

make sense. Boats do and boat ramps make sense. In places where the wall may not make sense, a fence may make sense. Roads along the fence may make sense. In some places, Border Patrol on horses makes sense. In some places, we have high grasses. Put a Border Patrol officer up on a horse and he can see for miles and miles. That makes sense.

This and more was included in the proposal that drew 54 votes. It is the kind of thing we ought to do. It doesn't cost \$25 billion, but it will be cost-effective and make our border more secure.

I have great affection for our colleague from Tennessee. I appreciate his encouraging tone that this is not the end. What did Churchill say when he got bounced out of office at end of World War II? He was asked 6 months after the war, when he really carried Britain through on his back. The war is over. He gets beaten. He is asked by a reporter after he lost: For you, Mr. Churchill, is this the end?

He said: It is not the end. It is not the beginning of the end. It is the end of the beginning.

I hope this is the end of the beginning—maybe with the help of God and maybe with a little bit better leadership from the folks down at 1600.

The last thing is this. The Department of Homeland Security—which I worked for years to strengthen, to make something we can all be proud of—apparently has put out a statement today. I asked to read it. I am told by all kinds of people that it is riddled with inaccuracies and falsehoods. I am going to read it tonight on the way going home. I hope that is not true. What we need to operate here is the truth.

I will close with the words of Thomas Jefferson: If the people know the truth, we will not make a mistake. I heard that what the Department of Homeland Security put out today was not truthful. It is hard, with that kind of information, to do the right thing.

I wish to thank my colleague for giving me this much time and for being so patient with me. We will be back here in 10 days or so, and we will have a chance to reconnect and see if we can pull a victory out of the jaws of defeat.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his remarks and his comments. I certainly hope that when we come back, we can get a result. That is what the job is about. I cosponsored and voted for the President's legislation. I cosponsored and voted for the bipartisan legislation. My hope is that I have a chance to cosponsor and vote for legislation that gets 65 or 70 votes and solves the problem.

#### THANKING THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to note the presence on the

floor of the junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. JONES, who has been waiting patiently. He and I were working together on something that I am about to speak about, a resolution that has to do with an event that happened 50 years ago, the Memphis sanitation workers strike.

He has plenty to say about it, but he has not yet made what we call his maiden speech on the Senate floor. We usually reserve that moment for a singular opportunity to speak. So he is waiting until that time to speak. I respect that. I told him the little story of what happened to Senator Baker when he was in Senator JONES' position. Baker's father-in-law, Senator Dirksen, whom I mentioned, was the leader. Everybody assembled to hear Baker's maiden speech. Baker spoke a little too long. Dirksen came over to congratulate him. Baker looked up and said to his father-in-law, Senator Dirksen: How did I do?

Dirksen said: Howard, perhaps you should occasionally enjoy the luxury of an unexpressed thought.

So I congratulate Senator JONES on his sticking with tradition here. I value the fact that we are working together on civil rights, as well as the fact that we will be in Memphis together on the Civil Rights Pilgrimage, which he is taking a part in leading early next month. I thank him for being on the floor today while I make these remarks.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEMPHIS SANITATION WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 1968 was a tumultuous year. Violent protests erupted in cities across the country. Both Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and then-Senator and Presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy were assassinated, and American soldiers were fighting in the Vietnam war.

In Memphis, TN, African-American sanitation workers had faced years of hazardous working conditions and discrimination in pay and benefits. Their strike would become a historic event in the civil rights movement.

In January 1968, the workers began negotiating with Memphis Mayor Henry Loeb and the Memphis City Council to improve pay and working conditions.

On February 1, 1968, two sanitation workers, Echol Cole and Robert Walker, sought shelter from the pouring rain and were crushed to death in their garbage truck when the compactor on the truck malfunctioned. Their deaths galvanized the 1,300 African-American sanitation workers who decided to begin their strike to protest working conditions on February 12, 1968.

The workers demanded recognition of their union, increased pay, and safer working conditions. Mayor Loeb and the city council responded by threatening to replace the striking workers unless they returned to work.

Throughout February and early March, negotiations continued, and on March 28, 1968, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Rev. James Lawson led a march from the Clayborn Temple that ended with rioting, arrests, and the death of 16-year-old Larry Payne. Civil rights leaders vowed to march again, focusing on the principles of non-violence.

On April 3, 1968, Dr. King addressed a rally of 10,000 African-American workers and residents, members of the clergy, and union members at the Mason Temple—the Memphis headquarters of the Church of God in Christ. His speech included these lines:

I have been to the mountain top. . . I've seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land.

That was Dr. Martin Luther King.

The next day, April 4, 1968, Dr. King was assassinated as he stood on a balcony at the Lorraine Motel.

On April 8, 1968, 4 days later, 42,000 people marched in Memphis. The strike was resolved on April 16. The 1,300 sanitation workers in Memphis took a stand for freedom, and they displayed courage in their pursuit of equality.

In his speech on April 3, Dr. King said:

Now we're going to march again, and we've got to march again, in order to put the issue where it is supposed to be—and force everybody to see that there are 1,300 of God's children here suffering, sometimes going hungry, going through dark and dreary nights wondering how this thing is going to come out. That's the issue. And we've got to say to the nation: We know how it's coming out. For when people get caught up with that which is right and they are willing to sacrifice for it, there is no stopping point short of victory.

Now, 50 years later, this resolution that I, Senator JONES, Senator CARDIN, and Senator CORKER submitted seeks to recognize their sacrifice and contributions to the civil rights movement.

It is important that our children grow up learning about how these 1,300 Memphis sanitation workers and many others struggled for racial justice in the midst of all that chaos. That is why, on Tuesday, I submitted the Senate resolution to which I referred. I did it, along with U.S. Senator BOB CORKER, my colleague from Tennessee; Senator DOUG JONES from Alabama; and Senator BEN CARDIN from Maryland, to recognize the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike.

Representative STEVE COHEN has submitted the same resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives. He recruited 76 cosponsors.

I would like to thank Representative COHEN for taking the lead in the House. I would like to thank my Tennessee colleagues, Representatives BLACK, BLACKBURN, COOPER, DESJARLAIS, DUNCAN, FLEISCHMANN, KUSTOFF, and ROE for their support as well.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

The majority leader has asked me to make some concluding remarks.

---

EXECUTIVE SESSION

---

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 588, 589, 642, 677, 678, 679, 680, and 681.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Joseph D. Brown, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas for the term of four years; Matthew D. Krueger, of Wisconsin, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years; John H. Durham, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years; John C. Anderson, of New Mexico, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico for the term of four years; Brandon J. Fremin, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years; Joseph P. Kelly, of Nebraska, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nebraska for the term of four years; Scott W. Murray, of New Hampshire, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Hampshire for the term of four years; and David C. Weiss, of Delaware, to be United States Attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown, Krueger, Durham, Anderson, Fremin, Kelly, Murray, and Weiss nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

---

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

---

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a pe-

riod of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

---

FORCED SEPARATION AT THE BORDER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the actions by the Trump administration regarding undocumented immigrants in this country have been ineffective and nothing short of heartless. Their priorities have abandoned long-held practices such as the need to focus limited enforcement resources on those who actually present a public safety risk.

These changes are being felt by families across the country. Last fall, Rosa Maria Hernandez, a 10-year-old girl with cerebral palsy who was taken to the hospital for urgent surgery was forcibly taken into custody by ICE when she was discharged, instead of being released into the care of her parents as recommended by her doctors. A few months ago, Jose Fuentes who was fleeing El Salvador with his 1-year-old son, Mateo, was detained at the border and transferred to a facility in San Diego while Mateo was held in Texas. These actions are appalling and run counter to the time honored values in this country. No child should be separated from their parents in this way. The effect of such a traumatic experience and disrupted attachments on children, adolescents and families is longlasting. The cost of these failed policies will not be fully realized for years to come.

Under current policy, families are supposed to be kept intact while awaiting a decision on whether they will be deported and held in special family detention centers or released with a court date. The Trump administration's proposed policy change sends parents to adult detention facilities, while their children would be placed in shelters designed for juveniles or with a relative in the United States.

Wendy Smith recently wrote an article in the Chronicle of Social Change on the Trump administration's proposed policy of separating immigrant children from parents entering the United States illegally, as a means of deterring immigrant families from coming to the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this January 29, 2018, article entitled "Separating Families at the Border Will Multiply Child Trauma" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chronicle of Social Change, Jan. 29, 2018]

SEPARATING FAMILIES AT THE BORDER WILL MULTIPLY CHILD TRAUMA

(By Wendy Smith)

Parents do not uproot their children to make a long and dangerous journey to an uncertain future in the U.S. unless the circumstances in their home country are so

threatening that the risks of migration pale in comparison to more certain risks at home. They leave their homes, other family members, schools, churches and familiar communities because they feel they must.

In December 2017, the Trump Administration proposed a new policy of separating immigrant children from parents entering the U.S. illegally, as a means of discouraging or deterring immigrant families from Central America and other countries from coming to the U.S.

Although the administration has already engaged in this practice in some cases, this policy would alter the current standard, which has attempted to keep families intact while asylum issues are considered and addressed.

As a former psychotherapist, I saw firsthand the long-lasting effects of traumatic experience and disrupted attachments on children, adolescents and families. Having taught courses in child development, I know that development of the brain and the child are inextricably linked to environmental opportunities and dangers, and to the continuing presence of important relationships to mediate the environment.

Recovery from trauma and attachment loss is possible, but requires enormous time, effort and care. This knowledge tells me that a policy of separating families should sound an alarm for us all.

Advocates, immigration experts, academics and lawyers have voiced concerns regarding the issues of constitutionality, deterrence, negative effects and unanticipated consequences, alongside the undermining of the core American value of family unity.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child—ratified by every country on the planet except Somalia, Sudan and the United States—specifies that children, including immigrant and refugee children, should be treated with dignity and respect and should not be exposed to conditions that may harm or traumatize them.

Family unity and reunification is one of the primary stated goals of the U.S. immigration system, found in many sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1952. It is also a central theme of American identity. In *Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, the Supreme Court held that "the Constitution protects the sanctity of the family precisely because the institution of the family is deeply rooted in this nation's history and tradition."

The constitution does not allow the government to detain one asylum-seeking family for the sole purpose of deterring that action on the part of other families. And finally, through both United Nations conventions and protocols and U.S. law, migrants have rights not to be returned where their life or freedom would be threatened on the basis of race, religion, nationality, social group or opinion. If these factors exist, migrants can seek asylum if they can show "well-founded" fear of persecution.

The impact of such policies on children is severe. Stress is defined as the result of events or circumstances in which physical or psychological demands exceed our ability to cope. A critical buffer to the detrimental effects of stress is a protective relationship, such as with a parent who can provide comfort and a sense of safety.

Prolonged exposure to stress in the absence of a protective relationship causes the human stress response system to remain activated, preventing rest and recovery of the coping system, and the child's ability to manage or regain the sense of safety necessary to move forward in life is severely compromised.

Trauma, the most extreme form of toxic stress, is the occurrence of events or situations in which one's physical or psychological integrity is threatened (such as a