

Pullman workers fought for fair labor conditions in the late 19th century, and Pullman porters helped advance America's civil rights movement.

During the economic depression of the 1890s, the Pullman community was the catalyst for the first industry-wide strike in the United States, which helped to lead to the creation of Labor Day as a national holiday. The Pullman porters are credited with creating the African-American middle class.

I have supported this designation for some time and have introduced legislation with my colleague Senator KIRK and with Congressman ROBIN KELLY to make the site a national historical monument.

Alderman Anthony Beale of Chicago's 9th Ward has worked hard to garner support for the recognition of Pullman. Many others in Chicago helped advance the proposal: Eleanor Gorski, with the Chicago Department of Planning and Development; David Doig, president of Chicago Neighborhood Initiatives, Lynn McClure and LeAaron Foley with the National Parks Conservation Association, and many others who drew attention to the historical significance of this neighborhood.

The Pullman national monument will be an important addition to the current National Park System. It highlights stories from communities that are rarely represented in other national parks. The park's urban location on Chicago's South Side makes it easily accessible to millions of people by public transportation—again setting Pullman apart from other national parks.

The National Park Service is associated with national wonders such as geysers and forests. Urban national parks are few and far between. With this designation, the Pullman neighborhood is joining the ranks of the National Mall and the Statue of Liberty as national parks accessible in urban areas. The monument will also provide an opportunity for tourism and job creation—much needed in this community.

It is only right that Pullman be preserved and honored as a part of our National Park System. I commend the President for this decision to showcase the prominence and legacy of Pullman in our Nation's history.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Alaska.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes today to talk about my growing concern over President Obama's policies regarding several major national security issues.

Of course, the President has just today sent over to Congress an authorization for use of military force against ISIL, the Islamic State, but over the past 6 years, as the quantity and frequency of international crises have grown, there have been some very clear trends that have emerged from this administration's foreign policy.

First, we have seen what might be dubbed the red-line syndrome in which the President uses stern language and strong rhetoric toward a hostile foreign regime or terrorist group and then backs it up with either total inaction or ineffectual action, thus inviting not respect, not fear, but ridicule.

The most infamous example, of course, is when the President remarked that the use of chemical weapons by Bashar al Assad of Syria would constitute a red line and then, after Assad had crossed that red line and used chemical weapons on his own people, the President did essentially nothing in response, thus damaging the United States' credibility on the world stage in the eyes of both our friends and our foes.

And I don't have to remind the Senate what has happened since that time. More than 200,000 Syrians have lost

their lives in this terrible civil war, and millions of Syrians have become displaced, either internally within the country or outside of the country in refugee camps, such as those I visited in Turkey and others in Lebanon and Jordan, just to name a few places.

So there are consequences associated with tough talk and no action.

The second pattern I have observed is what might be what my dad called, when I was growing up, paralysis by analysis. In other words, this is what some have called just plain dithering.

I think what the President seems to regard as a deliberative process and as a virtue others call dithering or paralysis by analysis. We can think of numerous examples, starting with the snail-like pace of the President's decision process early in his administration with regard to whether to surge U.S. forces in Afghanistan and, if so, what long-term role we should play there.

Again, in today's Washington Post, when I got up and was getting my first cup of coffee, I was reading that now apparently the administration is starting to reassess again their commitment to Afghanistan.

But the list of the President's paralysis by analysis is lengthy. The situation in Ukraine is another painful example. In Ukraine, the President has stood idly by and watched Russian President Vladimir Putin carry out a de facto invasion of Ukraine, starting with Crimea, and continuing today in eastern Ukraine.

From "mysterious little green men" to columns of full-up Russian tanks, the hand of Putin in the Ukraine has been unmistakable. It has been the most blatant land grab by a force that Europe has seen in quite some time. Yet the best President Obama has been able to do is more hollow rhetoric.

Now there have been modest economic assistance and nonlethal military resources to Ukraine's Government, and there have been some sanctions, but they apparently have not worked to dissuade Putin.

The Senate might recall what I recall when the President of Ukraine came to speak to a joint session of Congress just a few months ago when he asked for more aid, lethal aid to fight and defend his country. But he did say: Thank you for the blankets. Obviously you can't win a war with blankets.

By the way, the President's policies toward Russia have been an unabated disaster, dating all the way back to his 2009 reset of relations with Russia, and Vladimir Putin has taken full advantage of the opening that he sees and the lack of resoluteness on the part of the U.S. Government.

We have little to show for this so-called reset except realities such as this: the aforementioned Russian annexation of Ukraine, a Russian violation with impunity of President Reagan's landmark intermediate-range nuclear arms treaty, which now poses a direct threat to the security of our NATO allies in Europe.