

thousands of people killed; half the population of the country displaced, many living as refugees in neighboring countries; whole cities reduced to rubble riddled with landmines and booby-traps.

For years, I, like others here, have called for a comprehensive U.S. strategy for responding to the Syrian crisis that is grounded in cooperation with the international community, to be presented to Congress. I have also supported hundreds of millions of dollars in humanitarian aid to desperate Syrian civilians. We must at least do what is within our power to address the needs of those affected while efforts are made to bring the violence to an end.

I have also defended Congress's sole authority to declare war, which should always be based on a clear strategy. I opposed the Obama administration's proposal for the authorization for the use of force in Syria in 2013 because it was overly broad and would have ceded to the White House power reserved to Congress under the Constitution. I have also opposed the manner in which President Trump has twice launched attacks against Syria without approval from Congress.

While I recognize and appreciate the considerable precautions that were taken in the early hours of April 15 by the U.S. military to prevent civilian casualties and avoid targeting Russian assets in Syria, whenever military operations are conducted the outcome is never certain. Things can go terribly wrong. In this instance, instead of demolishing two or three Syrian chemical weapons facilities, we could have triggered a shooting war with Russia, and Israel and Iran might have quickly followed suit. What began as a missile attack lasting a few minutes could have ignited a regional war. That is a risk that Congress must be given the opportunity to weigh.

The use of chemical weapons is a crime against humanity and a violation of international law that cannot be tolerated, but it is also a fact that conventional attacks by the Assad regime have caused far more deaths of innocent men, women, and children. The Assad regime has been slaughtering its own people for more than 7 years by dropping barrel bombs, laying siege to cities to prevent access to food, water, and medicine, and using poison gas. While we all want to act decisively in the face of such atrocities, the United States cannot solve this crisis using Tomahawk missiles. All such attacks can do, it appears, is degrade, most likely only temporarily, Assad's ability to use chemical weapons. This was demonstrated in the aftermath of President Trump's first military response to Assad's use of chemical weapons in April 2017. It was conducted with great fanfare, without congressional authorization, and it failed to prevent future attacks. President Trump has now launched a second attack without the approval of Congress, and he has proclaimed "mission accomplished."

Why didn't the President seek Congress's approval? And what is the mission? How would we have responded if the attacks had triggered an escalation of violence, potentially spinning out of control? Those critical questions need answers.

Perhaps the most fundamental question for this administration is what does President Trump seek to achieve in Syria? Is it limited to defeating ISIS and punishing Assad for using chemical weapons? Are we willing to accept Russia and Iran determining Syria's future? If not, what is the strategy for ending the war, if Russia continues to block diplomatic efforts in the U.N. Security Council? How does the White House explain cutting aid for refugees overseas, withdrawing the United States from the Global Compact on Migration, limiting the resettlement of Syrian refugees here to only 11 people so far in 2018, compared to 790 last year during the same period, and suspending \$200 million in U.S. aid for civilians in Syria? Those funds are intended to help improve the livelihoods of Syrians impacted by the war, including to provide access to basic services.

Does the White House believe that it is in the national interest to conduct attacks against Syria, at the risk of triggering a wider war and after failing to produce the intended results in the past, but that it is not in our national interest to provide aid to Syrian civilians in areas controlled by our partners?

I am also concerned about what these attacks against Syria may reveal about President Trump's willingness to direct a military attack elsewhere without obtaining the consent of Congress, for example, against North Korea or Iran.

The conflict in Syria obviously has no easy solution, and it is apparent that it has no military solution. It is the President's job to explain what our strategy is, including how we can overcome Russia's intransigence at the United Nations amidst mounting concerns that we will abandon the Syrian people, before he fires off another volley of missiles that do not get us any closer to a solution and which may have the opposite effect.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID MOATS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in this week when new Pulitzer Prizes were awarded to outstanding reporters and courageous news organizations, I want to take a moment, on behalf of all Vermonters, to recognize and thank an earlier Pulitzer Prize winning journalist, Vermont's own David Moats. Until earlier this year, David has been the editorial page editor and the editorial page voice of the Rutland Herald.

David Moats is a Green Mountain treasure. John Walters of the newspaper *Seven Days* called David "a beacon of quality" in Vermont journalism. He represents and gave voice to ideals,

the aspirations, and the decency that characterize Vermont's vibrant, outward-looking, and engaged citizens.

On July 1, 2000, our brave, small State again stepped up to tackle a difficult and momentous issue. That is when Vermont became the first State to offer to same-sex couples the same legal rights and responsibilities of traditional marriage. Vermont's law was written, debated, and approved by the Vermont Legislature.

David Moats documented and illuminated the debate that led to that breakthrough. He won a Pulitzer Prize for his series of 20 editorials that were published throughout that difficult and groundbreaking debate.

The Pulitzer Committee honored David Moats, in their words, "For his even-handed and influential series of editorials commenting on the divisive issues arising from civil unions for same-sex couples."

In 2004, he wrote a book about this debate, "Civil Wars: A Battle For Gay Marriage." Ted Widmer, writing in the *New York Times Book Review*, said this in his review: "Near the end of 'Mr. Deeds Goes to Town,' the Vermonter played by Gary Cooper dishes out a series of homespun metaphors for how government is supposed to treat people, from helping to push a car up a hill to saving a swimmer who's drowning. Obviously, life isn't quite that simple. This will take time. But in the long run, the question will be answered in the vast middle where most Americans live, and where they privately decide what is right and wrong."

David Moats served as editorial page editor of the *Rutland Herald* since 1992. Previously, he had worked as the newspaper's wire editor, State editor, assistant managing editor, and city editor. Earlier in life, he served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Afghanistan.

He is also the author of 11 plays, has made his home in Middlebury, VT, and is the father of three children, Jared, Thatcher, and Nina Moats.

David, we thank you, and we wish you and your family all the best as you write your next chapter.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from an editorial titled, "Legacy," in the *Rutland Herald* last month, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

[From "Legacy," an editorial in *The Rutland Herald*, March 3, 2018]

A consistently reasoned voice is difficult to find. It's challenging to hear in these polarizing times, and it's even harder to find it on the everyday occasion of an editorial page. The distillation of issues into comprehensible, authentic points is a skill few writers can pull off, certainly not with any regularity.

We all know a man who has come to make the blend of opinion and language an art form.

Vermont has been blessed for decades by David Moats' compassionate approach to measured debate and thoughtful provocation. In this very space, David has wrestled to submission some of the most gut-

wrenching issues of our times, insisting upon a more controlled, solution-based dialogue. He has celebrated our triumphs. He has challenged the parties in power (much to their chagrin), and he has endeavored to teach us—as readers and participants in our communities—a bit about ourselves by shining truths on flawed thinking or highlighting the arrogance made against a public trust. He has broken our hearts in tribute, and he has—time and again—called us to action, whether it was spurring us to vote, raise our own voices, or simply by being engaged and showing up.

David has won scores of accolades for swinging his mighty pen, including the coveted Pulitzer Prize in 2001 for his body of work on civil unions. In that case, David not only informed, he shaped policy and rewrote history.

For Vermont, he has been advocate, champion, instigator—and friend. His editorials (and commentaries on Vermont Public Radio) have generated a loyal following. Liberals and moderates have come to quote from his editorials, while conservatives regularly condemn his words as out of step. But David has more friends than enemies, conservatives among them. That's how the deepest respect works.

(The editorial continues:)

David Moats has graced these pages with deliberate conscience, pouring his heart into the collective of Vermont. His insights and opinions have—and will—continue to underscore what defines us as Vermonters, and what passions and principles drive us to stand up for that better life for our best selves.

We are all indebted to David Moats for being our mentor, our leader, and our voice. We have needed him, probably more than we even know.

Vermont is a better place because of the man and his words.

TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY BILL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I would like to express my support for S. 140, an act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

The Senate initially passed this legislation on May 8, 2017, by unanimous consent. The House of Representatives passed this legislation on January 10, 2018, with an amendment. That amendment adds an important provision safeguarding the sovereignty of Native American tribes.

This new provision was the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, introduced by Senator MORAN. The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs voted to favorably report the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act by voice vote, with only three committee members requesting to be recorded as voting against the bill, on February 17, 2017.

Private sector labor relations in the United States are regulated by the National Labor Relations Act, NLRA. Created in 1935, the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB, administers the NLRA. The five members of the NLRB have 5-year, staggered terms. I am pleased the Senate recently confirmed Mr. John Ring, a well-qualified nominee, to a position on the NLRB.

The NLRA seeks to mitigate and eliminate labor-related impediments to the free flow of commerce. The law exempts “the United States or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof . . .” from NLRB jurisdiction. However, the NLRA is silent about the application of the law to Native American Tribes.

In its 1976 Fort Apache Timber Co. case, the NLRB held “individual Indians and Indian tribal governments, at least on reservation lands, are generally free from state or even in most instances Federal intervention, unless Congress specifically provided to the contrary.”

However, in a 2004 decision, San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, the NLRB reversed Fort Apache Timber Co. The NLRB held that the NLRA could be applied to commercial activity on tribal lands.

Under San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, the NLRB applies a subjective test to determine whether it will assert jurisdiction. If the activity is commercial, it asserts jurisdiction; if the NLRB determines the activity is a traditional tribal or government function, the board does not assert jurisdiction.

Native American Tribes are sovereign and, as such, should be treated the same as State and local governments under the NLRA. S. 140, as amended by the House of Representatives, would amend the NLRA to include “any Indian tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its Indian lands,” to the list of other exempted entities, such as State and local governments.

Under the bill, an “Indian tribe” would be defined as “any Indian tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.”

I commend Senator MORAN for his leadership on Tribal labor sovereignty, and I hope the Senate will pass the legislation so it can be signed into law.

ISRAEL'S DAY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to extend my support for the State of Israel in commemoration of the 70th anniversary of its founding.

Since its independence in 1948, Israel's promotion of democratic values has helped forge a thriving society and represents freedom in a region where that value is all too scarce. From its outset, Israel has faced a myriad of challenges, which it has navigated successfully and against all odds. Israel continues to remain America's strongest ally in the Middle East, as well as a central pillar of our strategy to achieve peace and stability in the region.

Once again, I want to extend my warmest congratulations to the State of Israel on its 70th anniversary.

AUTISM AFTER 21 DAY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, April is National Autism Awareness Month. Although much of our focus is on the challenges that children with autism face, today I wish to recognize April 21 as Autism After 21 Day, representing the age when Federal services for children end and adulthood begins.

In declaring this day, we draw attention to the fact that there are millions of Americans with exceptional gifts who need our help in overcoming the unique challenges that they face. In Maryland, approximately 1 in 55 8-year-old children have autism, and I am committed to ensuring that these kids are empowered to live independent and fulfilling lives. As someone who has personally employed individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder, ASD, I can attest to the outstanding talents that this population brings to the workforce.

I am so proud of the organizations in my State that are working tirelessly to address these needs. To celebrate their work and advocate for adults all over this Nation with ASD, I call on the Senate to recognize Autism After 21 Day and acknowledge the millions of people who are navigating an uncertain adulthood to reach their full potential.

We all must work together to ensure that this journey is not lonely and isolated. Rather, these individuals must be recognized as an important part of our communities. Twenty-eight years after the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, adults with ASD deserve access to the goals set by the ADA: equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency.

Thank you.

REMEMBERING MARILYN WARE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Ambassador Ware was a true light of poise and patriotism, strength and dignity, her presence firm and her personality embracing, warm, and loving. Her politics she did well, but the policy achievements delivered through her politics and philanthropy will be her lasting legacy.

Starting at the grassroots, she began her political career in Pennsylvania serving as a county chairperson eventually rising to chair Governor Tom Ridge's two successful gubernatorial campaigns. In 2002, President George Bush asked her to serve on the National Critical Infrastructure Advisory Council, a position she held until she was named the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Finland in 2005. She was an outstanding diplomat and a great representative of the United States.

I recall telling Ambassador Ware about one of my favorite duties as a Member of Congress—the opportunity to call students to tell them they had received an appointment to a service academy. She smiled fondly as I told