

We are telling ourselves what Neville Chamberlain once told himself about a different problem from hell in an earlier time; that is, and I quote Neville Chamberlain, "a quarrel in a far away country between people of whom we know nothing." Where is our outrage? Where is our shame?

It is true that our options to help in the conflict in Syria were never good, and they certainly are worse and fewer now. But no one should believe that we are without options, even now, and no one should believe that doing something meaningful to help in Syria requires us to rerun the war in Iraq. That is an excuse for inaction. That is not a question of options or capabilities; it is a question of will.

These images of the human disaster in Syria haunt me. They should haunt all of my colleagues and all Americans. But what haunts me even more than the terror unfolding before our eyes in Syria is the thought that we will continue to do nothing meaningful about it, and how that deadens our national conscience, how it calls into question the moral sources of our great power and the foundations of our global leadership, and how many years from now an American President will stand before the world and the people of Syria, as previous Presidents have done after previous inaction in the face of mass atrocities in far away lands, and say what all of us know to be true right now: That we could have done more to stop the suffering of others. We could have used the power we possess, limited though it may be; we could have exercised the options at our disposal, imperfect though they may be, and we could have done something. It is to our everlasting embarrassment that we did not.

That future President will apologize for our current failure. Shame on us if we let history repeat itself that way.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I very much appreciate Senator MCCAIN's stunning delivery on this horrible situation going on in Syria.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request just to get us through the day. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding lack of receipt of the papers if they have not arrived from the House, it be in order for the majority leader or his designee to move to concur in the House amendment to S. 25 at 1:30 p.m. today; if the message has arrived prior to 1:30 p.m., then the Chair lay before the body the message from the House at 1:30 p.m. and I then be recognized to move to concur in the House amendment to S. 25; that there be up to 30 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment;

and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to have up to four votes starting at 11:30 a.m., and then at 1:30 p.m. we will come back and finish some other business today. We hope to have a lot of votes today. I am aware, as I mentioned last night, we are following the storm on an hourly basis, and we should know within the next few hours how accurate the reports of the snowstorm—good or bad—will be.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADEGBILE NOMINATION

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, fairly recently, the President of the United States nominated a candidate to lead the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. His name is Debo Adebile. I am here this morning to explain to my colleagues why I believe that Mr. Adebile is a very bad choice to run the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

To make my case clear, I need to start with a story of a slain Philadelphia police officer. His name was Daniel Faulkner. This is a picture of Daniel Faulkner. It is important to tell his story. It is a story that begins 32 years ago. Many people have never heard this story, others have perhaps forgotten, since it was some time ago.

But the fact is that Danny Faulkner can no longer speak for himself and those who have tried to speak for him have often been drowned out by some powerful and wealthy voices that have had a political agenda and that have perversely defended his killer rather than the memory of Daniel Faulkner.

The story begins late at night on December 9, 1981. It was actually in the early morning hours that 25-year-old Philadelphia police officer Daniel Faulkner stopped a car that was driving in Philadelphia. The driver got out of the car and began to assault Officer Faulkner. The driver's brother Mumia Abu-Jamal was watching the incident from across the street. When he saw what was happening and as Officer

Faulkner attempted to handcuff the driver of the car, Abu-Jamal ran up to the car and shot Officer Faulkner in the back. As Officer Faulkner was falling, he got off a shot, but the shot did not seriously wound Mumia Abu-Jamal.

Officer Faulkner then collapsed on the ground. While he was lying on the ground, helpless, defenseless, and severely wounded, Mumia Abu-Jamal stood over him and pumped four more bullets into him, including five bullets to the face, which killed Danny Faulkner on the spot.

Abu-Jamal himself was quickly apprehended. There were police who were on the next block over, and they got there almost immediately. They arrested Mumia Abu-Jamal. They took him to the hospital because he had been wounded, and while he was at the hospital he bragged about the fact that he had just shot a police officer and stated that he hoped the police officer would die.

Given these facts, Mumia Abu-Jamal's guilt was never in any serious question. There was a trial. There were four eyewitnesses to the shooting. There were three other witnesses who heard Mumia Abu-Jamal brag about the murder he had committed while he was in the hospital. In addition, there was ballistic and forensic evidence that made his guilt completely obvious to everyone. So it was not surprising that a jury took only 3 hours to convict Mumia Abu-Jamal after the trial occurred. It took them a further 2 hours to sentence him to death.

Then, instead of allowing Daniel Faulkner's young 24-year-old widow and his extended family to grieve in peace, a group of political opportunists decided this would be the case they would use to launch a campaign to further their political agenda. They fabricated a whole set of claims that Mumia Abu-Jamal was somehow framed. They spread lies about the trial. They organized a rally. Amazingly, what they were doing was portraying Mumia Abu-Jamal as a victim when, in fact, he was unquestionably a cold-blooded murderer.

It was part of a bigger campaign to turn Abu-Jamal into a celebrity and use him by those who had an agenda to attack America's criminal justice system. Unfortunately, to a large extent it worked. Abu-Jamal the murderer became somewhat of a celebrity in certain Hollywood circles. In Paris, they even named a street after him, and there were plenty of high-priced lawyers who lined up to volunteer their time to jump on this cause and to file endless series of appeals in a case that was an open-and-shut case. This, of course, among other things, had the effect of forcing Danny Faulkner's widow to relive this tragedy, this disaster for her, time after time, for decade after decade.

This gross abuse of justice, this travesty of justice had been going on for nearly three decades when in 2009 the