that has enabled colleges to aggressively market and mislead many vets.

We have all spoken on the floor about the need to close that loophole. It is the plain vanilla solution that should be a matter of consensus, yet Mrs. DeVos refused to commit on that issue. She has earned a failing grade for lack of study, complete lack of diligence in preparing for her testimony and to lead in higher education programs. Mrs. DeVos neglected to protect students and veterans from massive debt, low-quality education standards and accountability, or pernicious for-profit companies and leaders deserves a failing grade as well.

I will not support a nominee who fails to agree that predatory practices, exploitation of taxpayers, and deception of students have no place in our education system. While Mrs. DeVos evaded questions about bringing accountability to schools, she also refused to commit to keeping guns out of schools. When asked by my colleague Chris Murphy whether guns have any place in or around schools, Mrs. DeVos gave the following reply: “I would imagine that there is probably a gun in the schools to protect from potential grizzlies.” That statement has given a lot of amusement to a lot of people around the country, but it dealt with an intensely serious subject, that is really no laughing matter. All of us who went through the tragedy and grief experienced by those families and loved ones who lost children in Sandy Hook, CT, cannot regard with anything but contempt the sense of outrage that should have come from her spontaneously, and it should be the leadership that she should provide.

There is nothing more important than keeping our children safe from anyone who would do them harm, particularly in a school, which should be the safest place in the world, and that means that our Secretary of Education must protect students, NGOs, and schools that have work to do. It is absurd to teach students to duck and cover in active shooter drills rather than demanding our legislators do the responsible thing and make it more difficult for dangerous people to get their hands on firearms.

That is what Betsy DeVos should have said in her hearing when she was asked about guns in schools proves just how little she has considered the important role that the Education Secretary plays in keeping students and faculty safe.

It is insulting to tell teachers that they should carry sharpshooters to their jobs. It is absurd to tell students to duck and cover in active shooter drills rather than demanding our legislators do the responsible thing and make it more difficult for dangerous people to get their hands on firearms.
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Her responsibility is beyond being a bureaucrat or a placeholder in a Federal organization chart. She has a public trust, even as a nominee, to show America the importance of public education. Her career is about demeaning and detracting from public schools. Her testimony to the Senate hearings has, I fear, played a role in the inaccuracy, the incompleteness and the poor answers to questions posed to her by Congress as well as her track record in Michigan where she worked to destroy public education, serve as a spokesperson for a company which backs Neurocare, is a company which deals with attention deficit disorder, her career is about demeaning public education, to give back and give more to public schools.

After observing her testimony, I am convinced she lacks the leadership ability to invest more resources in public education, to give back and give more to public schools.

Please do not approve a person who has no experience with public education and has no clear understanding about student need or how students learn. This is an extremely important job. We should not take it lightly and just let anyone take that title. Mrs. DeVos' plan for our children will disenfranchise the poor, the disabled and quite honestly, every child in America. Her inaccuracy is a reprehensible choice for our Department of Education.

I want to close by saluting them and most especially the teachers and parents who are so committed to their students.

Erin, a third-grade teacher from Connecticut, captured this fear in her letter to my office:

I write this to you as a teacher in despair. After a decade and a half of public service as a teacher, I fear that our basic precepts of our obligation to educate ALL children has come into question. I am fearful of what lies ahead for my students if someone like Mrs. DeVos is in charge of our Department of Education. Her lack of experience in public education, her desire to separate and sort our children by income, academic ability and socioeconomic status, her blatant disregard for students with special needs and our obligations to these students under IDEA—strike panic in the education community.

One of the best things about being a public school teacher is the challenge and privilege to work with all kinds of students with all kinds of abilities and needs. I have the honor to work in schools that is rooted in the inclusion of all students.

More than 15% of the students in my school are entitled to special education services. We are so proud to provide this group with the services that are specialized just for them to meet their academic, social and emotional needs.

You see, our work here is not merely about proficiency, it is indeed about growth. We are tasked to help our children grow to their own individual potential—not just meet a mandated academic framework—cultures clash. It's inevitable. Differences abound. And yet, in this sphere of gaps and spaces, we bridge to one another.

We reach because we have to; there is no option. We see differences and we've learned the inherent power in them. We develop minds of course—but we also develop tolerant citizens who can thrive in a multi-cultural and diverse society.

Vouchers and school choice, as Mrs. DeVos champions, are exercises in political directives in our public schools.

Mrs. DeVos has a very clear conflict of interest on many levels. Financially, she wants to maintain the $5-25 million dollar dividend she received from the company which deals with attention deficit disorder. Her investment in Windquest Group, which backs Neurocare, is a company focused on neuroscience and brain-based program that targets children is clearly a conflict. She has presented a clear history of disingenuousness, a lack of experience in public education, to hold that trust that our country desperately and urgently needs now, not at some point in the future. That commitment is necessary now because every day, every month, every year is a lifetime in a student's education. So I will vote against her confirmation today, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, for his leadership on public education issues and the fight against gun violence. He has been a voice calling for commonsense measures to address gun violence and to make our schools more safe, and I thank him for all he has done in that regard.

Yesterday I came to this floor to discuss the risk that Betsy DeVos would pose to our public education system for students from kindergarten through 12th grade. With her track record on vouchers for private schools, she has ignored accountability and the unique needs of communities in Maryland and...
throughout the Nation. Education is a public trust, and we should not con-tract it out to the highest bidders in various voucher schemes.

In addition to overseeing support for K–12 education, the Secretary of Educa-tion is responsible for Federal efforts in the area of higher education. So this morning, I would like to talk a little bit about higher education.

We know very little about the posi-tion the new President will take in the area of higher education. However, what we do know about his track record is very troubling. Based on the testimony of Ms. DeVos and her re-sponses to questions for the RECORD, we can have little confidence that she will be a check on President Trump’s worst instincts.

Here is what we know: We know that President Trump’s main foray into continuing education was the now-extinct Trump University. Make no mis-take about it, Trump University was a scam. To give you an example, it promised students great wealth if they only paid $36,000 to go to a university that is a fake school. And you know what they got,” Senator Rubio asked, “They got to take a picture with a cardboard cut-out of Mr. Trump.”

Senator Rubio was absolutely right when he made that statement.

First of all, the word “university” in Trump University was totally mis-leading. Trump University was not an accredited institution, but it did prom-ise to educate its students in the real estate industry so they could become skilled investors.

An article in the conservative Na-tional Review entitled “Yes, Trump University is a Scam” explained that prospective students were offered a free seminar where they would be pressured to purchase a class, where they would be “mentored by hand-picked real estate experts who would use President Trump’s own real estate strategies.”

Of course, Mr. Trump was neither handpicking instructors nor developing class materials, and instructors did not even necessarily have a real estate background.

Mr. Trump could not identify a single in-structor at Trump University.

Students were promised access to lenders, improved credit scores, and long-term mentoring. The university did not deliver. According to a former employee, Trump University “preyed upon the elderly and uneducated to separate them from their money.” Em-ployees were told to rank students based on their liquid assets so they could target them to sell more seminars. They took advantage of people. Because of its fraudulent practices, Trump University was sued multiple times. In February 2016, Mr. Trump dis-missed those suits saying: “I could set-tle it right now for very little money, but I don’t want to do it out of prin-ciple.”

Right before the class action lawsuit in San Diego was scheduled to be heard by a jury, the principals evaporated and Mr. Trump settled all the lawsuits for a whopping $25 million, and about 7,000 former students were granted a full or partial refund.

Now, because Trump University was a university in name only and not ac-credited, students attending Trump University were not eligible to use Fed-eral student loans or grants—thank goodness. But there are many accred-ited, for-profit colleges and univer-sities that do take large sums of money from students who obtain Federal stu-dent loans or Federal grants, and it is the job of the Secretary of Education to make sure that those for-profit col-leges are good stewards of those tax-payer dollars and that they are giving their programs good attention.

For example, under President Obama’s leadership, the Department of Education took action against the for-profit Corinthian College for fraudu-lently enticing students to enroll by lying about their job placement rates. They told students: You enroll in our programs, and we can get you a job. It wasn’t true.

As California’s attorney general, our colleague Senator Harris, pointed out in her testimony, $9 billion in damages and restitution from Corinthian College because they tar-geted vulnerable, low-income popu-lations, including the homeless. They directed them to predatory lending and failed to deliver an education that could really help them get a job. Their tactics were similar to those of Trump University—callously targeting “prospects they perceived as having low self-esteem,” who were “unable to see and plan for the future, and those who had few people in their lives who cared about them.”

In order to stop these kinds of abuses, the Department of Education, under the Obama administration, put in place something called the gainful employment rule, which requires for-profit colleges to demonstrate real re-sults for their students in order to con-tinue to enroll students who use Fed-eral student loans and grants. We want to make sure that students enrolling in those programs do not get a rip off at success and are not simply being sepa-rated from their money, including Fed-eral student loans.

This gainful employment rule is im-portant for protecting both students and taxpayers. That is why it was alarming that during her hearing, Mrs. DeVos would not commit to enforcing the gainful employment rule.

Our veterans have been among the students who have been most targeted by these abusive practices. Just last week, I received a copy of a letter that was sent to Senators Alexander and Murray and Representatives Fox and Scott from a coalition of veterans or-ganizations. I have it here. It is a letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of Amer-ica, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, the National Mil-i tary Family Association, AMVETS, Blue Star Families, Vietnam Veterans of America, the Wounded Warrior Project, and Student Veterans of America, all opposing any weakening of the gainful employment rule and urging greater, not fewer, consumer protections.

As they note in this letter, a loophole in what is known as the 90–10 law, which caps the amount of funding for-profit schools can obtain from Federal sources, exempts funds from the De-partments of Defense and Veterans Af-fairs. They write: As a result, our Na-tion’s heroes are targeted with the most deceptive and aggressive recruit-ing.

The letter quotes Holly Petraeus of the U.S. Consumer Financial Protec-tion Bureau, who says for-profit col-leges are motivated to view veter ans and their families as “nothing more than dollar signs in uniform.”

The letter further states that “vet-erans express anger when they discover that the programs they were told a career education program had a lousy record, but allowed them to waste their time and GI Bill benefits enrolled in it.”

That should make all of us angry. It should make us angry because of the service our veterans have performed for our country. It should make us angry because it is a waste of taxpay-er dollars to have these monies spent in in-stitutions that are not providing an education to our veterans or other stu-dents in the way they advertise.

Yet Mrs. DeVos provided no assur-ance—none, none—that she would en-force the gainful employment rule that these veterans groups are calling the 90–10 law. She also gave no assur-ance that she would pursue other pro-tections to help our students and vet-erans. In fact, when asked, she point-edly did not make that commitment.

Taxpayers and students should also be troubled by statements that have been made by the Trump team regarding their plans for the Federal student loan program. As many people know, the Department of Education is respon-sible for managing a $1 trillion bank of student loans and $30 billion in Pell grants each year. It is important that these funds be managed in a way that protects the best interests of both students and taxpayers, rather than simply fattening the bottom lines of the big banks and big lenders.

In fact, 7 years ago, Congress—the House and the Senate—passed and the President signed the bill that “made important reforms to the Federal stu-dent loan program.”

Under the old system, banks distrib-uted Federally guaranteed loans in ex-change for a subsidy from the Federal Government. In effect, banks were paid a premium to be the middleman and
Those schools have a very sorry record in terms of the education they provided to students in Michigan. Now, when it comes to higher education, in her hearing she refused to commit to enforcing the gainful employment rule, which is designed to protect students and taxpayers from the kind of predatory practices that goes on at Trump University. She did not disavow proposals to turn the student loan program back over to the big banks.

We need a Secretary of Education who understands that our education system is a public trust and not simply a vehicle that allows for-profit schools and big banks to make a profit off of these important taxpayer investments. I wish to say a word, as well, about community colleges. I think all of us recognize the really important role that community colleges play in our educational system. Just two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to attend a meeting of the presidents of Maryland's community colleges. It was organized by the Association of Community Colleges and included folks from all over the State. We are fortunate in Maryland and around the country to have some terrific community colleges that provide associate's degree and advanced certificate programs. In other words, they got a great deal. In other words, they got a great deal.

For example, according to the code, some banks were able to make loans guaranteed by the government to give them a 9.5 percent return, even though students receiving those loans were paying a 3.5 percent interest rate. The difference—6 percent—was pure profit paid by the taxpayers to the banks for zero risk.

We were able to close that loophole after a number of years, and then in 2010 the Congress and President Obama agreed to stop using banks as the middlemen in the student loan process. We shifted entirely to the direct loan program through the Department of Education. That move saved taxpayers $61 billion over a 10-year period, and we were able to use the savings to support for struggling families to make college more affordable. By increasing funding for Pell grants and indexing them to new inflation, we were able to expand the income-based repayment program so more students could afford college, and we put $10 million toward deficit reduction.

The Republican Party platform under President Trump calls for rolling back those important reforms and putting student loans back in the hands of the big banks. When Senator Murray, the ranking member of the Education Committee, asked Mrs. DeVos in a question for the record about privatization of the student loan industry, Mrs. DeVos refused to rule out a return to the days when the big banks reaped huge profits off students and taxpayers while taking very little risk.

It turns out that Mrs. DeVos may herself have investments that represent conflicts of interest for the job of Secretary of Education or indicate a preference for privatization within higher education. For example, according to her ethics forms, she has an investment in Procurement Recovery, Inc., which had a contract with the Department of Education for student loan debt collection. The court blocked that contract last year and it is currently challenging the decision.

There is a common thread connecting the approach that both President Trump and Mrs. DeVos have taken with respect to both K-12 education and higher education; that is, the idea that we should put for-profit private interests over the interests of students and taxpayers. As we have heard, in Michigan Mrs. DeVos was very instrumental in helping Michigan State University in a way that attracted for-profit charter schools to the State of Michigan. Those schools have a very sorry record in terms of the education they provided to students in Michigan. Now, when it comes to higher education, in her hearing she refused to commit to enforcing the gainful employment rule, which is designed to protect students and taxpayers from the kind of predatory practices that goes on at Trump University. She did not disavow proposals to turn the student loan program back over to the big banks.
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There is a common thread connecting the approach that both President Trump and Mrs. DeVos have taken with respect to both K-12 education and higher education; that is, the idea that we should put for-profit private interests over the interests of students and taxpayers. As we have heard, in Michigan Mrs. DeVos was very instrumental in helping Michigan State University in a way that attracted for-profit charter schools to the State of Michigan. Those schools have a very sorry record in terms of the education they provided to students in Michigan. Now, when it comes to higher education, in her hearing she refused to commit to enforcing the gainful employment rule, which is designed to protect students and taxpayers from the kind of predatory practices that goes on at Trump University. She did not disavow proposals to turn the student loan program back over to the big banks.

We need a Secretary of Education who understands that our education system is a public trust and not simply a vehicle that allows for-profit schools and big banks to make a profit off of these important taxpayer investments. I wish to say a word, as well, about community colleges. I think all of us recognize the really important role that community colleges play in our educational system. Just two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to attend a meeting of the presidents of Maryland's community colleges. It was organized by the Association of Community Colleges and included folks from all over the State. We are fortunate in Maryland and around the country to have some terrific community colleges that provide associate's degree and advanced certificate programs. In other words, they got a great deal. In other words, they got a great deal.

For example, according to the code, some banks were able to make loans guaranteed by the government to give them a 9.5 percent return, even though students receiving those loans were paying a 3.5 percent interest rate. The difference—6 percent—was pure profit paid by the taxpayers to the banks for zero risk.
not share this gross misunderstanding of student needs.

We heard from Senator Blumenthal, we have heard from others on this floor, about the incredible grassroots outpouring of opposition to the nomination of Betsy DeVos. She has drawn opposition from teachers, parents, and civil rights organizations. We have seen that groundswell overwhelm the phone system here in the United States Senate.

Maryland’s schools, and schools throughout the country, deserve a champion in their Secretary of Education. When President Trump and congressional Republicans propose plans to cut and divert Federal education funding, we need a Secretary of Education who is going to fight for public education. Mrs. DeVos is clearly not that person.

Our Founders understood from the earliest days of this Republic that a free public education is a fundamental American value that so many people believe in, and that it is a school they can go to, to learn to write and participate in this democracy, the Secretary of Education.

I think all of my colleagues will agree with me that there has been an unprecedented outpouring of concern from across the country about this Cabinet nominee. Why is that? Why is this nomination of Secretary of Education brought such emotion and discussion to this country? For a very important reason: Education is a critical part of everyone’s life.

The Founders of this country knew that when they determined we in this country were going to have a free public education system. Why? Because they want to make sure that every citizen had the opportunity to read and write and participate in this democracy, a core principle to assure that all of us would have a voice in who our President and elected officials were so we would understand and be educated and make the right decisions.

That core principle is so important to this country and has allowed us for centuries to be the kind of country where we have a middle class. People who are born into poverty know there is a school they can go to, to learn to read and write and get the skills they need to be a participant in our democracy and in our economy. That is what is at stake in this nomination. People across the country are writing in, calling, holding rallies, talking to their neighbors and friends, and letting us know how important it is because they do not want to lose that principle. In this nominee who has been sent to us is a threat to that very basic core value that so many people believe in, in this country; that no matter who you are or where you grow up or how much money you have and who your parents are, you will have that public education, that public school in your community that you will be able to go to.

I was a school board member before I was a U.S. Senator, before I was in the State senate. Those school board meetings were jammed with parents who wanted to know what was happening in their schools, who would call me at midnight and complain about a school policy and what was going on. As a school board member, I had to listen and respond to that. People value their schools. They want to know they are the heart of our communities. It is a place children from different backgrounds who may be fighting with their neighbor across the street during the day, show up Friday night to cheer together for that foot- ball team. It is the epicycle of our communities. It is the epicenter of our country. and that is what is at stake in this nomination.

People want the Secretary of Education to be a champion for their public schools. In this nomination that has been sent to us by the President, Betsy DeVos, we have someone who values and speaks out for—and has used her fortune to fight for—something very different. She has denigrated public schools. She says they need to end. She has been giving a voucher and telling them to find a private school, leaving behind kids who can’t afford to go hours to another school or to pay the extra money the voucher doesn’t cover, leaving kids in those schools with really critical money from our schools and from the kids who would be left behind.

Yes, our kids want choices. This is not a debate about charter schools. Many States, including mine, have those schools. The difference is, in those States—in my State and many—those charter schools are held accountable, just like the public schools so you know your child is getting the education they have been promised and that it is held accountable to taxpayers. Mrs. DeVos refused in our committee to say that those charter schools, those private schools, if they take taxpayer dollars—which a voucher is—would be held accountable to taxpayers. To the parents in those communities who showed up at my school board meetings to tell what they thought of their schools and what we should be doing and had a voice, it would not be accountable to them. I find that wrong, as a principle in this country and our democracy and what we have fought so hard for. That is why so many parents are speaking out. That is why so many Senators have been here on the floor. That is why we have been here all night long and will continue until noon today during this vote.

That is what is at stake. In our higher education system, all of us know that so many young people today want that ticket to success and student loan debt is such an incredibly huge challenge to so many people, a barrier to getting the education they need. They want someone who is going to head up the Department of Education who understands that. Betsy DeVos has no experience in higher education, none. And she is going to lead the agency and be the voice and be the vision? That is why
parents, students, teachers, community leaders, superintendents, school board members, and families across the country have stood up and said no.

This is so close. We are within one vote of sending this nomination back and giving this President the opportunity to send us a nominee who can be supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, who can set a vision, who can fight for public schools, who can be that champion and that leader who sets us apart in the world as a country, who values the core of our mission and values all children, regardless of where they live—will get a good education.

The Secretary of Education is not a figurehead. The Secretary of Education spends his or her days trying to make the right decision and being a champion across the country on issues across the board. They oversee the Office for Civil Rights. Last night I had the opportunity to listen to Senator Booker speak about the importance of their office and what it meant to him and what it means to so many kids today to know that there is in this country an agency, the Office for Civil Rights, embedded in the Department of Education, that they will not be denied an education because of the color of their skin.

Isn’t that a value we all want to continue? That is why people have spoken out and written letters and made phone calls and have been heard. So many parents in this country today want to make sure the basic education law that we have fought for for so long, IDEA, which assures that students with disabilities get a good education, is not put in jeopardy.

When Mrs. DeVos came to our education committee and was asked about this, she had no idea that it was the law of the land. She said to our committee: The States can do that.

I want to start by putting a focus on education because the top person in this land to be your advocate, too—not someone who doesn’t know the law, not someone who isn’t directing her staff to make sure that no matter where you are, if you are a student of disability, you get access to public education and are not denied.

Our country is great because we have these principles. Our country is great because we value each individual. Our country is great and will continue to be great if we continue to do that, but it will not be great if this body gives their imprimatur to a Secretary of Education who doesn’t value that.

When we say that no young kids across the country, to parents with students of disabilities, to young people in this country living in poverty or living in a community or having family issues who wants to know that they, too, live in a land of opportunity? They have heard from so many parents and so many administrators and so many community leaders. This is a core value of our country—the ability to know that you can get an education.

Mrs. DeVos, if she is confirmed, would stand up on our side and two Republican colleagues to think about that, to talk about education, about boosting our high school graduation rates. Part of what families and parents and communities want because it deals with education.

I heard some of my colleagues on the other side talk about the fact that we have a GI bill, which they essentially called in the debate a voucher for men and women who served our country to go to school. And likened that to the voucher system they are talking about in K-12. That is not equal. That is given to members of our service, rightly so, to say: You served our country; we will make sure you get an education.

I want to start by putting a focus on education because the top person in this land to be your advocate, too—not someone who doesn’t know the law, not someone who isn’t directing her staff to make sure that no matter where you are, if you are a student of disability, you get access to public education and are not denied.

Our country is great because we have these principles. Our country is great because we value each individual. Our country is great and will continue to be great if we continue to do that, but it will not be great if this body gives their imprimatur to a Secretary of Education who doesn’t value that.

What I say to Mrs. DeVos, who is telling her staff to enforce this law and to back up those students.
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mobilized. I want to start my remarks by saying that I know people across the country are concerned about this. We worked very closely with Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER on this.

The reason that Oregonians feel so strongly is that we have been first in so many areas, for example, protecting our natural treasures, but we are not where we want to be in terms of high school graduation rates. For communities like Oregon, the business community, Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, Independents—you name it—it is top priority business for our State to improve high school graduation rates. That is because we understand that getting those graduation rates up is crucial to making sure that young people can be better prepared for their next step, whether that is college, whether it is the workforce—anything they want to do.

I want to start my remarks with respect to the nomination of Betsy DeVos very specifically. I do not believe improving high school graduation rates can be built on a foundation of alternative facts. Yet that is what Betsy DeVos has been promoting. For example, she recently wrote that graduation rates at virtual private schools—private schools which she has invested in—were almost twice as high as the actual graduation rates at those schools.

She said that at the Nevada Virtual Academy there was a graduation rate of 100 percent. The actual graduation rate is 57 percent. She claimed that at the Ohio Virtual Academy there was a graduation rate of 92 percent. The actual rate is 46 percent.

I think this pretty much qualifies as a set of alternative facts. At home, at the kinds of townhall meetings I had this weekend, people would probably call them four-Finocchio falsehoods and kias-sucoes. The tentative facts may be the DeVos way, but they aren’t the Oregon way.

As I said to Oregonians this weekend—we had teachers and community leaders come to these meetings—what we do is operate on something we call the Oregon way. The Oregon way is about Democrats and Republicans, people of all philosophies. We had great Republican Governors—Tom McCall, Mark Hatfield—who also served in this body and were independent. We want fresh, practical approaches.

We focused on our ideas that work, ideas that get results, and we focus not on alternative facts but on the truth. What I heard again this weekend at home is that we are bringing together teachers in the classrooms and parents and community leaders and trying to determine what are the key factors in why students are not graduating. At home people are asking, how do you get results? What actually is going to get students to graduate from schools? Educators and principals tell me that mentoring programs work. They tell me at home that summer learning programs work. They point out the track record of afterschool programs, and they have the facts to back them up. These facts aren’t alternative facts. They are not inflated graduation rates, the way Betsy DeVos told the Senate. These are based on actual studies: Schools have been shown that youth—especially at-risk youth—with mentors are more likely to join extracurricular activities, take on leadership roles at school, or volunteer in their communities. Afterschool and summer programs, have actually shown very solid track records, providing a safe place to learn and keeping low-income and at-risk youngsters on a path towards graduation.

Those same educators have told me in my townhalls that they oppose elevating Betsy DeVos to a job with the important responsibility of steering the future of our Nation’s children. The reason they have expressed these views is much like what I have stated to the Senate: We get them evidence, not alternative facts but hard evidence—doesn’t back up many of the judgments Betsy DeVos has made in guiding her work in this field.

In Oregon, citizens—thousands of them—could be unable to think the graduation rate of Betsy DeVos is going to make it harder to help students succeed in the classroom and graduate from high school. This graduation rate for us in Oregon—and I am sure we are not alone—takes on a new and important urgency because of the changes that were made last year—bipartisan changes Senators MURRAY and ALEXANDER made to pass the Every Student Succeeds Act. The whole point of this bill was because, of course, there was great frustration across the country with No Child Left Behind, the predecessor.

I remember at one point illustrating the frustration with that law. We had a wonderful school in rural Oregon with many youngsters and mostly minority youngsters. They worked like crazy. Their parents were very involved. Their teachers rolled up their sleeves, and they were doing well at getting their test scores up. At one point, we were told they were going to be labeled a failing school, because, apparently, for a short period of time, a number of youngsters had the flu, and so the attendance rate wasn’t what it should be. Those were the kinds of stories that we raised so important to fix No Child Left Behind and focus on approaches that work.

It is my view that what Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER did with respect to bipartisan leadership was to work for an important bill—important for the future of students, important for their ability to get a job and do what they want in their years ahead. When you have a bipartisan bill that the President has signed into law, replacing failed education policies, and giving schools the tools that they need for their classrooms, you ought to move quickly and boldly to carry out that law. That law included a provision that I wrote to help high schools with low graduation rates turn around student achievement by putting the most disadvantaged students on a path to success. It allows local educators—this isn’t run by Washington, DC. I am always hearing that everybody is talking about Washington, DC. That is not what I voted for. What I voted for—and the majority of Senators voted for—was a fresh approach allowing local educators to promote and expand programs and policies that actually work in their communities. They recognized that what works in Coos Bay or Roseburg, OR, may not necessarily work in Tallahassee.

We wrote a bipartisan bill to come up with approaches tailored to what local educators want to pursue. Now as we are moving to see this law implemented in the States and as schools across the country are moving to implementation, it is more important than ever that the Senate get this right, that we get this right, and do it in a way that we use approaches grounded in the facts and grounded in the reality of public education. My concern is that—based on Betsy DeVos’s record, which I have looked at in length—bipartisan legislation could be subverted by a system that has not been shown to improve academic outcomes for students.

In Detroit, Mrs. DeVos has spent years advocating for a voucher system that gives taxpayer dollars to private schools, which have essentially left public schools to do more for their students with less of the funding they desperately need. I was on a program this morning, a radio program. They were discussing the views of various Senators on this. I heard discussion of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle describing the fact that they were supportive of Mrs. DeVos because they thought her unconventional approaches and her fresh ideas were a real advantage in her having this position.

I don’t take a back seat to anybody in terms of being for unconventional approaches. I think it would be fair to say that pretty much most of my time in public life has been defined by taking unconventional approaches. So I welcome new ideas from people who have not been involved in government—and ideas that, frankly, are out of the box, that are unconventional. But they still have to be based on hard evidence that they get it right to work.

We are trying fresh approaches in Medicare, for example. The idea is that Medicare today is no longer the Medicare of 1965. It is all about chronic disease, cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and stroke. A bipartisan group of us here in the Senate have written bipartisan legislation to try a very different approach—certainly unconventional—but it is grounded on the facts. It is grounded on what we know about taking care of people and on the benefits of teledmedicine.

So that is why I am opposing the DeVos nomination. It is not because I
am hostile to unconventional approaches or fresh faces or people who haven’t been involved in government—quite the contrary. I probably have a bit of a bias for just that. I am opposing the nomination, No. 1, because of the track record that she has advocated for hasn’t worked, and, No. 2, when she was challenged on it—such as the question of the graduation rates and some of those programs she invested in—she inflated the rates. She said they were almost twice as high as they actually were. So the country can’t afford to allow failed policies—particularly as we move to implement the new laws that do not suggest a very positive set of opportunities for public schools at the local level.

We have recognized as a nation for years how vital public education is to giving children in America the chance to climb the economic ladder. It is a bedrock principle of public education that investments in public schools and investments in dollars and there is a record of fresh ideas that work, rather than ideological approaches where the evidence suggests it doesn’t work, can serve everyone.

I cannot support an Education Secretary with a track record that flies in the face of the need for our country to make smart investments in public schools. I described how the next Education Secretary faces a challenging agenda with huge stakes. Graduation rates and improving them are right at the heart of it. But, obviously, we are going to have a need for other fresh ideas, like making college more affordable.

Mrs. DeVos just doesn’t have the qualifications to achieve the success that 50 million students in American public schools demand. The person entrusted with our children’s future should not be put at the head of the class just because she is part of a family that has tremendous public influence. You get these jobs because you earn them, because you have been involved in your community and various kinds of charitable or philanthropic efforts, and your work produces concrete, tangible results that indicate that you can carry out a job of this importance. The reality is that these nominations are some of the most important judgments we make as a Senate. The people we put in these offices are going to make literally trillions of dollars in spending. They are going to enforce laws that in some instances are decades old and, at a minimum, update the ones that need updating.

I can tell you that what I heard again this weekend in rural Oregon indicates that the people I have the honor to represent do not believe Betsy DeVos is up for the job. So this morning, I stand up for kids, parents, and families who deserve education policies that will let them go after their dreams and secure their future. I believe they deserve better. I believe Betsy DeVos is going to make it harder for working families to achieve those aspirations. That is why I will vote this morning against the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be Secretary of Education. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from the State of Oregon for his detailed, lengthy, and compelling remarks on the floor this morning about why he will vote against Betsy DeVos for Secretary of Education for the United States. You have heard from my colleagues last night, this morning, and for an entire day the concerns they have come away with from her confirmation hearing and the concerns they heard from their home State and from educators and parents, teachers, and administrators—all concerned about education in their home State.

I am honored this morning to add my few brief words this morning to explain to my constituents and to everyone in this Chamber why I, too, believe that Betsy DeVos is not qualified to serve as Secretary of Education of the United States. I ask the question for any parent out there is this: Why would a parent want a classroom teacher who wasn’t qualified to stand before that class and teach their children? Why would any community leader, civic leader, parent, or educator want an Education Secretary who hadn’t taught in the school building, to lead instruction, and to make sure that the school was moving forward in a good and positive way? The answer is that they wouldn’t. Why would any parent, why would any business leader, why would any legislator want a superintendent for a school district who had no previous experience in public education and whose agenda was well outside the mainstream in education? The answer is they wouldn’t. The answer is that they wouldn’t.

So I think the question before us in the Senate today is, Why would any of us want, support, or vote for a nominee to be Secretary of Education who has demonstrated a lack of grasp for the basics of education, which makes her, obviously, unqualified? The answer is, I don’t. We don’t. We shouldn’t.

As we saw during her abbreviated Senate hearing, Mrs. DeVos has no grasp of basic public education issues. She has zero direct experience. She has zero direct experience. She hasn’t taught in the public schools. She hasn’t sent her kids to public schools. She hasn’t been educated or trained in teaching in the public schools. She doesn’t seem to understand, for example, that Federal law provides basic protections for students with disabilities. It has no idea what the IDEA is and why it is a central part of protecting, supporting, and serving students with intellectual disabilities. She refused to rule out privatizing public education and the divestiture of the hopes and dreams of parents and students who are seeking progress, and it ends up undermining and defunding and devaluing traditional public schools all across our country.

As my colleagues, my friend from the State of Washington, and many others have pointed out, there are serious concerns with how Republicans have considered her nomination. Mrs. DeVos was rushed into her confirmation hearing before she had submitted the basic and appropriate ethics paperwork, meaning Senators had no way of clearing her from potential conflicts of interest.
Traditionally, this has not been much of a concern, since we have often had Secretaries of Education with long public careers who had been subject to some transparency and some review previously. I cannot remember a time when we had a Secretary of Education who had a billion-dollar stake to those to whom we are entrusting them. I am concerned that it may lead to much broader potential conflicts of interest. I frankly cannot remember a time when we had a President who was a billionaire and declined—refused to release his taxes or to address his many areas of interest.

So, frankly, the fact that the Senate HELP Committee raced forward without addressing some of these basic issues is more concerning in this context than at any previous time. As the members of this committee, who represent a broad range of views and experiences—and it is exactly what the Senate is for—were limited to one round of 5 minutes for questions, hardly suitable for the key nominee, let alone a controversial nominee with no public education experience other than undermining the underpinnings of the public school system, we can only conclude that there was something behind this effort to push Mrs. DeVos forward.

We have seen here on the floor, she has become so unpopular that the other party has had to delay the confirmation vote in order to ensure her confirmation. It is my guess that later this morning, we will see the President of the Senate cast the deciding vote, something that although not unprecedented, is certainly unusual and suggests that other Senators have heard from their States, as I have from mine, a chorus of opposition.

In her confirmation hearing, Mrs. DeVos struggled to articulate basic concepts central to current debates in public education. In trying to identify and reconcile the simple concepts of growth and proficiency, she showed neither growth nor proficiency. She showed neither a grasp of the basics, nor an ability to learn, nor a mastery of simple concepts central to how we make progress in public education.

You know in the Senate, the Congress in recent years, after years of disagreement and fighting with the Every Student Succeeds Act, we had reached a modicum of agreement. We had reached a point of equilibrium and had hopefully turned to a point where we could move forward in a balanced and balanced way on some of the pressing issues in higher education, in elementary education, in career and technical education.

Instead, we are one of the more radical nominees ever for Secretary of Education, someone who brings, I am afraid, an agenda, a strong and forceful agenda that if it is continued nationally, as it was in Michigan, I am concerned predicts a difficult future even for those who are most in need of support, of engagement, of quality schools.

Even those who Mrs. DeVos claims to have dedicated her education activism to advancing I think will be deeply harmed. None of these reasons that I just laid out about the timing, about the length of the hearing, about the disclosures, about her performance in the confirmation hearing, none of them would, necessarily taken alone, be cause enough to hold back her confirmation, but taken in combination, they are fundamentally disqualifying.

Don’t take my word for it. I am on five different committees. I have lots of other confirmations I am challenged to be expedited in. I have other issues going on that have made it hard for me to attend every single meeting and hearing about Mrs. DeVos, but there are folks in my home State of Delaware who have watched every minute, who have followed it very closely, and who have, in an unprecedented wave of input, reached out to my office.

Now, these numbers, if I were from a State like California or Texas or New York, might not seem striking, but coming from a Senator who represents constituencies, the idea that more than 3,000 Delawareans have reached out to me urgently and directly is fairly striking. I have gotten more than 450 phone calls in opposition to Mrs. DeVos. My office has received a signed petition with 800 signatures from Delawareans asking me, urging me to vote no. Someone buttonholed me, literally, on the train this morning to make certain that I was going to vote no. Mrs. DeVos, you and I represent communities who have followed it very closely, and at least 2,200 letters from Delawareans, letters from educators, from parents, from community and civic leaders, of all different backgrounds, all up and down my State.

Those 2,200 letters make this one of the top issues that Delawareans have reached out to me on in this past year. As I said, that may not sound like a lot of input if I were from California, New York, Oklahoma, Washington State—3,000 letters from Delaware, but even in my State, that is a loud and clear message. So let me be just as loud and clear in my reply. I hear you, and I will today vote against Betsy DeVos for Secretary of Education. Let me take a minute and share with you some of the concerns I have heard from Delawareans, constituents who followed her confirmation hearing closely, who followed the record of its progress from committee to floor closely and who raised the alarm and who shared that with me.

One educator, a career teacher, somebody who is very agitated about the record she showed in Michigan and what it might mean for our State of Delaware, said—concisely: Why should we vote no? She received a letter from a parent in her school district which siphon dollars off from public schools. She does not have a degree in education, has no experience in public education, and has not shown a willingness to listen to and learn from practitioners and experts in the field.

Cheri is exactly right. Our kids deserve better. That is why, when it comes to Betsy DeVos’s nomination to serve as Secretary of Education, I am not just voting no. I am voting no way.

It is important to me that everybody here knows that my constituents in my State have spoken with nearly a unanimous voice. A very, very few have conveyed any support whatsoever for Mrs. DeVos, and an overwhelming voice of thousands have expressed concern, agitation, even alarm at the idea that this person, with this record, would be handed the reins of the Federal Department of Education with likely disastrous results.

For this most foundational experiment, that is at the core of American democracy, that is essential to our being a country where equality of opportunity, the freedom to pursue our own skills and gifts and have them enlightened, educated, uplifted is at the very core of what it means to be American—public schools in which any child of any background has a free and fair opportunity to pursue their God-given talents and to rise through our society and contribute at the highest levels—is not something to be played with, isn’t something to be experimented with casually.

It is something to be taken deeply seriously. We have challenges in our public schools. We have challenges in our society. They are reflected in our schools, but if our schools are not strong, if our schools are not educating our children, we have no hope of becoming a more just, a more equal, a more constructive, a more coherent, and a more inspiring society.
Our public schools are the very foundation of what it means to be American. To put in charge of our Department of Education someone who does not share that view pains me deeply, concerns my constituents, and alarms many of us who have spent year after year working to improve, and to advance public education in the United States.

For all these reasons, it is my intention to vote no; in fact, no way today on Mrs. DeVos.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss why I do not think Betsy DeVos is the right person for this very important job.

As you know, I have been a long and proud supporter of our education system. I have supported public, charter, private, and magnet schools across the great State of California. I have always supported a parent’s right to choose the right school for his or her child, and I have always believed that different models of schools provide students with more individualized experiences that are tailored to meet their needs and how they best learn and are enabled to succeed.

While Mrs. DeVos is also a proponent of school choice, I believe we have very different philosophies on this issue. Personally, I can only support schools when there is accountability. Schools should be accredited, well managed with proper fiscal controls, and transparent in regard to student performance for all of the students they serve. We owe it to our parents and students to protect their right to access a high quality education. We owe it to our teachers to provide them with the resources and leadership they need to become master educators.

Mrs. DeVos has never worked in the classroom or as a school administrator, and during the Senate committee hearing on her nomination, she clearly showed she does not have a firm grasp of basic tenets of education policy or program implementation. Mrs. DeVos and her family have been longtime donors to efforts to expand unregulated school choice. Their financial efforts prevented accountability efforts to go into effect that would have provided regulation over the proliferation of the for-profit charter schools throughout Michigan.

Additionally, I found it troubling that, during Mrs. DeVos’s confirmation hearing before the Senate Health Education, and Pensions Committee, she testified that she would support the repeal of the Gun Free School Zones Act, which bans guns in schools. Mrs. DeVos cited the deadly bears in Wyoming as one legitimate reason why guns should be allowed in schools; yet the vast majority of our Nation’s schools face zero threat of an attack from grizzly bears that would justify the risk of allowing guns on their premises.

Throughout my career, I have been a strong supporter of gun free school zones. And educators, parents, and students—who are all directly affected by this law—support gun free school zones. I find it problematic that Mrs. DeVos makes light of this issue and would go along with the President’s opinion on this issue, considering we had 15 school shootings throughout 2016.

The Secretary of Education serves in a very important role. The Secretary ensures that all of our Nation’s students have equitable access to a high quality education. They ensure that students’ civil rights are protected under Federal law and that schools are held accountable for the performance of all students regardless of socioeconomic status, language barrier or disability.

My colleagues and I have an opportunity to stand up for our children by opposing Betsy DeVos and demand that the President put forward a highly qualified candidate that can best serve our students, parents, and teachers in this important role.

I would also like to mention that I have heard from over 96,000 of my constituents, whether they left comments on a letter or wrote me a letter, explaining why Mrs. DeVos was an unacceptable candidate for Secretary of Education. I heard you all loud and clear, and I want you to know that I am here to serve you, and I will continue to be your voice.

Thank you.

Mr. COONS. 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.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, again, I am on the floor, and I want to thank all of the folks, the clerks and everyone who has been here throughout the last 20 hours. I thank everyone for speaking from their hearts about the issue of public education, why it is so important to them, and why they want a Secretary of Education who has that value and promotes that value and has the vision of that value, which is really why so many people in this country have spoken out and sent us letters and held rallies and inundated our phones.

And I thank all of the people who have done that. It has made an impact here and has made a difference. I think it has woken up each one of us to what we care about in this country and what we value and what we want.

Like many people, I received so many letters from my constituents, over 48,000 letters. That is just the letters—not phone calls—that I got, and I want to share some of them with you because they come from people’s hearts. They are not form letters. They are not written by me from somebody else and forwarded. These are personal. And I think it is important that we hear these people.

I thank Marie Carlsen from Federal Way. She sent me a letter, and she said:

Dear Senator Murray,

Thank you for your continuing efforts at trying to prevent Betsy DeVos from becoming head of the Education. I have a child who has just started his schooling in our public school system, and from everything I have read or listened to about this woman, I have no business in education at all. She has no knowledge of the laws and protections guaranteed to our children, no comprehension of what our education system is about. She would have on a daily basis, and would regress, gut, and otherwise destroy our educational system if she were allowed to become head of the Department. I fear for my child’s education, his safety, and his ability to compete in a global community in the future. I stand with you and thank you again for your efforts.

I thank Marie for writing in. Like so many people across the country, she watched the hearing Mrs. DeVos came to where she spoke to our committee. We were only allowed 5 minutes each, which I really regret because I think it is important that we see who is going to lead this department. And why their inability to ask her questions with full information really gave just a shallow picture of who she was. But like many people, my constituents and those across the country watched and were just shocked that somebody who had been nominated to head the Department of Education had such little experience and knowledge and understanding of the agency they had been tapped to lead.

I heard from Ms. Ina Howell in Seattle. She wrote to me, and she said:

I am writing to express opposition to the nomination of Mrs. Betsy DeVos as Education Secretary. Mrs. DeVos does not have any experience in the field of education and, as a result, will not effectively lead the Department of Education in maintaining and improving public education in the country. She did not seem to possess a basic understanding of key education policies, including the responsibilities of the IDEA Act.

She did not understand the difference between student proficiency and student growth measures. She did not understand simple facts and figures, like the percent increase in student debt from 2008 to 2016. She failed to adequately answer questions on equal protection for LGBT students and their civil rights, confronting campus sexual assault and the regulation of the for-profit higher education industry.

This is Ms. Ina Howell—she happens to be with the National Alliance of Black School Educators—expressing deep concerns that the nominee doesn’t have the basic issues and knowledge that she should have in running this agency that is so important to the nation, which is so important as the leading spokesperson in the country.

I heard from Dana Hayden from Poulsbo, WA, and she said:

Dear Senator Patty Murray,

I have been an educator in our State since 1981. I have seen your positive efforts for the citizens of WA firsthand.

Last night, we found out that our family will be welcoming our first grandchild in July—a girl. I am so joyous, yet quite worried about the world she is coming into.
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Then I saw you on the news. You give me hope! Thank you! I wonder what kind of school experience the next generation will have if DeVos is allowed to decimate our education system, the way Trump is decimating our Nation with orders.

These are people who have not written in before. They are writing long letters, many on them pages long, speaking from their hearts about the value of public education, what it means to them and their grandchildren. They know this country was built on a system of public education that ensured every child would be provided for in their communities. To go so that they could have the opportunity their parents and grandparents and great-grandparents had.

I could read through so many of these. Here is one from Miles Erdly from Kent, WA. He says:

My name is Miles Erdly, and I am the principal of Horizon Elementary in Kent. As a strong supporter of public education, I ask that you vehemently oppose the confirmation of Betsy DeVos as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education. Educators and students deserve a Secretary who can commit to supporting every student in all public schools, who will work tirelessly to promote a public education system that provides each child with the optimum conditions for teaching and learning. Betsy DeVos’s past work in education and her performance at the recent confirmation hearing demonstrated neither a depth of experience nor knowledge of education policy and on critical issues facing the community. As a principal, I have spoken with teachers, parents, students, and community members across the spectrum, and there is widespread agreement that Betsy DeVos is not the right person for the job. This is Miles Erdly, a principal, and he watched the hearings, like so many people did, and was so concerned that we had in front of us a nominee for the Secretary of Education who didn’t share that core value of public education for all students.

Ms. Gabrielle Gersten from Seattle, WA: As a college student, the idea of Betsy DeVos becoming the Secretary of Education concerns me for multiple reasons. She obviously has been fortunate enough to go through school and a higher education with- out a worry about money, but that is not the case for most college students. I, myself, am lucky enough that my mom saved money for me to attend college, but many of my friends are working on their own to pay for college education themselves. Also, her zeroing the funds for title I is worrisome because every State should be held to the same standard to give children in poverty access to an education. An educated nation is a stronger nation. Not everyone can afford to go to private schools to have the opportunity to attend one, whether that be the money or even finding a way to get to school. She has goals, but they are not as easy to achieve for everyone, and I don’t think she keeps that in mind.

Additionally, title IX is very important to me, as a female college student, and the rest of us. It is to support title IX and keep universities accountable to it.

Mr. President, I couldn’t agree more. Title IX is critically important in our higher education system. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to ensure that title IX is enforced. And to have a nominee for Secretary of Education who came before our committee, did not understand title IX, didn’t have a commitment to title IX, sends shock waves throughout the country, and their parents who have pushed and pushed for us to make sure that title IX is overseen in a way that makes sure our students at schools have the support they need from our highest education person in this country.

I could go on forever. I know several other Senators are going to be here on the floor shortly. Let me just say this: I have had the opportunity to be out hearing the floor to hear from so many Senators who gave their personal stories about what education meant to them. Young people growing up in poverty knew that school was there for them. They knew they had teachers who were there for them. Not everyone was perfect. Certainly not every school is perfect. Certainly all of us who have been involved in public education strive for better every day, but that school was there for them.

The thought that we have a Secretary of Education nominee who doesn’t share that basic value, who wants to change the system to privatize it—she has said herself that she wants to end public education. Privatizing schools, having some kind of corporation running our schools, is just not what our country is about, is not what we want. We are not even learning in that direction. They want our country to lean in the other direction—to strengthen all of our public schools, to have taxpayers across the country investing in every student, and that those schools be held accountable and that we have representatives to hold them accountable. That is not the vision that this nominee has presented to us, and it is a vision that I have worked passionately on through all of my life, and really that is why I am here to object.

I want to thank everybody who has written in and called and been passionate about public education in this country, and I encourage them to keep using their voices to fight for that passion. It is well worth the fight. With that, 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. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, “Now is the time to put country before party.” That was an observation by the Democrat—he or, just yesterday, the Senate floor. One friend from New York makes a good point, and I am hopeful it is a principle his own caucus will follow in the days to come.

We are no longer in the midst of a contentious Presidential election. We have a new President, and that President has now put forth an exceptional Supreme Court nominee and a number of well-qualified Cabinet nominees. Yet, more than 2 weeks into his term, President Trump’s Cabinet Secretaries confirmed at this point than any other President since George Washington.

The President deserves to have his Cabinet in place. The American people deserve that as well. I would remind our Democratic colleagues of the things they themselves have said when the shoe was on the other foot.

Here is what their last Vice Presidential candidate, our colleague from Virginia, had to say: “I think we owe deference to a President for choices to executive positions.” So yes, “Now is the time,” as the Democratic leader said, “to put country before party.”

One way to do so is by ending the unprecedented delay shown by Democrats on the President’s Cabinet appointments. Our colleagues will have an opportunity to chart a different path later this afternoon and the rest of the week as we vote to confirm more nominees.

This afternoon we will vote on the President’s nominee for Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos. I look forward to confirming her to this important position so that she can get to work on behalf of America’s students and schools.

As I said yesterday, this well-qualified candidate has earned the support of several education groups and nearly two dozen Governors from across the Nation. She understands that teachers, students, parents, school boards, and State and local governments, not Washington bureaucrats, are best suited to make education decisions for our kids. And I know she is committed to improving our education so that every child—every child—has a brighter future.

After we confirm Mrs. DeVos, the Senate will turn to another well-qualified Cabinet nominee, our own colleague, Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama. We all know Senator Sessions, and we know him to be a man of his word. We know he is a man who believes in the rule of law. We know him as someone who is willing to work with anyone, regardless of party, as he did when he teamed up on legislation with Democratic colleagues such as Senator Durbin and our late colleague, Ted Kennedy.

I would remind Democratic colleagues that Republicans did not filibuster when a newly elected President Obama put forward his own Attorney General nominee, Eric Holder. In fact, the nominee who will soon be before us, Senator Sessions, crossed the aisle to support Eric Holder. This, despite the fact that the Holder nomination from the Republican conference here in the Senate was one steeped in considerable controversy.
What a contrast with the way the Democrats are now treating our colleague's own nomination now. They are looking to waste even more time for its own sake today. It has been unfortunate to hear the attacks that some on the far left have directed at our friend over the course of 4 days. Greatly disappointed that the American people have had the opportunity to learn the truth about Senator Sessions and to see for themselves how qualified he is to lead the Justice Department.

We support her. In Senator Sessions in his new role will continue fighting to protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans as he also defends the safety and security of our Nation.

Tomorrow I will have more to say about Senator Sessions and the impact that he has had on each of us here in the Senate, but for now, I would encourage colleagues to finally come together and show him and each of the remaining nominees the fair consideration they deserve.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeds to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just listened to my friend the majority leader and the majority whip on the floor. They are able legislators, but they are sort of misleading the public as to our motivation. They have tried to paint every Democratic request as somehow—was put in the awkward position of having to rush through a nominee, 5 minutes of questions, that is it, for each Senator; 5 minutes at night, no second rounds. There was no rationale for that, other than he was afraid of what, and what he said wasn't true. Sure enough, when she testified, those fears were actualized because Betsy DeVos couldn't answer the most fundamental questions about public education.

She couldn't get her paperwork in on time. What kind of nominee is that? How is someone who is going to run the Department of Education, with tens of thousands of employees, unable to get her paperwork submitted in enough time to clear the ethics organizations? How was she unable to get her paperwork in on time? Every nominee of President Obama's did, and we didn't hear from them until they did.

The rush; a few extra days, some hours last; certainly examine a nominee who has tremendous power over the future of millions of American kids and their families—oh, no. If anything, we should be spending more time on Betsy DeVos, not less. What should be happening is she should go back for a second hearing now that her paperwork is in. What should happen is she should be asked more questions because she was so unable to answer so many rudiments last time. What should happen is, there should be more time, not less, on debating this nominee, not because we want to be dilatory but because we want a nominee who at least meets some basic tests, and she does not.

That is why every Democrat will be voting against her, and two Republicans, who showed tremendous courage. Again, I have been around here a while. I know the pressures. That is why I have such respect for the Senators from Alaska and Maine who voted against Betsy DeVos not for political considerations, not in frustration that they lost the election but because they knew how bad she would be for public education because their States are largely rural. In rural America, there is not much choice, which has been Betsy Devos's watchword, although the charter schools she set up have been, by and large, a failure. They are fighting that choice. Someone who decimates public education, is not good for their State and, I would dare say, is not good for the States of a lot of Senators on the other side of the aisle who feel compelled—that party loyalty—to look out for the interests of the party. When we talk about parties demanding things, it is the Republican side demanding a vote for an unqualified candidate, not the Democrats delaying the vote.

I hope against hope that another Republican will have the courage of the Senators from Alaska and Maine and join us. Then what can happen is the President will get to make the nomination. We Democrats are not going to pick the Secretary of Education, but it will be a qualified nominee because they will have learned their lesson at the White House that they can't brush through these nominations with such little vetting.

Nomination of Jeff Sessions: Mr. President, now I would like to say a word—we will be saying more later—on Senator Sessions, who will be coming forward after we vote on Mrs. DeVos at noon today.

The nominee for Attorney General has the importance that the nominee would have had 3 or 4 weeks ago. We need a lot of discussion on that. What we have seen is a President who bullies judges when they don't agree with him. What we have seen is a President who is willing to shake the roots of the Constitution and a fundamental premise—no religious test—that is embodied within our Constitution within his first few weeks in office.

Certainly we need an Attorney General who will stand up to the President. We have seen other Attorneys General do it, most notably in the Clinton administration. Senator Sessions—I ride with him on the bike in the gym—is not—if you can say one thing about him, he is not independent of Donald Trump.

He supported Donald Trump from the very beginning. Even when Donald Trump didn't look like he was going to win the nomination, he had to pick someone who would not stand up to a President when the President goes too far—well, let's put it the other way. If you had to pick someone who would stand up to a President when the President goes too far on picking on the judiciary, on avoiding the tenants, breaking the tenants of the Constitution, whatever the legal case shows, you wouldn't pick Jeff Sessions.

His record is clearly troubling. We will hear a lot more about it later. He is probably the most anti-immigrant Member of this body, Democrat or Republican. And many of us on this side believe that immigrants are an asset to
America, not a liability. Many on the other side of the aisle probably do too. When it comes to voting rights—so important, so fundamental, and under attack right now—again, Jeff Sessions has not been a stalwart. He has had a record that leaves much to be desired. On issues of civil rights as well, Senator Sessions' record is not a record that I think anyone who believes in civil rights could admire. We just had an acting Attorney General stand up to the President. That is what you do in this administration, because there seems so little regard for an independent judiciary and even for the Constitution itself. That is probably the most important quality of this new Attorney General. I have to say, as much as I agree with Jeff Sessions on an issue like trade, he is the wrong, wrong, wrong choice for Attorney General. He would be at any time because of his record on immigration, civil rights, and voting rights, but particularly now because so many Democrats are someone who has some degree of independence from the President. I am going to yield the floor. I hope one of our Republican colleagues will step up to the plate in a few hours, but even if we do, we Democrats are very proud of what we have done here because the nominee is so unqualified and the American people now know it. That is an important tenet of this democracy, for the public to understand who runs this government. I hope my colleagues will listen to our arguments for the sake of America—not for any partisan sake—about the Attorney General in these very troubled times when it comes to the independent judiciary and the Constitution of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me first of all begin by thanking Senator Murray for her leadership in terms of leading us to scrutinize this nominee, Betsy DeVos. It seems to me the more we dig into this, the more we look at it, the worse it gets. So I rise in strong opposition to the confirmation of Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education.

Mrs. DeVos is nominated to lead our Nation's public education system. Yet she has worked for decades to privatize it and even to create profitmaking centers. She is siphon public funds to private schools. She has led a multi-million-dollar lobbying campaign to fund private, religious, and for-profit schools with public education dollars.

We can all agree that we want our Nation's schools to be the very best they can be. We want our children to have all the opportunities we can provide, but that really is the issue. That is why Democrats have held the floor all night long to do everything in our power to convince the Senate to reject this nominee.

I believe in the public school system. I want all of our children to have opportunities. That is the fundamental principle of our American school system. Everyone should be able to get a great education.

Mrs. DeVos wants to dismantle our public schools. She would drain resources from the children and teachers who do so much to be desired. On issues of civil rights as well, Senator Sessions' record is not a record that I think anyone who believes in civil rights could admire.

Senator HASSAN asked if Mrs. DeVos would require schools using vouchers to comply with that law. Mrs. DeVos initially responded that she believes the decision should be left to the States. When Mrs. DeVos was informed that it is Federal law, that it is not up to the States to determine, she must have been “confused.” Confused? Mrs. DeVos bragged that she has been an education advocate for 30 years. The IDEA was passed over 25 years ago, in 1990. Mrs. DeVos was not “confused.”

It is strongly troubling that Mrs. DeVos did not know that children with disabilities can lose their Federal right to an equal education under State voucher programs—voucher programs that have been rampant for years. She did not know that voucher programs can require students with disabilities to sign away their IDEA rights. Most troubling of all, she would not commit to making sure voucher programs comply with the law.

I am also quite concerned that Mrs. DeVos fails to appreciate the important role that tribal cultures play in educating Native American children. This Nation has a solemn trust and treaty responsibility to provide quality education to Native students, both through the public school system and the Federal Bureau of Indian Education. Her testimony has proven that she is uneducated about these students and their needs.

Many States have significant tribal populations. In my home State of New Mexico it is about 10 percent. As vice chair of the Indian Affairs Committee, my job is to make sure that any Education Secretary is committed to respecting tribal sovereignty and self-determination. Mrs. DeVos has given me no assurance she understands, cares about, or is prepared to address the needs of Native American students.

Valerie Siow, who has taught in public schools in New Mexico for 13 years, observed that Mrs. DeVos “had not bothered to do her homework” for the hearing. It is clear that Mrs. DeVos does not have the breadth or depth in education policy or finance to be the Secretary of Education.

Senator HASSAN has a son who has cerebral palsy. She told us a moving story about the good education he received in the New Hampshire public schools, despite his disability, because of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or the IDEA.
tribally-run school system and to a system that does not require consultation and does not require active engagement of Native communities.” I couldn’t agree more. She just shows a basic lack of understanding of tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Before she was driven by her personal religious views. I respect the strength of her Dutch Calvinist religious beliefs, but imposing her religious beliefs should have no place in funding public education, which serves children of all beliefs.

In 2001, she talked about whether Christian schools should continue relying on contributions instead of vouchers. Mrs. DeVos said:

There are not enough philanthropic dollars in America to fund what is currently the need in education. . . . Our desire is to confront the culture in ways that will continue to advance God’s kingdom.

I support her right to devote her philanthropy to her church and other religious efforts, but I oppose her view of using public dollars to advance her view of “God’s kingdom” in public schools. Separation of church and State is a fundamental principal in our democracy. I want to protecting and upholding the constitutional rights of all children to public education. This is absolute, totally, unqualified. This is extremely troubling on so many levels.

We need assurance that every public school student—no matter their religion, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation or identity, ability or disability—will be respected, protected, and included at the highest levels in Washington, DC. That is the job of the Secretary of Education. Mrs. DeVos has not shown over the many decades she has been involved in education that she agrees with this basic proposition.

I respect Mrs. DeVos’s views on public education and magnet school options available. There are many great public charter and magnet schools around the country. We have some good ones in New Mexico. But these public schools should meet the same accountability standards as other public schools—standards for student achievement, teacher performance, and fiscal responsibility.

I also support the option of private and religious schools. We have a great private religious school in our country. But public dollars must go to public schools, not private or religious schools, and certainly not private for-profit schools. The first objective of any for-profit venture is to make money. That cannot be the first objective of a school using public funds.

The first and foremost objective of public education funds should be education for students. When public dollars are used, their use must be fully accounted for and transparent to the public. Betsy DeVos should not commit that private for-profit charter schools and voucher schools should have the same accountability standards as public schools. Why didn’t she make this commitment? Likely, because the private charter schools in Michigan, funded by public dollars—that she has championed for decades—do not have to meet the same accountability standards as public schools. This is wrong. These schools have not shown appreciable gains in Michigan over the years. In fact, Michigan test scores have gone down over time. These schools have not shown significant improvement over public schools.

Finally, I am not convinced that Mrs. DeVos has been transparent in her responses to the American public. She did not make her disclosures available to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee at the time of her confirmation hearing—this is unprecedented—and the committee had no opportunity to look into her many, many conflicts.

Since then, she has entered into an agreement with the Office of Government Ethics. While she will divest from approximately 100 investments that pose a conflict, we do not know if she has divested from all conflicts. Mrs. DeVos benefits from three trusts. She has not disclosed the assets in two of those trusts.

The complexity and enormity of Mrs. DeVos’s $5 billion holdings is mind-boggling. We know that from one trust at least 100 conflicts required divestment. That is a large number of conflicts with the public. The public does not know if she has any more conflicts.

I also want to raise the issue of Mrs. DeVos’s unwillingness to address her PAC’s unpaid $5.3 million fine in the State of Ohio for violating campaign finance laws. This situation is troubling on a number of levels. First, Mrs. DeVos led a multimillion dollar political effort to influence elections throughout our Nation. Second, while doing so, Mrs. DeVos’s political action committee willfully ignored campaign finance laws and warnings from State election officials. She racked up an unprecedented $5.3 million fine in Ohio. Then, third, rather than acknowledging that she broke the law and owning up to her responsibility to pay it, her PAC simply folded up shop and walked away.

As Secretary of Education, Mrs. DeVos will be responsible for overseeing the loans for millions of students. Yet she refuses to acknowledge or pay her own debts. Does she believe the law doesn’t apply to her?

I have written to Mrs. DeVos and the HELP Committee several times demanding answers about this. Her response was evasive. She refuses to pay the fine—hiding behind the corporate veil—while still paying lawyers to fight it. This is hypocrisy, on top of disregard for the law.

We have a Cabinet nominee who led a dark money PAC, which broke the law and flouted the judicial system. This is absolutely, totally, unprecedented.

For all these reasons, I must vote no on the confirmation of Mrs. DeVos as Secretary of the Department of Education.

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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it is pretty clear. It is pretty simple. There never has been a nominee for Secretary of Education as unqualified as Betsy DeVos. That is clear to pretty much every Member of this body—not that every Member of this body is going to stand up and vote the way that probably their conscience suggests they do. Whether they like her ideology or not, whether they like the millions of dollars they have contributed to all kinds of political campaigns or not, they clearly understand that this nominee, from her performance and her lack of depth of knowledge of education, is simply not qualified.

I think that when I first ran for Congress some years ago—I assume it was the same for the Presiding Officer; I know it was the same for the ranking member from Washington State who sits here in this Chamber and who has led the opposition to Betsy DeVos—from my first days in Congress, every time I met with school administrators, with principals, they would talk to me about IDEA. They would talk to me about school districts and the costs and their obligation and duty and desire to serve these students. Yet the designee for Secretary of Education put her hands up when there were discussions in the committee on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

It is astonishing that a nominee for Secretary of Education would demonstrate complete ignorance on something as crucial and important to public school education—to education as a whole—on this. It isn’t her hearing performance alone that should disqualify her; it is her record. She has no experience with public schools at all.

The President of the United States has nominated for Secretary of Education someone with no experience in public schools at all—not as a teacher, not as an administrator, not as a student, not even as a parent. Nothing. Her only experience in education is as
a wealthy donor inheriting tens of millions of dollars herself. Her only experience in education is as a wealthy donor who spent millions of dollars advocating for for-profit—not charter schools like KIPP and Breakthrough in my State—but for-profit charters in her State. She has left a trail of unpaid fines, failed students, and underfunded programs. It betrays students, and it undermines and flees taxpayers.

It is obvious that if she and her family hadn’t donated $200 million to Republican and conservative causes, there is no chance someone this unqualified would ever have been nominated for a position as exalted, as crucial, as important as Secretary of Education. Two hundred million dollars apparently is the price for the Cabinet slot.

So much for the President’s campaign promise of draining the swamp. We see nominee after nominee, appointee after appointee coming from Wall Street. Now we see a $200 million contributor has also earned a Cabinet slot.

Because of her crusade, more than 80 percent of Michigan’s charter schools are operated for profit. She helped design and push ineffective for-profit charter school systems in the country in Detroit. This matters to me because I know a lot about what has happened with for-profit charter schools in Ohio. For-profit charters have failed in Ohio. They have led the charter school sector in Ohio. Again, taking out KIPP and Breakthrough and the good charters that we have seen in Ohio, we have seen a charter school sector that has wasted taxpayers’ money, that has funneled it to unaccountable for-profit companies, and that have been plagued by scandal after scandal.

I take that personally in Ohio because I know how students have been betrayed by this for-profit sector, I know how taxpayers have been fleeced in my State in this for-profit sector, and I know the devastation it leaves behind in less money, fewer dollars for public schools.

People call my State, regrettably, the “Wild Wild West of charter schools.” What a name to earn—Ohio is the “Wild Wild West” of for-profit charter schools. Students suffer as a result. Students in public schools, students in for-profit charter schools, and students in not-for-profit charter schools all suffer as a result. That is one thing we need to do is take the Wild West model in Ohio or, even worse, the for-profit charter school structure and model in Michigan and replicate it at a national level.

This is important to remember: Of all the K–12 students in the country, public schools educate 90 percent of them, 90 percent of the students in this country. Betsy DeVos called traditional public education a “dead end.” Dead end for whom? She called traditional public education a “dead end.”

Think of what we have done in this country. From 1789, when George Wash-ington took the oath of office, up until now, public education has built this country. It has given all kinds of people opportunity, given all kinds of people a chance to get ahead. It has educated our children. We should be proud of our public school system.

We must vote today on a nominee who called a traditional public education a “dead end,” someone who has never worked in a public school, never gone to a public school, never been a parent of somebody in a public school.

She said she doesn’t think that all schools that receive taxpayer dollars—whether they are public or for-profit charter—should be held to the same standards of accountability. To me, one of the most telling moments of the committee hearing was when she would not commit to the same accountability standards for for-profit charters as she did for public schools. Do you know why? Because she knows her for-profit charters that she is so proud of don’t live up to the same standards and that they are simply not as good. That is why she doesn’t want accountability measures applied equally to for-profit charters and public schools.

In Michigan, she fought a rescue plan for Detroit Public Schools that would have finally provided accountability for charter schools. No. She is against that. Why? There are lower standards for for-profit charters, and she knows that is because—I don’t know about her investments. I don’t think she has disclosed everything to the committee, but neither did Secretary-Designee Mnuchin. Neither did Secretary-Designee Price. I can go on and on. She doesn’t want the same accountability for profit charters because it might hurt some of her investor friends.

She funneled $25,000—mostly inherited money—every day to legislators of Michigan until this accountability proposal was defeated. It was probably not $25,000 every day, but over time it averaged $25,000 a day to legislators in Michigan so she could have her way. Talk about draining the swamp. Yet she can’t seem to come up with—this I take personally too—the $5 million she owes to Ohio taxpayers for violating State election laws. What is that about? She came into Ohio with a political action committee. She said she would pay the legal fees for it, but she wouldn’t pay the fine that this committee owes, saying: I don’t owe it.

Is that who you want? Is that the kind of person you want in terms of personal integrity, personal responsibility? I don’t know how many times I have been preached at in this body by my colleagues on personal responsibility. But she will not pay her $5 million debt. Again, she founded a political action committee. She chaired it at the time it broke the law, she paid the legal bills for it, but she wouldn’t pay the fine that this committee owes, saying: I don’t owe it.

Most people in this country used to think that billionaires are not above the law. In fact, some people—3 million fewer than voted for the other candidate—some people voted for this President because he said he would drain the swamp. If billionaires are, in fact, above the law—if we are not holding Betsy DeVos accountable, it is hard to believe that billionaires are not above the law.

She is opposed by the disability community. She is opposed by the civil rights community. She is opposed by a number of people in the more liberal charter school community. She is opposed by teachers. Even the National Association of Principals has come out against her nomination. If Senator MURRAY’S words are correct about this—and I know they are because we have talked to them—this is the first time in history that the National Association of Principals has come out against a Secretary of Education.
I can't support Betsy DeVos because I can't look Ohio’s parents in the eye and tell them she will not put profits ahead of their children's education. Our children deserve better than that.

In closing, I will come back to my constituents. Ohio has Tribal Education Disparities Education Act, about which she knew nothing or knew little. I think how could a Secretary of Education-designate, who prides herself on knowing a lot about education, how could she not know much about IDEA? And then it occurred to me. If you are running a for-profit charter school, you don’t want disabled kids coming to your school. Why? Because it costs more to educate a disabled child than it does a child without any disabilities. It costs more because you might need more use of a nurse, a student aide, wheelchair accessibility, you might need special tutors. It costs more to educate a disabled child. A for-profit charter school doesn’t want disabled kids with disabilities to walk through their doors or come in through a wheelchair through their doors. They can’t make as much money.

This is how we do privatization in this country: Let the public schools take care of the disabled, the child with disabilities, because we are in this for profit. It is a little bit like Medicare. The private for-profit insurance companies want the youngest, healthiest part of Medicare, the 65- and 76 year-olds who are active, who take walks, do all that. They don’t really want the sickest and the oldest. Let taxpayers pay for them. That is exactly what her model of education is all about. Let the for-profit charters skim the cream, if you will; take the children who cost the least and are easiest to educate, but the public schools take care of the children with disabilities.

Let the public schools take care of the children who maybe didn’t have as much advantage in life as Betsy DeVos growing up. Let the public schools worry about kids who might have a little more difficult because of discipline and other issues and what is going on in their homes. That is pretty clear how she looks at the world and looks at this job and, most importantly, how she looks at education in our country.

That is what disturbs me. That is fundamentally why I oppose Betsy DeVos and plan to vote emphatically today, no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his passionate remarks on this topic. I have had the opportunity over most of Friday and over the last 23 hours, to listen to my colleagues come to the floor and speak passionately about an issue they care about, speaking against DeVos. I have had the opportunity of speaking for Betsy DeVos, but we heard a tremendous amount of passion against.

I want to thank the Senator from Ohio, in particular, speaking to the issue of the fact that Mrs. DeVos does owe a fine to Ohio that has not been paid. I find it incredulous that we are just dismissing that here and the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio spoke passionately about what vouchers would mean for students with disabilities, and their ability to get a good education could be in jeopardy over the vision on that, this Secretary is about to put forward.

A few moments ago, I listened to the Senator from New Mexico speak about our tribal schools and the fact that this Secretary of Education has no knowledge of tribal education and her role in being in charge of that with no experience and no idea of what that means or how that will be enacted.

Again, I want to just say that we heard from so many people in our States because we clearly have a nominee to run the Department of Education with no experience and a background that is really in opposition to what most of us have stood up and fought for most of our lives. I have mentioned throughout this debate—as I have spoken numerous times about the tremendous amount of letters that have come to me through our mail over the last several weeks since this nominee came before our committee and the public had a chance to see Mrs. DeVos at our hearing, without the knowledge she needs to lead this agency, with the tremendous conflicts of interest that were portrayed over and over.

I want to again go back and read some of those letters as we get into the last hour of this debate because I think they are quite telling.

I have from Dr. Jennifer Kay Lynn of Olympia, WA. She says to me: Thank you for your understanding Betsy DeVos would devastate U.S. public education. Betsy DeVos’s Senate confirmation hearing was underhanded as she understated and refused to serve as America’s Secretary of Education. Mrs. DeVos has no experience in public schools, either as a student, an educator, administrator, or even as a parent. Mrs. DeVos doesn’t understand key policy issues, like proficiency versus growth, or the Federal role of the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

Mrs. DeVos would not even commit to upholding current guidance on preventing sexual assault. Mrs. DeVos has no idea of how the arts and public education are critical for human development, education. All of the arts help our students grow emotionally. Without education to task or more and more connections with the brain, and perhaps, most importantly, find out how much the arts enhance their lives. We need a Secretary of Education who will champion innovative strategies that we know how to improve success for all students, including creating more opportunities and equity for all. Betsy DeVos, and I urge you to vote against her for Secretary of Education.

Those aren’t my words. I didn’t talk to Jennifer Lynn. She wrote to me because she does not want the Secretary to come before our committee. She has looked at her record and has said: This is not what our country is about.

I got a letter from Jamie Michaelson of Oroville, WA, very small community.

Senator Murray, as a public school administrator, I am extremely concerned about Betsy DeVos’s lack of knowledge and support for public schools. Having never been a teacher or administrator is bothersome enough, but to have not attended a public school herself, nor sent her kids to one, makes her ill-equipped to making educational decisions.

Furthermore, I worry about her understanding of small, rural schools and our own unique needs, which include funding professional development for teachers, Federally-funded programs for at-risk youth, and support to recruit and retain high quality teachers.

As a strong supporter of public education, I ask that you oppose the confirmation of Betsy DeVos as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education. We must have a Secretary who can commit to supporting every student in our public schools, and provide leadership that will help our neighborhood schools succeed. Betsy DeVos’s record in education and her performance at the recent confirmation hearing proves she is the wrong candidate for the job.

As a principal, I have spoken with teachers, parents, students and community members that America’s future depends on a strong investment in our Nation’s public schools.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I understand that you are being inundated with emails concerning Cabinet picks. I feel the nomination of Betsy DeVos is political. Students, families and educators deserve a highly-qualified candidate that understands our complex educational system. I am not writing to you because I have a political motivation. Instead, I am looking for the best for the Secretary of Education position. Unfortunately, in my professional opinion, Betsy DeVos is not the right person for this job.

I couldn’t agree more. Shouldn’t we have the best of the best at the top of our education system today? That is what my constituents are asking—and I know many across this country are hoping that just one more Republican Senator will agree. That is what will occur in about an hour.

I see my colleague on the floor who has come here to talk. I appreciate him being here, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, thank you for your leadership on this issue, and God knows, how many others. You are a force of nature. I am happy to be with you on this day.

I come from Delaware, and we have about a million people who live in Delaware, and they are not shy about telling their congressional delegation—Senator Coons, Congresswoman Lisa Blunt Rochester, and me—what they are thinking. We go home just about every other week. They get a lot of times in person. They also call our office. We have three offices in Delaware. They call our office here in Washington. They send us emails. We used to get a lot of letters, but now mostly we receive emails, not too many letters.

I have never seen the kind of outcry, if you will, from the people of my State...
on any nomination, I have been privileged to serve. This is my 17th year. So we have seen a lot of nominations come and go, seen a number of Presidents come and go, but I have never seen anything quite like this.

As of yesterday, over 3,700 people had contacted my office. That may not be a lot from Oklahoma. That may not be a lot from California. That is a lot in Delaware. I ask my staff to break down—let us know if we heard from anybody outside of Delaware: over 700. Then I said, for the folks who contacted us from Delaware with respect to this nomination of Betsy DeVos, how many were for her? Out of over 3,700—10. I have never seen anything like that.

So that means there are over 3,700 people in my State who raised their voice up against her nomination. Just because the numbers are like 370 to 1 against the nomination, that doesn’t necessarily mean I should oppose the nomination, but it certainly makes me stop and think if I had been inclined to do so.

I rise today, not just as a United States Senator, but as a recovering Governor and a father, one who knows the value of public education from personal experience. My wife and I grew up—she in North Carolina and me in West Virginia, a little bit of Ohio, and mostly Virginia—we grew up in public schools. Our sons attended public schools throughout high school, graduated and went off to college, and we are proud of what they have accomplished. They are 26 and 28 years old today. I am very proud of what they have accomplished. I have a stepson from my first marriage. He lives in Michigan, a family, four children and his wife, and I am very proud of what he accomplished—again, a product of public schools.

When I graduated from high school, I was fortunate to win a Navy ROTC scholarship and go to Ohio State. I worked a couple of jobs while I was going to school and was able to become one of the first people in my family ever to go to college and to graduate from college. I spent five as a naval flight officer in the Vietnam War. At the end of the war, I came back to the United States and moved to Delaware. There, thanks to the GI bill and continuing to fly as a Reserve F-3 aircraft mission commander, I was able to make ends meet and get a graduate degree in business administration from the University of Delaware.

The 8 years I was Governor, from 1993 to 2001, I spent a big part of those 8 years focusing on creating a more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. My Presiding Officer has heard me wax on in our committee—more often than he probably wants to remember—about a major job of government under State, local, Federal, is to create a nurturing environment for job creation, job preservation. In a family, you have breadwinners, people earning an income, making a way for themselves, for the rest, and our job is to make that possible.

One of the keys to that nurturing environment is to make sure the young men and women coming out of our colleges, our high schools, our trade schools have the ability to read, to write, to think, to use the technology, and to go out and be a good employee for any employer who might hire them.

Public education is personal for me. I have had this remarkable connection to it for my whole life. In our little State, I visit schools almost every week. We have a program called Principal for a Day. I have been Principal for a Day. It is from the State chamber of commerce. I joke and tell people I have been Principal for a Day in about 370 schools, so it is probably not quite right but probably 30 or more. I keep running into kids who went to high school and say: “I was your principal, did you know that? Only for a day, but it was a good day.”

I learned a lot from doing that. I mentored, for probably a couple of decades, a bunch of different kids, trying to help be a good role model for them and give them an extra person to be able to lean on and to count on. Just recently, I was over at the school a couple of miles from our home at Mount Pleasant Elementary, which has a terrific elementary school in the Brandywine School District in northern Delaware. The Teacher of the Year there for the State was good enough to let me come by and shadow her for part of her day and see what a really terrific teacher does. During the 8 years I was Governor, one of the highlights of every year was the day I would host, in June, Principal for a Day. We have 19 school districts. Each school district picked the Teacher of the Year. They have the chance to have lunch—the Delaware Teachers of the Year—and just to focus on their school districts and their schools and their classes, what was working to raise student achievement and really be inspired by all of them.

I hear regularly from my constituents about the importance of public education. In fact, I was out running late Sunday afternoon, actually just into the dusk. I was going by a Wawa on Philadelphia Pike, just north of Wilmington. Some guy came by and he rolled down his window. As I ran along, he said, “Don’t vote for that Betsy DeVos.”

I said, “Really. Can’t get away from it.” But I hear it a lot. I hear the message loud and clear.

Many of our colleges have covered this nomination at some length. But I think it bears repeating. I would just say this: Experience matters. Mrs. DeVos has, as far as I can tell, no experience in public education as a student, none as a parent, none as a teacher, none as a school administrator—none.

Maybe that alone should not disqualify her, but it is concerning. During her confirmation hearing, Mrs. DeVos failed to answer the most basic questions relating to education policy, and she demonstrated, not just in my view but certainly the views of a lot of the people who watched and shared their views with me, that she was unqualified, really unprepared for what I think is a critical task.

Many of my colleagues who support Mrs. DeVos point to her experience in Michigan, where Mrs. DeVos used her significant wealth and influence apparently to push an education reform agenda centered on vouchers, centered on for-profit charter schools that delivered questionable outcomes for students and taxpayers.

Let me just say, I was a Governor who proposed legislation, signed legislation creating charter schools. I have been a champion of public charter schools in my State and in our country. I have been a champion here in the Congress. I am not a champion of all these for-profit colleges and universities. And I think that we have seen a lot of them are very good; some of them are not.

I am concerned with the advent of for-profit charter schools, particularly those that are not doing the job, getting the job done and raising student achievement, and the employer who might hire them.

Leading the Department of Education is a very big job. It is a very important job. The Secretary of Education is responsible for overseeing a budget of some $736 billion for K–12 education and $150 billion for higher education, as well as managing a portfolio of more than $1.2 trillion in outstanding Federal student loans.

I have been fortunate as a Congressman to be a Governor, to work with any number of Secretaries of Education in the administration of George Herbert Walker Bush, the administration of Bill Clinton, the administration of George W. Bush, and the administration of Barack Obama—people like Dick Riley, former Governor of South Carolina, people like Arne Duncan, who was a great school leader in Illinois and for our country as well. When I think of the giants they were and the work they did and how knowledgeable they were, how inspiring they were, how uplifting they were, that is the kind of leader we need. They were not just all in Democratic administrations or Democratic and Republican administrations. As much as ever, we need that kind of leader today.

I will conclude by saying that Mrs. DeVos too often lacks experience, just as often has the wrong experience that we should expect from someone to lead the Department of Education at what is really a critical juncture for our country. I cannot support her nomination because I am not a convinced that she is interested in bringing Democrats.
and Republicans together on a shared vision of improving public education in this country. Reluctantly, I must urge my Democrat and Republican colleagues to listen to this groundswell of voices from across the country and ultimately to reject the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be Secretary of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as the Senate deliberates the nomination of Betsy DeVos to be Secretary of Education, I found several Marylanders who have called my office, more than 3,700 Marylanders who have emailed me, and countless others who have sent me messages via Twitter and Facebook, and, as Senator CARPER has indicated, those who have just stopped me on the streets and urged me to oppose her nomination.

They have contacted me to express their strong support for public education, and they are concerned about whether Mrs. DeVos is equally committed to public schools, I share their concern. Marylanders and I agree that our children deserve an advocate in this position who will work to strengthen the ability of public school educators to serve our children.

As the Secretary of the Baltimore City Public Schools, I understand the transformative powers that quality public school education can provide a child. The education I received at city schools has allowed me, the grandchild of immigrants, to represent Maryland in the Senate. I owe that to my public education, my public school education.

Maryland has made a commitment to providing adequate funding for public education over the past decade. Consequently, Maryland has consistently been a national leader in student performance and student outcomes. Each day, our State’s nearly 880,000 students make their way to classrooms of more than 60,000 and thousands of more personnel and education leaders in over 1,400 Maryland schools. I appreciate the service of Maryland educators, not only from the perspective of a lawmaker, a father, and a grandfather but also as a husband of a former school teacher.

Mrs. DeVos appeared before the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee to articulate her view on how to best serve our students as Secretary of Education. I found several of Mrs. DeVos’s answers to the committee questions to be troubling, particularly what appeared to be her tepid support for our Nation’s public schools; her failure to recognize the critical Federal civil rights safeguards for children with disabilities; her inability to offer an opinion on longstanding debates within the education community that she would be expected to join as Secretary of Education; her support for President Trump’s dangerous campaign promise to eliminate gun-free school zones; and her apparent lack of respect for the challenge on how to provide students and their families with affordable higher education.

Maryland families know and understand the value of a high quality public school education. Since 2008, enrollment in our State public schools has increased by nearly 36,000 students to a record enrollment of approximately 880,000 students for the 2016-2017 school year.

While enrollment has continued to increase at a record pace, I am proud that Maryland public schools have consistently ranked among the top five public school systems in the country.

I worry that Mrs. DeVos’s enthusiastic support for private school choice programs could hamper the progress in State and local education in Maryland and could prevent us from providing the highest quality level of education for our public school students. School choice programs that shift Federal fund dollars from public schools to defray tuition at private schools weaken the ability of Maryland’s hard-working public school professionals to deliver quality education and can lead to the elimination of Federal civil rights safeguards for Maryland’s diverse students.

Certainly private schools play an important role in our education system. As Senator CARPER points out, he supports, I support, charter schools within our State. I support the role that public schools play. But we mustn’t forget that more than 91 percent of American children attend public schools. They and their families deserve a Secretary of Education who will fight to strengthen public as well as private education.

School choice programs are not one-size-fits-all solutions to strengthen education in the United States. They leave out students in our rural communities, for instance, and have been shown in Maryland for the most part to support students who are already enrolled in private schools.

I urge our Secretary of Education nominee—if she is confirmed—to work with principals, teachers and school leaders to fight for a system that better show student growth in the classroom.

Mrs. DeVos’s expressed support for President Trump’s misguided pledge to eliminate gun-free schools zones is deeply concerning. Maryland’s families have made it loud and clear to me that this approach is wrong and would unnecessarily put our students in harm’s way in the very classrooms in which they are expected to learn. Since 2000, there have been four school shootings across my home State. Each of those incidents is a tragedy, and I do not wish to see more students and educators put at risk of additional tragic incidents of gun violence by allowing firearms in our classrooms.

Rather than support the Federal programs developed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide additional funding for school-based mental health resources in our Nation’s public schools that can provide assistance for those who may commit gun violence at schools, Mrs. DeVos would spend those tax dollars on Every Student Succeeds Act was a true success.

This was an incredible accomplishment put together by Senators Alexander and Murray. For the first time in 14 years, Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, legislation that was first enacted 50 years ago as part of the civil rights era to ensure that all of our children are able to attain a high-quality education.

Carper act eliminated the outdated and ineffective accountability system of adequately yearly progress and now provides States with the flexibility to decide their own accountability system to identify, monitor, and assist schools in need of improvement to best educate their students.

We gave local flexibility but maintained accountability. That was a major improvement in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The modifications allow States to move away from reliance on a collective set of test scores to measure students’ proficiency. Now, States will be able to design accountability systems that take into account student growth over the course of a school year.

And for the first time in 14 years, Maryland educators oppose the high-stake testing requirements under the previous Federal accountability system. They deserve a Secretary of Education who understands the basic concepts of Federal involvement in our public schools, so they can effectively advocate for more accurate accountability systems that better show student growth in the classroom.

Mrs. DeVos’s expressed support for President Trump’s misguided pledge to eliminate gun-free schools zones is deeply concerning. Maryland’s families have made it loud and clear to me that this approach is wrong and would unnecessarily put our students in harm’s way in the very classrooms in which they are expected to learn. Since 2000, there have been four school shootings across my home State. Each of those incidents is a tragedy, and I do not wish to see more students and educators put at risk of additional tragic incidents of gun violence by allowing firearms in our classrooms.

Rather than support the Federal programs developed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide additional funding for school-based mental health resources in our Nation’s public schools that can provide assistance for those who may commit gun violence at schools, Mrs. DeVos would spend those tax dollars on
Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?  

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii for a question.  

Mr. SCHATZ. I thank the ranking member of the HELP Committee, the senior Senator from New Hampshire.  

You can trace the history of public education in America to the Original Thirteen Colonies. In 1635, boys in Boston could get a free education, and by 1647, the Massachusetts Bay Colony required every town to provide boys a basic education. Some 340 years later, our public education system has come a long way, but some things don’t change. Our commitment and how public education lays a foundation for success. It is still the great equalizer. 

Senator MURRAY, during Betsy DeVos’s hearing, you asked a very important question. You asked: Can you support the core principle of public education to privatize public schools or cut a single penny from public education?  

Mrs. DeVos responded by saying she would work to find common ground and give parents options. I am wondering whether you were satisfied with her answer and her commitment to the basic premise of public schools and public education. 

Mrs. MURRAY. Well, I thank the Senator from Hawaii for his question. He is absolutely right. I did ask Betsy DeVos, when she came before our committee, if she would commit to not privatizing our schools or cutting a single penny from public education, and she would not do that. To me, that sends a very clear message, and it did obviously to parents, students, and administrators across this country, that she was not committed to the core principle of public education, that our tax dollars in this country always have and should continue to be to make sure that every student, no matter where they are, will have the opportunity to participate in education. I clearly meant that she was going to take money from our public education system, from our schools—big, small, rural, urban, and suburban—to go to private schools. That would mean a devastation for many communities. 

So I thank the Senator from Hawaii for his question.  

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?  

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire. 

Ms. HASSAN. Thank you very much. Senator MURRAY, I have been very concerned, as you know, with Mrs. DeVos’s lack of understanding of issues related to disabilities. My constituent Ben’s experience in public education was made possible because there were so many families and advocates who came before my family to make his inclusion possible. Before IDEA, students who experienced disabilities in an institutional setting often didn’t get an education at all and were often mistreated. 

Yesterday when I spoke on the floor, I discussed a woman in New Hampshire who had been in our State school before IDEA was passed and gave accounts of terrible experiences there. 

I also have concerns with Mrs. DeVos’s lack of understanding of the challenges faced by students who experience disabilities and her lack of commitment to ensuring that all students have a free and appropriate public education. 

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I deeply share the concern of the Senator from New Hampshire. She came to the floor last night to speak eloquently about the challenges that our students with disabilities face and the promise that this country has made for decades that if you are a student with a disability, you will be able to go to a public school and get the education that you need. 

She spoke eloquently. For everyone who didn’t hear her, I ask you to go back and look at the Record and listen to it. 

Yes, I am deeply concerned that this nominee whom this President has sent to us is not committed to that basic premise that, no matter who you are or where you come from or what you look like or if you have a disability, you get a public education. But I am not only concerned that she doesn’t have a commitment. I am deeply concerned that she doesn’t even understand that it was current Federal law. How can someone be a Secretary of Education in this country and not understand that basic premise and not give that commitment to people across the country that, if it is your child or someone you love or someone you know, they, too, can go to school and get what they need. 

So I want to thank the Senator from New Hampshire. And, yes, I am deeply concerned, as we all should be in this body and across the country, that this nominee is not prepared or qualified to make that basic assurance for all students in this country. 

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota. 

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, my mom was a second grade teacher, and she taught second grade until she was 70 years old. That was her life’s work. I went to public school, and I sent my daughter to public school. It has really been the core of how I ended up in the Senate. 

After a close review of Mrs. DeVos’s confirmation record and the hearing, I have concluded that, like all of my colleagues on the Democratic side and two of our colleagues on the Republican side, I cannot support her. I don’t believe she is prepared for this job, and I don’t believe she is committed to the kind of public education that got my family from an iron ore mine in Northern Minnesota to the United States Senate. 

My question of Senator MURRAY is that one of the most troubling examples of this lack of preparation came...
when Mrs. DeVos was questioned by my colleagues Senator HASSAN, who just spoke, and Senator KAYE about whether schools should meet the standards outlined by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. She said she would leave this decision to the States.

As I noted yesterday, I occupied the Senate seat once held by Minnesota’s own Hubert Humphrey. He was someone who, of course, was never at a loss for words.

He delivered a speech at the Minnesota AFL-CIO 40 years ago, and one line of that speech is just as appropriate today as it was back then. He said: “The moral test of government is how the government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.”

The fair rights protections and the funding that we have seen under IDEA have always been an area of bipartisan cooperation. I have heard from so many parents in my State.

A mother from Winona, with a son who was born with Down syndrome says that thanks to IDEA, this law has given her the opportunity for her son to participate in a normal education.

For a woman from Lakeville, her son was born with developmental disabilities in the late 1980s. She was so worried about what his future would be. Then that law was put into place, and today he is a successful young adult who happily lives, learns, and works in his community.

So my question of Senator MURRAY is what her views are of the nominee’s qualifications when it comes to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the concern that she has heard from others in her State as well as across the country when it comes to this very important issue for our children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota, who came the other night to talk passionately about her own mother, who was a teacher and her favorite course was about the monarch butterflies and how she would come dressed up as a butterfly and how she impacted a young student in her classroom who is now a young adult and still remembers the learning experience that her mother gave to her.

That spark is so important for every child in this country—that spark for education—no matter who you are, your disability, or what brings you to school that day. That is what is so important: “The real term education.” Every child in this country deserves a public education and to reach their full potential, no matter what they look like, how they come to school that day, whether they have been found or have a disability. That spark is what is so important.

That is why so many people have spoken out in this country about this nominee, who knows nothing or very little about IDEA—not even that it is a Federal law that is under the jurisdiction of the Department that she is seeking and that she would oversee and protect those students. That, to me, is deeply disappointing. It says to me that she has not read the law, because I don’t want this nominee to go forward. I will send you someone who understands this law.

I appreciate the question from the Senator from Minnesota. Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield for a question. Mrs. MCCASKILL. I say to the Senator, it is my understanding that the essence of Mrs. DeVos’s career has been an effort to impose on States programs—and now a Federal Government program—that will take money out of public schools to provide for parents and students to then go to private schools. Is it a fair characterization of the essence of that parents should have a choice with public money to decide whether they want to attend a public school or a private school?

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator is correct. The essence of what she has promoted and used her vast wealth for and has worked for throughout her experience is to take money away from public education and put it into private schools.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. So I am confused. We just had an election. In my State, the reddest parts of my State are parts of the State where there are no private schools—rural Missouri. I am a daughter of rural Missouri. My father went to public school in Houston, MO. My mother went to public school in Lebanon, MO. I attended public school in Lebanon, MO, and Columbia, MO. In fact, I am a product of public education from beginning to end. Both of my parents went to the University of Missouri, and so did I.

In rural areas of this country, there are no private schools for parents and kids to choose. They would have to drive miles. By the way, in my State, the newly elected Governor just cut transportation funds for public schools—just cut them. So they now have less money for transportation than they had last year. And, by the way, it isn’t like public schools are getting fully funded in my State. They are not.

So I guess what I am confused about—I know what public schools mean to rural Missouri. I know they are the essence of the community. If the essence of this woman’s career is to take money out of public schools in rural communities and put them in private schools that will never exist in many of these small communities, they are kicking the shins of the very voters who put them in power. I don’t get that, Senator. I don’t understand how you could give the back of your hand to rural America with this decision. I would explore my colleagues who understand that rural America is where their base is in large part that they are misreading this vote if they think that rural America is going to forget that this woman wants to rob the public schools of rural America and put in private schools, which will never be able to attend.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for her question. I just want to say I don’t believe money is magic. It doesn’t just get printed to give vouchers to schools. It comes from our public schools. As she stated so eloquently, there are many schools—some in rural areas, some in urban areas, or mostly in rural, and there is no private school to send your kids to. That voucher money, that public money, those taxpayer dollars will come away from those schools. They will have less money, but it won’t go to the advantage of those students, and they will be left behind.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield for a question. Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much. Before asking my question, I want to thank the senior Senator from Washington State for her leadership and passion on behalf of my children and on behalf of myself. As a product of a small rural school in Northern Michigan, I was one of two children in a public school, and my two grandchildren are now going to public schools.

I want to thank you for your leadership, and I am so grateful to all of our colleagues and our two Republican colleagues who are joining us today.

Would you agree that when we look at this—and I certainly have a bird’s-eye view. We in Michigan have lived what has happened in cutting public schools and moving dollars to private, for-profit, non-profit charter schools without virtually any accountability. Would you agree that essentially we have a nominee who is looking through a lens of a private sector for-profit model, where in the private sector we have winners and losers, so you can have a business open and close. That is based on our private marketplace. It works well, but in education it is different. We can’t afford for any of our children to be losers in education, and it just doesn’t work to have a competitive marketplace; that what we need is a quality public school along with public choices. I support public charters with accountability and other choices, but what we have is a view of a nominee, someone who has not been involved in public schools herself, her children, and so on, who comes at it from this perspective of winners and losers in the private market, and we cannot afford any child to be a loser as it relates to their education.

Mrs. MURRAY. Well, I want to thank the Senator from Michigan for that question because it is at the heart of what this entire debate is about.
have a nominee who has come forward who is quite successful in private business—a billionaire herself—whose idea and vision for our Nation’s education comes from a private business perspective.

The Senator from Michigan is absolutely right. Our schools are not about profits. They are not profit centers, and we can never run them that way because there is a core principle that this country was founded on that our forefathers very wisely thought of. They made sure that every young person in this country, no matter who they were and how much money they had, would get a public education.

You can’t run that as a for-profit business because there are kids who come to our schools who are very hard. Maybe they come without having had a parent home the night before, they come hungry, they come with disabilities, they come with challenging education needs. We can’t show those kids out because there are other kids who come with parents who are very active and are really bright and we want to keep them because they are better for profit. We have to run our public education schools so every child has that opportunity because who knows who that young child is going to be who takes that nugget of public education and ends up sitting here in the U.S. Senate. That is the foundation of our country.

I really appreciate the Senator from Michigan for raising that because that is the core essence of why so many people have spoken out against this nominee, who stood up and have written us letters and made phone calls and stood at railies and spoken out—many people who have never spoken out on issues before who have never really paid attention before, but this is about the core principles our country was founded on, a public education for all—not a profit education for all but a public education for all.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I appreciate your point and the belief that the son or daughter of a millwright, a mill worker as I was, should have the same opportunities as the son or daughter of a CEO in a big company. That is embedded in the notion of quality public schools.

What I was really struck by was that DeVos wants to divest all these public funds from our schools to for-profit schools. If you are for-profit, you squeeze down the services in the school to maximize the profit, and that is just exactly the type of attack on our children that we can’t tolerate, but I was also struck about how she imposes the accountability for these alternative schools. It is a big company. You are too tough to teach. We don’t want to keep you here anymore. You are too tough to teach.

It can say that they will not keep records of dropout rates so we know whether or not they are encouraging these tough kids to go to another school. They can deny access to students with disabilities or who come from tough backgrounds who may not meet their standards, and they will not be held accountable under the policies that Ms. DeVos proposes. So the Senator raises an absolutely critical question. At the end of the day, each elected official in this country is held accountable to their taxpayers to assure that the money they give out in their taxes is used in a way that our country agrees on, and this Secretary of Education has to respond. We want to change that. We want your tax dollars to go to schools that are not accountable to you.

Mr. MERKLEY. I thank the Senator from Washington for her answer. So often I have heard speeches about accountability from across the aisle. This is a case where accountability matters a tremendous amount because it determines whether our children have a fair shot. I would like to ask unanimous consent that I continue this dialogue with Senators until a quarter to 12, and the last 15 minutes be equally divided between the chairman of the committee and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That would mean the chairman of the committee would speak last.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me revise my request. I ask unanimous consent that we continue this dialogue with Senators until a quarter to 12 p.m.: that at a quarter to 12, I will give my final remarks and divide equally the last 15 minutes so the chairman of the committee has the last 7½ minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection.

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have a number of Senators who have been on the floor who are here now and we would like to ask unanimous consent that I continue this dialogue with Senators until a quarter to 12, and the last 15 minutes be equally divided between the chairman of the committee and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That would mean the chairman of the committee would speak last.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me revise my request. I ask unanimous consent that we continue this dialogue with Senators until a quarter to 12 p.m.: that at a quarter to 12, I will give my final remarks and divide equally the last 15 minutes so the chairman of the committee has the last 7½ minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection.

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I do not believe that the President nominated the best candidate to serve as Secretary of Education. I don’t believe he even nominated a qualified candidate. Mrs. DeVos has never taught, never worked in a school system, and has no educational degree in education policy.

I was hoping that she would ease my concerns over her qualifications at the confirmation hearing and prove that she was indeed up for the job, but, instead, Mrs. DeVos failed to study, showed up unprepared, and appeared unfamiliar with the foundational civil rights law that guarantees every student, including those with disabilities, the right to a quality equitable education.

I would not be here today were it not for strong public schools and civil rights protections. Confirming her to lead the agency tasked with educating our children and helping them develop into successful adults would be a mistake for our children because they would have to pay for and live with this mistake for decades to come. There is simply no way that I can support her nomination.

I would like to know how is it possible that we could have a Secretary of Education who does not understand or even know about those Federal protections
for students with disabilities to have access to equitable and fair education?

Mrs. MURRAY. I want to thank the Senator from Illinois, who is an amazing new and great Member of our Senate. She comes from Illinois. She comes from an incredible background and is asking a critical question about whether our students with disabilities should have access to education.

It is a passion many of us have feelings about, it is a principle that our country has supported, and it is a principle that this nominee is uniquely unqualified about and, to me, that is reason enough for any of us to vote against that nominee.

Mr. FRANKEN. Will Senator Murray yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you. As Senators on opposite sides of the aisle, we have philosophical differences, but one thing I think we all agree on is that our children must be qualified and up to the challenge of running an agency.

Betsy DeVos has demonstrated that she is not qualified to run the Education Department. I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you watched her confirmation hearing, you would know that. It was the most embarrassing confirmation hearing I have ever seen. She could not answer the most basic questions about education. So I ask my Republican colleagues, if Mrs. DeVos’s performance in this hearing didn’t convince you that she lacks qualifications for this job, what would have had to have happened in that hearing in order to convince you?

If we cannot set aside party loyalty long enough to perform the essential duty of vetting the President’s nominees, what are we even doing here?

Let’s do our job for the sake of the children and for the sake of our Nation’s future. Thank you.

Mrs. MURRAY. I say thank you to the Senator from Minnesota, and I want to thank him for being a committed part of our committee, really helping us all recognize that this nominee is not qualified.

I see the Senator from Hawaii who has, I believe, the last question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. As we have spent many hours debating whether Mrs. DeVos is the best person to head our Department of Education, my question is, Do you think Betsy DeVos is the best prepared, the best experienced, and the best committed person to lead the Department of Education who is qualified, who is prepared, who is ready to stand up and fight for every child no matter where they live or where they come from?

With that, Mr. President, I believe we are down to the last 15 minutes before the vote, with the time equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I noted, Democrats have been here on the Senate floor for the past 24 hours straight, talking about the importance of public education, sharing stories from parents and students and teachers in our home States, highlighting all of the reasons for Senators to stand with us and stand with their constituents, stand with other Republicans who are doing the right thing, and urging them to say no to Betsy DeVos and her plans to privatize and underserved public education in America.

But I come to the floor today to make one final push before this vote, to make the case one last time, because we are so, so close and because this is so important and also because we have a real shot right now to show people across the country that the Senate can actually listen to them, that their voices matter, and that their Senators put them and their kids and their families and their futures above loyalty to a party and ideology.

I have talked about my frustration with the fact that Republican leaders did everything they could to jam this nominee through the Senate. They cut corners and rushed into a hearing before her ethics paperwork was in. They blocked Democrats from asking more than 5 minutes of questions, forcing a vote before all of our questions were answered about her tangled finances and legal potential conflicts of interest, and rushed straight from the committee vote to the shortest possible floor debate they could manage.

So I won’t spend more time on that today because the truth is that despite Republicans’ best efforts, people across the country have learned a whole lot about Betsy DeVos over the past few weeks, and the more they have learned about her, the less they have liked and the more outraged they have become.

Over the past few weeks, people have learned about Betsy DeVos’s tangled finances and potential conflicts of interest and how she and her family have given hundreds of millions of dollars to Republicans and extreme conservative groups. They have learned about her failed record, how she spent her career and inherited for anti-public school policies that have hurt so many students in her home State of Michigan and across the country. They have learned about the extreme right-wing ideology that drives her, how she wants to bring her anti-government, free-market-above-all philosophy to an education system that she has called nothing more than “an industry, and a dead end.”

When people saw her in her hearing, they learned even more. When they watched Betsy DeVos in that hearing room, when they saw it live on the evening news, on “The Daily Show,” on “The View,” and on many other shows covering it, and one of the many clips that went viral on social media or shared by a friend or a family member, a whole lot of people were introduced to Betsy DeVos for the first time in that hearing, and they were not impressed. People across the country saw a nominee who was clearly ill-informed and confused, who gave a number of very concerning responses to serious and reasonable questions.

In that hearing, Betsy DeVos refused to rule out slashing investments in or privatizing public schools. She was confused that Federal law provides protections for students with disabilities. She didn’t understand a basic issue in education policy—the debate surrounding whether students should be measured based on their proficiency or their growth. She argued that guns needed to be allowed in schools across the country to “protect from Grizzlies.” And even though she was willing to say that President Trump’s behavior toward women should be considered sexual assault, she would not commit to actually enforcing Federal law protecting women and girls in our schools.

I understand just a few moments in that hearing that made it clear why Betsy DeVos is not qualified to do this job. There were many more.
Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am voting for Betsy DeVos because she will implement our law fixing No Child Left Behind. To do that she worked with states that are tired of giving low-income children more of the same kind of choices that wealthy families have.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I urge one more Republican to join me in support of Betsy DeVos for Education Secretary.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as we approach the end of the 115th Congress, let us acknowledge those whose tireless efforts have made our schools better. Let us remember those who have fought for education reforms in 30 years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, was there not enough time to question her? I wonder. We treated her just like that. We wanted to make sure she had no conflict of interest. What is the problem with that?

One, her support for public charter schools. They were founded by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota. They have now grown to 6,800 schools. They are the most effective public schools. They have now grown to 6,800 schools. They have now grown to 6,800 schools. They have now grown to 6,800 schools. They have now grown to 6,800 schools.

Another, her support for school choice. What is wrong with giving low-income Americans more choice and better schools? We have done it since the GI bill from 1944—taxpayer money funding vouchers, no Washington mandates for vouchers, no Washington mandates for common core, no Washington mandates for specific kinds of teacher evaluations with Betsy DeVos in charge of the Department of Education.

One year ago, we had no Education Secretary. I asked President Obama to appoint one, even though I knew he would appoint John King, with whom I disagreed. I promised that if he did, we would promptly confirm him, and we did. We asked him 53 questions, not 1,397. We didn’t say he had conflicts of interest when the Office of Government Ethics said he did not.

I know my friends are surprised about the election, but wouldn’t they be really surprised if he appointed someone from within the education establishment to be the Secretary of Education? Wouldn’t you be surprised that a Republican President would be looking for schools that actually sur- face in the South and the Midwest? Wouldn’t you be surprised that a Republican President has appointed an Education Secretary who wants to give low-income children more choices of schools? Are you surprised that a Republican President has nominated an Education Secretary who wants to reverse Washington mandates for common core, no Washington mandates for specific kinds of teacher evaluations with Betsy DeVos in charge of the Department of Education?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. ALEXANDER, your time has expired. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as we approach the end of the 115th Congress, let us acknowledge those whose tireless efforts have made our schools better. Let us remember those who have fought for education reforms in 30 years. We asked President Obama’s Education Secretaries before their offices.

Then there were followup questions. We asked President Obama’s Education Secretaries before their offices.

Then she testified for 90 minutes longer than either of President Obama’s Education Secretaries before our committees.

Then there were followup questions. We asked President Obama’s Education Secretaries before their offices.

Then she testified for 90 minutes longer than either of President Obama’s Education Secretaries before our committees.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President.

She has had conflicts of interest. We have had an independent conflict of interest office, the Office of Government Ethics. The head was appointed by President Obama, confirmed by the Senate. He has an agreement with every Cabinet member about conflicts of interest. He wrote a letter to us 8 days before we voted on her and said she would have no conflict of interest if she followed this agreement.

So plenty of time for questions, no conflict of interest. What is the problem?

One, her support for public charter schools. Some people don’t like that. But 2.7 million children attend them. They were founded by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota. They have now grown to 6,800 schools. They are the most effective public school reform over the last 30 years and she has a commitment to help low-income children.

I would say to my Democratic colleagues, we confirmed President Obama’s first Education Secretary in 7 days—on the day he was inaugurated; his second one in 3 weeks, just as we will Betsy DeVos today. You may disagree with the new President, but the people elected him and I urge you to give the new Republican President the opportunity to choose his own Edu- cation Secretary, just like we did with the Democratic President 8 years ago and a year ago, even though we disagreed just as much with their view on Federal policy on local schools as you do with her policy and President Trump’s policy on school choice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 4½ minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. President.

She has led the most robust public school reform movement over the last 30 years and she has a commitment to help low-income children.
education, I support public education. Education is the closest thing to magic in America. Let me say again that again. Education is the closest thing to magic in America. I experienced that magic.

As a kid growing up in a single-parent household, my parents faced poverty, disillusion about life, I nearly flunked out as a freshman. I thank God for public education. But far too many kids—too many millions of kids today—do not have a quality educational experience in their communities. And what does that mean? There is a high correlation between incarceration, high unemployment, and lower lifetime incomes for those students who do not have quality public education.

This Nation—the greatest Nation on Earth—has afforded a kid who almost dropped out of high school to become a U.S. Senator. Why? Because I found a path that included public education, and quality public education.

So what does it look like in some of our cities? Let me give my colleagues an example from Detroit. Only 9 percent of African-American kids meet standards in English, and 12.5 percent of Hispanic kids meet or exceed standards in English in Detroit. We need to make sure that every child in every ZIP Code has a quality choice.

The Secretary of Education cannot—cannot—privatize education. That would take an act of Congress.

So, yes, we should have a passionate debate about education, and yes, we should make sure—make sure—that the focus of this debate is on the kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator’s time has expired.

PRAYER

Pursuant to rule IV, paragraph 2, the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Senate having been in continuous session since yesterday, the Senate will suspend for a prayer from the Senate Chaplain.

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

PRAYER

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

The majority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote on the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the Senator will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

RECESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 p.m. today
and that the time during recess count postcloture on the Sessions nomination.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, I rise to speak in favor of the Senate confirming Senator Sessions to the position of Attorney General, chief law enforcement officer of our country, but I do want to say thank you to the Democratic minority of my committee because they did not boycott the meetings. They debated. They debated too long, from my point of view, but they debated, and we were able to do our work in a businesslike way. So I want to thank all of them for their participation.

Now I will take a few minutes to speak on strong support of my friend and our colleague Senator JEFF SESSIONS to serve as the 84th Attorney General.

Last week, the Judiciary Committee spent over 6 hours debating the nomination. Every single Democrat opposed the nomination, but this wasn't, of course, much of a surprise. During our committee debate, Senator GRAHAM correctly pointed out that, based on the standard the Democrats established for a Democrat in the Senate, they appear not to be able to ever earn their support.

It is no secret that our Democratic colleagues don't like the new President. They are doing what they can do to undermine the new administration. With respect to Senator Sessions, my Democratic colleagues disagree with a number of policy positions he has taken over the years, but this year seems to be unlike previous administrations where Democrats supported Cabinet nominees even if they disagreed with the nominee on policy grounds. That is what happened in 2009, when Senator Sessions and I both supported Eric Holder for Attorney General, even though we disagreed with him on many policies.

So after listening to all the reasons they are opposing this nomination, I can boil their objections down to these points:

Even though many of my colleagues have known this good man for years, even though many of my colleagues have worked closely with him to pass important bipartisan legislation, even though many of them have praised him in the past for his integrity and for being a man of his word, even though Senator Sessions has pledged to support and defend all laws passed by Congress, even those he disagrees with, when it comes time to stand up in support of the law, they are unwilling to take him at his word.

This is very troubling because all of us in the Senate know JEFF SESSIONS. Some of us have known him for decades. Regardless of what my colleagues are willing to admit publicly, we all know him to be a man of deep integrity, a man of his word, and a man committed to fairness, to justice, and, most importantly, to the rule of law.

We all know that when Senator Sessions served as an assistant U.S. attorney, as a U.S. attorney, and as attorney general for his home State of Alabama, he worked hard to promote the rule of law and to protect both victims and perpetrators. We know he has a deep commitment to the rule of law, something an Attorney General must possess or he could not be the chief law enforcement officer of the United States. In other words, that law or that position is all about carrying out and having a commitment to the rule of law. As I said, much of Senator Sessions' hearing focused on his record as the latter.

Now, it is true Senator Sessions has voted on legislation in ways that the left doesn't like, and of course I have even disagreed with him from time to time, but we all understand that every time we have ever voted the way we see as the best for our country. I think we all also understand that very rarely is any bill a so-called perfect piece of legislation.

At one time or another, every single Member of this body has opposed legislation based upon a principle objection to a particular provision.

So, of course, Senator Sessions has voted differently than his Democratic colleagues on that, that is common sense. That is to be expected. This is the Senate. We are all about debating policy and for long periods of time. That is how the Senate works.

We all know the role of an Senator and how the role of Attorney General are very, very different. A legislator debates policy and votes on legislation. The Attorney General enforces the laws as enact. All of us in the Senate understand that difference. Senator Sessions understands the difference better than most.

In addition to serving as a Senator for 20 years, he served in the Department of Justice for 15 years, a Department dedicated to law enforcement and to the rule of law and following what Congress directs law to be.

I am disappointed in my colleagues who have suggested Senator Sessions will not be able to put aside his policy differences and work to make sure that the United States enforces the law, even if he voted against that law.

This is especially troubling because he is a committed to our justice system and to upholding the law, regardless of whether he supported that statute as a policy matter.

The criteria for this nomination is, will this man, whose integrity is beyond reproach, enforce the law as he said he will?

Senator Sessions answered that question directly during his hearing. He stated this:

The Justice Department must remain ever faithful to the Constitution's promise that our government is one of laws and not of men. It will be my unyielding commitment to enforce the laws as confirmed, to see that the laws are enforced faithfully, effectively, and impartially.

He goes on to say:

The Attorney General must hold everyone, no matter how powerful, accountable. No one is above the law, and no American will be beneath its protection.

Now, whether he said those things one time or dozens of times—and it is more apt to be dozens of times during the day and a half of hearings that we spent with him, plus speeches that were given—it can't be much clearer than what he just said.

But even after he made this promise, Members asked Senator Sessions if he would defend the laws that he had voted against, and he answered in the affirmative, stating:

I would defend the statute if it is reasonably defensible. It is passed by Congress, it would be the duty of the Attorney General, whether they voted for it or support it, to defend it.

He was questioned about a host of hot-button policy issues. Time and again, his answer was the same. He will enforce the law. This will actually be quite different from the Obama administration, which refused to enforce laws it didn't like. They did this while the people who are now in the minority—the Democrats—turned a blind eye when they didn't enforce the law.

Senator Sessions also made clear that he possesses the independence necessary for the Attorney General. I have often heard Senator Sessions ask Executive nominees, including nominees for Attorney General, whether they will have the fortitude to stand up to the President who appointed them. So I asked him the same question during my time of questioning in the committee. I asked if he will be able to say no to President Trump, and he said:

I understand the importance of your question, I understand the responsibility of the Attorney General, and I simply have to help the President do things that he might desire in a lawful way and have to be able to say, “No,” both for the country, for the legal system, and for the President to avoid situations that are not acceptable. I understand that duty. I have observed it through my years here, and I will fulfill that responsibility.

Senator Sessions' commitment to be independent from the President when it is necessary and his promise to enforce the law is exactly what this Nation needs right now. We haven't seen much of this over the past 8 years. And the Department of Justice has been politicized over the past 8 years, and that has caused great harm. The leadership of the Department of Justice has undermined our confidence in the rule of law by picking and choosing which laws it will enforce. I am looking forward to turning a new page at the Department of Justice under our friend's leadership as Attorney General. It is desperately needed, particularly at this time.
Last weekend, in particular, it showed us how critical it is to have someone leading the Department who is committed to following the law. Last week, then-Acting Attorney General Sally Yates announced that she wouldn't defend the President's recent Executive order, even though she admitted there was a defense to be made. As soon as she did this, Democrats ran to her defense and sang her praises, but after Senate Republicans' hearing, I would have expected Democrats to come to the opposite conclusion. During his hearing, they asked Senator Sessions whether he would enforce a law that he didn't like over and over and over. But last week, Ms. Yates refused to defend an Executive order or statute in a law—why?—because she didn't like it, and the Democrats lauded her “bravery” and “courage.” They lauded her “courage.”

Now, let’s be very clear. She didn’t say that she can’t constitutionally defend the President’s order or offer good-faith defenses of its legality in the court. Instead, this is what—she explained her decision by saying her job is not the same as the job in the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel. She said, importantly, OLC, meaning Office of Legal Counsel, does not address whether any policy choice embodied in an Executive order is wise or just but simply to support the law, that the decision on whether to defend an Executive order or statute in court turns on whether the Attorney General believes the law or order is wise or just. But with all respect to Ms. Yates, the President’s order is not a law—what?—because she didn’t like it, and the Democrats lauded her “bravery” and “courage.”

This unfortunate situation with Ms. Yates highlights why it is important to swiftly move to confirm an Attorney General who will be faithful to the Constitution and uphold the law regardless of policy preferences.

Ultimately, it comes down to this: There is no one more qualified than Jeff Sessions for this position. He served in the Department for 15 years. He served as attorney general for his home State of Alabama, and for 20 years he served on the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has oversight over the Department of Justice.

We all know Senator Sessions is a man of his word. We all know he will enforce all the laws on the books, regardless of whether he supported them. Both Republicans and Democrats know he will make an excellent Attorney General will be served well by his appointment. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, thank you very much, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his remarks. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to work with him, and we have a number of major issues forthcoming.

I rise to oppose the nomination of Jeff Sessions to be Attorney General of the United States. I think some of us and I certainly have lived through many difficult times in this country, but today this country is as divided as I have ever seen it.

Some have said that Democrats are in the anger stage of grief, but with all due respect, those statements just trivialize what is going on in this country. It is not trivial, and it is not small. The America of unity split in half, with at least half objecting to the actions of this President, including his nominee for Attorney General.

My office has received approximately 114,000 calls and emails regarding Senator Sessions, with 112,000—more than 98 percent—opposed to this nominee. I would like to quote a few of my constituents who deeply oppose this President and this nominee and have been taking to the streets to protect the fundamental values of America.

Here is one from a doctor:

"I marched because of the thousands of patients I’ve seen in the community, people of color, immigrants from all over the globe, who are worried about the loss of their rights and the dramatic expulsion of racially and culturally focused hate crimes we’re reading about.

I marched on Saturday because women must not be denigrated, as we’ve seen by the attitude exemplified by our new President in his unmeasured remarks.

I marched on Saturday because I’m desperately worried that the progress this country has made in recognizing the rights of all Americans regardless of race, ethnicity and religious belief, is now threatened with a roll-back to the ‘50s.

The American process of justice is a beacon and an example to the world. Jeff Sessions must not be confirmed.

Here is another:

As a Californian who wants to finish school as a Californian with ‘pre-existing conditions,’ as the child of a South American immigrant—I don’t know what I can say other than please, protect us from whatever is coming as best you can.

One woman who marched after the inauguration came to my office the following Monday and wrote a handwritten note explaining why she marched. Here is what it said:

Our President has excised all protestors as ‘professionals’ and ‘sore losers.’ I am here in Washington for his first full week of the presidency to send the message that I am neither a ‘professional’ nor a ‘sore loser’—just an ordinary American citizen who can no longer sleep well at night worrying about how his agenda will negatively impact not only our nation but democracies all over the globe. America is already great; what Trump and his administration will do is destroy it.

To my constituents—112,000 have called and emailed to oppose this nominee—let me just say this: I hear you. To my Republican colleagues, this is not grief about losing an election. At no time when my party lost an election or when the President was of a different party did I feel the way I feel today. For most Presidents, there is hope—a hope of unity, a hope of bringing people together, a sense of common purpose. That is what it must be a leader of this country. red the whole country—red States and blue States, all of our people.

President Obama began his tenure in office with a 68 percent approval rating. President George W. Bush talked about compassionate conservatism. After a terrorist attack killed nearly 3,000 people, President Bush went to the Islamic Center in Washington on September 17, 2001, and said: ‘‘Islam is peace.’’

He said:

Muslims are doctors, lawyers, law professors, members of the military, entrepreneurs, shopkeepers, moms and dads. And they need to be treated with respect. In our anger and emotion, our fellow Americans must treat each other with respect.

Incidentally, President Eisenhower dedicated the Islamic Center in 1957, and here is what he said then:

Using the American process, under American tradition, and in American hearts, this Center, this place of worship, is just as welcome as could be a similar edifice of any other religion. Instead, America would fight with her whole strength for your right to have here your own church and worship according to your own conscience.

Now, Mr. President, that was the man who led America and Allied forces in Europe against Nazi Germany, a regime of pure evil that targeted Jews based on their religion and exterminated millions of Jews, Poles, Serbs, Roma, Soviet citizens, gays, lesbians, and many others. President Eisenhower was saying that this country, the United States of America, would fight with her whole strength to protect the religious freedom of Muslims.

‘‘Without that concept,’’ President Eisenhower said, ‘‘we would be something else than what we are.’’

Can anybody even imagine Donald Trump uttering words like two of his Republican predecessors, Dwight Eisenhower and George W. Bush?

Instead, there is attack after attack after attack on minorities, on immigrants, on Muslims, on women, on his critics, on judges, on the press, and yes, even on truth itself.

There is the President’s Muslim ban Executive order, which Senate Democrats says has caused between 60,000 and 100,000 visas to be revoked. That order, which caused chaos at airports around the country, is now subject to nearly 60 legal challenges in Federal courts. On Friday, a Federal judge in Washington State blocked implementation of major portions of the Executive order. The judge, appointed by President George W. Bush, was then promptly attacked on Twitter by President Donald Trump. This afternoon, the Ninth Circuit will review the order.

To say this is just a stage of grief after losing an election is really to ignore reality.
Last week Sally Yates had to stand up and tell the President no. Now more than ever, it is clear how important it is that the Department of Justice be independent from the President. When she stood up, she was promptly fired by this President. And not only was she fired for loyalty and for doing her job, but also because she refused to participate in a movement that she believed in.

Here is the point: This is the man for whom Senator Sessions has been a stalwart campaign advocate. In response to my written questions, Senator Sessions stated: “I endorsed him in part because he was a leader advocating for issues I supported and believed in.”

Senator Sessions was a close campaign adviser and supporter of the President. He was the first Senator to endorse him. He spoke on Trump’s behalf at the National Republican Convention. He appeared at numerous rallies. He was at 45 campaign events. During the campaign, he spoke at large rallies, smiling and laughing, while crowds chanted “Lock her up.”

Then in October of last year, at one of the Presidential debates and again at a rally in Virginia, Candidate Trump repeatedly referred to him as “my attorney general.”

A month after the announcement of his nomination to be Attorney General, he appeared again with the President-elect on a thank-you tour in Alabama. This was a rally where many of the President’s campaign promises, such as building the wall, were repeated. Crowds once again chanted “Lock her up.” The President-elect introduced him, Sessions campaigned forward. As he walked out to speak to dramatic effect, he whipped out a “Make America Great Again” hat, put it on, and pumped his fists into the air.

Already, at this point, he had been designated to be the next Attorney General of the United States, an independent legal check on the President, a man who responds to the Constitution and the law independent of the Chief Executive. One would have thought a day kind of work and just remarkable what is happening. I’m one of the co-chairs, of five, I believe, co-chairs of the committee under Vice President.

Then Senator Sessions said, “Steve Bannon is a powerful intellect and a thoughtful leader that consistently provides good advice.”

We learned last week that Steve Bannon thinks the same thing about Senator Sessions. As Senator Sessions wrote to the Washington Post just days ago, Sessions was—and I quote, and here it is—“the fiercest, most dedicated and most loyal proponent of Congress of Trump’s agenda, and has played a critical role as the clearhouse for policy and philosophy to undergird the implementation of that agenda.”

The Post went on to report that Senator Sessions “lobbied for a ‘shock and awe’ period of executive action that would rattle Congress, impress Trump, and set the stage for a day of legislative action.”

Then Senator Sessions, speaking at Trump Tower about the transition on November 15, in the lobby of Trump Tower, he said:

My former chief of staff is doing a great job under incredible demands, and the whole team we have here is doing a day kind of work and just remarkable what is happening. I’m one of the co-chairs, of five, I believe, co-chairs of the committee under Vice President.

Senator Sessions was quite critical of Russia during the campaign. That was a floor speech on April 13, 2000. He pointed to the campaign connection and said that meant the Attorney General needed to appoint a special prosecutor because of allegations of $1 million in Chinese monetary contributions to a Presidential campaign. That is from a floor speech on March 9, 2000.

In 2014, after Russia invaded Crimea, Senator Sessions said, “I believe a systematic effort should be undertaken so that Russia feels pain for this.” This was in the Montgomery Advertiser, March 19, 2014.

When he was a Senator in the 1990s, he and other Republican Judiciary Committee members called for a special prosecutor because of allegations of $1 million in Chinese monetary contributions to a Presidential campaign.

That is from a floor speech on March 9, 2000.

He pointed to the campaign connection and said that meant the Attorney General needed to appoint a special prosecutor. He said: “This is serious business. We ought not to treat this lightly.”

Floor speech, March 9, 2000.

Yet, now that our intelligence community has concluded that Russia, at
the direction of Vladimir Putin, invaded the American political process with massive hacks and leaks for the purpose of favoring candidate Trump, Senator Sessions says that he has not even reviewed the intelligence community’s reports.

When asked in writing by myself in Question for the Record 2b after his hearing whether he had even read the intelligence assessments, classified or unclassified, he said he had not read either one.

Now, that is stunning. One of the most important national security revelations in recent years, and he is nominated to be Attorney General, and he hasn’t reviewed it? Why? He attended 45 campaign events, was intimately involved in the campaign and transition, but despite all of this, he would not commit himself to recuse himself.

This should be of real concern to all of us.

Another nation—namely, Russia—has attacked our political process in a major way: hacking a political party and leaking its internal deliberations.

This time, it targeted the Democratic Party; next time, it could be the Republican Party, but whichever party it is, we will continue.

Intelligence and law enforcement professionals must be able to follow the facts wherever they lead. The investigation could lead to the prosecution of people who helped hack and leak information backed by Russia to help the President’s campaign. It obviously has the potential to create embarrassment for the President and his people, and to implicate people involved in the campaign.

So the question is a big one, and we ought to think about it. How will this nominee handle investigation and prosecution into an unprecedented and major foreign intrusion into the election of the President of the United States?

“Is he independent of the White House?” I do not believe he can.

Let me move on to voting rights. Senator Sessions long ago testified that he thought the Voting Rights Act was an intrusive piece of legislation. He acknowledged this again in his hearing. In 1986, Senator Sessions said: “It is a serious thing . . . for the Federal Government to come in and sue a county and say we are going to change the form of government you have been living with for years.”

That implies a hesitation to use the Voting Rights Act to change certain systems of election in counties that were adopted to disenfranchise minorities.

When we considered the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization of 2006, the Senator voted for it. But he also expressed skepticism about the preclearance provision of the act, section 5, which was a core part of the act.

And then, when the Supreme Court narrowly ruled five to four in Shelby County—that is a decision—and that section 5 of the Voting Rights Act could no longer be enforced, Senator Sessions called it “good news for the South.”

What does that mean? It means State after State that had been prevented from denying the right to vote by section 5 can now proceed unless they are affirmatively stopped by a new lawsuit that takes time to develop, and a wave of new laws suppressing the vote were quickly passed following the Supreme Court’s ruling.

He has tried to argue that he will fully enforce the Voting Rights Act. In his committee questionnaire, he pointed to 4 cases he claimed were among the 10 most significant litigated cases he personally handled. As Senator Franken demonstrated in our committee, his record of handling these cases is thin, at best. Lawyers who handled three of the cases say Senator Sessions had no substantive involvement. He did not mention them in his 1986 questionnaire, even though the cases were ongoing at that time. And now he says he played a supporting or assistance role in them.

So these cases do not make me confident that as Attorney General overseeing the Civil Rights Division, he will ensure that the civil rights and voting laws are fairly enforced.

So I asked him questions to see what he would do. I pointed out in written questions that several voter ID laws have now been struck down, or severely limited, under the Voting Rights Act. Just one example: One of the most conservative appeals courts in the Nation, the Fifth Circuit, found that Texas’s law violates the Voting Rights Act. According to the courts, 608,470 registered voters in Texas lack required ID, and Black and Latino voters were far more likely than White voters to lack the required ID. The court found that the Texas law had a discriminatory effect, in violation of the Voting Rights Act.

Now, this means the Justice Department could enforce the Voting Rights Act in these situations. So I asked him, would you continue to enforce the Voting Rights Act in these situations? Is there is now precedent for it. He would not answer. He tried to say that the Supreme Court has actually held that voter ID laws do not necessarily violate the Voting Rights Act.

That is my written question for the record, No. 14.

But the Supreme Court decision he referenced, Marion County Election Board, did not talk about the Voting Rights Act at all. So I asked him to clarify his response. His answer indicated that it was just his own view that voter ID laws do not necessarily violate the Voting Rights Act. This was a follow-up question, No. 7a. That may be his personal view, but the courts’ view is that these laws can and in some circumstances do violate the Voting Rights Act. But he still has refused to say he would enforce the law.

Then, when asked about voter fraud by Senator Coons, Senator Sessions responded that he believes “fraudulent activities regularly occur” during elections. He pointed to a single report to support his view that voter ID laws are a good idea. That is Senator Coons’ question for the record 9b. He refused to comment on data provided by Senator Franken that showed the rarity of in-person voter impersonation fraud, which is the only thing a voter ID law can catch. He didn’t comment about the impact on hundreds of thousands of legitimate voters, many of them minorities and students, who are denied their fundamental right to vote by these laws.

Now we have the President on Twitter and television claiming that millions of illegal votes were cast and that is why he lost the popular vote by nearly 3 million votes, and he is ordering his administration to investigate that. If President Trump asks Attorney General Sessions to carry out his partisan, pointless investigation, what will Senator Sessions do? Is the Legal Department going to become President Trump’s political investigator? Or will it defend and use the Voting Rights Act to protect the right to vote of millions of Americans who have benefited by it? Can Sessions take that right away? I just don’t have confidence that Jeff Sessions will fairly apply the law in this area.

Now, if confirmed, what will Senator Sessions do when faced with questions about reproductive rights? Will he undermine a woman’s fundamental right to control her own body and her own reproductive system?

In 2015, Senator Sessions voted for legislation that would impose a nationwide ban on abortion after 20 weeks. That legislation had a penalty of jailing doctors for up to 5 years, and it would have forced survivors of rape and incest to overcome additional and medically unnecessary hurdles before they could receive care. The legislation also had no exception for a woman’s health and only a narrow exception to save her life.

Imagine what it is like to be a woman who learns that she has serious complications late in pregnancy and that she will suffer debilitating physical health effects if she cannot get an abortion. Then imagine having to tell her that her health must suffer for the rest of her life because politicians have prohibited her from making her own health care decisions. But this is the outcome Senator Sessions voted for.

Senator Sessions believes the case that established a woman’s right to control her own reproductive system—Roe v. Wade—is “one of the worst, completely erroneous Supreme Court decisions of all time.” In fact, weeks ago when testifying before our committee, I asked him if this is still his view, and he said “it is.” He even said Roe v. Wade “violated the Constitution.” That statement essentially invites States to enact more and more restrictions on women’s fundamental access to health care. It is a signal to those
States that if they enact restrictions and are challenged in court, then the Justice Department may in fact support them and try to overturn Roe v. Wade. In fact, I asked him about that, and he did not rule out the Justice Department's pushing to overturn Roe. He left the door open by saying:

Such decisions would depend upon the unique circumstances of the case or cases as they arise. I will not pre-judge the issues.

That is the response to my question for the record.

He even refused to rule out punishment for women who have abortions—a position President Trump took during the campaign. That is a response to Senator BLUMENTHAL's question for the record.

So what does it mean for him, as Attorney General of the United States? It means he very well may seek to overturn Roe v. Wade. It means the Justice Department may go to court and support continued State efforts to further and in fact even exacerbate the unequal position of women to control their own reproductive system.

The bottom line: I do not have confidence that Senator SESSIONS will fairly and independently safeguard the freedom of women of America.

Let me move on to immigration. Senator SESSIONS has been the staunchest opponent of comprehensive immigration reform, preventing the passage of legislation to strengthen the border and prevent families from being torn apart.

Senator SESSIONS opposed immigration reform so strenuously that he drafted and distributed his own book entitled "Immigration Handbook for the New Republican Majority." This handbook implied that immigrants were taking jobs from low-income minorities and abusing public benefit programs—setting people against each other. More alarmingly, Senator SESSIONS voted at least twice against the DREAM Act, which seeks to protect some of our country’s most vulnerable youth, undocumented individuals—children—who were brought here through no choice of their own.

On President Obama’s Executive action to protect those children—known as DACA—he doesn’t just oppose it. He is actively seeking to take it down. A recent Washington Post article says he is lobbying for the administration to overturn DACA. It is one thing to disagree with policy, but it is quite another when the policy could crush the lives of ordinary people.

In December, I wrote an op-ed in the San Francisco Chronicle about the importance of DACA and what it means for Californians.

I discussed the story of Denisse Rojas, brought to the United States as a 10-month-old baby. Rojas’ family is similar to many families with mixed status. Her mother and father came to the United States to create a better life for their children.

Denisse excelled in high school and majored in biology at UC Berkeley. She worked as a waitress and commuted an hour each way to classes because she couldn’t afford to live near campus. After graduation, she volunteered at San Francisco General Hospital. Denisse dreamed of going to medical school, driven in part by a family member’s early death from cancer.

That is how our system works today. The mission of a prosecutor is to do justice, not instinctively bring the harshest charges. They have been instructed to do so by Attorney General Robert Jackson in 1940:

"The prosecutor has more control over life, liberty, and reputation than any other person in America. His discretion is tremendous. Your positions are of such independence and importance that while you are being decisive, strict, and vigorous in enforcement, you can also afford to be just. Although the government technically loses its case, it has really won if justice has been done."

For Senator SESSIONS to say that a prosecutor cannot exercise some judgment, based on the circumstances of a case, to seek a lesser charge or a lesser punishment, in my view, is just not correct.

I have discussed mandatory minimum sentencing in the Judiciary Committee. The Senator from Illinois, distinguished as he is, has been a leader in this cause. It has been discussed for years in the context of sentencing reform efforts led by Senators LEE, CORNYN, DURBIN, GRASSLEY, LEAHY, and WHITEHOUSE. Senator LEE, in particular, has been a passionate advocate against mandatory minimum sentencing.

I believe in enforcement of the drug laws. I always have. There are difficult questions about what actions the Justice Department would take in States that have legalized marijuana in some way or another under their own laws. The bottom line is this: sensitivity and good judgment are needed in prosecutorial decisions. We want to make sure the sentence fits the crime and that resources are used wisely. Senator SESSIONS’ comments make it clear that he generally opposes granting discretion to a prosecutor to impose a lesser charge or a lesser sentence based on the circumstances of the case before them.

One thing I found striking was that in Senator SESSIONS’ written statement to the committee, he said the following: “I understand the demands for justice and fairness made by the LGBT community.” I have served on the Judiciary Committee for 24 years. Twenty of them have been alongside Senator SESSIONS. I cannot recall a single time when he spoke about supporting any kind of “justice and fairness” for the LGBT community or made any kind of statement like this. We looked and couldn’t find one in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD either. In fact, the statement stands at odds with his record.

Let me give you a few examples. In 2011, we marked up a bill I had introduced to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act. Known as DOMA, it denied married gay and lesbian couples equal protection under the law. Not only did Senator SESSIONS vote no—as
all Republicans on the committee did—but he asked questions like, “What about two sisters?”—as if to compare same-sex marriage to incest, a demeaning statement about hundreds of thousands of families in this country.

He voted against allowing gay and lesbian Americans to serve in the military. In 2009, he voted against the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Act. He said he did not see the kind of discrimination happening against the LGBT community or women. He said the law was potentially unconstitutional, which is not an argument that, to my knowledge, has ever been accepted by a court.

In 2006, he voted to enshrine discrimination in our Constitution by supporting the constitutional amendment to ban same-sex marriage everywhere in the country. What did he say? He said the Senate had to debate the amendment because of a “deliberate and sustained effort by leftists in America, social activists,” and “activist judges.”

He talked about harm to children, ignoring the fact that same-sex couples are raising children and that denying equal recognition to their families actual children. Then he went on to criticize the 2003 decision of the Supreme Court in Lawrence v. Texas, which essentially said that private homosexual conduct cannot be made a crime in this nation.

The decision, written by Justice Anthony Kennedy, was a victory for freedom. How did Senator Sessions describe it? He argued the decision was wrong, and “troubling with far-reaching ramifications.” He said it was a “new vision of social justice, masquerading as constitutional law.”

He called Justice Scalia’s dissent “brilliant.” That dissent, by the way, accused the Supreme Court of “signing the death warrant of the sexual agenda, by which I mean the agenda promoted by some homosexual activists directed at eliminating the moral opprobrium that has traditionally attached to homosexual conduct.”

When he was Attorney General of Alabama, he sought to shut down a conference of LGBT students on a public university campus in Alabama. This was despite a Supreme Court decision issued just a year earlier protecting a Christian student group from discrimination.

The Eleventh Circuit Court—in a panel of three judges appointed by Republican Presidents—called the state’s action “blatant viewpoint discrimination” and characterized Sessions’ arguments as “fence decision,” voiding constitutional law.

Does any of this sound like the actions of a person who understands the demands for justice and fairness made by the LGBT community? My answer is no.

How will that impact the Attorney General? The Attorney General must enforce Federal hate crimes laws. The Attorney General must ensure that Federal law treats same-sex couples equally; that the right to marry and be treated equally under Federal law is recognized and protected.

How will that impact the Attorney General? The Attorney General must ensure that Federal law treats same-sex couples equally; that the right to marry and be treated equally under Federal law is recognized and protected.

Here we are, I think, at a very difficult and dangerous turning point. We have a President who is little apparent Social Security restrictions and who is willing to take to Twitter to target and abuse individuals and groups of Americans, and even little and demean Federal judges and the Federal court system, just as he did during the campaign.

We have a President who has taken a “shock and awe” approach with cruel, un-American, and potentially illegal Executive orders even in his first 2 weeks in office, which this nominee reportedly urged be done even faster.

We have a President who wants to bring back torture, even though—thanks to Senator MCCAIN—Congress has already stated it is clearly illegal. We have a President who is already aligning with the likes of Australia and making ridiculous threats of sending troops to Mexico.

We have a nominee for Attorney General who is anything but independent. He was part and parcel of the Trump campaign apparatus, transition, agenda, and way of thinking.

As Steve Bannon wrote in the Washington Post just days ago, SESSIONS was “the fiercest, most dedicated and most loyal promoter in Congress of Trump’s campaign, a critical role as the clearinghouse for policy and philosophy to undergird the implementation of that agenda.”

Do any of my colleagues—Republican or Democratic—think Steve Bannon didn’t know what he was talking about in this email to the Washington Post? Do any of my colleagues believe that if Senator Sessions is confirmed, he is going to take off the political hat and be an even-handed Attorney General for all Americans, transition, agenda, and way of thinking.

I found him to be an incredibly honorable man worthy of the job of being U.S. Senator from the great State of Alabama, reflecting the values of the people of Alabama. That is what he got elected to do, by the way.

I think he will be uniquely qualified to serve as Attorney General of the United States at a time of great challenge. He has been a U.S. attorney. He has been Attorney General of his state. He is a man steeped in the law. His biggest crime, I think, is that he is very conservative. That, to me, is not a disqualifier any more than being very liberal is a disqualifier.

How do you think we felt when Barack Obama basically turned Obamacare upside down with one Executive Order? When was the last time it started stinking up in public? He would unilaterally change the law to avoid a political consequence or granting millions of people legal status with a stroke of a pen, well beyond his lane, struck down by the Court as being outside his authority as President to do.

Not once did anybody on that side raise an objection. Eric Holder is a fine man. I can’t remember a time when Eric Holder stood up to this runaway train in the Obama administration. Loreta? She is a fine woman. I can’t remember one time she expressed doubt about President Obama’s agenda. When it was left up to the courts to express
doubt in this election, believe it or not, that had a lot to do with the way the last 8 years rolled out.

This was a check-and-balance election, and you are not going to be able to undo the consequences of this election. I think it would be unfair to say that Senator JEFF SESSIONS is not qualified for the job at hand.

Most of the attacks against Senator Sessions could be levied against almost all of us on this side of the aisle. The NAACP, according to JEFF SESSIONS, is one of the premier civil rights organizations in the history of the country. I think that is a fair characterization. Mr. Cornell Brooks, CEO of the NAACP, said of Senator Sessions: Senator Sessions’ record throughout his career, whether in the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama, as attorney general of the State of Alabama or, most recently, as the junior U.S. Senator from Alabama evinces a clear disregard, disrespect, and even disdain for the civil and human rights of racial and ethnic minorities, women, the disabled, and others who suffer from discrimination in this country—a damming indictment.

Apparently, he doesn’t stay in contact with the NAACP chapter in Alabama. In 2009, the NAACP gave JEFF SESSIONS a Civic and Human Rights Convention, April 23 to 26, 2009, NAACP Governmental Award of Excellence. Senator JEFF SESSIONS: For the outstanding work you do.

That is one of the awards he forgot to tell the hope he will amend. Another attack on Senator Sessions, he received an award from a David Horowitz group that was labeled by the Senator from Connecticut as being some rightwing extremist organization. All I can say is that the Ann Taylor Award is named for a lady who went over Niagara Falls in a barrel. They give it to conservatives who stood up under difficult circumstances. I actually received the award as an impeachment manager. Chris Matthews understood. They give it to conservatives who stand up under difficult circumstances. I actually received the award as an impeachment manager. Chris Matthews understood. They give it to conservatives who stood up under difficult circumstances. I actually received the award as an impeachment manager. Chris Matthews understood.

Here is what I would say: Senator Sessions voted as a very conservative Senator from the State of Alabama who has conducted himself honorably in this chamber and I regret that we have gotten to this point. All of us in here know JEFF, and I have been on this floor fighting with him tooth and nail about immigration reform. I worked with Senator DURBIN, who is going to speak next, and our chief antagonist most of the time was Senator Sessions. Never in my darkest day will I ever believe JEFF SESSIONS said one word on this floor that he did not truly believe. And he reflects the views of millions of Americans.

As to the status of the LGBT community, I think JEFF SESSIONS was representing the values of his State. And all I can say is, that is what we are sent up here to do. If we disagree, we disagree, but we have to set aside the policy disagreement to not qualified.

I asked the NAACP chairman: Name one Republican you would recommend to be Attorney General. I have not heard one.

So what we are talking about here, unfortunately, is an attack on conservatism more than it is JEFF SESSIONS because almost everything said about JEFF could be said about me and most of my colleagues over here. Why did I vote for Holder? Why did I vote for Lynch? Why did I vote for Sotomayor and Hagel? And the list goes on and on and on.

I expect that when a liberal President wins, they will pick people who are qualified, who share their view to represent their administration. When it comes to the Attorney General, you can be liberal and you can be conservative, but you also still can be fair to the public as a whole.

I don’t believe for 1 second that JEFF SESSIONS, as Attorney General of the United States, will take any of his political positions and jam them down your throat if the law says no. I have never seen that about the man.

The minority leader of the Alabama Senate, Senator Ross, an African-American Democratic minority leader, said:

I have worked with Jeff Sessions. I know him personally, and all of my encounters with him have been for the greater good of Alabama. We have spoken about everything, from civil rights to race relations. We agree that as Christian men, our hearts and minds focus on doing right by all people.

That is the JEFF SESSIONS I know. That is why I am lending my support to his nomination.

I have some serious differences with President Trump, and those differences will materialize over time. And I hope I have the courage of my convictions to stand up for what I believe even when my party has the White House. That is a very hard thing to do for all of us. I intend to do it to the best of my ability, and I will get a lot of coverage for doing that because that makes for good political reporting. But what will not be covered is the fact that on the really big issues, mostly, I agree with President Trump and JEFF SESSIONS about what we need to do to change the dynamics regarding crime. I worked with Senator DURBIN to bring about sentencing reform, but it is now time to go in on the offense against crime.

One of the things that pleases me most about this nomination of Senator Sessions is that we have been very strong allies in fighting the War on Terror. JEFF SESSIONS understands the difference between fighting a crime and fighting a war. It will be welcome news for me to have an Attorney General who understands the difference between fighting a crime and fighting a war, not domestic criminal law. And the days of terrorists being read the Miranda rights as if they were common criminals will soon be over. That will make all of us safer.

I look forward to voting for Senator Sessions and working with him. And if we have disagreements, the one thing I know for sure is that JEFF will at least listen to me.

This body is adrift. The country is really divided. I hope that once this confirmation process is over, we can get back to doing the business of the American people.

To the extent that Donald Trump becomes the problem, we will push back. Right now, people are pushing back against everything all the time, and you are going to hurt yourself, as well as this body, because there is no way you can ever convince me that JEFF SESSIONS is not qualified to be the Attorney General. I can understand why you wouldn’t pick him, but there is no doubt in my mind that he is somebody a Republican conservative President would pick, and that is why I did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sasse). The Senator from Arizona.
Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy. I think this will take about 7 or 8 minutes, I would say to my colleague from Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate on an morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO VLADIMIR KARA-MURZA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last week I asked to learn that a dear friend and great fighter for freedom, Vladimir Kara-Murza, had been hospitalized in Moscow. Those of us who know the work of this brave Russian patriot could not afford to hope or assume that he was suffering no ordinary illness. Just 2 years ago, under mysterious circumstances, Vladimir grew very ill and fell into a coma.

Many suspected he was poisoned, to intimidate him or worse. That is why last week I asked to learn that shadowy strike against a brilliant voice who has defied the tyranny of Putin's Russia.

Many Americans are not familiar with the name Vladimir Kara-Murza, but it is one that reflects the best qualities of leadership, courage, selflessness, idealism and patriotism, and it is a life dedicated to the principles we all hold dear: truth and justice, freedom and fairness, human rights and human dignity.

All his life, Vladimir has been a brave, outspoken, and relentless champion for the Russian people. He is a deputy leader of the People's Freedom Party, an emerging pro-democracy party. He is a leading coordinator of Open Russia, a foundation that promotes civil society and democracy in Russia. In 2011, he helped mobilize the largest anti-Kremlin demonstration since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In the United States, Vladimir was one of the most passionate and effective advocates for passage of the Magnitsky Act, legislation that gives the Federal Government powers to punish human rights violators in Russia. Most recently he has eloquently and persuasively campaigned to expand the Act to impose sanctions on those Russians journalists who were so cowed and corrupted by the Kremlin that they become indispensable to propagating the lies and atmosphere of hate, fear, and lies on to maintain power.

Vladimir's family has a long history of heroism for years, dating back to the early 1900s. Vladimir once described the experience of visiting the KGB archives in Moscow where he reviewed the thin file on his great-grandfather who was executed. It contained the scant evidence required for a death sentence in Stalin's Russia. He recalled the weight that fell upon him when he read the most dreadful document to which the executioners affixed the date and their signatures to signify that the judgment had been carried out.

Vladimir also learned what it takes to be a revolutionary from our mutual friend Boris Nemtsov. Vladimir and Boris struggled together for years in the cause of freedom and democracy. Vladimir once called Boris the best President Russia never had.

Boris was wise to warn of the incoming Putin dictatorship, even when many of his fellow liberals could not see it. He told the truth about Putin's reign of terror, rampant corruption, and his illegal invasion of Ukraine. We can only imagine the crime of telling the truth in Putin's Russia. Boris Nemtsov was murdered in the shadow of the Kreml in 2015.

He died a martyr. He died a martyr for the rights of people who were taught to hate him but who will one day mourn his death, revere his memory, and despise his murderers. After Boris's assassination, many urged Vladimir not to return to Russia. He had every reason not to. He knew his own family's history. He knew what happened to Boris Nemtsov, and he knew all too well about the culture of impunity that Putin has created in Russia, where individuals are routinely persecuted and attacked for their beliefs, including by the Russian Government, and no one is ever held responsible.

He knew about Sergei Yushenkov, who was investigating the Kreml's potential role in the 1999 apartment bombing in Russia when he was shot and killed at the entrance of his apartment. He knew about American journalist Paul Klebnikov, who was investigating Russian Government connections to organized crime when he was shot to death in Moscow in 2004.

He knew about Anna Politkovskaya, a journalist, human rights activist, and fierce critic of Putin's brutal war in Chechnya, who was murdered in the stairwell of her apartment building on Putin's birthday in 2006.

He knew about former FSB officer Alexander Litvinenko, who exposed the Putin regime's massive corruption tied to organized crime and involving assassination and murder. He was poisoned to death in 2006 with a radioactive isotope in a brazen act of nuclear terrorism.

He knew about Sergei Magnitsky, that most unlikely of heroes in the cause of freedom, the humble tax attorney who blew the whistle on tax fraud and large-scale theft by Russian Government officials, only to be charged with their crimes and die in a squalid cell inside the prison that once held him.

In short, Vladimir knew that Putin is a killer—and he is a killer. He might very well be the next target. Vladimir knew that there was no moral equivalence between the United States and Putin's Russia. I repeat: there is no moral equivalence between that butcher and thug and KGB colonel and the United States of America, the country that Ronald Reagan used to call a shining city on a hill. To allege some kind of moral equivalence between the two is either terribly misinformed or incredibly biased. Neither can be accurate in any way.

Knowing all this, knowing that his life was at risk, Vladimir returned to Russia committed to power. He kept faith with his ideals and was in confrontation with a cruel and dangerous autocracy. He kept faith honorably and bravely with the example of his friend and comrade Boris Nemtsov.

Now it appears that Vladimir has once again paid the price for his gallantry and integrity, for placing the interests of the Russian people before his own self-interest. He is very ill, but I am encouraged to learn his condition is now stable.

So today, speaking for so many Americans, I offer my most heartfelt prayers for the recovery of Vladimir Kara-Murza and for the success of the cause to which he has dedicated his life: truth and justice for the Russian people.

And I do so with the confidence Vladimir himself once expressed: "I am sure that in the end, we will win, because even when dictators prevail for some time, sooner or later, freedom wins."

I thank my colleague from Illinois for his indulgence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I am glad I was here for the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina. We disagree on many things. We agree on things as well. I respect him very much and turn to him often to find bipartisan support when, frankly, no one else will answer the phone. He has been a great friend and ally and has been very blunt with me when we disagree. We do disagree today, and I do it respectfully because Senator Graham is a person I do, in fact, respect as a Senate colleague.

He is right about one thing: You would expect a new President to pick someone to be an Attorney General whom they know and trust. It might have even been someone from the campaign trail.

A classic example is 1980, when President Jimmy Carter appointed a liberal to the post of Attorney General and then was defeated for reelection. Many Americans were profoundly disappointed when they learned that Attorney General Brown was a liberal who opposed the death penalty and was willing to enforce the law only in a selective, moralistic manner. Such an Attorney General would have been a disaster for the death penalty and for law and order in America.

The same is true today. Candidate Trump is one that goes beyond familiarity, beyond support in a political campaign. In fact, they did work together, and they do agree on some fundamental issues.

If the press can be trusted—and the White House is the first to tell us they can’t—but if the press can be trusted,
in a Washington Post article of January 31, 2017, we see a very clear working relationship that extends beyond the would-be Attorney General JEFF SESSIONS and the new President Donald Trump but includes a former key staff member of his, Steve Bannon, and a man named Steve Bannon, who is with Breitbart News and is now a political inspiration to the Trump White House. It appears that they have a very close working relationship among them. Their Senate stitching, except when you look at the lines.

The issue of immigration, thebling, except when you look at the lines they have worked on closely together—the issue of immigration, the Executive orders, of which the Post said Senator SESSIONS was the ‘intellectual godfather.’ That is a clear example pointed out by this article, and that is one of the reasons it was raised by Senator FEINSTEIN.

I understand what Senator GRAHAM has to say: that Senator SESSIONS has been nothing more than a Senator loyal to the state of Alabama in his politics and in his views on issues. I do acknowledge that and can tell you that, over 20 years, I have heard Senator SESSIONS’s speeches repeatedly, and he does take those positions. But the truth is that Senator SESSIONS has a very clear position about whether the values of the Senator from Alabama are the values we want in the Attorney General of the United States. To be very blunt, in some cases, they are not, as far as I am concerned.

I understand that President Trump won the election, but that doesn’t mean, when it comes to advice and consent, that every Member of the Senate has to bow and step back a few steps for every nominee proposed by this new President. We have a responsibility to ask what is right for America, what is right in terms of values and judgments that we bring to this job, as well.

It is not a happy moment for me to say to Senator SESSIONS in opposition to the nomination of JEFF SESSIONS to serve as Attorney General of the United States. The reason I don’t view this as a happy moment is I have known him for 20 years. We have worked in the Senate, in committees, and on the floor. I know him personally. I met his family. And to say that I don’t support him for this elevation to Attorney General is something that is hard to say, but I know that I have to. This is a decision I have come to lightly. Senator SESSIONS is a colleague of over 20 years. But the question we now face is whether he is the right person to be the No. 1 law enforcement official in the United States of America.

He comes to this new opportunity in a sharply divided nation. We have a controversial new President who already has seen an Executive order blocked by the courts in what appears to be record time. Think about that for a moment. Donald Trump has been President of the United States for 19 days. In those 19 days, he has issued an Executive order stopped by the Federal Courts of the land from implementation and he has dismissed an Attorney General. No other new President, in 19 days, can point to that happening. It is an indication of the types of policies he is promoting. It is also an indication that he is likely to again test the separation of powers in this government.

In this context, the need for an independent Attorney General has never been greater. The Attorney General who will not just serve as the President’s lawyer or cheerleader but who will defend the constitutional rights of everyone, including protecting those rights from an overreaching President. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have carefully considered this nomination, and I am not persuaded that Senator SESSIONS will serve that level of independence.

Also, I have strong concerns that, if he is confirmed, he won’t adequately pursue the cause of justice on a range of important issues. In his nomination hearing, Senator Sessions said on issue after issue that he would simply follow the law, namely, the law that doesn’t come close to capturing the real role of the Attorney General. The Attorney General, as chief prosecutor in America, doesn’t just “follow the law”; that person uses his discretion to determine how the law is enforced and whom it is enforced against. Ignoring that is to ignore one of the key elements of service as Attorney General.

As Acting Attorney General Sally Yates reminded a Senate Judiciary Committee, it is for the Attorney General to determine how the law is enforced or not. And as such, I expect of Attorney General JEFF SESSIONS in the next 4 years when it comes to criminal justice and criminal sentencing reform? I am afraid we can’t expect a caring person to take a look at the simple injustice in our system.

I have listened, as many other colleagues have, to the statements made by Senator Sessions on the issue of immigration. I have said before on this floor—and I will say it again—that I am the proud son of an immigrant. For generations, America has been renewed and enriched through immigration. Since World War II, we have set an example to the world when it comes to providing a safe haven for refugees.

We have four Hispanic Senators in this Chamber. Three of them are Cuban Americans. What can we say about the Cuban refugees who came to the United States by the hundreds of thousands to flee the oppression of Castro? They were not subjected to extreme vetting. In most cases, we said: If you can find freedom in this country you are welcome. They have made America a better nation for it.

Since World War II, that has been America’s standard. Now it is being challenged. It is hard to understand how the Trump administration could consider spending so much on a Mexican wall that Texas Republican Congressman WILL HURD, whose district covers 800 miles of the southwest border, described as “the most expensive and least effective way to secure the border.”

I have come to this floor and voted for more money for walls and obstacles and technology on that border than I ever imagined necessary, in the hope that we could finally put to rest the notion that we could always do more. I wonder what image it creates of
country, as we continue to talk about walls and banning travel.

President Trump signed an Executive order on January 27 banning immigration from seven Muslim-majority countries, and banning refugees from those countries. I go through the list of the people who were affected by this, overwhelmingly they are women and children, victims of war, terrorism, and persecution. Many of them have been waiting literally for years to come to the United States since World War II, we accepted so many refugees from Eastern Europe, from Vietnam, from Cuba, as I mentioned earlier, and from Yugoslavia. Over 100,000 Soviet Jews make their home in the United States because we accepted them as refugees.

Now President Trump has issued this Executive order that is being challenged in court, and we will know within a matter of days whether it will be stayed or continued, contested or if it will stay. Acting Attorney General Sally Yates said that she could not stand to defend that order. She felt it was illegal and unconstitutional.

The question, obviously, is what would the new Attorney General, if it is J U N E T I F O R D, when faced with that same challenge? My fear is that he would not stand in independent judgment of the actions of the President. That to me is unfortunate and falls short of what we expect from the Attorney General.

We need someone like Edward Levi, the longtime president of the University of Chicago, who served as a truly nonpartisan Attorney General under President Ford. He restored honor and integrity to the Justice Department after Watergate. Where would Senator SESSIONS stand once confirmed? Would he defend the President’s Executive orders? Would he stand up to the President if he disagreed with him? I have strong reservations.

Mr. President, one of the most important issues when it comes to the Attorney General is the oversight of the Civil Rights Division, which is, in fact, the crown jewel of the Justice Department, as far as I am concerned. It is responsible for protecting the civil rights of all Americans.

Senator C OR Y B O O K E R and Congressman J OH N L E W I S and C E D R I C R I C H M O N D gave powerful testimony at Senator Sessions’ confirmation hearing. They discussed their concerns about the Justice Department under his leadership and whether it would protect the civil and voting rights of all Americans. I took their words to heart. I want to talk specifically about their concerns about the Voting Rights Act.

One month from now, we will recognize the 52nd anniversary of what came to be known as Bloody Sunday—March 7, 1965. J O H N L E W I S and Rev. Hosea Williams led 600 brave civil rights activists in a demonstration across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL. The marchers were brutally beaten as State troopers turned them back and chased them down. J O H N L E W I S was beaten unconscious and nearly killed.

A few months after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law, guaranteeing that the right to vote would not be restricted by any means, like poll taxes and literacy tests devised to keep African Americans from voting.

In 2006, Congress voted to reauthorize that same act after holding 21 hearings. As Senator Sessions testified, more than 90% of witnesses, and receiving 15,000 pages of evidence.

Congressman L E W I S said in an op-ed about the ongoing need for that act:

"Congress came to a near-unanimous conclusion: While some change has occurred, places with a legacy of long-standing, entrenched, and state-sponsored voting discrimination still have the most persistent,flagrant, contemporary records of discrimination in this country. While the 16 jurisdictions affected by Section 5 represent only 26 percent of the nation’s population, they still suppress voter registration and voting participation in excess of 80 percent of the law suits proving cases of voting discrimination."

While Senator SESSIONS ultimately voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, his comments about the law have been very troubling.

In contrast to Congressman L E W I S’s statement about the need for a strong Voting Rights Act, Senator SESSIONS repeatedly criticized the law’s section 5 preclearance provision, which required certain jurisdictions—including, but not limited to, Alabama—to “preclear” any changes to their voting laws with the Department of Justice. At his nomination hearing last month, Senator Sessions reiterated his view that section 5 of the law, in his words, was “intrusive.”

He also celebrated the Supreme Court’s decision in Shelby County v. Holder when a divided Court—5 to 4—gutted the Voting Rights Act and struck down the preclearance provisions still being enforced by the Department of Justice with fewer tools to protect Americans’ right to vote. Nonetheless, on the day of that awful decision, Senator SESSIONS stated: “[The decision was] good news, I think, for the South, in that [there was] not sufficient evidence to justify treating them disproportionately.” Senator SESSIONS was wrong to dismiss the vital role that preclearance has played in protecting voters from discriminatory laws.

When Senator SESSIONS came to my office for a personal meeting before this hearing began, I sat down with him and talked about the Voting Rights Act. I gave to him a book written by political science professor at Emory University in the State of Georgia. The book is entitled “White Rage.” Carol Anderson systematically goes through the history of race in America after the Civil War, and she points out in each section that on one hand, give rights to African Americans and then turn around and take them away. The most recent example relates to the Voting Rights Act itself and all the efforts of the 1960s to guarantee that minorities had the right to vote in America. She follows it with the undeniable record of efforts toward voter suppression when it comes to minorities in the United States.

I pointed this out to Senator SESSIONS because he has been in denial over this reality. I told him about hearings that we held in Ohio, in Florida, taking election officials, putting them under oath—that both political parties—and asking them point blank: Before you established the need for these voting restrictions in your State, what was the incidence of widespread voter fraud that led you to believe it was necessary? And the answer repeatedly was, there was none. No incidents of widespread voter fraud to speak of. No incidents of anything substantial when it came to prosecution. Clearly the motive behind these voter suppression laws is that to suppress voters from their opportunity to vote.

What can we expect of Attorney General SESSIONS on this issue? I am afraid, based on his statements, his record, his voting, we can expect the worst.

Example: A three-judge Federal appeals court struck down a North Carolina law that required voter ID and limited early voting. The court found that the law was crafted and passed with “racially discriminatory intent,” in violation of the Constitution and section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. In the decision, this Federal court noted regarding the North Carolina statute:

"Before enacting [the] law, the legislature requested data on the use, by race, of a number of voting practices. Upon receipt of the race data, the General Assembly enacted legislation that restricted voting and registration in five different ways, all of which disproportionately affected African Americans. This is the pattern I have seen across the country, as we continue to talk about walls and banning travel."

We are still facing this challenge in America. I wish it were not the case. I have hoped at this point in my life that I would be pointing to our problems with race as something from the past, but it is a current challenge we face, and it is a challenge the Attorney General must face squarely. I do not believe that Attorney General J E F F S E S S I O N S will do that, and that is why I can’t support him for that position.

Of course there is also Senator Sessions’ decision as Attorney General to bring the 1985 Perry County case when he was in Alabama. He prosecuted three African-American civil rights activists for voter fraud. All three were acquitted. That case prompted former Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick, who was attorney general of the defendants, to send a letter to members of our committee saying, “To use prosecutorial discretion to attempt to criminalize voter assistance is wrong and should be disqualifying for any aspirant to the Nation’s highest law enforcement post.”

Senator SESSIONS’ statements and his records are particularly concerning in
light of President Trump’s recent repeated, baseless claims about voter fraud in the 2016 Presidential election. Make no mistake—President Trump’s false claim that there were millions of fraudulent votes cast in the last election is an excuse for further voter suppression efforts.

It is imperative that the Department of Justice be led by someone who values the vital role the Department plays in protecting the right to vote. Given Senator Sessions’ dismissive comments about the Voting Rights Act and his history of supporting burdensome voting laws, I am not confident he is prepared to do that.

Senator Sessions’ record on religious freedom also raises significant questions. The free exercise of religion is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Constitution. However, Senator Sessions has only been outspoken in his defense of religious freedom for some groups. For example, he denounced a 1997 court order that limited prayer in Alabama public schools, calling it “one more example of the effort by the courts to eliminate the natural expression of religious belief from public life.”

A year later, he introduced a Senate resolution “affirming the right to display the Ten Commandments in public places, including government offices and courthouses.” He said “[w]e’ve got to end the hostility toward the display of the Ten Commandments in public places.”

But he has been much more ambivalent about Islam. He has referred to Islam as “a toxic ideology” and said of American Muslims “our nation has an unprecedented assimilation problem.” When President Trump first proposed his ban on Muslim immigrants during the 2016 campaign, Senator Sessions said, “I think it’s appropriate to begin to discuss this, and he has forced that discussion.”

I am also concerned about Senator Sessions’ support of laws and cases that could be used to discriminate against other Americans on the basis of religious beliefs. For example, in 2015, the Supreme Court held that marriage equality is the law of the land in the landmark Obergefell v. Hodges decision. Senator Sessions referred to the decision as an “effort to secularize, by force and intimidation, a society that would not exist but for the faith which inspired people to sail across unknown waters and trek across unknown frontiers.”

After disparaging the decision, Senator Sessions went on to cosponsor the First Amendment Defense Act, which would permit widespread discrimination against LGBTQ individuals on the basis of religious beliefs.

Senator Sessions also praised the Supreme Court’s troubling 5-4 decision in Burwell v. Hobby Lobby, which held that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act permits closely held, for-profit corporations to deny contraceptive coverage to employees due to religious objections.

If confirmed to be the next Attorney General, Senator Sessions will be responsible for protecting the rights of all Americans, regardless of their faith or beliefs. That is why I am deeply concerned about Senator Sessions’ record, which suggests that he may prioritize the religious beliefs of some faiths over others, and permit religious freedom to be used as a guise for discrimination.

The Attorney General also has great power to determine how the Department of Justice’s resources will be prioritized. I am alarmed that Senator Sessions will not commit to support funding for important programs like COPS and Byrne-JAG. And I am deeply disappointed that he will not commit to increase Justice Department resources for Chicago to address the city’s surge in gun violence.

I asked Senator Sessions about this when we met in person before his hearing and again as part of my written hearing questions. It is well known that there’s a public health crisis facing the City of Chicago. There were more than 760 homicides in Chicago last year, a 58 percent increase over the previous year. More than 4,300 people were shot last year in the city. It is a crisis.

At our meeting, I handed Senator Sessions a copy of Mayor Emanuel’s plan to improve public safety. The plan calls for hiring nearly a thousand more Chicago police; more training and equipment; like body-worn cameras and gunshot detection technology; more mentoring programs for youth; and reforms to rebuild trust and cooperation between police and the community.

All of these are areas where the Justice Department can, and must, help. The Justice Department’s COPS program helps local police departments put more cops on the beat. The Byrne-JAG program helps them buy equipment. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provides mentoring and violence prevention funds. And the Civil Rights Division was invited in by me, the mayor, and the state Attorney General to review the Chicago Police Department’s practices. On January 13, they reached an agreement in principle with the city to pursue much-needed reforms and to seek to enforce the reforms through a consent decree.

I asked Senator Sessions about his support for these efforts, especially in light of President Trump’s tweets where he has urged Mayor Emanuel to ask for Federal help—even though the Mayor has already asked for aid—and threatened to “send in the Feds” to Chicago. But Senator Sessions has steadfastly refused to make any commitment of Justice Department resources to help reduce Chicago’s violence. He refused to commit to increase Justice Department funding for Chicago. And he refused to commit not to cut funding. He refused to commit to honor the agreement in Principle that the Justice Department signed with the city to reform the Chicago Police Department.

And he refused to commit not to request budget cuts to the COPS and Byrne-JAG programs and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

This is unfathomable to me. Now is not the time for the Justice Department to turn its back on the City of Chicago and its people. It is hard to understand how the Attorney General could think about spending $15 billion on an inexpensive and ineffective wall and not commit to spend another penny to address gun violence in Chicago. If the administration took just 1 percent of what they want for a border wall and used it to help Chicago implement the mayor’s public safety plan with more police, training, and youth job programs, we could save a lot of lives. But instead Senator Sessions prioritizes cutting programs that could save children’s lives.

Senator Sessions did say he would support funding for Chicago and the Nation’s cities. That may be helpful, but it is not enough to reduce gun violence. The Chicago Sun-Times looked at Federal gun prosecutions over the past 5 years and found that cities like Detroit and Baltimore had significantly more gun prosecutions over the past 5 years than Chicago, but their per-capita homicide rates are still higher than Chicago’s. So that is not enough.

Senator Sessions also seems to think that immigrants are at the root of our Nation’s problems. That is why he pushes to withhold critical Federal funding to so-called sanctuary cities. But many studies have shown that immigrants are less likely to commit serious crimes than native-born individuals. And there is no evidence whatsoever that undocumented immigrants are responsible for any significant proportion of the murders in Chicago. If sanctuary cities are the problem, why did a sanctuary city like New York have significantly more than Chicago, but their per-capita homicide rates are still higher than Chicago’s? Senator Sessions’ priorities when it comes to these issues does not give me confidence.

I am also troubled by the casual approach that Senator Sessions has adopted when it comes to Russian interference in our Presidential election. Election Day 2016 was a day that will live in cyber infamy. A foreign adversary intentionally manipulated American presidential elections—warning of Russian manipulation going back to early October, President Donald Trump not only resisted these findings, he has praised Russian President Vladimir Putin and dismissed the true nature of Putin’s interference. As early as July of last year, then-candidate Trump urged a foreign adversary of the United States to conduct espionage against Hillary Clinton. He said, “I will tell you this. Russia: If you’re listening, I hope you’re able to find the 30,000 emails that are missing . . . I think you will probably be rewarded mightily by our press.” And
President Trump, who has impulsively attacked just about anyone who criticizes him, has not criticized the one person who is guilty of sponsoring this cyber attack: Vladimir Putin.

This is bigger than one election or one person. This is about our national security, and we should take it seriously.

For those who have been following Putin’s actions over the last several years, this attack should come as no surprise. Russia has conducted cyber warfare against Ukraine, the Netherlands, Georgia, Lithuania, Estonia, and a host of other nations. Russia now appears focused on disrupting the upcoming German elections over Putin’s dislike of Chancellor Merkel. And it could happen again here.

We need to know that the next U.S. Attorney General will take this matter seriously as well and will be independent of the White House. This means allowing career Justice Department prosecutors and the FBI to follow the facts and the law.

I am concerned about Senator Sessions when it comes to this assignment. I asked Senator Sessions questions about this. In his written response, he noted that he had not even read the January 6 intelligence community assessment on Russian involvement in the U.S. election—neither the classified nor the unclassified version. As recently as last week, Senator Sessions admitted he still has not read this report.

The unclassified version incidentally is just a few pages if you don’t count the annexes. I read it in less than 15 minutes.

Senator Sessions, seeking to be the top law enforcement official in the land, should have found time to read this report. His failure to do so is inexplicable. This does not give me confidence that Senator Sessions is giving this matter the attention it deserves.

I also asked Senator Sessions if he would commit not to impede or terminate ongoing Justice Department or FBI investigations into Russian involvement in the 2016 election. He would not make any commitment about allowing investigations to continue if confirmed.

And I asked Senator Sessions if he would recuse himself from any FBI or DOJ investigation into Russian efforts to influence the election. He said he was not aware of a basis to recuse himself.

Well, Department of Justice regulations call for recusals from investigations due to personal or political relationships. And it is clear that Senator Sessions has a close relationship with President Trump, including on Russia issues. Senator Sessions was a prominent supporter of the President’s campaign.

On March 3, 2016, then-candidate Trump announced that Sessions would serve as chairman of Mr. Trump’s National Security Advisory Committee and that he would “provide strategic counsel to Mr. Trump on foreign policy and homeland security.”

In a July 31, 2016 interview with CNN, Senator Sessions stated the following:

“What I want to tell you is that Hillary Clinton left her email system totally vulnerable to the kind of cyber attack that probably did not exist. What is the purpose of this? If you want to use unsecured email to transfer and send sensitive email like I was told, why don’t you ask the Russians? They’re the ones that have them... The big issue is, can we, should we be able to create a new positive relationship? I think that... it makes no sense that we’re at the hospitality level we are.”

On August 15, 2016, USA Today published an article entitled “Sen. Jeff Sessions backs Donald Trump on Russia Policy” detailing how Sessions changed his hawkish position on Russia to align with then-candidate Trump’s statements. It said:

“Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., has long supported increased military spending and tough talk about the threat Russia poses to the U.S. and its allies in Europe. Since becoming an adviser to Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, however, those principles appear to have taken a backseat to Russia’s actions in the 2016 election, as well as Sessions’ close relationship with his political ally. Trump has upended traditional conservative caution toward Russia by exchanging niceties with President Vladimir Putin during telephone calls, sending congratulatory telegrams and letters, and expressing hope for warmer relations. Trump has upended traditional conservative caution toward Russia by exchanging niceties with President Vladimir Putin during telephone calls, sending congratulatory telegrams and letters, and expressing hope for warmer relations.

And Sessions, a frequent surrogate for the Trump campaign in public appearances, is nodding in agreement.”

On October 7, 2016, Politico published a story entitled “Lobbyist advised Trump campaign while promoting Russian pipeline: Richard Burt helped shape candidate’s first foreign-policy speech while lobbying on behalf of a Moscow-controlled gas company.” The Politico story noted that the lobbyist in question “attended two dinners this summer hosted by Alabama Sen. Jeff Sessions, who had been named chairman of Trump’s national security committee” and that the lobbyist “has made public his issues of national security and foreign policy, and wrote white papers for Sessions on the same subjects...”

In an October 30 interview with DefenseNews, Senator Sessions said, “The United States and Russia should be able to be far more harmonious than we are today.”

Clearly, an investigation into the reported Russia-Trump allegations has the potential to significantly impact the Department of Justice. Senator Sessions is a soon-to-be-boss, if he’s confirmed, and his close political ally.

Again, Senator Sessions’ answers to my questions do not give me confidence. In the end, the American people deserve the truth about Russian involvement in our election. The stakes are too high to ignore.

There are other aspects of Senator Sessions’ record that give me serious concerns about what his priorities would be if confirmed. Attorney General, including his vote against authorizing the Violence Against Women Act; his votes against the Detainee Treatment Act and the McCain-Feinstein Army Field Manual Amendment; his past statement that the use of prison chain gangs was “perfectly proper”; his opposition to laws such as the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; his questioning of the Department of Justice’s guarantee of birthright citizenship; and his refusal to commit to recuse himself from involvement in any case, investigation or Office of Legal Counsel decision involving the receipt of emoluments by President Trump. All of these factors have, to my mind, disqualified him.

Mr. President, let me conclude.

We need a nonpartisan Attorney General with the independence, judgment, and backbone to stand up to a President when his actions are illegal or unjust. Senator Sessions is an able politician. He has been an able representative of his State of Alabama. But he is not the right person to serve as Donald Trump’s Attorney General. I do not anticipate Senator Sessions being such an Attorney General. I cannot support his nomination, and I will vote against him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week we have to decide whether Senator Sessions, somebody whom many of us have known and worked with for many years—I certainly have during all of the time he has been in the Senate—is the right person to lead the Department of Justice. I thought long and hard on it. I decided he is not. I would like to share a few reasons why.

In fact, the Trump administration itself underscored what is at stake with this nomination. When the administration accused Acting Attorney General Sally Yates of having “betrayed” the Department of Justice, it was providing a view of the Justice Department that is disturbing and dangerous. The claim that Ms. Yates “betrayed” the Department by refusing to defend the President’s illegal and shameful Executive order—she has to believe that in the Attorney General’s office, your job is to defend the President at all costs. That is wrong. I think Senator Sessions knows that.

There is a reason the Justice Department was left leaderless by the Attorney General: the Attorney General is the people’s attorney, not the President’s attorney. The Trump administration has already shown us why this distinction...
matters. Within its first two weeks, the current administration found itself rebuked in numerous Federal courts around the country. Its extreme agenda cast a shadow over all the President’s nominees. This is an administration that criticized the travel ban by a very conservative Republican. John Yoo, in a New York Times op-ed entitled, “Executive Power Run Amok.” You know there is a problem when the same man who twisted the law in order to dreamlight torture thinks you have gone too far.

The President seems to have a penchant for going too far. During the campaign he promised—and he said this a number of times; it was covered in the press—he would implement a Muslim ban. He actually stood before the cameras and said that. As President, he then signed an Executive order that barred immigration from certain Muslim-majority countries but created an exception that gave preference to members of religions in those countries; that is, non-Muslims. He even spoke to a Christian press organization stating he would protect Christians. That is nothing more than a Muslim ban by another name.

My grandparents fought religious biases in this country. I have always felt one greatness of this country is when we said there would be no religious bias and we would actually stand up for the First Amendment. The First Amendment says you can practice any religion you want or none if you want, and it gives you freedom of speech. Now if you have a country and a government that protects your right to practice any religion you want and protects your right of free speech, then that same government is protecting diversity, and if you have diversity, it is very easy to have democracy.

When a Federal judge in Washington State temporarily blocked this order, President Trump did not express respectful disagreement as every President I have ever known, Republican or Democrat, would. He took to Twitter—Twitter, like a teenage kid—to attack the judge’s legitimacy, labeling him a “so-called judge.” President Trump attempted to blame this judge who was nominated by a Republican President and confirmed by a Republican-led Senate for any future terrorist attack on this country. The President’s words are beneath the American People. It is almost as though he wants to precipitate a constitutional crisis.

That is why the question of who should be our next Attorney General is so critical. This is a President who must have an Attorney General who is willing to stand up and say no for going beyond the law. Sally Yates knew that. Two years ago, Senator Sessions asked Ms. Yates: “Do you think the Attorney General has a responsibility to say no to the President if he asks for something you think is illegal?” Ms. Yates have defended the Lynch nomination, just two years later she proved that by telling the President that his travel ban was indefensible under the law. Perhaps she was remembering the commitment she made to Senator Sessions, and that is exactly what she did.

Many around Senator Sessions felt that she never should have stood up to President Trump. She should stand up to President Obama but not President Trump.

I have reviewed Senator Sessions’ long record. I have reviewed his responses to many questions from members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am not convinced that he is capable of telling the President no. Under oath, Senator Sessions denied that he was involved in creating the Muslim ban Executive order. Well, I will take him at his word, but Senator Sessions’s views are well known to Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In 2015 I offered a simple resolution in the committee. It expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States must not bar individuals from entering into the United States based on their religion—a very simple resolution. Every Democrat, most of the Republicans—including the Republican chairman, Senator Grassley—voted in support of my resolution.

The committee recognized that imposing a religious test for those who seek to enter this country violates our most cherished values, but Senator Sessions broke away from the majority of his Republican colleagues, and he strongly opposed the resolution. I found that deeply concerning in 2015 when he was a Member of the committee. I find it even more disturbing now that he seeks to be our Nation’s top law enforcement official. We need an Attorney General who will stand in the way of religious discrimination, not one who endorses it.

Today I am introducing a very similar resolution. It reaffirms that no one should be blocked from entering into the United States because of their nationality or their religion. I invite Senator Sessions—and I invite all Senators—to cosponsor this resolution. Senator Sessions is still taking an active role in the Intelligence Community. I am seeking voting on controversial Cabinet nominees for President Trump. If he cosponsored it, it would help to reassure Americans that he stands against religious discrimination and religious tests. But my concern whether Senator Sessions would be willing to tell President Trump no extend well beyond religious tests. In fact, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, both Republicans and Democrats pointed to the district attorney for the District of Colorado, to the Judiciary Committee that he would be willing to tell the President no on any issue, no matter how objectionable. Take, for example, the President’s many conflicts of interest. For months, there has been media coverage about President Trump’s conflicts of interest and the constitutional concerns they present. Yet Senator Sessions repeatedly avoided answering written questions on this topic by claiming that he has “not studied the issue.”

I asked Senator Sessions whether President Trump should follow guidance from the Office of Government Ethics in divesting from assets that might create a conflict of interest. Senator Sessions said that he has not studied the issue.

I asked Senator Sessions whether President Trump receiving payments from entities controlled by foreign governments raises any concerns under the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution, which forbids such payments absent Congressional consent. Senator Sessions said that he has not studied the issue.

I asked Senator Sessions whether President Trump’s family members who are running the organization that he still owns should participate in policy discussions or meetings with foreign governments. Again Senator Sessions said that he has not studied the issue.

Senator Sessions has refused to acknowledge that there is a conflict of interest for a President to have a personal financial stake in the policies he pursues by his family. Actu-ally, that is definition 101 of a conflict of interest. The President should not personally profit from their decisions. This answer was particularly troubling because I know that he knows the right answer. Senator Sessions told Senator Feinstein at his hearing: “I own no individual stocks because I want to be sure that I don’t have conflicts of interest.” He added, “I want to adhere to high standards. Well, I appreciate that. But Senator Sessions—and I assume Attorney General Sessions—appear to refuse to hold the President to any standards at all.

In fact, his woeful blindness extends even to the Russian interference into our democracy. In response to questions in the Intelligence Committee’s report on Russian interference—the intelligence community found without a doubt that we had Russian influence in our democracy—he said: “I have not re-reading the report, but Senator Sessions clearly does not accept the intelligence community’s conclusions as contained in the report.”

Well, if he hasn’t read the report on something as critical as this, I suspect he is one of very few Senators who hasn’t. I asked him whether the activi- ties described in the report are illegal: Are they a threat to our democratic process? For anyone other than President Trump, that is not a difficult question. Reading the report, the answer should be obvious yes, but Senator Sessions refused to answer. If Senator Sessions is not willing even to acknowledge facts that make President
Trump uncomfortable, how can we believe that Attorney General Sessions will ever say no to President Trump?

Senator Sessions also refused to answer questions from all nine Democrats on the Judiciary Committee on how he would maintain independence from President Trump, that gives me confidence that he would be willing to stand up to the President. He has demonstrated only blind allegiance. This is a President who first cited what is now called “alternative facts” to deny his small crowd size at the inauguration, but now he is citing “alternative facts” to excuse murders and assassinations by Putin’s regime. That should alarm us all. It shouldn’t matter what party you belong to; as Americans, that should alarm us.

Later today I will describe my concerns about Senator Sessions’ record on civil rights issues. But I have one concern that is made much worse, given Senator Sessions’ lack of independence from President Trump, I am particularly worried that, if confirmed, Senator Sessions will fail to protect Americans’ constitutional right to vote. There is nothing more sacred in a democracy than the right to vote. Yet Senator Sessions called it “a good day for the country but for the South”—when the Shelby County decision, which effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act, was handed down, something that virtually every Republican and Democrat in both the House and Senate voted for that President Bush signed into law.

The fact that Senator Sessions voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act in 2006 doesn’t give me much comfort when immediately after that unanimous vote he turned around and opposed it, notwithstanding his vote, that it was unconstitutional.

We cannot view his record on this issue in isolation because if he is nominated and confirmed to be President Trump’s Attorney General—well, we know the President has his own views on voting in America. Several Republicans, like the Speaker of the House, Mr. Ryan, and our own colleague Senator Graham, have rightly condemned President Bush and his administration for the view, which he defended, that the constitutionality of a widely supported voting rights law was dependent on the idea that millions of illegal votes cost the popular vote, which he lost by nearly 3 million votes. I fear that continuing this dangerous falsehood can be used to justify further attacks on the hard-earned right to vote for racial minority groups, students, poor and elderly citizens.

What bothers me the most is that Senator Sessions again refused to acknowledge the fundamental and plainly visible fact that the President Trump flat out wrong that there were 3 million illegal votes cast. Senator Sessions responded to me that he doesn’t know what data the President may have relied on. Well, the rest of us know there isn’t any such data, but Senator Sessions refuses to admit as much.

So his close ties to President Trump and the important role he played in forming President Trump’s agenda raise important questions about his impartiality in matters involving the President. I asked him several times, What is the scenario in which he would recuse himself, given clear conflicts of interest? But he brushed those questions aside and simply said, “...a supporter of the President’s during the campaign.” Well, that would be fine, but I think Senator Sessions is selling himself short.

He was widely expected to be a central figure in the Trump campaign. A key figure in the Trump campaign, Steve Bannon, called him the President’s “clearinghouse for policy and philosophy.” This relationship appears to fly in the face of the Justice Department’s recusal standards. The Department’s standards mandate recusal when the attorney has “a close identification with an elected official ... arising from a personal or professional relationship thereto or a principal official thereof.” I asked Senator Sessions the obvious question—whether that language would apply to his relationship with President Trump, but he refused to say one way or the other.

The Justice Department has to be independent because it is the chief law enforcement department in our government. But I worry about that independence in this administration. It is already clear that if you say no to this President, there goes your job. Now more than ever, we need an Attorney General who is willing to pay that cost for the good of the country—for the country outweighs any partisan interest of a particular officeholder or a particular President.

I am not convinced that that kind of independence describes Senator Sessions. He has not demonstrated the independence that he himself used to demand of nominees.

David Frum, a former speechwriter for President George W. Bush, recently wrote an article in the Atlantic addressing whether someone should accept an invitation to serve in the Trump administration, given the real risks that there may be tremendous “pressure to do the wrong thing.” The “very first thing to consider,” said the former Bush speechwriter, is, “How sure are you that you indeed would say no? And then humbly consider this second troubling question: If the Trump administration were as convinced as you are that you would do the right thing—would they have asked you in the first place?”

In the case of the nominee before us—the Trump administration’s “clearinghouse for policy and philosophy,” as Mr. Bannon called him—I fear the answer to these questions is clear. That is why I am going to be voting against this nominee.

It is ironic that as we consider the nomination of Senator Sessions to be the Attorney General, a position which he is going to be responsible for is defending the fundamental rights and liberties of the American people—all of them. Senator Sessions supported during the last campaign of President Trump or Secretary Hillary Clinton. But even though Senator Sessions is supposed to defend our fundamental rights, we see President Trump continuing to praise Russian President Vladimir Putin, who has clearly demonstrated his disdain for freedom of speech, of association, of due process, and of the rule of law.

In less than a week the President has attacked a Federal judge for performing his constitutional duty. He has called unfavorable polls “fake.” He has continued to discredit as “dishonest” any media outlet that dares criticize him. His spokesperson, Sean Spicer, echoes these sentiments. They sound remarkably like what one would expect to hear from Vladimir Putin.

In fact, President Trump has done this while retracting his support of torture and his admiration of Putin. Remember, Putin’s critics continue to turn up dead. Putin has stolen tens of billions of dollars that were taken in bribes from oil and gas and other industries. President Trump seems unaware of this, or is unconcerned about it, even though everybody knows about it.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that, after repeatedly lauding Putin’s leadership, Trump is now attempting to emulate Putin’s efforts to spread misinformation, chastise his critics, and intimidate those responsible for upholding the law. His assaults on anyone he perceives to be standing in his way, including a Federal judge nominated by President George W. Bush, is even worse than his routine expressions of contempt for anyone he perceives to be coming straight out of Stephen Bannon’s playbook. Not only has the President expressed little, if any, concern that every U.S. intelligence agency—every U.S. intelligence agency—believes that Russia sought to influence, and quite possibly did influence, the Presidential election, and that Putin himself was involved, but Senator Sessions, who campaigned for the President, refused to recuse himself from decisions related to Russia’s cyber attacks.

Can anybody imagine what the Republican leadership would be saying if the table was turned? They would try to shut down the government to hold a new election.

The point is that, they would demand that an independent commission be established to investigate the Russian hacking, and they would insist that the nominee for Attorney General pledge to recuse himself.

Well, along with Senator Durbin and others, I have called for such an independent commission outside of Congress, but the Republican leaders have
summarily rejected it. It is cynical politics at its worst that puts partisanship over the integrity of our elections.

President Trump and Senator Sessions both speak about the importance of law and order. President Trump and Vladimir Putin seem to agree about what those words mean. Senator Sessions has said nothing to suggest that he disagrees, even though the Congressional Republican leadership recognizes Putin as a dangerous thug who tramples on the rule of law.

While President keep praising this man who assassinates his critics, who has killed people who have criticized him in the media, who has stolen so much money, and taken so many bribes? He has become one of the wealthiest people in the world, but he is not a person to praise. We have a lot of leaders in our own country—both Republicans and Democrats—whom we can praise, but not Vladimir Putin.

I think we have to be careful. We have to maintain the integrity of our democracy, about due process, the rule of law, and about the constitutional checks and balances that distinguish this country from autocracies like Russia. We should expect the nominee for Attorney General, and all public officials, to demonstrate that he will defend these principles, not to remain silent when they are attacked, even if the person attacking them is the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my distinguished colleague from Vermont who has led the Judiciary Committee with such vision and courage over so many years, and whom I respect as a former prosecutor, as an advocate, as a lawyer, and as a conscience of the Senate.

I am deeply concerned that our Nation is careening toward a constitutional crisis, a legal nightmare that will test the independence of the judiciary and require the utmost resolve and integrity from everyone involved in the justice system and from the Congress, because only the Congress may provide the kind of check on the ongoing assault against our court system.

President Trump has repeatedly tried to put himself above the law, and in just a few weeks has moved from scornful conflict-of-interest and disclosure principles to promulgating destructive, discriminatory Executive orders, and openly attacking the judiciary. His personal invectives and insults are unprecedented for the President of the United States against the judiciary.

Without respect for the rule of law and the court system, democracy fails. No Cabinet member has more responsibility to the people of the United States than the Attorney General of the United States. The sweeping authority in this position impacts the lives and livelihoods of everyday Americans, implicating everything from our immigration system to law enforcement, to civil rights, national security, capital punishment, sentencing, and the U.S. Supreme Court.

This job is one I know well. Like some of my colleagues, I served as U.S. attorney in the Department of Justice as the chief Federal prosecutor for Connecticut, for several years, reporting to the U.S. Attorney General, and, then, for a private litigator, and, then, for 20 years as attorney general of the State of Connecticut. I fought alongside, and sometimes against, the U.S. Attorney General and the armies of lawyers at his disposal. In fact, the Attorney General commands thousands of lawyers who embody his power to speak on behalf of the United States. His job is to protect the public from criminal offenders and to convict the guilty, but also to protect an innocent who may be wrongly accused and assure that justice is done.

In fact, as Justice Jackson said about the role of the U.S. Attorney General, which he filled, he is to seek justice, not power—power corrupts, and he who would be a great power must be ready to do great wrong. His duties are so numerous and so important that the Attorney General must always remain independent, not just in reality but in appearance. His decisions must supersede partisan politics. In most cases, there is, in fact, no recourse from his decision without political interference, which would be improper. He is not just another government lawyer. He is not just another Cabinet position. He is the Nation’s lawyer. He is the people’s lawyer. He must be the Nation’s legal conscience.

The job requires a singular level of intellect and integrity, and a nonpartisan, but passionate devotion to the rule of law.

Over the past week, as our Nation’s courts did their job and sorted through the implications of the President’s hasty, ill-conceived, and illegal Executive orders, President Trump called into question the very integrity of our judicial system. Not only did he label U.S. District Court Judge Robart a “so-called judge,” but he suggested that the American people should blame him and our “court system” if something should happen as a result of the court’s blocking his Executive order.

In this anticipatory blame, the bluster and bullying are inappropriate and un-Presidential, and I believe they threaten harm to our democracy as well as the judicial system.

The comments were deeply disturbing to all of us who believe in the integrity of the judicial system—including the American Bar Association, which said through Linda Klein, its president, that “personal attacks on judges are attacks on our Constitution,” and “the independence of the judiciary is not up for negotiation... independence from party politics, independence from Congress, and independence from the President of the United States himself.”

Klein called upon all lawyers to defend the rule of law in light of these attacks on the Constitution. I echo this call proudly today, the importance of which cannot be overstated. No where is that job more significant than the Department of Justice and the Attorney General of the United States as head of that Department. The agency is tasked with seeking and achieving justice, not with carrying out the President’s agenda as a priority.

That does not mean lawyers at the Department of Justice who are currently defending the orders in court are acting improperly or wrongly. What it means is, the country needs an independent justice system staffed by people who are ready to stand up and say, “We will not defend orders that may contravene constitutional law.”

We saw this principle in action last week. We saw what it really means to serve at the Department of Justice and represent not the President but the Constitution and the people of the United States who are ready to stand up and say, “No.”

Klein’s words demonstrated genuine grit and grace in standing strong for the rule of law. Her actions are in the long, proud tradition of the Department. Not since Watergate has an Attorney General or Acting Attorney General been fired for acting in accordance with their conscience and the rule of law.

Unfortunately, President Trump threatens to return us to that era. He has made his intentions clear: The Department of Justice will not be an impediment to the President’s agenda as a priority. Instead, it will be just another enabler of the President’s ongoing efforts to substitute his whims and wishes for legal and ethical responsibilities.

I believe the President’s orders are misguided and illegal. The courts will rule in days. His orders are wrong, in no small part, because they threaten to take away one of the primary reasons why ours is the greatest country in the history of the world—the country that my father, a refugee from Nazi Germany, sought in 1935. He arrived here at 17 years old with not much more than the shirt on his back, speaking
little English, knowing just about no one. This country gave him the chance to succeed.

I think about how sad and ashamed he would be if he saw the actions taken by this President: orders to ban people from entering our country based on their religion; prioritizing one religion against another and raising fears that do damage to our core constitutional principles.

Barring refugees like children who are barred from other lands seeking to come to this country deprives us of the great talents, gifts, and energy that have helped to shape and build this country because we are truly stronger as a result of our diversity. We are a nation of immigrants. Our strength comes from the talents, energy, and vibrancy of these individuals who come to this country as children with their parents.

This order makes us less safe because it provides a recruiting tool to ISIS. We are at war with ISIS, and we must win that war. It frays trust between law enforcement and Muslim communities, but it also weakens us in a deeper moral sense. It is wrong. It is morally wrong. It is wrong for this country, devoted and founded on the ideals welcoming people seeking that beacon of hope, opportunity, and protection.

The rule of law protects us from these moral harms, but the rule of law depends on confidence in its enforcement. As we have seen the harms of these past few days play out in real time, we have also seen people who are willing to stand strong against them. People have gone to the streets in marches and rallies in the New Haven Green and in front of our State Capitol in Connecticut, and all across our State, saying it is not only wrong, but they will rally against this wrong.

All of these points are simply to say that Senator Sessions is an important part of our Nation's law enforcement. As Attorney General of the United States, Senator Sessions’ past positions and his subsequent responses show that he is inherently opposed to providing women with the ability to make those preeminently private health care decisions and personal reproductive rights decisions without interference from the government.

President Trump’s vast business holdings present an unprecedented threat of conflict of interest. Yet the President has not only refused to divest himself, he has mocked the idea that he should. Should conflicts arise, from the emoluments clause or the STOCK Act—the President has opposed key legislation that protected those clinics.

He must have the courage and strength to speak truth to power. He must be able to stand strong against them. People have gone to the streets in marches and rallies in the New Haven Green and in front of our State Capitol in Connecticut, and all across our State, saying it is not only wrong, but they will rally against this wrong.

All of these points are simply to say that Senator Sessions is an important part of our Nation’s law enforcement. As Attorney General of the United States, Senator Sessions’ past positions and his subsequent responses show that he is inherently opposed to providing women with the ability to make those preeminently private health care decisions and personal reproductive rights decisions without interference from the government.

As we all know, declaring abortion illegal solves no problem. Laws against abortion do not stop them from happening, it simply stops them from happening in a safe, legal manner. Laws that restrict abortion force women to endanger their own lives in order to avoid suffering the trauma of childbirth, suffering, and health care decisions and personal reproductive rights decisions without interference from the government.

Senator Sessions’ congressional record and hearing show that he is inherently opposed to providing women with the ability to make those preeminently private health care decisions and personal reproductive rights decisions without interference from the government.

Focus for a moment, shall we, on some of the rights that affect women and their privacy. Women comprise more than half the population, but unfortunately our society and our laws have too frequently prevented them from achieving the equality that every American should enjoy. Over the course of his career, Senator Sessions has opposed key legislation that protects and further enhances women’s rights.

In 1973, the Supreme Court recognized a vital constitutional right of privacy for women. It is a right that is both basic and fundamental, now enshrined in five decades of precedent, that women have the freedom to choose what medical procedures they will undergo, with state-sponsored health care decisions and personal reproductive rights decisions without interference from the government.

Senator Sessions showed this point to me through his testimony at his hearing and his subsequent responses. While he must be ready to say no to the President, we must also demand that he is unwilling or unready to perform his core tasks.
he voted against included significant new language that closed a glaring loophole in the jurisdictional requirements of this basic law. The bill guaranteed and granted tribal communities power over non-Indian defendants who commit domestic violence against Native American women, and before the reauthorization act, tribal courts lacked jurisdiction to prosecute these horrific crimes and often the assailant would escape prosecution entirely.

During his confirmation hearing, Senator Sessions told us that he had a "big concern" about that jurisdictional provision in the reauthorization act. He was concerned that the law would leave non-Native Americans open to prosecution under tribal law, despite safeguards in the bill that were clear and unequivocal. The large gaps that the original law left were apparently acceptable to him.

Additionally, the VAWA reauthorization included a non-discrimination clause. This provision protects members of the LGBT community from discrimination in housing and employment, schools, and other areas of civil rights cases.

Senator Sessions also took this issue with the nondiscrimination provisions in the reauthorization act, including the protection for LGBT individuals. He took issue with those provisions. I am concerned, also, by several other votes that Senator Sessions took in 2009. He voted against extending Federal unemployment benefits to people who leave their jobs as a result of being victims of domestic or sexual assault.

In 2009, he voted against an amendment which would have strengthened the rights of victims of wage discrimination, contributing to the roadblocks and hurdles that women encounter while facing issues of inequality. As recently as March of 2015, Senator Sessions voted against the Paycheck Fairness Act, a vote he has taken multiple times before. These bills sought to strengthen women’s rights and opportunities in the workplace.

In 2017, our world is one where women still struggle to obtain the same pay levels as men in the workplace for the same work. This kind of discrimination is un-American and really an embarrassment to our Nation.

Senator Sessions’ voting record consistently shows his opposition to this kind of key legislation designed to protect women from oppression and discrimination and protect women’s autonomy and choice, and I cannot support an Attorney General with this record.

Speaking on the floor some time ago, I added other details as to the reasons why I have opposed Senator Sessions. I see colleagues on the floor right now so I will continue with this point. Over the past weeks, I have received an outpouring of outrage from throughout my State of Connecticut, more than 4,500 letters from Connecticut residents opposing this nomination because they recognize the need, the desperate imperative for a true champion of civil rights and liberties, constitutional freedoms in this office facing the threat that is more real and urgent than ever in our history. Just hours ago, I received a million signatures on a petition from civil rights groups. They are contained magically on a thumb drive that is so easy to display, even if the signatures were not million brave and steadfast individuals and the organizations that represent them. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and Liberties, other groups that have proudly and actively worked on this cause are to be thanked, as are the advocates throughout the country who have galvanized public opinion, raised awareness, and shown what democracy looks like.

This is what democracy looks like. This is what Connecticut looks like—people rallying and rising up against an unconstitutional immigration ban, against a set of nominees that fail to reflect and serve America against an Attorney General, in particular, who cannot be relied upon to actively and aggressively, vigorously, and vigilantly protect our constitutional rights and liberties. We need a champion of those rights and liberties. I will support Mr. Sessions as our next Attorney General because we cannot count on him to do so, and I urge my colleagues to join in this opposition.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAUKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my 5 minutes, the distinguished senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. Shaheen, be recognized; and following Mrs. Shaheen, the distinguished whip of the Republican Party, Mr. Cornyn, be recognized.

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

BIPARTISAN BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. ISAUKSON. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a labor of love before the U.S. Senate. We are talking about confirmations of people for Secretary positions on the Cabinet of the new President. It is not talking about all kinds of things. We are in a budget period of time. We are talking about this year having two budgets—one we are going to use early and one we are going to use late.

There is, since 1980, we haven’t passed all 12 appropriations bills in the year but twice. In other words, in the last 37 years, we have only twice done our job that we ought to do every year. So 2 years out of 37 we did it; 35 years we did not do it.

I am joined with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, a great Governor of that State and now a great Member of the U.S. Senate, to propose for the third Congress in a row an idea that is so simple and so great that it works and it works for all the American people. It is called a biennial budget process. What it does is it embraces a discipline for how you budget to bring about the right solutions in terms of what you do.

What the biennial budget process does is it says this. We would be far better off if we had more oversight of spending, more authorization projects, and more discipline in the way we do it. We need to think ahead before we start appropriating more.

Therefore, in every even-numbered year, we ought to do oversight of our spending, we ought to do accountability in our spending processes, we ought to do accountability in our spending process, and we ought to do no appropriations.

In our odd-numbered years, the non-election years, is when you appropriate. Every other year you are spending. Then every three years you are doing accountability. What that causes is the cream to rise to the top. All of a sudden in 1 year, instead of departments coming to say we don’t have time to oversight, we have to authorize more money. They come to say: Here is how we spent our money, here are the savings we have found, and here is how we want to move forward in a more efficient way.

It is a little bit like my kitchen table and my family. All the way through my 49 years of marriage, my wife and I and our kids have sat around the kitchen table, decided what our family priorities are, from our vacations to our jobs, and then we budget our money for that year so we can pay our bills, enjoy the time we had together, and end up not being broke at the end of the year.

What happens when you don’t do that and you are a government is you end up owing $19 trillion and don’t know how to pay for it. I would continue to spend at the escalated rate that we are spending without more accountability on the process so I think the biennial process is the right way to go.

There is some documentation for that. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire was a Governor of her State who had a biennial budget, but 19 of the 50 States have biennial budgets already. They work, and they work fine. They give them the luxury of doing what we don’t do in Washington, they give them the flexibility of spending the time to study their appropriations, find savings in existing taxation before they start raising anybody’s taxes or appropriating anymore.

It is a simple, disciplined way to go about the business of spending the people’s money in the same way they make their determination.

I ran a pretty large company for 19 years and was in business for 35 years before I came to Congress, and that requirement is hard, but it is not hard because it is complex; it is hard because it is tough. Prioritizing your appropriations is tough business.
Somebody has to do it, and the people who are elected to the Congress of the United States are elected to do that job.

I am proud to join Senator SHAHEEN on the floor today and urge all Members of the Senate to pass biennial budget process. I remind everyone in the room that we had this vote a few years ago as a test vote on an all-night vote-a-rama on the budget, and we got 72 votes, if I remember correctly, in favor of the budget. We had to, past Budget Committee chairman vote in favor of the biennial budget. We have had people from the majority and the minority vote for it. The fact is, it is a good idea whose time has come. I am pleased to join Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire and plead to the Members of the U.S. Senate to do what we ask the American people to do. Let's prioritize the way we spend our money, find savings where we can, and run a more efficient, more honest government, and a more transparent government for all.

Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am really pleased to be able to join my colleagues Senator ISAKSON from Georgia as we have introduced our bipartisan legislation, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act. I think this is a welcomed piece of bipartisan legislation at this point in the year. I want to start by thanking the Senator from Georgia for his very good work on this legislation. He has been leading this effort since he first came to the Senate in 2005, and I have been fortunate enough to partner with him on the legislation in the past two Congresses.

I think that by working together, we could produce this common sense, bipartisan legislation that could change the way we do business in Washington for the better. As Senator ISAKSON said, there is no question that our budget process is broken.

Since 1980, we have only finished two budgets on time. In that timeframe, Congress has resorted to nearly 170 short-term funding bills or continuing resolutions. We also experienced a costly and dangerous government shutdown in October 2013 that cost our economy $24 billion.

It hurt small businesses. It hurt the people across this country.

That is no way to govern. I understand, as Senator ISAKSON said, that biennial budgeting will not fix everything, but it is common sense that will encourage us to work across the aisle to become better stewards of taxpayer dollars. I can attest to this personally because, as Governor of New Hampshire, I saw how you make a biennial budget work.

In each biennium, I worked with a Republican legislature, and we put together a balanced budget in the first year of the legislative session. In the second year, we had the opportunity to do oversight. That is exactly what this bill would allow us to do here in Washington. It is a reform that has worked in New Hampshire, and it has worked in 18 other States. So as Senator ISAKSON and States in all have biennial budgeting, and it really gives us a better opportunity to review the budget to see what is working, what is effective, and what is not.

One example that I think shows how we can do better is looking at several reports that have been issued by the Government Accountability Office. They have found areas of waste, fraud, and duplicative programs. And they have identified ways to reform things, like our farm program, to cut down in inefficiencies in defense, and to reduce fraud in health programs. But today, Congress hasn't really taken the time and effort to go through those recommendations. Under biennial budgeting, we would be able to look at those kinds of recommendations and implement savings in the second year of the budget process.

Biennial budgeting also reduces the number of opportunities for manufactured crises, like a government shutdown. As Senator ISAKSON said, we have gotten real momentum in the last couple of years. We had a great vote in 2013 in the Senate, where we had an overwhelming bipartisan group endorse the concept. And we saw a vote in the House Budget Committee where legislation on a biennial budget passed with a bipartisan vote. It not only passed the House but had over half of the House Members as cosponsors. And we saw a favorable hearing in the Senate Budget Committee on the legislation, so I think momentum is growing for this idea. It is a real way for us to take action to reform the budget process and make it work better.

The bill that we are introducing has 13 bipartisan cosponsors. We are going to keep working to get more bipartisan cosponsors, and I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in this effort. I look forward to continuing to work with Senator ISAKSON and with Senators ENZI and SANDERS on the Budget Committee to get this important reform through the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. RURO). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my post closure debate time to Senator FEINSTEIN from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
known as the preclearance provision. And while the overwhelming majority of civil rights organizations considered this ruling, which invalidated a landmark achievement of the civil rights movement—a devastating defeat—Senator Sessions was quoted as saying that it was a “good thing for the South.” He has been quoted as saying that he views the Voting Rights Act as an intrusive piece of legislation. We often refer to the shorthand name for this same decision: it is simply Shelby County. But I believe the full title is instructive: Shelby County v. Holder. Holder, of course, was Attorney General Eric Holder. And in this case, the Supreme Court ruled against the Department of Justice and against the views of this Congress, which voted in 2006 to extend section 5 for another 25 years.

It also demonstrated the awesome responsibility and discretion of the Attorney General. Eric Holder was fighting a case against the State of Alabama with a history of racial discrimination from future voter suppression efforts. In contrast, as U.S. Attorney General, Jeff Sessions prosecuted several members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the leader of civil rights organizations formerly led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He indicted these people for allegedly attempting to fraudulently register people in minority communities to vote. All of those dismissed the case. However, the chilling effect of this type of use of government authority in our civil society should not be underestimated. This illustrated the awesome power of the prosecutor in our judicial system. That power is exponentially greater in the Office of the U.S. Attorney General.

As I said, Senator Sessions is also an outspoken advocate for voter ID laws, including at the Federal level. In State after State including my home State of New Hampshire, unnecessarily stringent voter ID laws have been passed by Republicans with the clear intent to deny access to the ballot box on the part of minorities, the poor, and women. Striking down the laws passed by Republicans in North Carolina, a unanimous Federal court ruled that they “target African Americans with almost surgical precision”—that is a direct quote—and “impose cures for problems that did not exist.”

Invalidating similar laws in Wisconsin, U.S. District Court Judge James Peterson wrote: “The Wisconsin experience demonstrates that a preoccupation with mostly phantom election fraud leads to real incidents of disenfranchisement, which undermine rather than enhance confidence in the elections, particularly in minority communities.”

President Trump has falsely claimed on numerous occasions that 3 to 5 million people voted illegally in the election in November. We have even heard that claim in New Hampshire, where our deputy secretary of State, a Republican, has said those claims are not accurate.

Throughout our history, these arguments, not grounded in fact and data, have been used as a pretext for advancing new voter ID laws, including at the State level. Senator Sessions voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. Senator Sessions would enthusiastically support this agenda. I believe that to be disqualifying for any nominee to serve as Attorney General.

When I was Governor of New Hampshire I had the honor of being able to appoint the attorney general in our State. My qualification was that the attorney general should be the people’s attorney. I think that is no less true of the Attorney General of the United States.

I am also deeply concerned by the nominee’s record on issues associated with women’s health and autonomy. For example, as Senator Blumenthal said so eloquently earlier this afternoon: Senator Sessions voted against the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. This law has been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis each time it has been brought up since 1994.

The 2013 reauthorization expanded the scope of domestic violence programs, yet Senator Sessions was one of only 22 who voted no. This is of particular concern when we see the framework for what is suggested will be the Trump administration’s budget, which would eliminate the Office on Violence Against Women at a time when one in five women is a victim of rape, either completed or attempted.

Senator Sessions has also been a fierce opponent of a woman’s right to choose. He voted against a resolution supporting the Roe v. Wade decision, which affirmed the constitutional right of women to control our own reproductive choices. He has cosponsored legislation to prohibit Federal funding for health insurance plans that include coverage for abortion. He even opposed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which removed barriers to women who bring charges of discriminatory wage practices.

Senator Sessions voted against it in 2008 and again in 2009, when it became law over his opposition. Senator Sessions has consistently argued for “color blind” enforcement of our Nation’s civil rights laws. He contends that race as a legal issue has been effectively addressed, and, therefore, diversity programs unfairly discriminate against White Americans.

For the same reason, he has voted against legislation to protect the rights and safety of the LGBT community. In 2009, he vehemently opposed the Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Act, which protects LGBT Americans from hate crimes. In debate on that proposed law, Senator Sessions said:

“Today I am not sure women or people with different sexual orientations or gender identities would feel safe in that kind of discrimination. I just don’t see it.”

Well, Senator Sessions, if you talked to the members of the gay and lesbian community, as I have, if you would talk to women across this country who have faced discrimination in employment practices, who have faced discrimination before the Affordable Care Act, in terms of our health insurance, who have faced discrimination in terms of their ability to seek justice against women, you would understand that we need to make sure that the laws protect women and minorities.

In 2013, Senator Sessions voted against a measure to prohibit discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation or gender identity. And similarly, he voted in favor of a constitutional amendment to ban gay marriage.

Mrs. McCaskill. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 sentence?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I will yield to the honorable Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. McCaskill. Thank you so much. I yield the remainder of my postcloture debate time to Senator Feinstein.

I thank Senator Shaheen. I apologize for interrupting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. So in 2013, as I was saying, Senator Sessions voted against a measure to prohibit discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation or gender identity. And similarly, he voted in favor of a constitutional amendment to ban gay marriage. Finally, Senator Sessions’ views on immigration are just outside the mainstream. Most Americans want fair, humane treatment for would-be immigrants to the United States, as well as for undocumented immigrants who are already here.

Senator Sessions has amply demonstrated that he does not agree with this view. Since he came to the Senate, he has been a leading opponent of bipartisan immigration reform efforts. In 2007 and again in 2013, he was instrumental in defeating immigration reform proposals that had widespread support in Congress and the country.

More recently, he has been a key advisor to Candidate Trump and now President Trump on immigration policies, encouraging extreme positions such as a ban on Muslim immigration and harsh treatment of DREAMers, those undocumented immigrants who arrived in the United States as young children.

I have also had the opportunity to work with Senator Sessions in trying to renew and extend the special immigrant visa program for those Afghans and Iraqis who helped our men and women in the military as we were fighting conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have heard from multiple members of our military who served that these interpreters and these people from Iraq and Afghanistan who arrived in the United States are the very people that they could help keep them safe have saved lives and have made a difference in that military conflict because of the
help they provided to our fighting men and women.

Yet Senator SESSIONS, as we were trying to extend that program, was unwilling to allow us to make sure that we could bring them to the United States, with all of the vetting that goes on, so make sure that the people who come here are actually people who helped us. He opposed extending that program to allow all of those folks to come here.

I believe we need an Attorney General who will not only insist on equal enforcement of the laws but who has a passion for pursuing justice and fairness for all Americans, as well as for those who want to visit or who want to immigrate to the United States. In my view, Senator Sessions has failed to demonstrate that commitment.

Indeed, I worry that as Attorney General, Senator Sessions would affirm and encourage Trump’s most troubling tendencies, especially with regard to minorities, women, immigrants, and to the LGBTQ community. I believe Senator Sessions is the wrong person for the critically important post of U.S. Attorney General. I intend to vote against his confirmation.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my post cloture debate time to Senator SCHUMER. I want to thank Senator THUNE for his courtesy.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. The Senator has that right.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we continue to just sort of—at a glacial pace—work through the nominations. We have in front of us the nomination for Attorney General of the United States, an eminently qualified nominee that a Democrat chose. Senator JEFF SESSIONS would affirm and encourage that commitment.

Senator JEFF SESSIONS would affirm that commitment. He clerked for two Supreme Court Justices, Byron White and Anthony Kennedy. He worked in both private practice and at the Justice Department before being nominated to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals where he served with distinction for 10 years. He is widely regarded as a brilliant and thoughtful jurist and a gifted writer whose opinions are known for their clarity.

Above all—above all—he is known for his impartiality, for his commitment to following the law wherever it leads, whether he likes the results or not. A judge who likes every outcome he reaches is very likely a bad judge. Judge Gorsuch, on the other hand, is much more fair. Why? Because a judge who likes every outcome he reaches is likely making decisions based on something other than the law. That is a problem.

The job of a judge is to interpret the law, not to write it; to call balls and strikes, not to design the rules of the game. Everyone’s rights are put in jeopardy when judges step outside their appointed role and start changing the meaning of the law to suit their personal opinions.

Judge Gorsuch’s nomination has been greeted with praise by liberals as well as conservatives. I think one of the biggest reasons for that is that both a Democrat and a Republican can be relied on to judge impartially. Here is what Neil Katyal, an Acting Solicitor General for President Obama had to say about Judge Gorsuch:

I have seen him up close and in action, both on the court and on the Senate Rules Committee (where both of us serve); he brings a sense of fairness and decency to the job and a temperament that suits the Nation’s highest Court. I, for one, wish it were a Democrat choosing the next justice, but since that is not to be, one basic criterion should be paramount: Is the nominee someone who will stand up for the rule of law and say no to a President or Congress that strays beyond the Constitution and law?

I have no doubt that if confirmed, Judge Gorsuch would help to restore confidence in the rule of law. His years on the bench is a commitment to judicial independence, a record that should give the American people confidence that he will not compromise principle to favor the President who appointed him.

Again, those are the words of Neil Katyal, former Acting Solicitor General for President Obama.

When Judge Gorsuch was nominated to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, his nomination sailed through the Senate. Both of his home State Senators—one a Republican and one a Democrat—supported his nomination, and he was confirmed by a unanimous vote.

Then-Senator Obama could have objected to the nomination. He didn’t. Senator SCHUMER could have objected to the nomination. He didn’t. Then-Senators Biden or Clinton or Kennedy could have objected to the nomination, but they didn’t. Why? Presumably because they saw what almost everybody sees today; that Judge Gorsuch is exactly the kind of justice one would expect the President who appointed him. Gorsuch is eminently qualified, thoughtful, fair, and impartial.

Unfortunately, this time around, some Senate Democrats are being less public-spirited. They are upset that their party didn’t win the Presidential election so they are threatening to filibuster an eminently qualified nominee, an eminently qualified nominee that a number of them had previously supported.

The Democratic leader recently said:

Now more than ever, we need a Supreme Court Justice who is independent, eschews ideology, who will preserve our democracy, protect fundamental rights, and will stand up for the President who has already shown a willingness to bend the Constitution.

That, of course, is precisely the kind of judge that Judge Gorsuch is, as pretty much everyone who knows him—both liberal and conservative—can attest, but leaving that aside, if the Democratic leader who already has these concerns about Judge Gorsuch, why did he allow him to receive a unanimous confirmation to the Tenth Circuit?
Surely, if he had these concerns, it was his obligation to speak up.

No one likes to lose an election, but that is what happens in a democracy, and throwing a temper tantrum and refusing to play ball after you lose is not the most enlightened response. Democrats do not want to confirm him because they are mad that President Trump is the one who nominated him.

Well, it is time for them to get over that. It is one thing to oppose the President when he does something they believe truly endangers our country; it is another thing entirely for them to oppose this outstandingly well-qualified nominee because they are still upset about the election.

Reports have surfaced that the President will make his decision sometime this week, which is quite unfair to those of us that have talked to agrees he should get a hearing or that he should be confirmed. If any other President historically of either party—President Obama's nominee, Elena Kagan and Sonia Sotomayor. Had this President nominated Justices Elena Kagan and Sonia Sotomayor. Had this time gone the other way, we were also waiting for many of those nominees to provide the background information that is required for those positions to have the background checks done, to have the questions that have been put forward to them in hearings answered. So I think we should all work together to move these nominees. That is what I have done on the Small Business Committee as the ranking member, and we have worked very well because that nominee provided all the required information. She had the FBI background check done, and we were able to hold a hearing on her. Well, that is what we expect from every nominee.

So I am disappointed to hear my colleagues come down and say that we are not going to give Judge Gorsuch a fair hearing. I think we are going to do that, but we are going to do it in a way that provides information to the American people so we all know where this judge stands and what he thinks about the law on the Supreme Court. I think rather than name-calling, it would be more effective for us to work together to get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I will just point out to the Senator from New Hampshire—perhaps she knows it, perhaps she doesn't, but her leader has suggested a 60-vote threshold for this nominee. I am delighted to hear her say that they are going to provide a hearing for consideration. I hope that she, like all of our colleagues, will provide this judge an opportunity to be heard, to respond to questions because I think they will find, as most of us who have looked at his record, that this is an exceptionally well-qualified judge. He is a very bright legal mind and somebody who I think understands what the role of a judge is in our constitutional democracy.

With respect to the nominees we are considering, we are here right now, and the Senator from Wyoming and some of her colleagues were here overnight last night stalling, if you will, to allow for votes on nominees that have been put forward by this administration.

I don't think you can dispute the record. At this time 8 years ago, President Obama had 21 of his nominees in place. This President has seven. What I mentioned earlier, you have to go back to the time of Dwight Eisenhower, roll back to today, President from that point forward has had, on this day, all or most of their nominees in place and confirmed by the Senate. So there is no question: There is no question what is going on here.

I am being called names. I am just pointing out what I see every single day: that is, foot-dragging and delays and obstruction trying to prevent a President—who they, understandably, didn't like getting elected—from being able to get his team in place.

All I am simply saying is I think the American people expect more of us, I think they expect better of us, and I think we have to answer the call to duty to allow that team to be put in place so this President and his team can go about the important business of governing this country.

You cannot debate the facts with respect to the number of nominees who have been confirmed to date with this President and Presidents going back in history, and I said earlier, you have to go back to George Washington. I think that is accurate. I think this is a time when you look at the annals of history to find any time where you see what is happening today happen in the Senate with any President historically of either party.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk about a couple of my friends. I want to say a few words about Judge Neil Gorsuch’s nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch to serve as the U.S. Supreme Court.

His work itself speaks highly of his understanding of the Constitution and the values that we, as Americans, hold dear. Some of the first signs Judge Gorsuch would be a great jurist happened just around the corner from here in Washington, DC, where he won a national debate championship in high school.

He attended college at Columbia University and received a scholarship to Harvard Law School. As a new lawyer, he was back here in Washington learning from some of the best jurists in America. He performed clerkships first to the U.S. Supreme Court of Appeals for the DC district court and later for Justice Byron White and Anthony Kennedy at the U.S. Supreme Court.

After working in private practice and at the Department of Justice, in 2006, President George W. Bush nominated Judge Gorsuch to serve as the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit—that is my circuit. The Senate confirmed him by voice vote. Let me say that again. In 2006, this body was so confident about Neil Gorsuch, his character and his qualifications to serve as a Federal judge—yes, a circuit court judge—that he was confirmed without anyone even asking for a recorded vote. I consider that unan- mous.

On the bench of the busy Tenth Circuit, Judge Gorsuch has proven he takes seriously his duty to uphold the Constitution. He is known for his legal opinions that stridently defend our
most fundamental constitutional rights and for writing those opinions in a way that is engaging and easy to understand.

He knows that his work as a judge is about serving this institution, not his personal preferences, as he said recently in his recent White House nomination. After his nomination was announced by President Trump, “A judge who likes every outcome he reaches is very likely to be a bad judge stretching for results he prefers rather than those the law demands.”

I love that quote.

As a uniquely exceptional scholar and respected jurist, not to mention a fellow westerner and avid outdoorsman who shares my love of fly fishing, he is the kind of man I trust to serve America on the highest Court of the land.

I have met Judge Gorsuch, and he has a lot of support from folks in Wyoming, in the Wyoming legal community, and from both parties. I got calls from people of both parties saying he is the one we want to put up. I know and I trust those people, and I know and trust Judge Gorsuch, and I value those people’s opinions. I believe he has a good understanding of the legal issues that matter to my home State.

I would be remiss if I didn’t state my disappointment in all the unproductive distraction about this pick by activists bent on politicizing the judicial nomination process. If their rhetoric and antics in the last days and weeks have told us anything, it is that no matter who President Trump nominated to fill the spot on the Supreme Court, they would have objected—no matter how learned, how objective, or how many hundreds of hours a nominee had already spent on the bench.

In November, millions of people went to the polls and rejected this kind of tired partisan bickering when they voted for a change in Washington. Those same voters went to the polls and rejected this kind of distraction about this pick by activists who come before us. Never is that more true than when our Nation faces a vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Jeff Sessions was nominated by President Ronald Reagan to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama. At that position, he handled a variety of cases at the trial level, including those related to wrongful death, gun violations, forgeries, bank robberies, drugs, and enforcing criminal penalties for pollution.

I am not an attorney myself, but I understand those are exactly the kinds of cases that teach foundational legal skills to a young attorney—managing a docket that may include dozens of cases at any one time; working long hours to track down key evidence and witnesses; developing relationships with investigators and closely advising them to ensure relevant and admissible evidence is gathered lawfully; giving up nights and weekends to prepare witnesses, motions, and arguments for trial; getting a case across the finish line; and conferring with victims to assure they are afforded the rights guaranteed to them by law.

As the proud product of my work and legal training paid off in 1981, when Senator Sessions was nominated by President Ronald Reagan to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama. For the next 12 years Jeff Sessions represented Federal agencies in legal controversies, prosecuted criminal cases, collected debts owed to the government, and defended the civil rights of U.S. citizens. He did this while also serving his country in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1973 to 1986.

Later he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and later as a military attorney, where the Army no doubt benefited greatly from his years of civilian legal training and practice.

In 1995, Senator Sessions was elected attorney general for the State of Alabama, and he served for 2 years as the State’s chief legal officer. Two years later he was elected to the U.S. Senate. I was first elected to the Senate in that same year, and Jeff Sessions has been my friend ever since. But I personally know the man, not just the Senator, and I believe him to be a caring person who wants justice for people and has compassion for people, no matter their backgrounds.

During his 20 years in the Senate, Jeff Sessions has worked on many tough legislative issues that further qualify him to serve as Attorney General. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, he has fought for the confirmation of judges committed to following the law. Consistent with his experience as a prosecutor, he has led successful legislative efforts to improve law and order, many times working with his colleague Jeff Merkley. He worked with another of my good friends, the late Senator Ted Kennedy, on legislation to reduce sexual assaults in prisons. He worked with Senator Durbin to pass legislation in 2010 to bring fairness to Federal drug sentencing and provide tougher penalties to repeat drug traffickers.

But his efforts haven’t been limited to the Judiciary Committee. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he has long advocated for America’s military and for those who serve in it. In 2006, he worked with Senator Lieberman to pass a law increasing death benefits for family members of fallen combat personnel and to increase members Group Life Insurance benefits.

He has worked to restrain the growth of Federal spending and rebalance Federal funding for HIV/AIDS treatment; through the Ryan White CARE Act. Those are just a few of his many legislative accomplishments as a U.S. Senator.

Jeff Sessions is a well-educated attorney, an accomplished prosecutor, and a skilled legislator. But I also believe his character, work ethic, and temperament make him well-suited to serve as America’s chief law enforcement officer of the Federal Government.

As I mentioned, he has been my friend and colleague for over 20 years. I am very proud to be able to support and vote for Jeff Sessions. He is a man who is guided by his principles. He is very active in his family’s church back in Mobile and in the entire Methodist community of Alabama. He and his wife Mary have raised three wonderful children who have given them ten grandchildren.

I believe Senator Sessions has the experience, character, and drive to be a fantastic Attorney General. If confirmed, he is committed to strengthening partnerships between Federal and local law enforcement officers to fight crime, and, specifically, to take out drug cartels and criminal gangs. He has vowed to prosecute criminals who use guns in committing crimes. And he will prosecute individuals who repeatedly violate America’s immigration laws.

In November millions of voters went to the polls and voted for change. I believe the priorities Senator Sessions will pursue if confirmed as Attorney General are shared by those voters. I would note the many organizations and individuals who have endorsed his nomination, including the Fraternal Order
of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, and 25 State attorneys general. These are people at the frontlines of law enforcement, and I think they know what it takes to make a great Attorney General.

Among our most important duties as Members of this body is to carefully vet all nominees that come before us. We have before us an opportunity to support the nomination of a man of high moral character, whose training, education, and professional experience make him the very best-qualified to serve our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Senator Jeff Sessions to serve as our next U.S. Attorney General.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my debate time to Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I yield one hour of the time under my control to Senator Booker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. And I yield 30 minutes of my time to Senator Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. And I yield 10 minutes of my time to Senator Klobuchar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader. Mr. SCHUMER. I yield one hour under my control to Senator Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues and make remarks on Senator Sessions' nomination to serve as Attorney General. I will be coming back later this evening to focus on voting rights and some of the other issues at hand—freedom of the press, antitrust. I am actually the ranking member on that subcommittee, and while Senator Sessions has assured me that if confirmed, he will keep the independence of that part of the Justice Department away from outside influence from the White House, I am very focused on that because I think we have seen a wave of mergers, and I want to address that more in depth later.

I worked successfully with Senator Sessions on a number of U.C.'s over the years such as adoption and human trafficking. We have worked together well, and if he is confirmed, I am sure we will find some areas of common agreement. I am not supporting him, however, simply because he is in person and I have talked about it at the Judiciary Committee because of my concerns relating to some of his views on some of the core functions of the Justice Department, and that is enforcing voting rights, the handling of immigration issues, the freedom of the press, and the Violence Against Women Act.

Now, he has assured me that he will keep the independence of the Justice Department against Women Act. But I was very concerned that he had actually voted against the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization recently. It was something that a majority of Republican Senators voted for and every single woman Senator, Democrat or Republican, voted in favor of.

As a prosecutor and a U.S. Senator, one of my main criminal justice priorities has been enforcing and reauthorizing VAWA or the Violence Against Women Act. It is a bill that took roots in my State, thanks to the efforts on the initial bill of former Senator Paul Wellstone and his wife Sheila. Both of them tragically died in a plane crash, and we lost them very much. But Paul and Sheila's legacy lives on in the work of the Violence Against Women Act.

It has a long history, as the President knows, of bipartisan support. Since one of our predecessors in 1994, we have made great strides in raising awareness that these are serious crimes, not shameful secrets. Since the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act, annual domestic violence statistics have fallen by 50 percent, but the data and the statistics make clear that domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault are still a major problem in America. According to data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for every minute, 20 people in the United States are victims of physical violence by an intimate partner. That is about 10 million people every year.

Millions more individuals are the victims of stalking crimes each year, with approximately 15 percent of women at some point during their lifetime experiencing stalking, during which they feel very fearful or believe that they or someone close to them could be harmed or killed.

I would like to note briefly that I am pleased that the Senate recently passed the resolution that Senator Perdue and I introduced on stalking to raise awareness. I have been confronted by these issues of domestic violence and stalking case where I was a Senator. In fact, that is when I was Hennepin County attorney. That is the largest prosecutor's office in our State. I managed an office of about 400 people. With that big office handling everything from representing our State's biggest public hospital to violent murder cases, the poster that you saw when you walked into our office and down the hallway so that everyone could see it was a picture of a woman who was beaten up. She had a Band-Aid over her nose, and I thought it was like a baby boy. The words read: Beat your wife, and it is your son that goes to jail. Why? That poster reminds everyone that domestic violence and sexual assault just don't hurt the immediate victims. They hurt children, families, and entire communities. We know that kids who see violence happen are twice as likely to commit it themselves and that the community that I worked with Senator Leahy along with Senator Crapo to make sure that the Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized.

What does this legislation do? The legislation ensures that law enforcement has the tools to prosecute domestic and sexual violence and ensures that victims have the support they need to get back on their feet. But we also made some important updates on the law, including addressing the problem of above-average levels of domestic violence in tribal areas, by allowing tribal courts to prosecute and to handle cases with people who are tribal members and in very specific cases when violence is committed on the reservation.

Providing a uniform nondiscrimination provision was also included to ensure services are available to everyone who needs them, including victims in same-sex relationships. The new bill also strengthens protections for victims and increased accountability for grant recipients. It also strengthened and updated anti-stalking laws to better address the new technologies that predators are using to stalk their victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Senator Sessions' nomination to serve as Attorney General of the United States. As a prosecutor and a U.S. Senator, I am very focused on that because I think we have seen a wave of mergers, and I want to address that more in depth later.

I worked successfully with Senator Sessions on a number of U.C.'s over the years such as adoption and human trafficking. We have worked together well, and if he is confirmed, I am sure we will find some areas of common agreement. I am not supporting him, however, simply because he is in person and I have talked about it at the Judiciary Committee because of my concerns relating to some of his views on...
her anymore. I went to meet with the family before the funeral with our prosecutor and our victim witness advocate. I heard the story then that at the airport—the little girl had never met her deceased mother’s twin sister. They had twins. And this day, the little girl got off the airplane and her grandparents and that aunt got off the airplane, the little girl ran up to that aunt and grabbed her and said “Mommy, Mommy” because she thought that was her mother and that her mother was still alive.

Those are the victims of domestic violence. It is not just the immediate victim; it is everyone around them.

Or, the case in Lake City, MN, of Officer Shawn Schneider, an incredibly brave police officer who was called one day to a domestic violence case. It was a man who was clearly affected by mental illness, who was threatening his 17-year-old girlfriend, and the cop went up to the door, and there he was. He had his bullet proof vest on, but the man shot the police officer in the head, and he died. I attended that funeral.

When I was there, I saw their young family sitting in the church with their little boys. And this little girl. I heard the story about the last time they were in their church for the nativity play, and the dad was sitting there—the police officer—in the pew, watching his family and his children perform. The next time they were in the church was when that little girl with the blue dress covered in stars was walking down the aisle for her dad’s funeral.

That is domestic violence. It does concern me that we did not get support from the nominee. I do appreciate that he said he would continue to fund the Office on Violence Against Women, and I believe that that is very important to the functioning of the Justice Department.

Since its inception in 1995, the Office on Violence Against Women has provided financial and technical assistance to communities nationwide—very important to the Department of Justice.

The last thing I want to mention—and I will come back again to some of these other priorities that I think are important, if Senator Sessions is confirmed, to continue to be a focus in the Justice Department, as well as other concerns that I have—is the funding of the COPS program. Republican Senator Murkowski and I are leading that effort, and we had a good discussion about that. He stated that he shared my view that this is a very important program, particularly with the sharp decrease in staffing levels we have seen for law enforcement around the country in recent years, including training funding—something that is really important.

The Community Oriented Policing Services, or the COPS program, was established many years ago. It helped to place more than 129,000 police officers on the beat in more than 13,000 State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. In fiscal year 2015, the COPS office was able to award grants to just 209 of the over 1,000 law enforcement agencies that applied. It translated into about 915 officers, which is still a lot, but, in fact, there were requests for over 3,000 officers.

I think we can all agree, and hope the administration agrees, that this is a very important program. I will continue to work with Senator Sessions, if he is confirmed, to make sure we have the support from the administration for this program, which, again, is one of the top priorities of the Fraternal Order of Police and other police organizations across the country.

I look forward to discussing other issues when the Senate returns. For now, I yield the floor. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Senator Jeff Sessions to be the next Attorney General of the United States and to head the U.S. Department of Justice.

I have had the privilege to serve with Senator Sessions in the U.S. Senate for nearly a decade. I have served on several committees with him, including the years that I was on the Judiciary Committee. I no longer serve on that committee that Senator Sessions served there with Senator Sessions.

I was listening to Senator Klobuchar’s explanations of her concerns. Senator Sessions is a person whom we work with, but it is his views and his record that give me great concern.

Just looking back at the first 2 weeks of the Trump administration, I think a growing number of Americans understand the importance of the Constitution. It is the system of checks and balances, the separation of powers, and the critical importance of the position of the Attorney General of the United States.

Over the years, the Justice Department has grown into one of the largest Cabinet departments, with over 100,000 employees, which touches just about every aspect of life in America today. It is known as the world’s largest law office and the chief enforcer of Federal laws.

Just think about the work every day to keep America safe undertaken by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Fire-arms and Explosives, the Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. Marshals Service, and the U.S. Attorneys in every State and territory. Think about the work of the National Security Division that tackles some of the toughest terrorism and national security threats every day. All of that comes under the Department of Justice. All of that comes under the Attorney General.

Think about the work of the Civil Rights Division to protect all Americans, regardless of their background, to ensure that every American—every American—enjoys full constitutional rights and privileges. Think about the work of the Environmental and Natural Resources Division, the Tax Division, and so many other offices within the Department of Justice. It is the direction of all of those agencies that come under the Attorney General of the United States. And the employees of the Justice Department keep America safe every day while protecting American lives, and some of them put their lives on the line to do so.

We need an Attorney General that will strengthen, not weaken, the Justice Department and will help carry out its important missions.

The Justice Department is charged with “[ensuring] the law and [defending] the interests of the United States according to the Constitution, the public safety against threats foreign and domestic,” as well as “[ensuring] fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans.” That is their mission. That is their responsibility.

The Attorney General is not the President’s lawyer; he or she is the people’s lawyer. After carefully examining Senator Sessions’ record—including his Senate service, confirmation hearing, and campaign trail for Mr. Trump—I am not convinced that he would be independent and impartial to the President and Federal agencies. I am not convinced he would enforce the law fairly and protect the civil liberties and civil rights of all Americans.

Let me discuss some of my concerns with Senator Sessions’ nomination. In this debate, I do want to mention my resolution calling on President Trump to divest his interest in his relationship to the Trump organization. My resolution was first introduced last year. It is intended to uphold the value and strictures of one of the most sacred documents: the Constitution, the instrument that the President took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend. It makes clear that Congress will consider all transactions by foreign governments and their agents with the Trump organization as potential violations of the emoluments clause of the Constitution.

The Attorney General is likewise sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution and provide legal advice to President Trump and the various Cabinet departments. He must exercise independent judgment. I am concerned as to whether Senator Sessions would, in fact, advise the President, as he should, that by holding on to Trump enterprises—by not divesting or setting up a blind trust—he is putting himself at risk of violating the Constitution of the United States.

It is not what the President wants to hear; it is what he must hear. We need
an independent Attorney General in order to make that recommendation to the President of the United States.

Senator Sessions has strongly supported restrictive voter ID laws that have had the effect of disenfranchising many eligible voters and have been flatly modern-day poll taxes. He has called the Voting Rights Act intrusive as it seeks to protect minority voters. He praised the Supreme Court’s ruling in Shelby County v. Holder, which gutted a key part of the Voting Rights Act, as “a good day for the South” when the decision was handed down.

Our next Attorney General should be working on how to expand the franchise, not restrict it. Now President Trump has said he will direct Vice President Pence to lead a task force or commission to examine so-called voter fraud in the 2016 Presidential election. We need an independent Attorney General.

Why is President Trump taking this action? Because Hillary Clinton won the popular vote by nearly 3 million votes, and that gets under his skin. He feels slighted. He feels his legitimacy is being brought into question. It does matter to him the electoral vote. So the President will direct the Vice President, and presumably his next Attorney General, to investigate these bogus claims of voter fraud. Instead, the new Attorney General should examine the history and disenfranchisement in the elections. I fear this new study on widespread “voter fraud” is simply a pretense to impose more onerous restrictions on the right to vote—to try to keep a certain segment of Americans—making it more difficult for them to vote because they may be more likely to vote for someone other than Mr. Trump. That is not what the Attorney General should be doing.

Based on his record, Senator Sessions has said to the Trump administration to further restrict the right to vote and roll back the clock on this cherished civil right, which is protected by our Constitution.

On the issue of immigration, Senator Sessions has a long record where he has fought against bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform in the Senate. He led the efforts in 2007 and in 2013 to defeat bipartisan legislation in the Senate. He used the untruthful “amnesty” to describe the fair-but-fair pathway to citizenship in this legislation, which passed by a 68-to-32 vote in 2013. He has opposed relief for the DREAMers and has opposed the Delayed Action for Childhood Arrivals—DACA—program. He supported anti-immigration hate laws in Arizona and elsewhere that the Supreme Court has struck down as unconstitutional.

During the Presidential campaign, Mr. Trump issued a press release “calling for a total and complete shutdown of immigration from the United States.” Several days later, Senator Leahy offered a resolution in the Judiciary Committee that stated, “It is the sense of the Senate that the United States must not bar individuals from entering the United States based on their religion, as such action would be contrary to the fundamental principles of which this nation was founded.” The vote was 16 to 4 in favor of the Leahy resolution. Senator Sessions voted no and spoke against the resolution for nearly half an hour and concluded by stating that the Leahy resolution “goes beyond being unwise. It is reckless. It is absolute and without qualification. It could have pernicious impacts for decades, even centuries to come. It may be even a step from the concept of the nation-state to the idea of ‘global citizenship.’”

Barriers to a religious test of people coming into our Nation would create that type of a Nation? That is who we are as a Nation. Those are our core values. We embrace diversity. Senator Sessions’ views are far outside the mainstream and would unsettle many years of law and precedent that protect individual religious beliefs.

I am gravely concerned about how an Attorney General Sessions would advise President Trump on the laws of our land. Mr. Trump recently issued his Executive order, which a district court has put on hold and is now being challenged in the Ninth Circuit. I cosponsored legislation to rescind President Trump’s discriminatory Executive order barring immigrants from Muslim-majority countries and suspending the U.S. refugee program.

I am also concerned as to how Attorney General Sessions would advise the President on matters of immigration. Former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates was fired and her conduct was called shameful by President Trump, simply because she was upholding the Constitution, giving her advice. The President has criticized the ‘so-called judge’ who temporarily stayed his travel ban with an “outrageous” decision, and said that the judge would be blamed if a terrorist attack occurred in the United States. The Attorney General has to be able to stand up to even the President with these reckless words and actions. We need an independent Attorney General who will uphold the Constitution and recognize that he is not the President’s attorney. It is the people’s attorney. I am not convinced that Attorney General Sessions would be that type of person.

Senator Sessions led the opposition to the nomination of my fellow Marylander Tom Perez to be the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice when President Obama nominated him in 2009. At the time, Senator Sessions said:

I am also concerned Mr. Perez will not be committed to seeking the full support of the American public by enforcing our Nation’s immigration laws, some I have worked hard on. We need to create a lawful system of immigration. . . . He previously served as the President of the Service Employees International Union, an immigrant advocacy organization that has taken some extreme views and been criticized by a number of people in the media. CASA of Maryland issued a pamphlet instructing immigrants confronted by the police to remain silent. CASA also promotes day labor sites. This is where people, often without lawful status, come and seek work . . . and [they] oppose restrictions on illegal immigrants receiving drivers’ licenses. He would be an unacceptable Attorney General.

That was Senator Sessions’ quote. Senator Sessions also commented on Mr. Perez directly:

I am concerned where Mr. Perez will be in the voice for the Department of Justice (Civil Rights Division). He has been pretty active politically. When he ran for the Montgomery, MD, county council he responded to a question asking, ‘Mr. Perez, can you tell the voters to know about you?’ Mr. Perez said: ‘I am a progressive Democrat and always was and always will be.’ This is a free country and that is all right. I am just saying, in all fairness, that statement makes me a little nervous.

Again, quoting from Senator Sessions. The Senate did right by my friend and colleague Tom Perez. He was confirmed by the Senate with the support of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice by a 72-to-22 vote. Now, I understand people may have a reason to vote one way or the other, but the reasons stated by Senator Sessions in reversing his position toward Mr. Perez is great concern. Senator Sessions again opposed Mr. Perez when he was later nominated to be Secretary of Labor. In both of these cases, Senator Sessions’ views were far outside the mainstream on Mr. Perez.

As the senior Senator from Maryland, I know CASA of Maryland. I have been there, I have seen the people they service. They do extraordinary work to help the immigrant community. They are not a fringe advocacy group. While Mr. Perez is a progressive, he is a dedicated public servant, having been elected by the people of Maryland to the Montgomery County Council and appointed by President Obama to run the Justice Department and later the Labor Department. Mr. Perez worked to expand the right to vote, protect the rights of all Americans, and ensure American workers had a decent wage and employers treated their employees with fairness and respect.

I fear Attorney General Sessions would turn back the clock on so many civil and worker rights that we hold dear as Americans. Mr. Sessions’ American Immigration Council has opposed a constitutional amendment to ban same-sex marriages, opposed the repeal of don’t ask, don’t tell in the military, and harshly criticized the Supreme Court’s recent decision legalizing same-sex marriages across the country. He harshly criticized the Court for redefining a “sacred and ancient institution,” and called the ruling “part of a continuing effort to ‘dechristianize,’ by ‘deinstitutionalization’ the Nation. Once again, I fear an Attorney General Sessions would turn back the clock on LGBT rights to a
time when individuals would no longer have the legal right to marry the person they love.

Senator Sessions voted against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the Paycheck Fairness Act, title X funding for contraceptive services and screening, and health services for low-income women, and reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. He voted to defund Planned Parenthood. I am concerned whether Senator Sessions would enforce equal rights and protection for women as our next Attorney General.

Senator Sessions has consistently fought against criminal justice reform in the Senate and led the effort to defeat the recent bipartisan proposals that would modestly reduce sentencing disparities and ease ex-offenders' re-entry into society.

Senator Sessions opposed my Ramos and Liu blue alert act due to fiscal concerns, even though the legislation cost was estimated to be less than 1 million for implementation by CBO. Law enforcement agencies strongly supported my legislation, which was signed into law by President Obama in 2015. Blue Alert helps our law enforcement officers and those who are threatened or endangered or where there has been an incident. It gives law enforcement the opportunity to apprehend the suspect in a timely way. It scored nominal or less than $1 million, and was opposed by Senator Sessions, who blocked this important tool to help our law enforcement officers.

Senator Sessions has generally condemned the Department of Justice’s use of its power to investigate law enforcement agencies accused of misconduct and a “pattern and practice” of violating civil rights, calling consent decrees that mandate reform following these investigations “an end run around the democratic process.” That statement is true because that is an important part of what we are doing in my hometown of Baltimore.

We had a major problem in the Freddie Gray episode. We requested a pattern and practice investigation. We are now working with the consent decree. The people of Baltimore and the people of Maryland are anxious to get this matter moving forward and are anxious to see this consent order bring a successful conclusion to that recommendation and investigation.

Senator Sessions led the opposition to Senator Mikulski and my recommendation of Paula Xinis to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor. The Alliance for Justice provided an account of Paula Xinis’ confirmation hearing, which I will quote from at length here.

“Turning to the nominee of the District Court of Maryland, Paula Xinis, Senator Sessions unleashed a line of accusatory questions suggesting that Xinis’ career as a public defender and civil rights lawyer showed an ‘agenda’ that she would invariably ‘bring to the bench.’ The questions were absurd and unfounded, but they could not be dismissed as such. Instead, Mrs. Xinis had to patiently explain that protecting the rights of America’s most vulnerable and disenfranchised had not left her tainted with disqualifying bias… Senator Sessions felt compelled to verify that someone with Mrs. Xinis’ professional background—which also includes time as a complaint examiner in the DC Office of Police Complaints—would not bring that to the bench.”

“Can you assure the police officers in Baltimore and all over Maryland that you might have a bias that they’ll get a fair day in court, and that your history would not impact your decision-making? And I raise that particularly because I see your firm [Billy Murphy] is representing Mr. Gray’s family and that’s gathered so much attention in Maryland, and there’s a lot of law enforcement officers throughout the state and they want to know that they don’t have someone who has an agenda to bring to the court to question that you won’t bring that to the bench?”

“The implication is clear: If you defend people against criminal prosecutions, and especially if you represent people in civil rights cases against police, there is a presumption of bias that you must rebut before the Judiciary Committee. One wonders whether Senator Sessions has asked a prosecutor if she would bring to her judicial role an ‘agenda’ against indigent criminal defendants. If the law says no one who is a lawyer would be biased against employees who allege unlawful discrimination or unpaid wages. I doubt very much he would ask that same question in that circumstance.”

“The depth of this double standard is underscored by Senator Sessions’ invoking Freddie Gray in particular. Freddie Gray, of course, was fatally injured in Baltimore police custody after being arrested without cause. His death led to an investigation for six police officers on homicide and assault charges, and the Department of Justice opened a civil rights investigation. Under these circumstances, representing Mr. Gray’s family hardly seems like an act of radical subversion that would call into question one’s ability to be fair, but in Senator Sessions’ view, any challenge to police authority can be done only in pursuit of some extralegal ‘agenda.’

Senator Sessions is in the floor opposition to Paula Xinis. I am pleased to report she was confirmed by the U.S. Senate, and she is now one of our distinguished members of the District Court of Maryland, where she serves with great distinction. Senator Sessions was one of only nine Senators to vote against the Detainee Treatment Act, which contained the McCain-Feinstein amendment that prohibited ‘cruel, inhumane, and degrading’ punishment of detainees in American custody. He has left the door open to reinstating waterboarding as needed. He has opposed shutting down Guantanamo Bay.

These issues are critically important because we got word of a draft Executive order that would bring back these types of torture centers—which are not only a stain on America’s reputation, they are counterproductive and against our values and our law. We expect the Attorney General of the United States to speak out against such reprehensible types of proposals.

Thomas Jefferson wrote: ‘The most sacred of the duties of government [is] to do equal and impartial justice to all our fellow-citizens.’ This sacred duty remains the guiding principle for the women and men of the U.S. Department of Justice, according to the Justice Web site. I would urge all of us to keep that in mind.

I do not have confidence that Senator Sessions will carry out this task so I must oppose his nomination. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Daines). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the nomination of Senator Jeff Sessions to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

I ask: Where are the Senators who will say no to the nomination of Senator Jeff Sessions as Attorney General of the United States? I hope there are at least enough Senators here who understand that America is caring that this is about the Constitution. We are at a crossroads, that all of us, regardless of political party, need an Attorney General who can be relied on to enforce the laws fairly and fight back against lawless overreach by an out-of-control President.

On January 27, the world turned upside down for tens of thousands of people directly affected by President Trump’s Executive order turning America’s back on refugees around the world and immigrants from seven Muslim-majority countries.

Last week, I recalled many of their stories. I spoke about students and professors, about mothers and children, about friends and neighbors, real people who were turned away, detained, or deported based solely on their religion or the simple fact that they were fleeing war. We all breathed a sigh of relief when a court temporarily halted that order, but we know the fight continues to permanently overturn this unlawful, unconstitutional, and deeply immoral executive order.

That isn’t all that happened last week. Last week, the Acting Attorney General of the United States refused to
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defend President Trump’s unlawful and unconstitutional Executive order so President Trump fired her. That is right, the President of the United States fired the Nation’s top law enforcement officer for refusing to defend an illegal Executive order, constitutional, and deeply immoral order.

Last week, after days of slow-walking or ignoring judicial decisions, President Trump went on the attack. He raged against the judge who temporarily halted his order, calling him a so-called judge and questioning his authority to act. That is right. The President of the United States attacked the legal authority of an individual district court judge, lawfully appointed by George W. Bush and confirmed unanimously by the Senate, to pass judgment on Trump’s Executive orders.

These are dangerous times. At times like this, it is more important than ever that the Attorney General of the United States has the guts, the independence, and the good moral judgment to stand up to the President when he seeks to violate the Constitution and ignore the law.

At his confirmation hearing last month, Senator Sessions claimed to be that person. I have to say, I wish it were true. I really do. I wish the President’s campaign had been different. I wish his actions now were different. I wish he could give his nominees the benefit of the doubt, but I will not ignore the real world, as unpleasant as it is, and neither can anyone in this Senate.

In the real world, Senator Sessions obviously isn’t going to stand up to the President’s campaign of bigotry. How could he? In the real world, Senator Sessions is one of the principal architects of that campaign.

Senator Sessions made a special name for himself for being a particularly vitriolic opponent of common-sense immigration policies. He railed against legal immigrants. He attacked cities and States that focus on keeping their streets safe instead of serving as a national deportation force. He called Islam a toxic ideology and a threat to our Nation. Despite the plain language of the Constitution, Senator Sessions doesn’t think that children born in the United States should automatically become citizens. He wants to round up and deport DREAMers, who were brought to the United States as kids. Does that all sound familiar? It doesn’t stop there. On crime, Senator Sessions’ solution is to lock up people for even minor, low-level offenses; throw away the key. He has advocated for expanding prisons for youth, aggressively prosecuting marijuana offenses, and eliminating parole or reduced prison time for good behavior.

During the 2016 Presidential campaign, he heaped praise on then-candidate Donald Trump for having once taken out a racially tinged full-page newspaper ad advocating for the death penalty for the Central Park Five, the Black and Latino teenagers who were falsely accused and convicted of raping a young woman in New York’s Central Park.

Senator Sessions is not a plain-old conservative Republican. No. Senator Sessions occupies a place way out at the radical fringe of his party, regularly taking positions that are far more extreme than his other Republican colleagues. For example, when Republicans and Democrats came together to pass a commonsense, bipartisan immigration bill, Senator Sessions worked overtime to make sure the bill did not make it through the House. When Republicans and Democrats propose legislation to reform our broken Federal criminal sentencing laws, Senator Sessions was part of the handful of Senators who ensured that the bill would not get a vote here in the Senate.

Senator Sessions has been a public figure for decades. None of this—none of this is secret, and much of it is completely indefensible, but President Trump wants this man to serve as Attorney General of the United States?

Well, if Senator Sessions is one of the principal architects of that campaign.

I ask again, where are the Senators who will say no to Senator Sessions as Attorney General of the United States? After all these years as Senate Republicans who once fought Senator Sessions' tooth and nail have now launched a massive PR campaign to try to repair his public image. That case against the civil rights workers helping Black in Alabama to vote? Hey, you go it all wrong. He was just trying to help out other African Americans who were concerned about voting irregularities.

His vote against the Violence Against Women Act? His position on LGBTQ rights? His opposition to a woman’s right to choose? Hey, don’t worry about it. He says he will vigorously enforce the law once he becomes Attorney General. Give me a break.

The law enforcement officer for the United States of America is an awesome thing. In the right hands, in steady and impartial hands, it can be used to defend all of us, to defend our laws, to defend our Constitution. In the wrong hands, it can be used to bully and intimidate the defenseless, to destroy lives, to undermine American democracy itself.

Senator Sessions is not misunderstood. Senator Sessions has never been a friend of good. For decades, he has been absolutely clear about who he stands. Now the time is here for every Senator to make absolutely clear where they stand as well.

Let’s be clear. Winning a seat in the U.S. Senate does not exempt a Cabinet nominee from the close scrutiny that all nominees to lead our government deserve. It does not change the Senate’s constitutional responsibility to examine a nominee to make certain that nominee will faithfully and fairly enforce the laws of the United States of America. It does not relieve the Senate of its duty to reject nominees whose records demonstrate that they will not stand up for American values and constitutional principles.

When it comes to the Senate confirming someone to be Attorney General—the highest law enforcement officer in this country—we are all personally responsible for that choice. To put Senator Sessions in charge of the Department of Justice is an insult to African Americans. To put Senator Sessions in charge of the Department of Justice is a direct threat to immigrants. To put Senator Sessions in charge of the Department of Justice is a deliberate affront to every LGBTQ person. To put Senator Sessions in charge of the Department of Justice is an affront to women.

I ask again, where are the Senators who will say no to Senator Sessions as Attorney General of the United States? After all these years as Senate Republicans who once fought Senator Sessions' tooth and nail have now launched a massive PR campaign to try to repair his public image.
They had the courage to stand up for the principles that transcend party affiliation—fairness, equality, justice for all. Their rejection sent a message that that kind of dangerous, toxic hatred has no place in our courts. I urge them again today to exert that moral leadership and send a message that this kind of dangerous, toxic hatred has no place in our Justice Department. I urge them to set aside politics and do what they know is right.

I wish to read two statements that really stood out to me as I was reviewing Senator Sessions' record on civil rights. One is the powerful speech that the late Senator from Massachusetts, Ted Kennedy, gave in 1986, and the other is a very moving letter from Coretta Scott King, a letter she wrote to the Judiciary Committee that same year.

I want to start with what Senator Kennedy said. He said:

"The confirmation of nominees for lifetime appointments to the Federal judiciary is one of the most important responsibilities of the Senate mandated by the U.S. Constitution, and the responsibility of the Senate to carefully examine the qualifications of nominees to serve as a Federal judge is the last opportunity to determine whether the candidate possesses the education, experience, and, most importantly, the commitment to equal justice under law, which are essential attributes of a Federal judge.

Once confirmed, a Federal judge literally has life and death authority over citizens that appear before him, with limited review of his decisions. Our Federal judiciary is the guardian of the rights and liberties guaranteed under law, which are essential attributes of our Federal court system. Therefore, the examination by the Senate of a nomination of Senator Sessions in 1986. This is what he wrote:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my strong opposition to the confirmation of a nominee's fitness to serve as a Federal judge.

"He is, I believe, a disgrace to the Justice Department, and he should withdraw his nomination and resign his position." Those were the words of Senator Ted Kennedy, and I will stand with Senator Kennedy, and, like he did, I do not agree that the nomination of Senator Sessions is a disgrace to the Senate.

Coretta Scott King also wrote to the Judiciary Committee about the Sessions nomination in 1986. This is what she wrote:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my strong opposition to the confirmation of a nominee's fitness to serve as a Federal judge.

"Mr. Sessions' conduct as U.S. Attorney, from his politically-motivated voting fraud prosecutions to his indifference toward the rights of Black Americans, rights which include equal access to the democratic process, compels me to testify that his appointment would not serve the public interest.

"Civil rights leaders, including my husband and Albert Turner, have fought long and hard to achieve free and unfettered access to the ballot box. Mr. Sessions' conduct has used the awesome power of his office to chill the free exercise of the vote by black citizens in the district he now seeks to serve as a federal judge. This simply cannot be allowed to happen. Mr. Sessions' conduct does not reflect the Senate's commitment to upholding the Voting Rights Act and inclusion for all Americans.

"The Voting Rights Act was, and still is, vitally important to the future of democracy in the United States. I was privileged to join Martin and many others during the Selma to Montgomery march for voting rights in 1965. Martin was particularly impressed by the determination to get the franchise of blacks in Selma and neighboring Perry County. As he wrote, 'Certainly no community in the history of the Negro struggle has responded with the enthusiasm of Selma and her neighboring town of Marion. Where Birmingham depended largely on poorly paid white-unemployed adults [to participate in non-violent protest of the denial of the franchise], Selma has involved fully 10 per cent of the Negro population, perhaps up to 2,000 persons; demonstrations, and at least half the Negro population of Marion was arrested on one day.'

"Mrs. King continues:
In these investigations, Mr. Sessions, as U.S. Attorney, exhibited an eagerness to bring to trial and convict three leaders of the Perry County Civic League, including Al- lie Turner. Federal agents demonstra-
ting their innocence of any wrong-
doing. Furthermore, in initiating the case, Mr. Sessions ignored allegations of similar behavior what was witnessed to chill the exercise of the franchise by blacks by his misguided investigation. In fact, Mr. Ses-
sions sought to punish older black civil rights activists and colleagues of my husband, who had been key figures in the civil rights movement in the 1960's. These were persons the potential of the absentee vote among Blacks, had learned to use the process within the bounds of legal-
ity, and had taught others to do the same. The only reason for doing with a federal prosecution what the

The actions taken by Mr. Sessions in re-
gard to the 1984 voting fraud prosecutions represent at just one more technique used to in-
imidate Black voters, and thus deny them the most precious franchise. The investiga-
tions conducted by Mr. Sessions also warrant grave concern. Witnesses were selectively chosen in accordance with the favorability of their testimony to the government's case. Also, the prosecution illegally withheld from the defense, certain writ-
nesses. Witnesses who did testify were pres-
sured and intimidated into submitting the "correct" testimony. Many elderly blacks were visited in the PRI, who
then hauled them over 180 miles by bus to a grand jury in Mobile when they could have more easily have testified at a grand jury twenty miles away. The voters, and others, have announced they are now never going to vote again.

I urge you to consider carefully Mr. Ses-
sions' conduct in these matters. Such a re-
view, I believe, raises serious questions about his commitment to the protection of the voting rights of American citizens. And consequently his fair and unbiased judg-
ment regarding this fundamental right.

When the circumstances and facts sur-
rounding the indictments of Al Turner, his wife, Evelyn, and Spencer Hogue are ana-
lyzed, it becomes clear that the motivation was political, and the result frightening—the wide-scale chill of the exercise of the ballot for blacks, who suffered so much to receive that right in the first place. Therefore, it is my strongly-held view that the appointment by Mr. Sessions to the federal bench would irremediably damage the work of my husband, Al Turner, and countless others who risked their lives and freedom over the past two decades to assure Black participation in our democratic system.

The exercise of the franchise is an essen-
tial means by which our citizens ensure that those who are governing will be responsible. My husband called it the number one civil right. The denial of access to the ballot box ultimately results in the denial of other fund-
damental rights. For, it is within the ballot box that the poor and disadvantaged are empowered that they are able to participate actively in the solutions to their own problems.

We still have a long way to go before we can say that minorities no longer need to be concerned about the discrimination at the polls. Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian Americans are grossly underrep-
resented at every level of government in America. If we are going to make our time-
less dream of justice through democracy a reality, we must take every possible step to ensure that the spirit and intent of the Vot-

ING Rights Act of 1965 and the Fifteenth Amendment are still honored.

The federal courts hold a unique position in our constitutional system, ensuring that minorities and other citizens without polit-
ical power to vindicate their rights. Because of this unique role, it is essential that the people selected to be federal judges respect the basic tenets of our legal system: respect for individual rights and a commitment to equal justice for all. The integrity of the Courts, and thus the integrity of our democracy, can only be maintained if citizens feel confident that those selected as federal judges will be able to judge with fairness others holding different views.
Miller’s work vastly overstates the threat of foreign terrorists to the homeland,” Nowrasteh said.

He pointed to Miller’s efforts to chronicle cases of refugees implicated in terrorism activities. It is true that some refugees in the U.S. have been indicted for terrorism-related crimes, Nowrasteh said. But instances of refugees perpetrating terrorist attacks on American soil, he added, were vanishingly rare.

“Almost all the refugees that I was able to specifically identify in his set were trying to get a foothold in terrorist activity, organizing, mostly Al Shabab in Somalia, by giving them money or something like that,” Nowrasteh said.

“I don’t know about you, but I think there’s a big difference between sending a militia in your home country and trying to blow up a mall in Cincinnati.”

The collective effect of Miller and Sessions’ messaging was to enthusiastically push a narrative that now dominates the Trump administration: that refugees and other immigrants steal Americans’ jobs, suck up too much welfare money, incubate terrorists in their communities and, overall, are a problem.

The conclusion was always the same: The government should let in far fewer refugees, and it should think twice about welcoming Muslims.

And now, that’s exactly what Trump is doing.

For instance, in one “Dear Colleague” letter that Sessions co-authored with conservative Republican Rep. David Brat—a letter Miller blasted out to his press list—the would-be Attorney General ripped into the refugee program.

“There can be no higher duty as lawmakers than to keep our constituents and their families safe,” Brat and Sessions wrote. “Yet our reckless refugee programs, lax green card and visa policies, utter failure to enforce rampant visa overstays, along with our wide open southern border, put the U.S. at grave and needless risk.

“Grave and needless risk”—it is a view that clearly informs Trump’s decision to temporarily ban refugees.

And on and on and on, for hundreds of pages, the President’s final State of the Union address, his office to chill the free exercise of religion, it stigmatizes those who would lawfully seek asylum, it restricts our core values and that it violates the law.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am surprised that the words of Coretta Scott King are not suitable for debate in the United States Senate. I ask leave of the Senate to continue my remarks.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

Mr. King are not suitable for debate, the words of Coretta Scott King.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3 Ex.]

Ms. WARNEN. Mr. President, I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3 Ex.]

The quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll and the following Senator entered the Chamber and answered to his name:

[Quorum No. 3 Ex.]

The quorum is not present.

The majority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?
from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS). Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 43, as follows:

Yes—Alexander (Mr. FRANKEN), Barrasso (Mr. CASCIOTTI), Blackburn (Mr. SCOTT), Boozman (Mr. RUBIO), Burr (Mr. TOOMEY), Capito (Mr. TRUMP), Cassidy (Mr. MANCHIN), Collin (Mr. JOHNSON), Cornyn (Mr. LANDFORD), Cotton (Mr. LEE), Cruz (Mr. CRUZ), Enzi (Mr. MORAN), Fischer (Mr. MURKOWSKI), Paul (Mr. CRUZ), Sessions (Mr. SESSIONS), and Wicker (Mr. WICKER).

Nays—Alexander (Mr. FRANKEN), Barrasso (Mr. CASCIOTTI), Blackburn (Mr. SCOTT), Boozman (Mr. RUBIO), Burr (Mr. TOOMEY), Capito (Mr. TRUMP), Cassidy (Mr. MANCHIN), Collin (Mr. JOHNSON), Cornyn (Mr. LANDFORD), Cotton (Mr. LEE), Cruz (Mr. CRUZ), Enzi (Mr. MORAN), Fischer (Mr. MURKOWSKI), Paul (Mr. CRUZ), Sessions (Mr. SESSIONS), and Wicker (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. MCCONNELL, moved that the roll be called. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 50, as follows:

Yes—Alexander (Mr. FRANKEN), Barrasso (Mr. CASCIOTTI), Blackburn (Mr. SCOTT), Boozman (Mr. RUBIO), Burr (Mr. TOOMEY), Capito (Mr. TRUMP), Cassidy (Mr. MANCHIN), Collin (Mr. JOHNSON), Cornyn (Mr. LANDFORD), Cotton (Mr. LEE), Cruz (Mr. CRUZ), Enzi (Mr. MORAN), Fischer (Mr. MURKOWSKI), Paul (Mr. CRUZ), Sessions (Mr. SESSIONS), and Wicker (Mr. WICKER).

Nays—Alexander (Mr. FRANKEN), Barrasso (Mr. CASCIOTTI), Blackburn (Mr. SCOTT), Boozman (Mr. RUBIO), Burr (Mr. TOOMEY), Capito (Mr. TRUMP), Cassidy (Mr. MANCHIN), Collin (Mr. JOHNSON), Cornyn (Mr. LANDFORD), Cotton (Mr. LEE), Cruz (Mr. CRUZ), Enzi (Mr. MORAN), Fischer (Mr. MURKOWSKI), Paul (Mr. CRUZ), Sessions (Mr. SESSIONS), and Wicker (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. MCCONNELL, moved that the roll be called. The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. President, if the average American heard someone read a letter from Coretta Scott King that
said what it said, they would not be offended. They would say that is someone’s opinion; that is all.

It seems to me that we could use rule XIX almost every day on the floor of the Senate. This is selective enforcement, and another example of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle escalating the partisanship and further decreasing comity in the Senate. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have a question. I guess it is in the nature of a parliamentary question, and that is, whether it would be in order to ask unanimous consent that the letter from which Senator WARREN read be put into the Record as a confirmation that she was, in fact, accurately reading from the letter, that it be added as an exhibit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The text of the letter is in the RECORD of the Senate as the Senator was reading it in her testimony.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The text of the letter as she read it, but not the complete letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may ask consent.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the complete letter from which Senator WARREN read be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to confirm that it is the letter read from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RISCH. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is fascinating. I say to my colleagues, I have served here longer than any other Member of this body. I have been here 32 years. I’ve been here when the Democrats were in the majority and when the Republicans were in the majority, with Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. I have never, ever seen a time when a Member of the Senate asked to put into the Record a letter especially by a civil rights icon and somebody objected. It has always been done.

I have had letters that people have asked to be put in that were contrary to a position that I might take. Of course, I would not object. They are allowed to do it. I have seen letters when Members of both sides of the aisle have debated back and forth and the other side would put in letters that were contrary to their opponents’ positions, and of course, they object to.

Don’t let the Senate turn into something it has never been before. I would hope that cooler heads would prevail, and we go back to the things that made the Senate great, that made the Senate the conscience of the Nation, as it should be.

I have never once objected to a Senator introducing a letter, even though they took a position different than mine. I have never known of a Republican Senator to do that, and here we are talking about a letter from a civil rights icon.

Let’s not go down this path. It is not good for the Senate. It is not good for democracy, and it sure as heck is not good for free speech.

I admire the Senator from Rhode Island. He is a man of great integrity, a man who was attorney general of his State and U.S. attorney in his State. His request was something that is normally accepted automatically. I would hope Senators would reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I am the one who entered the objection, and let me say to my good friend from Vermont that I agree with him 100 percent that she got back to what made the Senate great.

We have rules around here, and the rules are very clear that you don’t impugn another Senator. Now, you can’t do that in writing, and you can’t do it with writings. You can’t hold up a writing that impugns another Senator and say: Well, this is what somebody else said. I am not saying it, but that is OK.

It is not OK. It is a violation of the rules, and we should get back to what made this Senate great, and that is, to stay within the rules, stay within civility, and not impugning another Senator, whether it is through words or whether it is through writings.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. The first question, Mr. President, is this: Is it my understanding that the ruling of the Chair was based on the advice of the Parliamentarian. Is that accurate, Mr. President; on the advice of the Parliamentarian that the rule had been violated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair sustained the ruling of the majority leader on his own.

Mr. RUBIO. OK. The second question I have, Mr. President. Does the rule say anything that impugns another Member of the Senate, directly or indirectly? Is that an accurate reading of the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, and I will read the paragraph. This is rule XIX, section 2.

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. RUBIO. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. State your question.

Mr. MERKLEY. If a Member of the Senate is being considered for nomination, and we are exercising our advice and consent power, and if there is factual conduct in that individual’s background that is presented on the floor in the Senate, would presenting the facts of that conduct in the process of debating an individual be considered in violation of rule XIX?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule makes no distinction between those Senators who are nominees and those who are not. The rule does not permit truth to be a defense of the slight.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, just to make sure I understand that clearly, if we are considering a nominee who happens to be a Senator and we state factual elements of their background, for example, the conviction of a crime that is inappropriate conduct in the past, stating the factual record about an individual would be considered in violation of rule XIX?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each of these cases will be decided by the Presiding Officer in the context at that time.

Mr. MERKLEY. Just to clarify, if I could, therefore, the point is that something could be absolutely true, as, perhaps, a point that was made earlier—a statement can be true in a letter that is presented—but even if it is true and accurate for a person under consideration for a nomination, it would still be in violation. In other words, the fact that an individual is found in violation of rule XIX doesn’t mean that the statement had to be false. It could have been a true statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You are correct, Senator.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Republican Leader.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I just want the RECORD to be abundantly clear. The language that resulted in the vote that we had in invoking rule XIX was related to a quotation from Senator Kennedy to Coretta Scott King, and he should withdraw his nomination. ‘‘a disgrace to the Justice Department, and he should withdraw his nomination and resign his position.’’ That was the quote. Our colleagues want to try to make this all about Coretta Scott King and it is not. I think the complete context should be part of the RECORD.

Mr. MERKLEY. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is my understanding—I was not there—that there was a warning over Senator Kennedy’s letter, but the actual ruling was based on Coretta Scott King’s letter; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.
Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, pursuing Senator MERKLEY's hypo-
thetical, if it came before the Senate that a Member of the Senate who was a
nominee seeking the advice and con-
sent of the Senate to the position was, for example, in fact, a horse thief, and
we found the facts that he was a horse
thief to be relevant to whether or not
he should be confirmed, say, to the De-
partment of Interior, which has au-
tority over lands, does the ruling of
the Chair mean that it would not be in
order for a Senator to object on the
floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Once
again, the answer is the same, that
each of these decisions will be made at
the time and in the context in which
they occur, and the decision of the
Chair is subject to a vote of the Senate
and an appeal.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I guess, Mr.
President, what I don't understand is
that we have fairly significant respon-
sibilities under the Constitution to
provide advice and consent. It appears
that the ruling of the Chair has just
been that a member of this body by the
subject of that advice and con-
sent, then derogatory information
about that person is not in order and is
a violation of rule XIX on the Senate
floor. And with that being the ruling, I
don't know how we go about doing our
duties. Are we supposed to simply blind
ourselves to derogatory information,
discuss it privately in the cloak rooms,
not bring it out onto the floor of the U.S.
Senate, this supposedly great de-
bating society that actually has a con-
stitutional responsibility to discuss
both the advantages and the deficits of
a particular nominee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In each
case, it is the opinion of the President,
subject to the final vote by the Senate
to support or not to support the Presi-
dent's decision.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. So the precedent
going forward is that any Senator who
discusses derogatory information that
is a matter of public record, that may
even include criminal behavior by a
Senator who is a candidate for Execu-
tive appointment that requires advice
and consent, is at risk of being san-
tioned by this body by a simple par-
tisan majority of this body under rule
XIX if they raise those issues on the
floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not
necessary for a point of order to be
raised under rule XIX, but if the point
of order is raised, an opinion will be
made and it is subject to a vote of the
Senate in the manner previously de-
scribed.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I first have a parliamentary inquiry. These
are the continuing rules of the Senate
that have been in existence previous to
this time and have carried over into
this session, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
or is correct.

Mr. RUBIO. The reason I ask is that
the following—but I think we all feel
very strongly about the issues before
us. I have not been here as long as Sen-
ator LEAHY, whose service has been
quite distinguished over a long period
of time. I truly do understand the pas-
sions people bring to this body. I like
to think that I, too, am passionate
about the things I believe.

I think this is an important moment.
It is late. Not many people are paying
attention. I wish they would though be-
cause I think the question here is one
of the reasons I ran for this body to
begin with. Maybe it is because of my
background; I am surrounded by people
who have lost freedoms in places where
they are not allowed to speak. One of
the great traditions of our Nation is
the ability to come forward and have
debates.

But the Founders and the Framers
and those who established this institu-
tion and guided us over two centuries
understood that that debate was im-
possible if, in fact, the matter became
a violation of rule XIX that was
necessarily the intention
here, although perhaps that was the
way it turned out. But I think it is im-
portant for us to understand why that
matters so much.

I want people to think about our poli-
tics here in America because I am tell-
ing you guys, I don't know of a single
Nation in the history of the world that
has been able to solve its problems
when half the people in the country ab-
solutely hate the other half of the peo-
ple in that country. This is the most
important country in the world, and
this body cannot function if people are
offending one another, and that is why
those rules are in place.

I was not here. Secretary Clin-
ton was nominated as a Member of this
body at the time, but I can tell you
that I am just barely old enough to
know that some very nasty things have
been written and said about Senator
Clinton. And I think the Senate should
be very proud that during her nomina-
tion to be Secretary of State—despite
the fact that I imagine many people
were not excited about the fact that
she would be Secretary of State—to my
recollection, and perhaps I am incor-
rect, but maybe one of those horrible
things that have been written or said
about her, some of which actually did
accuse her of wrongdoing, was uttered
on the floor of the Senate.

I happen to remember in 2004 when
then-Senator Kerry ran for President.
Some pretty strong things were writ-
ten and said about him. I was here for
that when he was nominated and con-
firmed to be Secretary of State. And I
don't recall a single statement being
made into the Record about the things
that have been said about him.

Now, I want everybody to understand
that at the end of the night, this is not
a partisan issue. It really is not. I can
tell you this with full confidence that
if one of my colleagues on this side of
the aisle had done that, I would also
like to think that I would have been
one of those people objecting, and here
is where it gets interesting.

Turn on the news and watch these
parliaments around the world where
people throw chairs at each other and
throw punches, and ask yourself: How
does that make you feel about those
countries? It doesn't give you a lot of
confidence about those countries. I am
not arguing that we are anywhere near
that tonight, but we are flirting with
it. We are flirting with it in this body,
and we are flirting with it in this coun-
try. We are becoming a society incapca-
tive of having debates anymore.

In this country, if you watch the big
policy debates that are going on in
America, no one ever stops to say: I
don't know how we go about doing your
point of view. I get it. You have some
valid points, but let me tell you why I
think my view is better. I don't hear
that anymore.

Here is what I hear almost automati-
cally—and let me be fair—from both
sides of these debates. Immediately,
otherwise, as soon as you offer an
idea, the other side jumps and says
that the reason you say that is because
you only care about rich people, be-
cause you only care about rich people,
that I, too, am passionate
about those countries. I am
not myself from time to time in heated
debates outside of this chamber, and I
understand that because I have tre-
mented respect for the other Cham-
ber, and I understand that it was
designed to be different. But one of
the reasons I chose to run for the Senate
and, quite frankly, to run for reelec-
tion is that I believed I served with 99
men and women who deeply love
their country, who have different
points of view, who represent men and
women who have different views from
the men and women whom I may rep-
resent on a given issue and who are
willing to take unpopular positions,
never impugning their motives.

One of the things I take great pride
in—and I tell this to people all the
time—is that the one thing you learn
about the Senate is, whether you agree
with them or not, the other half of why
every single one of those other 99 peo-
ple are here. They are intelligent peo-
ple, they are smart people, they are not
hard-working people. They believe in what they are saying, and they articulate it in a very passionate and effective way.

When I see my colleague stand up and say something I don’t agree with, I try to tell myself: Look, I don’t understand why they stand for that, but I know why they are doing it. It is because they represent people who believe that.

I am grateful that God has allowed me to be born, to live, and to raise my family in a nation where people with such different points of view are able to debate those things in a way that doesn’t lead to war, that doesn’t lead to overthrows, that doesn’t lead to violence. And you may take that for granted.

All around the world today, there are people who, if they stood up here and said the things that we say about the 16 senators or others in authority, they would go to jail. I am not saying that is where we are headed as a nation; I am just saying, don’t ever take that for granted.

The linchpin of this institution. The linchpin of that debate is the ability of this institution through unlimited debate and the decorum necessary for that debate to be able to conduct itself in that manner. I know who probably was a made-for-TV moment for some people. This has nothing to do with censuring the words of some great heroes. I have extraordinary admiration for the men and women who led the civil rights effort for three centuries, and I am self-conscious or understanding enough to know that many of the things that have been possible for so many people in this country in the 21st century were made possible by the sacrifices and the work of those who came before us.

This has to do with a fundamental reality, and that is that this body cannot carry out its work if it is not able to conduct debates in a way that is respectful of one another, especially those of us who are in this Chamber together.

I also understand this: If the Senate ceases to work, if we reach a point where this institution—given everything else that is going on in politics today, where you are basically allowed to say just about anything, for I have seen over the last year and a half things said about people, about issues, about institutions in our republic that I never thought I would see ever—

If we lose this body’s ability to conduct debate in a dignified manner—and I mean this with no disrespect to anyone else. I don’t believe anyone came on the floor here tonight saying: I am going to be disrespectful on purpose and turn this into a circus. But I am just telling you that if this body loses the ability to have those sorts of debates, then where in this country is that going to happen? In what other forum in this Nation is that going to be possible?

So I would just hope everybody would stop and think about that. I know I have been here only for 6 years, so I don’t have a deep reservoir of Senate history to rely on. But I know this: If this body isn’t capable of having those debates, there will be no place in this country where those debates can occur. I think every single one of us, to our great shame, will live to regret it. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I don’t want to prolong this much more. In light of what my friend from Florida said, I would just reread what I said earlier.

If average Americans heard someone read a letter from Coretta Scott King that said what it said, they would not be offended. They would say that is someone’s opinion. That is all.

It seems to me we could use rule XIX almost every day on the floor of the Senate, as my colleague from Maine so pointedly and quaintly exhibited a few minutes ago.

This selective enforcement is another example of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle escalating the partisanship and further decreasing the comity of the Senate, which I treasure as well. This is offensive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I take umbrage with what the minority leader said. I sat here and listened to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who went on and on and on. Many of her remarks were criticizing a fellow colleague in the Senate. I don’t know about the other side, but I find it offensive for either side to be criticizing, as was done here tonight, a sitting Member of the Senate.

I am absolutely astounded that the Democrats, my friends on the other side, have taken to the war tables a desire to defeat JEFF SESSIONS. I have been here and have never had to say that I knew JEFF SESSIONS even before he came here, and I have known him since he has been here. And, yes, I differ with him on a number of issues, but I would never say things about him as have been said by my colleagues on the other side. I think that we all ought to take some stock in what we are doing here.

JEFF SESSIONS is a very fine person. Think of his wife. She is a really fine person. Jeff has been here 20 years. He has interchanged with almost all of us. Sometimes you agree with him, and sometimes you disagree with him, but he has always been a gentleman. He has always been kind and considerate of his colleagues. I can’t name one time when he wasn’t. Yet we are treating him like he is some terrible person who doesn’t deserve to be chosen by the current President of the United States to be Attorney General of the United States.

I think we ought to be ashamed of ourselves—I really do—on both sides. And frankly, we have to get to where everything is not an issue here. I know some of my friends on the other side and I have chatted, and they are not happy with the way this body is going with good reason.

Everything doesn’t have to lead to a gun fight on the floor, but that is where we are going. And frankly, sometimes there is an awful lot of politics being played here on both sides. Look, I happen to like the senior Senator from Massachusetts. I think he is an intelligent man in many ways. But I have to tell you, I listened to her for quite a while, and she didn’t have a good thing to say about a fellow Senator. Frankly, I don’t think that is right. If we don’t respect each other, we are going down a very steep path to oblivion.

I would hope that both sides would take stock of these debates. We can differ. We understand that the Democrats are not happy with the current President. I think we have to respect that. But I don’t believe that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was right in any respect. I have been here a long time and I have seen some pretty rough talk, but never like we have had this first couple of months here. We have gone so far on both sides that we are almost dysfunctional.

I admit it was tough for the Democrats to lose the Presidential election. Most people thought that Hillary Clinton would win. I was not one of them. I thought there was a real chance because I knew a lot of people would not say for whom they were going to vote. I think, correctly, I interpreted that meant that they were going to vote for Donald Trump, and the reason they were is that they are tired of what is going on. They are tired of what is hurting this country. They are tired of the picayune little fights that we have around here.

I think we have to grow up. I suggest that all of us take stock of ourselves and see if we can treat each other with greater respect. I have to say, I resented—as much as I like the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I resent the constant diatribe against a fellow Senator. Even if everything she said was true, it wasn’t the right thing to do. I don’t think any of us should do that to them, either. We can differ, we can argue, we can fight over certain words and so forth, but I have been appointed in the way that I have treated JEFF SESSIONS. I have found JEFF SESSIONS—having worked with him for 20 years and having disagreed with him on a number of things—to be a gentleman in every respect and to represent his viewpoints in a reasonable and decent way.

I would hope that my colleagues on the other side would consider voting
for JEFF SESSIONS or at least treating him with respect. I admit that I think some of this comes from the fact that they are very upset at Donald Trump, and it is easy to see why. He won a very tough, contested race against one of their principal people. That is hard to take, maybe. That doesn't justify what has been going on against JEFF SESSIONS.

We ought to be proud that JEFF has a chance to become the Attorney General of the United States, and he is going to be. That is the thing that really bothers me. Everybody on the other side knows that we have the votes to finally do this. Yet, they are treating it as though this is something that they have to try and win—which they are not going to win—and, in the process, treating a fellow Senator with disdain. It is wrong.

We should all take stock of ourselves. I am not accusing my colleagues of not being sincere, but they have been sincerely and personally up with it. If we want to fight every day and just go after each other like people who just don't care about etiquette and courtesy, I guess we can do that, but I think it is the wrong thing to do. I hold a special note of what has been going on, and on both sides start trying to work together. I know it was tough for my Democrat friends to lose the Presidential election, I know that was tough. And they didn't think they were going to, and, frankly, a lot of us didn't think they were going to. I did think that. But, then again, I was one of two Senators who supported Donald Trump, in my opinion, with very, very good reason. I am sure that doesn't convince any of my colleagues on the other side.

The fact is that we have to treat each other with respect or this place is going to devolve into nothing but a jungle, and that would truly be a very, very bad thing.

I am not perfect, so I don't mean to act like I am, but I have to say that all of us need to take stock. We need to start thinking about the people on the other side. We need to start thinking about how we might bring each other together in the best interests of our country and how we might literally elevate the Senate to the position that we all hope it will be.

I love all of my colleagues. There is not one person in this body that I don't care for a lot. I disagree quite a bit with some of my colleagues on the other side, and even some folks on our side, but that doesn't mean that I have to treat them with disrespect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Minnesota.

MS. KLOBuchar. Madam President, I first want to say a few words about the Senator from Massachusetts and her passion and what she has brought to this Chamber. While I know she has not been allowed to complete her remarks today, I know that will not silence her, and we look forward to hearing from her tomorrow and many days in the future on so many topics.

I also wanted to say something about my friend from Utah. We have worked together on so many bills. I have seen firsthand that he means what he says and is not out to treat them with the dignity that we all deserve and that the American people deserve.

Also, I was especially impressed by the words from the Senator from Florida. When I see the majority leader and the Democratic leader over there, the talking in the corner, I think that is a good sign, because I have never seen a time where the Senate is more important, as the Senator from Florida was mentioning.

This is a moment in time where the Senate will not just be a check and balance, but it is also a place for compromise. The one issue where I would differ slightly with my friend and colleague from Utah is that this isn't just about Democrats responding with surprise or anger to the election of a new President. There have been a lot of things said in the last few months, including calling judges "so-called judges" and some of the discussions and comparisons to foreign leaders, and things that have been said from the White House in the last few weeks, including the order that was issued that some of our Republican colleagues expressed a lot of concern about and that the Senate wasn't involved in and that a lot of law enforcement people weren't involved in.

There have been reasons that people's passions are high, and there are reasons that are good ones because we care about this country. So I hope people will see that in perspective for why people are reacting the way they do.

As for the Senator from Alabama, as I would call him for the purpose of these remarks, I am someone who has worked well with him. We have done this together, and we have worked together on trafficking, and I am proud of the work I have done with him. We have also gone to the State of the Union together every single year, and I value his friendship.

I came to the conclusion that I couldn't support him not for personal reasons, but because of some of the views he has expressed in the past and his record on the Violence Against Women Act, his views on immigration, and his views relating to voting rights. I have worked with my colleagues, especially those who serve on the Judiciary Committee, feel the same way—that this wasn't personal, but we simply had a deep disagreement with some of his views on certain issues.

Today I thought I would focus on the voting rights issue. I spoke earlier about the Violence Against Women Act, and I think that is a good place to start as we work together going forward. We have seen an attack on America's civil rights. We have had 17 intelligence agencies talking about the fact that a foreign country tried to influence our election. It is the core of our democracy. I know the Senator from Florida himself has said that this time it happened to one candidate, one party, and the next time it could be another party, another candidate. So this idea of voting—this idea of the freedom to vote—is the core of our democracy.

One of the most important duties of the Justice Department—and that is the office for which the Attorney General would run—is safeguarding voters' access to the ballot box. This issue is important in my State. We had the highest voter turnout of any State in the country in this past election, and part of the reason we had such a good turnout is that we have good laws that allow for people to vote easily. We have laws for same-day registration. We make it easy for people to vote; we don't make it hard. For me, that is one of the major duties of the Justice Department, and that is to enforce our voting rights.

I will never forget when I traveled to Alabama in the last few years with one of the leaders, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who was one of the 13 original Freedom Riders. In 1964 he advocated the efforts for the Mississippi Freedom Summit, recruiting college students from around the country to join the movement, to register African-American voters across the South. People from my State went, and people from every State in this Chamber went there for that March.

On March 7, 1965, Congressman LEWIS and 600 other peaceful protestors attempted to march from Selma to Birmingham to protest violence against civil rights workers. As they reached the crest of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they saw a line of troopers blocking their way. At the end of the bridge, those peaceful marchers were attacked, just for calling for the right to vote. JOHN LEWIS's skull was fractured, and he still bears that scar to this day.

The weekend that I went back there, 48 years after that bloody Sunday, was the first time that the chief of Montgomery actually handed Congresswoman LEWIS a badge and publicly apologized for what happened to him that day, 48 years later. But as moving as that apology was, we still have a duty to make sure that those sacrifices were not in vain. We also need to make it easier for people to actually vote, and that is a promise still unmet in America over 50 years later, whether it is lines at voting booths or whether it is lines at the place that make it harder to vote.

I just look at this differently, having come from a high voter turnout State, a State where we have same-day registration, and when we look at the other high voter turnout States there are a few places that same-day registration station—Iowa, the Presiding Officer's State is one of them; that is not really a Democratic State, yet they have a high voter turnout and people participate and feel a part of that process. New Hampshire, Vermont, these States are truly split, but what we want to see is that kind of participation.
A couple of months after I was in Selma, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Shelby County v. Holder. In this decision, the Justices found that a formula in section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional. This formula was intended to determine states and localities needed to have Federal approval for any changes made to their voting rights laws, endangering the progress made over the past 50 years. According to a report by the Brennan Center, following the Shelby County decision, 14 States put new voting restrictions in place that impacted the 2016 Presidential election. Three other States also passed restrictive voting measures, but those laws were blocked by the courts. So the harm is very real and very serious, and we can’t sit by and just let this happen.

Specifically, we need a Department of Justice that will vigorously enforce the remaining sections of the Voting Rights Act as well as the National Voter Registration Act and the Help America Vote Act. Currently, a majority of the States are not complying with the National Voter Registration Act, leaving voting rolls outdated and preventing voters from casting their ballots. Without a Department of Justice that makes the enforcement of these laws a priority, the rights of voters will continue to be infringed.

Congress also needs to take action through legislation to make right what came out of that Supreme Court decision. Effectively throwing out the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act just doesn’t make sense. As Justice Ginsberg put so well in her dissent: “...effective enforcement of the Voting Rights Act just doesn’t make sense. As I see it, ...”

Those marchers in Selma sacrificed too much for us not to fight back. That is why I cosponsored legislation last Congress that would amend the Voting Rights Act.

I am under no illusion that amending the Voting Rights Act in Congress will be easy. It won’t be. We have seen some bipartisan support. In fact, Congressman SENSENBRENNER, from my neighboring State of Wisconsin, who sponsored the reauthorization in 2006, called for Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act. As he put it, “the Voting Rights Act is vital to America’s commitment to ensure again permit racial prejudices in the electoral process.”

Another issue I want to focus on this evening is that I raised in Senator Sessions’ hearing is the fundamental importance of freedom of the press. My dad was a newspaper reporter, and up until a few years ago, he was still writing a blog. So I am especially sensitive to, and concerned about, maintaining the press’s role as a watchdog.

On the role of journalists is critical to our Nation’s democracy. That is why our Founders enshrined freedom of the press in the First Amendment. When we look at what we are seeing in the last few years in our country, what concerns me is this assault on democracy. We have voting rights issues with people unable to vote, with lines, with restrictive voting laws passed as opposed to doubling to double to double to double to vote. We have outside money in politics. Recently, we have some of the things being said about judges, and now we have some assault on this notion of the freedom of the press.

Said—one—not in this Chamber—the press is the best avenue to truth. In fact, these values are more important now than ever, at a time when people are not exactly valuing the freedom of the press.

I believe there are two distinct roles journalists will hold that Congress must take action on in the coming years. The first is providing the people with information about their government. Sometimes this is as simple as covering the passage of a new law in a public forum. This work does not just lead to a better informed public. It can also lead to important actions.

Thanks to excellent reporting from across the country, Americans have been energized in the past. For instance, a few weeks ago there was an attempt to gut the Office of Congressional Ethics over in the House. That came out, people were outraged, it was reported on, and they backed down.

The second role we must preserve is journalists’ responsibility to be fact-checkers. They research, they provide context, and, when they need to, they correct. We need newspapers and media to stand up for what is true and what is false. As Thomas Jefferson said—and not in this Chamber—the press cannot simply keep its mouth shut. The American people deserve the truth, and we are all relying on journalists to keep digging for it. I take this personally and seriously.

In Senator Sessions’ hearing I asked him whether he would follow the standard now in place at the Justice Department, which address when Federal prosecutors can subpoena journalists or their records and serve to protect reporters engaging in investigative activities. The previous two Attorneys General both pledged not to put reporters in jail if they were simply doing their job under the law.

The Senates from Alabama did not make such a commitment. When I asked him about this in his hearing, he said he had not yet studied those rules. He also did not make a commitment when I later asked him to do that on the record.

The Senator from Alabama has also raised concerns in the past about protecting journalists from revealing their sources, including opposing the Free Flow of Information Act when it was considered by the Judiciary Committee in 2007, 2009, and 2013. So at this time, when our freedom of the press has been under attack at the highest levels of government, I believe it is critically important that our Department continues to function as an independent voice that will protect the ability of journalists to do their job.

Lastly, I want to take a moment to focus on the importance of the Antitrust Division at the Department of Justice. As ranking member of the Antitrust Subcommittee, I am concerned about the state of competition in the marketplace. I wish to take a few minutes on this issue.

I did ask Senator Sessions about this at his hearing, and he said he was committed to an independent division in the Justice Department and to continue that work without outside influence. I continue to believe that this issue will be important because of the massive amount of mergers we are seeing. The legal technicalities behind our antitrust laws will not be familiar to most Americans. Effective antitrust enforcement provides benefits we can all understand. When companies vigorously compete, they can offer consumers the lowest prices and the highest quality goods and services.

Senator Sessions has stated that he will support the independence of that division, and I want to make clear how critical this is. It is absolutely essential that our next Attorney General enforce our antitrust laws fairly and vigorously, and that this person protects the integrity of the Antitrust Division’s prosecutorial function from inappropriate influence. This is because vigorous antitrust enforcement means money in the pockets of American consumers. The Attorney General can do this by identifying and preventing competition problems before they occur, like stopping a merger that would allow a few dominant players to raise prices, or, when a merger is allowed to move forward, putting conditions in place to protect competition.

The next Attorney General will also be able to stop price-fixing cartels that hurt consumers by artificially inflating prices for goods such as auto parts, TVs, and tablet computers. Last year alone, the Justice Department obtained more than $1 billion in criminal antitrust fines. Anticompetitive practices have serious impacts on consumers; for example, pay-for-delay settlements that keep cheaper generic drugs from coming onto the markets. Estimates suggest that eliminating those sweetheart deals would generate over a billion dollars in savings over 10 years and save American consumers billions on their prescription drug costs. That is why Senator Grassley and I worked on bipartisan legislation to give the Federal Trade Commission the authority to stop anticompetitive agreements. Our Preserve Access to Affordable Generics Act would increase consumers’ access to cost-saving generic drugs.
The bottom line is this. Antitrust enforcement is needed now more than ever. We are experiencing a wave of concentration across industries. Just last year, then-Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust Division Bill Baer, a lifelong antitrust practitioner, said he was reviewing matters with such antitrust concerns that they should never have made it out of the corporate boardroom.

Not only will antitrust violations mean higher prices for Americans and less innovation, but the indirect effects are equally troubling. There is concern that undue concentration of economic power would exacerbate income inequality. There is also concern that concentration can hurt new businesses, stifling innovation. Why would you innovate if there is just one or two firms? Only effective antitrust enforcement by the Attorney General will prevent those harms, and effective enforcement can occur only if the Department of Justice is independent of the White House and based on the merits of the individual case, rather than politics.

Traditionally, the White House has not interfered with antitrust enforcement decisions, but recent reports indicate that the President has discussed pending mergers with CEOs during ongoing antitrust reviews. Some companies have also publicly reported their conversations with and their commitments to the President. In both Senate and House hearings and in a follow-up letter, I raised this issue with him. The Senator from Alabama said: “It would be improper to consider any political, personal, or other non-legal basis in reaching an enforcement decision.”

That is the correct answer. I plan to rigorously protect the Antitrust Division’s prosecutorial integrity to make sure it is principled and done right. Antitrust and competition policy are not Republican or Democratic issues. A merger in the ag industry could have an effect on farmers in Iowa, as the Presiding Officer knows. These are consumer issues, and these issues could not be more important to all Americans. We can all agree that robust competition is essential to our free-market economy and critical to ensuring that consumers pay the best prices for what they need.

I want to switch gears and conclude today by speaking about the President’s Executive order regarding refugees, especially those from Muslim countries, which has caused so much chaos across our country over the past several weeks.

While I know Senator Sessions was not involved in writing the Executive order, it is very important that going forward, obviously, the Attorney General and the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel have a responsibility to review Presidential Executive orders regarding refugees, and assure they are legal and done right.

I sent a letter, with Senators Durbin, Whitehouse, Franken, Coons, and Blumenthal, and we asked Senator Sessions what he would have done if the President’s Executive order came across his desk. As a former prosecutor, I have long advocated for thorough vetting and supported strong national security measures. I believe that the No. 1 priority should be making people safe. While working to strengthen biometrics and other security measures is a good goal, this is not the way our government should be put out there without properly vetting it and figuring out the effect it would have on a four-year-old girl who is in a refugee camp in Uganda. That happened.

In my State, there was a mom who had two children, a Somali mother in a refugee camp. She got permission to come over to our State and to our country as a refugee. But she was pregnant with her third baby, that baby did not have permission to come with her. So she had a Sophie’s choice: Does she leave the baby in the refugee camp with friends and go to America with her two other daughters, or do all of them stay in the refugee camp in Uganda? She made a decision that she would go with her two older girls, that that would be the safest thing for them.

For 4 years, she worked to get the child that was left behind in the refugee camp to America to be reunited with her sisters. The baby, who is now 4 years old, was on a plane on the Monday after the President’s Executive order was issued. The 4-year-old could not get on that plane.

Senator Franken and I got involved. We talked to General Kelly. He was more than generous with his time. They made an exception, and the 4-year-old is now in Minnesota. But it should not take a Senator’s intervention—as many of my colleagues know that have worked on these cases—to get a 4-year-old who is supposed to be reunited with their family, something that our government has worked on for 4 years and Lutheran Social Services in Minnesota had worked on for 4 years.

If Senator Sessions is in fact confirmed as the next Attorney General, these are actual issues he is going to have to work on, and beyond that, we have the issue of how people in our country are afraid.

We have 100,000 Somalis in Minnesota. We have the biggest Somali population in the country. A man who works for me started with my office 10 years ago and has been our outreach to the Somali community. He was just elected to the school board.

We have Somali elections to our city council. This is part of the fabric of life in our State. Congressman Emmer, who actually took the seat held by Michele Bachmann, is the co-chair, along with Congressman Ellison, of the Somali caucus in the House of Representatives. We have not seen this as a Democratic issue or a Republican issue in our State. We have welcomed these refugees.

We have the second biggest populations of Hmong in the United States of America. We have the biggest Liberian population. We have one of the biggest populations of people from Burma. We have 17 Fortune 500 companies. When refugees come over, they are legal workers, and they are a major part of our economy. So it is no surprise that during the last year, when we heard the kind of rhetoric that we have heard, people have asked—is this the way we should be?—not just the refugees themselves, not just their friends and family, but a lot of people in our State. The churches have gotten involved—-all kinds and every denomination in our State—to stand up for our Muslim population. Why? Because they have all heard the story. One of my most memorable stories was from a family whom I heard about when I was visiting with some of our Muslim population in Minneapolis. This was a story of two adults who actually had been in our State during 9/11. And George Bush stood up and he said: This isn’t about a religion. This is about evil people who did evil things, but it is not to indict a religion.

His U.S. attorney at the time, the Republican U.S. attorney, went around with me—the elected prosecutor for the biggest county in our State—and we met with the Muslim population and assured them they were safe and told them to report hate crimes. The family, these two adults, they were there then. Nothing bad happened to them. No one called them a name.

Fast-forward to this summer. They are at a restaurant with their two little children. They are just sitting there having dinner.

A guy walks by and says: You four go home. You go home to where you came from.

The little girl looked up at her mom, and she said: Mom, I don’t want to go home and eat tonight. You said we could eat out tonight.

The words of an innocent child. She didn’t know what they were talking about because she only knows one home. That home is our State, and that home is the United States of America.

If Senator Sessions is confirmed for this position, he is going to have an obligation to that little girl who was in that restaurant and to all of the people in our country because this is the Justice Department of the United States of America.

As a former prosecutor, I know a big part of that job is prosecuting cases and doing all we can to keep America safe from evildoers, but it is also about keeping our Constitution and our rights safe.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, the Attorney General of the United States is the chief law officer of the United States and also somewhat unique position in the Federal Government. The Attorney General of the United States is tasked with
significant responsibilities that must be executed independently, sometimes even in defiance of the White House's wishes and interests.

The Attorney General of the United States is tasked with enforcing our laws by the Constitution, and ensuring that the Department of Justice acts as an independent and fair organization as well as with protecting the civil and constitutional rights of all Americans of all persuasions, of all backgrounds. The Attorney General of the United States does not work for the President so much as for the people and does not serve the administration so much as the law.

I have served in the U.S. Department of Justice. I have felt its esprit de corps, its pride. That pride is fortified on a firm sense of the Department's willingness to stand on what is right, even against the wishes of the White House. One fine example of this was Attorney General Ashcroft challenging and rebuffing the White House on the Bush administration's warrantless wiretapping of Americans. The Department of Justice is well aware of the importance of its independence.

A successful Attorney General must be stalwart in protecting the Department from political meddling by the administration or by Congress. We need only look back to Attorney General Gonzales's resignation to recall how badly things turned out when an Attorney General yields to political pressure.

An Attorney General also makes policy decisions about where and how to direct the Department's $27 billion budget and when and how to advise Congress to recommend new laws and modify existing policies. These are policy choices, not to follow the law. That doesn't apply in this arena of funding decisions and legislative recommendations that are policy choices not dictated by law. Those policy choices can have a profound effect on communities, and on the fabric of our Nations.

Americans should be able to trust that their Attorney General will not only enforce the laws with integrity and impartiality but stand up for Americans of all stripes and fight on behalf of their rights. That is the prism through which I evaluate Senator Sessions' nomination.

I have known Senator Sessions for a decade. I have worked with him on a number of pieces of legislation. However, the standard by which I evaluate an Attorney General nominee is whether Rhode Islanders will trust that in the tough clinches, he will always stand up, always fight, always be their voice. The standard by which I evaluate Senator Sessions' nomination is the same.

By the way, the attorney general in Rhode Island has full prosecutorial authority. Many States have a division in which the attorney general has a narrow ambit of authority, and district attorneys do the bulk of the criminal prosecution—not so in Rhode Island.

I have also been to listen to Attorney General Sessions testify before the Judiciary Committee. I have reflected on as well as his testimony before the Justice Department. For every constituent who has expressed support of his nomination, 15 have expressed opposition.

Senator Sessions has fought against our immigration system, opposing the leading opponent of bipartisan legislation which had it passed, would have spared us much of the current debate over visas and immigration. Senator Sessions fought against our bipartisan criminal justice and sentencing reform bill.

In fairness, I should disclose that Senator Sessions' nomination carries an additional burden with me as the nominee of this President and this White House. The need for an independent Attorney General has rarely, if ever, been greater.

On the campaign trail, the American people witnessed Donald Trump glorify sexual misconduct, mock a disabled reporter, and make disparaging remarks about immigrants and minorities. We all witnessed chants at Trump rallies of "lock her up." At his confirmation hearings, Senator Sessions excused these as "humorously done." In mass rallies that also featured people getting beaten and the press caged and vilified, this didn't seem very humorous to many Americans. I think Americans can only conclude that the way they are portrayed in the movie are not the ones in the mob; the good guy is the lawman who stands on the jailhouse porch and sends the mob home. To me, that 'lock her up' chant was un-American. I believe that across the country it made honest prosecutors' stomachs turn.

Not surprisingly, many Americans are fearful of what the Trump administration will mean for them, for their families, and for their country.

The problems with this President did not end with the campaign. President Trump and his family have brought unprecedented swamp of conflicts of interest, failures of disclosure and divestment, and dark money secrets. We have not been permitted, in the course of our nomination advice-and-consent process, to explore the full depth of that unprecedented swamp because the dark money operations of nominees have been kept from us. In one case, thousands of emails are still covered up. The Trump White House traffics in alternative facts, operates vindictively, and is a haven for special interest influence. None of this suggests that there will be more or less constant occasion for investigation and even prosecution of this administration.

Independence is at a premium. Nothing could have made this more clear than the first disagreement between the Trump White House and the Department of Justice, whose outcome was that the Acting Attorney General—a woman with 30 years' experience in the Department, a former prosecutor, former assistant U.S. attorney, former U.S. attorney, and someone recognized for her leadership throughout the Department—was summarily fired.

This is also not a good sign. In recent history, Attorneys General Gonzales, Meese, and Mitchell were politically close to their Presidents, and the Gonzales, Meese, and Mitchell tenures did not end well.

Attorney General Mitchell worked for President Nixon. They met when their New York law firms merged in the early 1970s, and they became law partners. John Mitchell was the campaign manager for Nixon's 1968 Presidential campaign. There were signs that things weren't quite right because when Nixon nominated Mitchell to be his Attorney General, he appealed directly to FBI Director Hoover not to conduct the usual background check. Hoover ultimately resigned as Attorney General in order to run President Nixon's reelection campaign. So the political link between Mitchell and Nixon was very close, and sure enough, scandal ensued. Attorney General Mitchell was turned out as a figue of the Watergate scandal.

That dirty tricks program ultimately included breaking into national Democratic headquarters in the Watergate.
The upshot of this was that Mitchell was charged with conspiracy, obstruction of justice, and three counts of perjury. He was convicted on all counts, and he served 19 months in prison.

Attorney General Edwin Meese was also very close to the President. Reagan. Meese joined the 1980 Reagan Presidential campaign as Chief of Staff. He ran the day-to-day campaign operations and was the senior issues adviser. After the election, Edwin Meese was quickly named Reagan's Chief of Staff and later, the transition, and once in office, Reagan appointed Meese as Counselor to the President. According to press accounts at the time, Meese was known as someone who “has known the President so long and so well, he has become almost an alter ego of Ronald Reagan.” That was the political background between Meese and President Reagan.

Again, it did not end well. Meese came under scrutiny for his role in the Iran-Contra scandal. The congressional committee that reported on the Iran-Contra scandal in November 1987 determined that Meese had failed to take appropriate steps to prevent members of the administration from destroying critical evidence. An independent counsel named Lawrence Walsh finished a report in 1993 that stated that Meese had made a false statement when he said Reagan had not known about the 1985 Iran-Contra deal. Iran-Contra was not the only controversy that plagued Attorney General Meese. A company called Wedtech Corporation was seeking Department of Defense contracts in the early 1980s. The company hired Meese’s former law school classmate and his personal attorney, a lawyer named E. Robert Wallach, to lobby the Reagan administration on its behalf. Attorney General Meese helped Wedtech at Wallach’s urging get a special hearing on a $32 million Army engine contract, although the Army considered the company unqualified. Well, the company got the deal, and then one of Meese’s top deputies went to work for Wedtech.

The Federal criminal investigation that resulted led to the conviction of E. Robert Wallach, the former law school classmate and personal attorney of Meese, for whom he had set up the meetings with the government.

Independent counsel James McKay investigated the Wedtech contract, including allegations of misconduct by Meese. While Meese was never convicted, he resigned following the issuance of the independent counsel’s 800-page report.

Third is Attorney General Gonzales. Attorney General Gonzales was close to then-Governor Bush in Texas. He was his general counsel. When Governor Bush became President Bush, Gonzales came to Washington to serve as White House Counsel. He was appointed Attorney General in 2005. During Gonzales’s tenure at the Department of Justice, there were multiple investigations, many of which played out before the Senate Judiciary Committee, involving the Warrantless Wiretapping Program, the U.S. attorney’s scandal, and inquiries into the Department’s management of the torture program legal opinions.

Ultimately, Members of both Houses of Congress called for Attorney General Gonzales’s resignation—or demanded that he be fired by the President—and Attorney General Gonzales resigned.

There is a track record here of Attorneys General who are politically close to a President coming into harm’s way, and doing poorly in the Department. One particular office that is vulnerable to this kind of undue proximity, and failure of independence, is a body in the Department of Justice called the Office of Legal Counsel. Jack Goldsmith, a former head of the Office of Legal Counsel—and a Republican, by the way—testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that “more than any other institution inside the executive branch, OLC is supposed to provide detached, apolitical advice.” And it has an honorable tradition of providing such advice to a remarkable degree, but under the Bush administration, the OLC departed from that tradition. It came up in a number of ways. The first was our investigation into President Bush’s Warrantless Wiretapping Program.

When Office of Legal Counsel memos supporting the program came to light, I plowed through a fat stack of those classified opinions that were held in secret over at the White House and pressed to have some of the statements declassified. Here are some of the statements that were declassified found in those OLC opinions:

An Executive order cannot limit a President. There is no constitutional requirement for a President to issue a new Executive order whenever he wishes to depart from the terms of a previous Executive order.

So this means a President could issue an Executive order, have it published in the Federal Register, put it forward as the policy of the administration—a direction to all the attorneys in the administration—and then secretly depart from it without ever changing what the public is told about the policy. A theory like this allows the Federal Register, where these Executive orders are assembled, to become a screen of false- 

hood, behind which illegal programs can operate in violation of the very Executive order that purports to control the executive branch. That was just one.

Another one I will quote: “The President exercising his constitutional authority under Article II, can determine whether an action is a lawful exercise of the President’s authority under Article II.”

If that sounds a little bit like pulling yourself up by your own bootstraps, well, it sounds that way to me, too, and it runs contrary to a fairly basic concept. This concept was enunciated in the famous case of Marbury v. Madison—which every law student knows—which says: “It is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary to say what the law is.”

A third example—and this is another quote from an OLC opinion: “The Department of Justice is bound by the President’s legal opinions.”

One thing that is true: what is the point of a President sending matters over to the Department of Justice for legal review? If the President did it, and it is therefore automatically legal, there would be no function to the Department of Justice accomplishing that legal review.

So in this area of warrantless wiretapping, the Office of Legal Counsel with the Department of Justice came up with what seemed to be quite remarkable theories in the privacy and secrecy of that office, in those classified opinions that are really hard to justify in the broad light of day. That is, we know, ordinarily involves strap- ping a captive in a reclining position, heels overhead, putting a cloth over his face, and pouring water over the cloth to create the impression of drowning. Senator John McCain, held captive for nearly 5 years by the Vietnamese, said this of waterboarding:

It is not a complicated procedure. It is tor- ture.

American prosecutors and American judges in military tribunals after World War II prosecuted Japanese soldiers for war crimes for torture on the evidence of their waterboarding American prisoners of war. None of that history appeared in the Office of Legal Counsel opinion.

The other major thing the Office of Legal Counsel overlooked was a case involving a Texas sheriff who was prosecuted as a criminal for waterboarding prisoners in 1984. Let’s start with the fact that this was a case that was brought by the Department of Justice. It was the U.S. attorney for that district who prosecuted the sheriff. The Department of Justice won the case at trial.

The case went up on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the court one level below the U.S. Supreme Court. In its appellate decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the
Fifth Circuit described the technique as “water torture.”

All a legal researcher had to do was to type the words “water” and “torture” into the legal search engines Lexis or Westlaw, and this case would come up, United States v. Lee. You can find it at 774 F.2d 1124.

Over and over in that published appellate opinion by the secondhighest level of court in the Federal Judiciary, they described the technique as torture. Yet the Office of Legal Counsel never mentioned this case in their decision.

Ordinarily, what a proper lawyer is supposed to do, if they find adverse precedent—i.e., decisions that appear to come down a different way than the argument the lawyer is making—is they report the decision to the court, and then they try to distinguish it, they try to convince the judge they are before what that case was either wrongly decided or does not apply on the facts. But the Office of Legal Counsel did not offer any effort to distinguish the Fifth Circuit decision; it simply pretended it did not exist or it never found it. It is hard to know which is worse.

At about the same time as the Lee case, the district judge admonished the former sheriff who had been found guilty of waterboarding: “The operation down there would embarrass the dictator of a country.” Well, it is also pretty embarrassing when what is supposed to be the institution inside the executive branch that is supposed to provide detached, apolitical legal advice in an honorable tradition of providing such advice, to a remarkable degree, to quote Professor Goldsmith, misses a case so clearly on point.

That was not the only OLC error. In addition to the warrantless wiretapping statements, in addition to the Office of Legal Counsel opinions on waterboarding, they undertook a review of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

In the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is something called an exclusivity provision. It says this: The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act “shall be the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance and the interception of domestic wire, oral and electronic communications may be conducted.” The exclusivity provision on waterboarding, they undertook a review of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

The decision was called United States v. Andonian, and the judge in that case ruled that this language, the exclusivity clause—I am quoting the court’s decision—“reveals that Congress intended to sew up the perceived loopholes through which the President had been able to avoid the warrant requirement.”

The exclusivity clause makes it impossible for the President to opt out of the legislative scheme by retreating to his inherent executive sovereignty over foreign affairs. The exclusivity clause assures that the President cannot avoid Congress’s limitations by resorting to inherent powers.

In the face of that case law, the Office of Legal Counsel held that Congress had not said what it said and this was not exclusive language, even though a court had said so.

The reason I share those three stories is because it really matters in important issues when the Department of Justice, the Office of Legal Counsel, and the President rush to theaddin to the warrantless wiretapping program. It really matters when they don’t find the case on point to evaluate whether waterboarding is torture. It really matters when they go around a clear congressional statute which a judge has said closes the door to going around that statute by simply saying privately: Well, that door is not actually closed. It matters.

I have insufficient confidence that as Attorney General, Senator Sessions will be able to stand up to the kind of pressure we can expect this White House to bring. We know that this White House operates vindictively and likes to push people around.

We found out recently that Mr. Bannon went running over to see General Kelly to tell him to undo the green card waiver of the Muslim ban. Thankfully General Kelly refused and stuck by his duty. But this is the kind of White House we have, where they try to push people around to do the wrong thing.

They are so contemptuous of authority outside their own that they are willing to attack a Federal judge who disagrees with them, calling him a “so-called judge.” They are willing to fire an Acting Attorney General who disagrees with them, firing her summarily and accusing her of betrayal. The pressure this White House can be expected to bring on the Department of Justice to conform itself not to the law but to the political demands of the President is going to be intense.

Moreover, the conflicts of interest that crawl through this White House and that crawl over this swamp Cabinet offer every reasonable cause to believe that there will have to be investigations and prosecutions into this administration.

That combination of a target-rich environment in this administration for investigation and prosecution with a vindictive White House that does not hesitate to try to bully officials into conformity calls for the highest degree of independence. I do not feel Senator Sessions makes that standard. He was too close to the President during the political race. He would up against any of those excesses I have mentioned since then. It is with regret that I must say I will not be able to vote to confirm him.

One of the reasons I became a lawyer was because of “To Kill a Mocking Bird.” As a kid, I just loved Atticus Finch. He is great in the movie. He is even better in the book. Some of the things that Atticus Finch says about the law and about human nature are so brave and so profound that from the first time I read that book, boy, I would love to have been Atticus Finch. I would love to have had the chance to stand in the breach when everyone was against you and stick up for doing something that was right. Gosh, that felt so great.

Like the scene in many movies, the hero is not a part of the mob, not carrying a torch toward the jailhouse; the hero is the lonely lawman who sits on the porch and won’t let the mob in. That is what I think we are going to need in our next Attorney General.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I will be speaking later tonight, perhaps about 2 o’clock, possibly on through 4 o’clock, but I wanted to take a few moments now and share some of the letter that was discussed earlier and which I would like to share it in a fashion that is appropriate under our rules. I would like to thank very much my colleague from New Jersey for yielding a few minutes in order to do so.

I think it is important for us to understand the context of what this letter was all about. This letter was a statement of Coretta Scott King, and it was dated Thursday, March 13, 1986. She noted: “My longstanding commitment, which I shared with my husband Martin”—of course that is Martin Luther King—“to protect and enhance the rights of black Americans, rights which include equal access to the Democratic process, tells me to testify today.” Then in her letter she goes on to essentially present an essay about the essential role of voting rights in our country, and so I will continue to read in that regard. She says:

The Voting Rights Act was and still is vitally important to the future of democracy in the United States. I was privileged to join Martin and many others during the Selma to Montgomery march for voting rights in 1965. Martin was particularly impressed by the determination to get the franchise of blacks in Selma and neighboring Perry County. As he wrote—

Now she is quoting Martin Luther King—

“Certainly no community in the history of the negro struggle has responded with the enthusiasm of Selma and her neighboring...
town of Marion. Where Birmingham depended largely upon students and unemployed adults to participate in nonviolent protests of the denial of the franchise, Selma has involved fully 10 percent of the negro population in active demonstrations and at least half the negro population of Marion was arrested on 1 day."

That was the end of the quote from her husband. She continued:

Martin was referring, of course, to a group that included the defendants recently prosecuted for assisting elderly and illiterate blacks to exercise that franchise.

Each time she refers to franchise, she is referring to this fundamental right to vote under our Constitution.

And she continued:

In fact, Martin anticipated from the depth of their commitment 20 years ago, that a united political organization would remain in Perry County long after the other marchers had left. This organization, the Perry County Civic League, started by Mr. Turner, Mr. Hooks, and Mr. King, as has been said at the hearing, continued "to direct the drive for votes and other rights."

That is a quote from her husband. And then she continued in this letter, she says:

In the years since the Voting Rights Act was passed, Black Americans in Marion, Selma, and elsewhere have made important strides in their struggle to participate actively in the electoral process. The number of Blacks registered to vote in key Southern states has doubled [she said] since 1965. This would not have been possible without the Voting Rights Act.

She continues in her essay. She says:

However, Blacks still fall far short of having equal participation in the electoral process. Particularly in the South, efforts continue to be made to deny Blacks access to the polls, even when Blacks constitute the majority of the voters. It has been a long uphill struggle to keep alive the vital legislation that protects the most fundamental right to vote. A person who has exhibited so much hostility to the enforcement of those laws, and thus, to the exercise of those rights, then she returns to her essay about how important this is.

The exercise of the franchise is an essential means by which our citizens ensure that those who are governing will be responsible. My husband called it the number one civil right. The denial of access to the ballot box ultimately results in the denial of other fundamental rights. For, it is only when the poor and disadvantaged are empowered that those who are governing will be responsible.

Coretta Scott King continues:

We still have a long way to go before we can say that minorities no longer need to be concerned about discrimination at the polls. Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans and Asian Americans are grossly underrepresented at every level of government in America. If we are going to make our timeless dream of justice through democracy a reality, we must take every possible step to ensure that the spirit and intent of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Fifteenth Amendment of the Constitution is honored.

The federal courts hold a unique position in our constitutional system, ensuring that minorities and other citizens without political power have a forum in which to vindicate their rights. Because of this unique role, it is essential that the people selected to be federal judges hold the highest view of our legal system: respect for individual rights and a commitment to equal justice for all.

The integrity of the Courts, and thus the rights they protect, can only be maintained if citizens feel confident that those selected as federal judges will be able to judge with fairness others holding differing views.

And she concludes her letter having examined a number of incidents in the historical record with this conclusion:

I do not believe Jefferson Sessions possesses the requisite judgment, competence, and sensitivity to the rights guaranteed by the federal civil rights laws to qualify for appointment to the federal district court.

And that is the context of her letter; that voting rights matter a tremendous amount. I applaud the efforts of my colleague from Massachusetts to make this point and share this essay with the body of the Senate earlier this evening.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, through the Chair, if the letter from which he just read has a date?

Mr. MERKLEY. Well, the answer is that it does have a date, and that is Thursday, March 13, 1986.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And is the Senator aware of the occasion that brought this letter to the Senate?

Mr. MERKLEY. I am.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. What was that occasion?

Mr. MERKLEY. That occasion was a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding the potential appointment of the individual to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Alabama.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. And this letter was made a matter of record in that hearing?

Mr. MERKLEY. I do not know if it was made a matter of record.

My impression initially was that she had marked this letter at the hearing, but I am not sure if it was presented in person or as a document submitted to the committee.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. But clearly the content of this letter has been a matter known to the Senate and, depending on what the facts may show, may actually have been a record of the Senate for more than 30 years.

Mr. MERKLEY. I believe that is probably correct.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. So a Senator of the United States has been accused of violating a rule of the Senate for resting to the Senate a phrase that has been a matter of record in the Senate— if, indeed, that is the case—for 30 years.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL LLOYD R. "JOE" VASEY

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, last week, we celebrated the 100th birthday of an American for whom my family
and I have always had the greatest personal respect and admiration: ADM Lloyd R. “Joe” Vasey.

Joe Vasey was my father’s dear friend and comrade for so many years. As he marks a century of life well lived, I wish him the warmest wishes and convey to him thanks of a grateful nation for embodying the very finest qualities of patriotism and for his constant service to a cause greater than himself.

From the Naval Academy to dangerous duty in the Second World War to five commands at sea to service in the highest councils of military command, Joe Vasey’s was a most distinguished and honorable Navy career. But he did not believe that his retirement from active duty relieved him of the responsibilities of patriotism. He continued to serve the national interest by founding the Pacific Forum to promote security and stability in the critically important Asia-Pacific region.

The only elaboration of this illustrious life I can offer are reminiscences of a friendship, some of which I was privileged to personally observe, which for me served as emblematic of a tradition; as an officer in the U.S. Navy and the bonds of respect and love that unite good officers in shared sacrifice and devotion to their service and their country. It is the tradition upon which, in the most difficult moments of my life, I relied for the strength to persevere for my country’s honor and for my self-respect.

Very late in his life, my father was interviewed for an oral history of our officers in the post-World War II Navy. “There’s a term which has slipped somewhat into disuse,” he remarked in the interview, “which I always used to the moment I retired, and that is the term: an officer and a gentleman.” Had my father been asked to identify a contemporary who personified the virtues he considered essential to the life of an officer and a gentleman, I have no doubt he would have thought first of his friend Joe Vasey.

My father’s respect and affection for Joe Vasey was unlimited. Their friendship was forged in the crucible of war and strengthened to last a lifetime by their shared experiences aboard the USS Gunnel as it prowled the Pacific from Midway to Nagasaki in search of the enemy. And find them they did. On one occasion, the ship sank a Japanese freighter and destroyer, but was then forced to submerge for 36 hours while avoiding Japanese depth charges. With the temperature on the submarine reaching 120 degrees and oxygen running low, my father decided to surface and try to fight the remaining Japanese ships. But he offered his torpedo officer, Joe Vasey, and the rest of his officers the option to abandon ship. To a man, they agreed with my father and rejected this offer. When the Gunnel surfaced, its weary crew found the Japanese destroyers had given up and were steaming away. My father, Joe Vasey, and their comrades lived to fight another day.

My father and Joe Vasey were proud veterans of an epic war. They never felt the need to exaggerate their experiences, extraordinary as they were. But they readily called to mind the lessons of leadership they learned and how they could be applied to new circumstances. And they had many occasions to do so. They were together when my father became commander-in-chief of Pacific Command during the Vietnam war and Admiral Vasey served as his most trusted adviser as head of strategic plans and policies. They were together when they argued to Washington for a strategy to win the war rather than just continue the bleeding. And they were together when my father gave orders for B-52s to bomb the city in which his son was held a prisoner of war. They were the best of friends and exemplified that noblest of traditions: brothers in arms.

I count myself immeasurably fortunate to have benefited from their example early in life so that I could derive the strength I needed to survive later misfortune from their stories, their courage, and their honor.

So to Joe Vasey, a great patriot, a good man, an officer and a gentleman, and a brave defender of this Nation, I wish a very happy birthday, fair winds, and following seas.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 337. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

H.R. 387. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by a member of its staff, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 618. An act to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 688. An act to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-689. A communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Army Force Structure (OSS–2017–0149); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 689. An act to ensure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
EC-672. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Data Mining Activity in the Department of State for calendar year 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-673. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Regulations: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act” (34 CFR Part 99) received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-674. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Open Licensing Requirement for Competitive Grant Programs” (RIN 1250-AQ07) received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-675. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Victims Compensation Fund established by the Witness Security Reform Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCaIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendment:
S. Res. 53. An original resolution authorizing expending by the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:

*David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RAUL THOMAS, for himself and Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt amounts paid for nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 324. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WALSH, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 325. A bill to permanently extend the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDINER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 327. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund reports of nonspendable oil and gas resources; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 328. A bill to enforce the Sixth Amendment right to the assistance of effective counsel at all stages of the adversarial process, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide declaratory and injunctive relief against systematic violations of such right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 329. A bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. ALBANY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 330. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a corporation to develop and operate a national capital stock fund to finance judicial decisions of capital cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 331. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain lands transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 332. A bill to restrict funding for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 333. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. RISHJ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DONELLY, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HETSKAMP, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 346. A bill to clarify Congressional intent regarding regulations related to the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. McCaIN:

S. Res. 53. An original resolution authorizing expending by the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.
By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RURO, and Mrs. McCASKILL): S. Res. 54. A resolution expressing the unwavering commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MUKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN): S. Res. 55. A resolution recognizing February 26, 2017, as the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. SHAMUS, Mr. BIERENSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BRUMMEL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHAFER, Ms. HETTKAMP, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASHEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SCHUMER): S. Res. 56. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should remain a global leader in welcoming and providing asylum to refugees and asylum seekers and that no person should be banned from entering the United States because of their nationality, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21
At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 59
At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. PISCHER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms, and that no person should be banned from entering the United States because of their nationality, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 85
At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 119
At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in connection with the terms thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 204
At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 224
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 224, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 260
At the request of Mr. CORKY.N, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. CAPITO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 260, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 279
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to modify a provision relating to acquisition of beach fill.

S. 294
At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration’s jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 301
At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 302
At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 302, a bill to enhance tribal road safety, and for other purposes.

S. 306
At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 306, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 315
At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 315, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to place in Arlington National Cemetery a monument honoring the helicopter pilots and crewmembers who were killed while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. J. RES. 14
At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. CORRINE) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.

S. J. RES. 17
At the request of Mr. CORKY.N, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the discontinuation of the process for consideration and automatic implementation of the annual proposal of the Independent Medicare Advisory Board for calendar year 1999A of the Social Security Act.

S. RES. 50
At the request of Mr. CORDIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 50, a resolution reaffirming a strong commitment to the United States-Australia alliance relationship.

S. RES. 51
At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 51, a resolution recognizing the contributions of Federal employees and pledging to oppose efforts to reduce Federal workforce pay and benefits, eliminate civil service employment protections, undermine collective bargaining, and limit the use of non-Federal contractors for inherently governmental activities.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAIN: S. 331. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. KAIN. Mr. President, this bill has a complex backstory— to allow a small daycare facility to relocate from Virginia to Hawaii— but it serves a simple purpose—to allow a small daycare facility to relocate from Virginia to Hawaii.

For more than 20 years, the Plains Area Day Care Center in Broadway, VA, has served children from moderately low-income families in Rockingham County. This facility sits on a 3-acre parcel that was once Federal land before the National Park Service conveyed it to Rockingham County in 1989...
under the Federal Lands to Parks Program. The county in turn leases this land to the center for $1 per year, with a contract that runs through the year 2027.

The center is in need of repairs and maintenance, including a new roof; however, it has had difficulty in securing private financing for these activities because of the complex land ownership structure—Federal land conveyed conditionally to a county and leased to a private company. Due to Virginia’s status as a Dillon State, Rockingham County cannot execute a loan either.

This bill would specify that the 1989 land conveyance is transferred in fee simple, with no further use restrictions. I appreciate the goal of the Federal Lands to Parks Program to preserve land as open space, particularly after having overseen the preservation of 400,000 acres of open space in Virginia during my time as Governor of the Commonwealth. There are no plans to develop the open space on this site, only to fix the daycare center building—a former Forest Service garage that has been on the site since before its transfer from Federal ownership.

My Virginia colleague, Congressmen Bob Goodlatte, has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives. During the 114th Congress, this bill was passed unanimously through the full House as a standalone; reported favorably without opposition by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee; and adopted by unanimous consent to be included in the Senate’s bipartisan Energy bill. Unfortunately, it fell just short of final passage.

This is a small modification that simply removes unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles and allows the daycare center to continue doing what it has been doing for 25 years. I am pleased to partner with Congressman Goodlatte in this commonsense, bipartisan effort.

By Mr. COTTON:
S. 332. A bill to restrict funding for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Without objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 332

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RESTRICTION ON FUNDING FOR THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that United Nations Security Council Resolution 2310 (September 23, 2018) does not obligate the United States or impose an obligation on the United States to refrain from actions that would run counter to the object and purpose of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

(b) RESTRICTION ON FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No United States funds may be made available to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The restriction under paragraph (1) with respect to the availability of United States funds for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization’s International Monitoring System shall not apply with respect to obligations of—

(1) the United States to refrain from testing nuclear weapons; or

(2) obligations of any country in order to—

(A) enter into and assume the obligations specified in the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty of August 1, 1996; or

(B) ensure that the United States have the means to verify its nonproliferation commitments to the United States; or

(C) receive financial assistance from a country eligible for assistance under the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, as established by the United States and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018 PERIOD ON ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2018.—The expenses of the committee for the period ending September 30, 2018, under this resolution shall not exceed $2,702,746, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $80,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $12,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act).

(b) EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(1) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(A) the payment of franked and mass mail items;

(B) the payment of telecommunications items;

(C) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(D) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers submitted by the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act)—

(1) for the period October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018, under this resolution shall not exceed $3,783,845, of which amount—

(A) not to exceed $12,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act); and

(B) not to exceed $33,334 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)));

(c) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019 PERIOD ON ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2018, through February 28, 2019, under this resolution shall not exceed $2,702,746, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed $80,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed $12,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j)(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2019.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery; and

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017;

(2) for the period October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2018, through February 28, 2019.

SENATE RESOLUTION 54—EXPRESSING THE UNWAVERING COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 54

Whereas, following World War II, the United States rejected isolationism, established its role as a world leader, and developed an international alliance system that protected the United States while supporting democracy, freedom, and economic prosperity with European nations;

Whereas, 70 years ago, the United States announced the Marshall Plan for Europe, a strategic investment in Europe, as well as articulated the Truman Doctrine, which sought to contain a growing Soviet threat in Southern Europe;

Whereas, in 1949, the United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland,
Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom signed the North Atlantic Treaty that formed the basis of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (this preamble referred to as "NATO");

Whereas NATO was created to protect countries from a growing Soviet threat, promote regional peace and stability, and defend freedom;

Whereas, to date, 28 countries have joined NATO;

Whereas, for more than 67 years, NATO has served as a central pillar of United States national security and a deterrent against adversarial threats;

Whereas NATO continues to improve its collective defense measures, enhance its military capabilities to address a full spectrum of threats, and partner with non-NATO countries to promote international stability;

Whereas Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty is an integral part of NATO and states that "[t]he Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack involving them all.";

Whereas NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time less than 24 hours after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against the United States;

Whereas, in Afghanistan, NATO allies and partners have served alongside United States forces in a campaign reaching a point of more than 42,000 allies and partner forces, 3,800 NATO forces continue to serve today alongside the 6,900 United States forces there, and more than 1,100 NATO ally and partner forces have paid the ultimate price in service to the collective defense of NATO;

Whereas NATO took the lead in helping combat the threat in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolve Support, contributing to the safety of the United States and the international community;

Whereas all 28 NATO allies and many NATO partners are contributing to the Global Coalition to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant;

Whereas approximately 18,000 military personnel are currently engaged in NATO missions around the world, conducting operations in Kosovo, the Mediterranean, and off the Horn of Africa;

Whereas NATO conducts a range of maritime operations in the Mediterranean and is essential to establishing stability along the borders of Europe and to responding to the ongoing refugee and migrant crisis;

Whereas, for nearly 10 years, NATO has provided airlift support for the mission of the African Union in Somalia, as well as assisted with training the African Standby Force at the request of the African Union;

Whereas, for more than 17 years, NATO has led peace-support operations in Kosovo to maintain safety and security in a volatile region;

Whereas NATO has three standing forces on active duty at all times to defend the Alliance, air policing capability, maritime forces, and an integrated air defense system;

Whereas NATO allies and the international community continue to look to NATO to deter and respond to increasingly revanchist activities of Russia;

Whereas Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, testified before the Committee on Armed Services during his hearing as nominee for Secretary of Defense, that "[w]e must also embrace our international alliances and security partnerships. History is clear: Nations with strong allies thrive and those without them wither";

Whereas there is a long tradition of strong bipartisan support in the United States for maintaining a strong and active NATO alliance. Membership in NATO strengthens the security of the United States;

Whereas NATO is the first peacetime military alliance the United States entered into outside the Western Hemisphere and today remains the largest peacetime military alliance in the world;

Whereas a fractured NATO alliance would harm the interests of the United States and embolden adversaries of the United States; and

Whereas a strong and united Europe is important to United States strategic interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) pledges that the United States will continue to maintain strong leadership and strengthen its commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this resolution referred to as "NATO");

(2) strongly encourages NATO members to fulfill their pledge to invest at least 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense spending, invest at least 20 percent of such spending on major equipment (including research and development), and shoulder appropriate responsibility within NATO;

(3) recognizes the historic contribution and sacrifice NATO member countries have made while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolve Support; and

(4) honors the men and women who served under NATO and gave their lives to promote peace, security, and international cooperation since 1949.

SATE RESOLUTION 55—RECOGNIZING FEBRUARY 26, 2017, AS THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DENALI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 55

Whereas Alaska Natives have lived on the land surrounding the Denali area and used the resources of the land for food, shelter, clothing, transportation, handicrafts, and trade for thousands of years;

Whereas Judge James Wickersham, of Fairbanks, Alaska, discovered gold in the Kantishna Hills following his attempted ascent of Denali in 1903, prompting a gold rush with several thousand prospectors and the establishment of successful placer and commercial mining operations that lasted for decades;

Whereas explorer Belmore Browne and hunter-naturalist Charles Sheldon visited...
the Denali region, observed the natural splendor of Denali, and, along with Alaska’s territorial delegate to Congress, Judge Wickerson, and pioneering biological survey and reclamation zealots Nelson, tirelessly advocated for Denali’s protection; whereas early proponents of national parks, such as the Boone and Crockett Club, the Sierra Club, and the American Museum of Natural History, sponsored early expeditions, including those of Sheldon and Brown, and advocated for the creation of a national park at Denali; whereas, in 1910, miners from the Kantishna Hills discovered an approach by which Denali might be climbed, relying on years of observations following quartz leads and hunting sheep in the foothills of the Denali area; whereas Athabascan Walter Harper joined Archdeacon Hudson Stuck, Harry Karstens, and Robert Tatum to successfully summit the highest peak of Denali in 1913, opening the door for thousands of individuals to test their own endurance and fortitude by attempting to climb the giant massif; whereas Woodrow Wilson signed into law the Act entitled “An Act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska”, approved February 26, 1917, chapter 121, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States and the preservation of the Denali area’s scenic beauty, animals, birds, and flowers; whereas Congress expanded the boundaries of Mount McKinley National Park in 1922, 1926, and 1966 and renamed that national park Denali National Park and Preserve after the traditional Yukonok Athabascan name for the highest peak in the park, Denali High One; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve protects and interprets Denali, which is the highest mountain in North America, at 20,310 feet, and the tallest above-water mountain, with a vertical relief of almost 18,000 feet measured from its base; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve preserves a wild subarctic landscape with a rich and diverse tapestry of plant life and intact ecosystems where bears, wolves, caribou, moose, and Dall sheep roam as they have for thousands of years; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve protects a wide array of fossils that point to a history of 30,000 years ago, when dinosaurs roamed that northern land; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve contains 2 of the oldest-known archaeology sites in North America, the oldest of which dates to just over 13,000 years old; whereas glaciers still blanket 1/6 of Denali National Park and Preserve and continue to shape the landscape by carving mountains, feeding slat-laden rivers, and depositing rock and silt across the valleys; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve is as an International Biosphere Reserve in 1976 and has become a premier international tourist destination; whereas, in 2016, nearly 600,000 visitors set foot in Denali National Park and Preserve, the greatest number of visitors in the history of Denali National Park and Preserve and a record number of visitors for the State of Alaska; whereas key tourism partners like the Alaska Railroad, the cruise ship industry, air and bus tour companies, and other outfitters have worked diligently to provide a wide array of ways in which the many visitors to Denali National Park and Preserve may experience Denali, including hiking, dog mushing, and wildlife viewing; whereas Denali National Park and Preserve’s historic Denali Park Road provides visitors with unparalleled opportunities to experience and explore millions of acres of an accessible wildlife sanctuary that represents one of the crown jewels of the United States; whereas residents of the State of Alaska continue their subsistence way of life by hunting and gathering in the majority of Denali National Park and Preserve using the age-old tradition of dog mushing; and whereas Denali National Park and Preserve hosts the only working sled dog kennel in a national park, and winter patrols are conducted inside Denali National Park and Preserve using the age-old tradition of dog mushing; and whereas Denali National Park and Preserve, known for its breathtaking scenery and iconic wildlife, protects more than 6,000,000 acres of towering mountains, expansive valleys, glacial rivers of ice, braided streams, and willland for the benefit of all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) congratulates and celebrates Denali National Park and Preserve on its centennial anniversary;
(2) encourages all people of the State of Alaska and the United States to visit and experience this national treasure; and
(3) designates February 26, 2017, as “Denali National Park and Preserve Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 56—EXPRESSION OF THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REMAIN A GLOBAL LEADER IN WELCOMING AND PROVIDING REFUGE TO REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS AND THAT NO PERSON SHOULD BE BANNED FROM ENTERING THE UNITED STATES BECAUSE OF THEIR NATIONALITY, RACE, ETHNICITY, RELIGION, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, OR GENDER

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mrs. HARKEN, Mr. BROOKER, Mr. HARKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENHOLT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DONELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution: which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

WHEREAS the United States is a country founded on the principles of religious and political freedom; whereas hateful rhetoric against refugees and asylum seekers betrays the principles on which the United States was founded; whereas for centuries, people from around the world have sought refuge in the United States in pursuit of freedom and protection for themselves and their families; whereas people often seek refuge and asylum in the United States to flee war, armed conflict, violence, and religious, ethnic, and political persecution; whereas refugees and asylum seekers have been welcomed by towns, cities, and States across the country; whereas refugees and asylum seekers have made their new communities stronger and more vibrant and have positively contributed to the betterment of the United States; whereas the United States has a moral obligation to ensure that people fleeing violence and persecution; whereas the United States Senate should continue its legacy of bipartisan leadership on refugees and asylum seekers; whereas, in a time of great challenge, a unified stance may result in prolonged and indefinite family separation; whereas executive actions targeting refugees and asylum seekers is most vulnerable populations at serious risk of death or injury; and whereas refugees are the most thoroughly screened individuals to enter the United States, undergoing multiple security checks by the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Counterterrorism Center; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That—
(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—
(A) the United States should remain a global leader in welcoming and providing refuge to refugees and asylum seekers; and
(B) no person should be banned from entering the United States because of their nationality, race, ethnicity, religious, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender;
(2) the Executive Order titled “Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States” issued by the President on January 27, 2017 undermines the national interest of the United States; and
(3) the Senate directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has reported that more than 65 million people have been forcibly displaced around the globe by the end of 2015. In the face of such staggering human suffering, we must not shutter our doors and abandon our foundational principle of religious freedom. Yet that is exactly what our new President would have us do with the Executive order he signed 2 weeks ago. This is not something I support, and for good reasons.

Our freedom of religion was enshrined in the Constitution 225 years ago. Since forming this promise, we have been a confident Nation welcoming those of all faiths. The Executive order issued by the new Republican President threatens these founding ideals and the very freedoms we enjoy as Americans. The new President would have us do with the foundational principle of religious freedom. Yet that is exactly what our new President would have us do with the Executive order he signed 2 weeks ago. This is not something I support, and for good reasons.

The ongoing conflict in Syria makes clear the enormity of the humanitarian crisis we face. The terror inflicted by both Bashar Al-Assad’s regime and ISIS has forced more than half of Syria’s 23 million people from their homes and claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians. Currently, there are more than 4.8 million registered...
Syrian refugees, the overwhelming majority of whom are women and children. Communities across the country, including some in Vermont, started the process to welcome these refugees who have undergone years of security screenings and vetting. Rutland, VT, is prepared to welcome 100 refugees, but to date only two families have arrived. One of these families shared that their own children “were exposed to a lot of terror, and the sound of bombs and the sound of bullets. The gunshots all day long.” This is no way to live. That is why I strongly agree with Rutland’s mayor Christopher Louras, who said accepting refugees “is just the right thing to do from a compassionate, humanitarian perspective.” We must do more.

There are other humanitarian crises impacting the world. Closer to home, ruthless armed gangs in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala continue to brutalize women and children with near impunity. We have a moral obligation to respond, and it is in our national interest to do that.

National security leaders agree that anti-Muslim rhetoric is not only contrary to our values, it also makes us less safe. FBI Director Comey told the Senate Judiciary Committee in November 2015 that part of ISIL’s narrative is to depict the United States as anti-Muslim. The Defense Department agrees to depict the United States as anti-Muslim. The Defense Department has made a similar point. House Speaker Ryan has also denounced a ban on Muslims, noting that it is “not conservatism” to impose a religious test. A bipartisan majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed in December 2015 when it passed my amendment expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States must not bar individuals from entering the United States based on their religion.

The chaos and confusion caused by this Executive order at our airports in the United States as well as around the world highlights the recklessness of this administration’s attempt to bar people based on their religion and national origin. The devastation this is causing to lawful immigrants and refugees fleeing violence is immeasurable. I fear for my constituents who are lawful permanent residents of the United States who also happen to be nationals of one of the seven targeted countries. Due to the widespread outrage expressed by thousands of concerned citizens and legal challenges across the country, the Trump administration has now clarified that the Executive order should not apply to legal permanent residents. But there continues to be an understandable fear that the Trump administration may again attempt to bar them from this country. Like them, I fear that the Trump administration may again seek to bar lawful immigrants from returning to their homes, work, and families in Vermont. I also fear for the young Somali refugee in Vermont who has been patiently waiting for the completion of the resettlement process so that his pregnant wife and young son will be saved from the squalor of a refugee camp and reunited with him in Vermont. And the man from Sudan who has been waiting for his two young sons to finally be granted their visas to join him and the rest of their family. And the husband whose Libyan wife was recently granted a visa and has been waiting for the International Organization for Migration to arrange her flight to the United States. I am concerned for these families and for so many others in Vermont and around the country.

Americans are bound together by our shared ideals. Among those ideals are tolerance and diversity. They unite us as a nation; they make us stronger. That is the message we should be embracing—one of inclusion, not one of exclusion and division. Federal District Court Judge Geoffrey Crawford perfectly encapsulated this sentiment at a naturalization ceremony for 31 new Americans in Rutland, VT, last week. The summary of his powerful remarks, which he directed particularly to our new Muslim citizens, was this: “You are equal in the eyes of the law.” This simple message is clear, and unequivocal: You are welcome, you are equal, you are protected.

That is why I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that no one should be blocked from entering the United States because of their nationality, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender. Adoption of this resolution simply reaffirms the basic principle that this country does not have a litmus test. It will also show that the Senate will not allow fear to undermine the very principles and values that we cherish and that we have sworn to defend. The resolution is consistent with the strong bipartisan actions taken by the Senate less than 4 years ago when we passed comprehensive immigration reform legislation that included protections for refugees and asylum seekers. I urge Senators to come together once again in support of my resolution.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 7, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

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

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 7, 2017, at 10 a.m.

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

**COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 7, 2017, off the Senate floor immediately following the vote scheduled at 12 p.m.

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

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, February 7, 2017, from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building.

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

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Zach Ormsby of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of the DeVos nomination.

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

**CONFIRMATION**

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 7, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Sec- retary of Education.
Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S685–S872
Senate continued in the session that began on Monday, February 6, 2017. See next volume of the Congressional Record.

Measures Introduced: Thirty-five bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 306–340, and S. Res. 48–56. Pages S745–46, S867–68

Measures Reported:
- S. Res. 48, authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence.
- S. Res. 52, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.
- S. Res. 53, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services. Pages S745, S869

Appointments:
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senator as the Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 115th Congress: Senator Wicker. Page S716

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: The Chair, on behalf of the President, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, appointed the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Senators Rubio (Chairman), Lankford, Cotton, Daines, and Young. Page S716

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85–874, as amended, re-appointed the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Senator Blunt. Page S716

Sessions Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General. Page S824

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:
- By 52 yeas to 47 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. EX. 55), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Page S824
- By 88 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 56), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. Page S855
- By 49 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 57), agreed to the ruling of the chair that the words spoken by Senator Warren violate rule XIX shall stand as the judgment of the Senate. Page S855
- By 43 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 58), Senate rejected the motion that Senator Warren be permitted to proceed in order. Page S855

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:
- By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 54), Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education. Page S824

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:
- By 91 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 53), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. Page S716

Messages from the House: Page S866

Measures Referred: Page S866

Executive Communications: Pages S866–67

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S867

Additional Cosponsors: Page S868

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S868–69

Additional Statements: Pages S744–45

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S751, S872
Privileges of the Floor: Pages S751, S872
Quorum Calls:
Two quorum call was taken today. (Total—3) Pages S716, S854
Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—58) Pages S716, S824, S855
Continuing Session: Senate convened at 12 noon, on Monday, February 6, 2017, and continued in session. (for complete Digest of today's proceedings, see next volume of the Congressional Record.)

Committee Meetings

(RECENT not listed did not meet)

RECENT YEMEN OPERATION
Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the recent Yemen operation from Theresa Whelan, performing the duties of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and J–3 Lieutenant General John L. Dolan, USAF, Joint Staff Director for Operations, both of the Department of Defense.

CYBER THREATS
Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on cyber threats from Admiral Michael S. Rogers, USN, Commander, Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, Chief, Central Security Services, Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53) authorizing expenditures by the Committee for the 115th Congress.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
An original resolution (S. Res. 52) authorizing expenditures by the Committee; and adopted its rules of procedure for the 115th Congress.
Also, Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

THE PLAN TO DEFEAT ISIS
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the plan to defeat ISIS, focusing on key decisions and considerations, after receiving testimony from James F. Jeffrey, Washington Institute for Near East Policy, and Jeremy Bash, Beacon Global Strategies, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.
Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 27 public bills, H.R. 871–897; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 64; H. Con. Res. 20–21; and H. Res. 92–94, were introduced. Pages H1011–12
Additional Cosponsors: Pages H1013–14
Reports Filed: A report was filed today as follows:
H. Res. 91, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (H. Rept. 115–9).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Smith (NE) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 12:01 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:06 p.m. and reconvened at 4:45 p.m.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:


Arapaho National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act of 2017: H.R. 688, to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado;

Bolts Ditch Access and Use Act: H.R. 689, to ensure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 407 yea to 1 nay, Roll No. 79;


Fort Frederica National Monument Boundary Expansion Act: H.R. 494, to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia; and

Email Privacy Act: H.R. 387, to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Aguilar wherein he resigned from the Committee on Armed Services.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Peters wherein he resigned from the Committee on Oversight and Armed Services.

Recess: The House recessed at 5:58 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 18, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Castro (TX) wherein he resigned from the Committee on Armed Services.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H980.

Senate Referral: S. 305 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H993 and H994. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9 p.m.
Committee Meetings

PRIORITIES OF THE HOUSE OFFICERS AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH ENTITIES FOR FY 2018 AND BEYOND

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Priorities of the House Officers and Legislative Branch Entities for FY 2018 and Beyond”. Testimony was heard from Stephen Ayers, Architect of the Capitol; Carla Hayden, Librarian, Library of Congress; Davita Vance-Cooks, Director, Government Publishing Office; and Matthew Verderosa, Chief of Police, U.S. Capitol Police.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS THAT ESTABLISH THE PROCEDURES USED TO PREPARE, REVISE, OR AMEND LAND USE PLANS PURSUANT TO THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976;
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE PLANS UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965;
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACHER PREPARATION ISSUES

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.J. Res. 44, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976; H.J. Res. 57, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and H.J. Res. 58, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues. The committee granted, by record vote of 8–3, a closed rule for H.J. Res. 44. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Additionally, the rule grants a closed rule for H.J. Res. 57 and H.J. Res. 58. The rule provides one hour of debate on each joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of each joint resolution. The rule provides that each joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in each joint resolution. The rule provides each joint resolution one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Bishop of Utah, and Representatives Rokita, Guthrie, and Scott of Virginia.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on the recent Yemen operation; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on cyber threats, 9 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the plan to defeat ISIS, focusing on key decisions and considerations, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: business meeting to consider the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The State of the Military”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Challenges and Opportunities in Higher Education”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, markup on H.R. 829, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the treatment of lottery winnings and other lump sum income for purposes of income eligibility under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; and H.R. 181, to amend title XIX of the
Social Security Act to count portions of income from annuities of a community spouse as income available to institutionalized spouses for purposes of eligibility for medical assistance, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the committee’s authorization and oversight plan for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Countering the North Korean Threat: New Steps in U.S. Policy”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Priorities of the House Officers and Legislative Branch Entities for FY 2018 and Beyond” (continued), 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 634, the “Election Assistance Commission Termination Act”; H.R. 133, to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns; and a committee resolution regarding views and estimates for FY2018, 12 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 732, the “Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Accomplishing Postal Reform in the 115th Congress—H.R. 756, the Postal Service Reform Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 428, the “Red River Gradient Boundary Survey Act”; H.J. Res. 42, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled “Making EPA Great Again”, 11 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Reimagining the Health Care Marketplace for America’s Small Businesses”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Assessing the VA IT Landscape: Progress and Challenges”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security; and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing entitled “Examining the Social Security Administration’s Representative Payee Program: Determining Who Needs Help”, to follow organizational meeting, 1100 Longworth.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
Tuesday, February 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue in the session that began on Monday, February 6, 2017. See next volume of the Congressional Record.

At approximately 12 noon, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Elisabeth Prince DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education.

Following disposition of the Nomination of Elisabeth Prince DeVos, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Tuesday, February 7

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 44—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.J. Res. 58—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.J. Res. 57—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Subject to a Rule).