

was 2 years old. Brandon goes to college and studies every day to be an architect, and he makes straight A's. He holds down a job to help support his family with medical bills and volunteers in his community. Brandon is grateful for the DACA Program that has given him the opportunity to work and pay taxes. Yes, he is grateful to pay taxes.

This President continues to divide our country like no other President we have known. Every day it is clear that his values are not in line with ours. I increasingly believe he is not fit to lead this great Nation.

His campaign began with anti-immigrant and racist rhetoric. He accused Mexican immigrants of being rapists and criminals, and his bigoted words have never stopped. He called for a wall along the entire border with Mexico—a wall that would cost billions of tax dollars and which border communities don't want. He called for a ban on Muslim refugees—turning our backs on people who are fighting terrorism and who value the freedoms that we have here in the United States. He tacitly accepted the support of the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and bigots in Charlottesville. He pardoned a law enforcement officer who terrorized the Latino community in Maricopa County, AZ, with unconstitutional raids and who forced detainees into inhumane living situations. Joe Arpaio is not a "good guy" as President Trump called him. Joe Arpaio is the criminal.

This President doesn't seem to value—let alone embody—the principles that America stands for, and now he wants to kick out of the country young people who do value this country—like Carlos.

Carlos was brought to New Mexico from Mexico when he was less than 1 year old. New Mexico is the only home he has known. Because of Carlos's immigration status, his opportunities were limited. He couldn't play sports in school, couldn't go on field trips, even though he pledged allegiance to the United States with his classmates.

Carlos registered with DACA 2 years ago and, in his words, he was given wings. He is a full-time student at New Mexico State University, studying to be a mechanical engineer. He volunteers as a firefighter. He works as a server at a local restaurant. He began a drive to help Hurricane Harvey victims. Carlos says:

We as DREAMers have proven ourselves to be worthy of being here in the United States.

There are 800,000 young people like Roxana, Brandon, and Carlos hoping to do their part to make our country strong. By any measure, DACA has been a huge success. We already have the outlines of a program that works for America. We in Congress must roll up our sleeves and make this program the law of the land, and we must make sure that America truly does belong to Roxana and all of our Dreamers.

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

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

RELIGIOUS TESTS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have been doing a lot of thinking lately about the fascinating men and women of America's founding generation. I want to share with you one of their stories.

Jonas Phillips was a penniless Jewish immigrant to America. He was an indentured servant, a hard-working businessman, and an American patriot who served in the Philadelphia militia during the Revolutionary War. During the British occupation of New York City, he sneaked messages past the censors by writing notes in Yiddish, understanding that his adversaries wouldn't be able to understand or decipher it easily.

Years later, Phillips addressed a letter to George Washington and to other delegates at the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia. He urged the delegates not to include a religious test in the Constitution as any kind of requirement for service for the Federal Government because no man, he wrote, should be "deprived or abridged of any civil right, as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments."

Jonas Phillips wrote this letter for a reason. He wrote this because Pennsylvania, the State where he lived, required officials to swear that the New Testament was inspired by God. As a faithful Jewish person, Jonas Phillips could not do that.

"By the above law," he wrote, "a Jew is deprived of holding any public office or place of government."

Thankfully, Jonas Phillips' letter—Jonas Phillips' prayer—ultimately would be answered. The Convention had voted unanimously to ban religious tests for Federal office. The language the Framers inserted into the Constitution was unequivocal upon this point. It said that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

When the Founding Fathers wrote the word "ever," they meant it. That word means something in the Constitution, and we need to protect it.

I feel the need to stress this point because of the conduct of some of my colleagues. Yesterday a Notre Dame law professor, Amy Coney Barrett, came before the Senate Judiciary Committee on which I serve. She had been nominated as a prominent legal scholar and lawyer in this country to be nominated as a circuit judge. That is why she was before our committee.

Her nomination has been endorsed by prominent legal scholars from across the political spectrum and across the country, including Neal Katyal, Presi-

dent Obama's Acting Solicitor General in the previous administration. Nevertheless, at Ms. Barrett's confirmation hearing, a number of my colleagues insinuated that her Catholic faith would somehow prevent her from applying the law freely and fairly.

Here is an actual quote from that hearing: "Dogma and law are two different things," remarked one of my colleagues. "When you read your speeches, the conclusion one draws is that the dogma lives loudly within you, and that is a concern."

Another one of my colleagues even went so far as to ask Professor Barrett to confess her faith under oath in the committee. "What is an orthodox Catholic?" this committee member asked. "Do you consider yourself an orthodox Catholic?"

If these remarks had been some sort of bizarre, one-time aberration, I probably would have passed them over in silence. But I feel compelled to speak out because I wondered whether a pattern might be emerging—a pattern of hostility toward people of faith who come before this body.

Just a few months ago, another eminently qualified nominee, Russell Vought, appeared before the Budget Committee to be considered for a post in the Office of Management and Budget. One of my Senate colleagues used his time to question this nominee, not about management or about budgets but about the nominee's evangelical Christian beliefs.

"In your judgment," asked this Senator, "do you think that people who are not Christians are going to be condemned?" Mr. Vought explained to the committee that he is an evangelical Christian and that he adheres to the beliefs espoused by evangelical Christians. That apparently wasn't good enough for the questioner, who later stated that he would vote against Mr. Vought's nomination because he was not "what this country is supposed to be about."

This is disturbing. This is not what the country is supposed to be about—some sort of inquiry into one's religious beliefs as a condition precedent for holding public office in the U.S. Government. These strange questions have nothing to do with the nominee's competence, patriotism, or ability to serve among and for Americans of different faiths equally. In fact, they have little to do with this life at all. Instead, they have to do with the afterlife—what comes after we die in this life. To my knowledge, the OMB and the Seventh Circuit have no jurisdiction over that.

This country is divided enough. Millions of Americans feel that Washington, DC, and the dominant culture despises them, and how can they not when they see their leaders sitting here grilling patriotic citizens about their faith like inquisitors. How can they not feel that their values are not welcome in this Chamber within this government?

Religious freedom is of deep concern to me as a Mormon. Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have weathered extraordinary religious persecution. Much of it, especially initially, was sponsored by government actors.

The first Latter-day Saints were exiled from home to home. In 1838, the Governor of Missouri ordered that Mormons be driven from the land or “exterminated.” And yes, that is an actual quote.

Our first leader, Joseph Smith, once said: “The civil magistrate should punish guilt but never suppress the freedom of souls.”

That, of course, was before he was martyred by a bigoted, angry mob.

Our country’s ban on religious tests is a strong bulwark for religious freedom. As an original provision of the Constitution, this ban against religious tests predates even the Bill of Rights, and it applies not to just some religious adherents but to all of them equally.

The religious tests raised against Mr. Vought and Professor Barrett do not favor one sect of Christianity over another as was sadly common for much of our Nation’s history. Rather, these particular inquiries tend to favor the secular, progressive creed clung to so confidently by many of our Nation’s ruling elites. This creed has its own clerics, its own dogmas, its own orthodoxy, and as these nominees have discovered, it has its own heresies as well.

More and more, the adherents of this creed seek to use the power of government to steamroll favored groups, especially dissenters, from their own personal political dogmas. So they force evangelical caterers to bake cakes celebrating same-sex marriages, as is the case that is now before the Supreme Court of the United States, and they force nuns to purchase contraceptive coverage—nuns. They sue religious hospitals that will not perform abortions or sex reassignment surgeries for religious reasons. Yes, the secular progressive creed has proved that it is capable of triumphalism and intolerance, just as the creeds that have gone before it, not because its own adherents are uniquely wicked—to the contrary, because they are human.

There is a way out of this vicious cycle of religious intolerance, and it is a way that we have to find. That is for all of us to treat one another with civility and respect while jealously defending the rights of conscience for ourselves, our neighbors, and all of our fellow citizens—for Christians, Jews, Muslims, atheists, agnostics, and everyone else.

This body can do its part by supporting legislation like the First Amendment Defense Act and the Marriage and Religious Freedom Act, which would protect the people who have conscious objections to recent cultural changes and make sure they are protected against one of the most brutal forms of discrimination that can

be brought to bear; that is, the type of discrimination brought about by governments against individuals.

At a minimum, this body can do its part by respecting the constitutional rights of citizens who come before it. Lest we forget, we work for them, not the other way around. I trust my colleagues—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—will take this to heart because religious freedom puts all Americans on the same footing. It helps men and women stand upright, honest before the law and before God.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DACA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the DACA Program, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, which is very important in my State. We actually have 6,000 kids who have gone through that program.

As we all know, 800,000 young people who have lived in the United States since childhood are included and affected by this recent action by the administration, which I strongly oppose. These Dreamers were brought to the United States as children through no fault of their own and are working hard to educate themselves and contribute to our Nation. In fact, more than 97 percent of DACA recipients are now in school or in the workforce, and all DACA recipients are required to meet the program’s education requirements. One recent study found that 72 percent of all DACA recipients who are currently in school are pursuing a bachelor’s degree or higher. According to the American Association of Medical Colleges, more than 100 students with DACA status applied to medical school last year.

The young people who have benefited from DACA have often been in our country almost their entire lives after having been brought here as children. They are valuable members of our community, and they have contributed to our economy and to the fabric of our society. In fact, one recent study estimated that ending this policy would cost the country over \$400 billion over the next 10 years.

Ending DACA, which has been in place since 2012, would create tremendous uncertainty and risk deportation for nearly 800,000 Dreamers who are studying and working across our Nation.

When I think of the Dreamers, I think of, first of all, the night that the Judiciary Committee, on a bipartisan basis, passed comprehensive immigra-

tion reform. There were Dreamers there. They were there late at night and had tears streaming down their faces. Then I think about the time that President Obama put DACA into place and made it so that they could come forward, sign up, and legally work. Now we are going to turn our backs on those same people, those people who were brought here through no fault of their own. Whether or not the current administration disagrees with the past administration, our country made a commitment to them that they could sign up for this program. Back when we passed comprehensive immigration reform, I felt that our committee—the Senators who voted for that bill, both Democrats and Republicans—made a commitment to them that day that we were going to work on their behalf. That is why this is so wrong.

I do appreciate that this morning the President said that he wants to work to pass this bill and that he said the DACA young people do not have to worry over the next 6 months about any actions taken against them. Those are, of course, good things. I just wish this had not happened in this way, but it did.

I am also not surprised that so many people have stood up in support of Senator DURBIN and Senator GRAHAM’s bill, that so many Republicans, Democrats, leaders in business, leaders in labor, and religious leaders have stood up.

As we discuss the fate of these young people under DACA, I am reminded of someone who is not young—Joseph Medina, who is a decorated Army veteran and an immigrant who just celebrated his 103rd birthday this July. He is 103 years old. When I found him, he was a young 99 years old. The reason I found him was that we were talking about this very issue—about DACA and about kids, actually, today who want to serve in the military. As we know, through various ways, some of the DACA kids are courageously serving in our military right now. Of course, they will not be able to if they are deported, but just think that we are actually considering deporting people who are currently serving in our military.

In any case, let’s go back 103 years ago or so—actually, maybe a little before that. Joseph Medina came to the United States from Mexico when he was only 5 years old. He did not actually know he was born outside of our country. He had been brought across the border as an orphan by his aunt and his stepfather, and he did not know that he had been born outside of the United States. He had lived his whole life in Sleepy Eye, MN, until he was in an Army boot camp in 1944. At that time, Joseph Medina wanted to serve our country, but he found out that he actually was undocumented.

In his own words to me, he said: Well, back then, the Army really wanted us. The Air Force wanted us. The Navy wanted us. Everyone wanted us.

So what did they do back then?