

with the Danville Police Department; Sean Johnson, of the Hilliard, OH, Division of Police; Steven Smith, of the Columbus Division of Police; and Kenneth Velez, an Ohio State trooper.

I had the opportunity to meet with some of the families of these fallen officers to express our appreciation, to express our respect for them and the sacrifices that they bear. It takes courage to wear the badge, and those officers wear the badge day in and day out. They knew what they were getting into. Yet they wore that badge; they died wearing that badge.

Although these heroic men were taken from us, their examples can never be taken away and will not be. Ohioans are going to remember them as models of bravery and service, as examples of fellow citizens who, on behalf of all of us, were in the habit of walking into danger rather than running away from it.

We have an opportunity to do something that will make a difference for our police officers by supporting the Police Week resolution that the House and the Senate are working on. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I am sure they will. I think we need to show our men and women in blue, who are on the frontlines, that we do appreciate them.

There is also legislation that can be supported. Most recently, with the majority whip, I introduced legislation that is called the Back the Blue Act. It is very simple. It says, if you target law enforcement officers, you are going to have to pay a very high price. That is appropriate. We think the Back the Blue Act, which would increase penalties on those who would attempt to harm or kill a police officer, is going to make a difference because it will send a strong message and help deter some of these crimes. Ultimately, I think that it will make our heroes in blue safer and help save lives.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in the wake of this terrible tragedy we had in central Ohio. I know the people of Ohio are looking for Congress to stand tall and to stand with our police officers and to thank them for what they do to protect us every day.

Let's support this Police Week resolution. Let's support the Back the Blue Act. Let's do everything we can to ensure that our police officers know that we are with them—that we are at their side—as they do their job every day to protect us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the nomination of Rachel Brand to be the Associate Attorney General of the United States—the United States, not of the President.

We once had an Attorney General who told us on the Judiciary Committee that as a member of the President's staff, it is not the Secretary of Justice; it is the Attorney General of the United States.

I say this because her nomination to the third most senior position at the Department of Justice comes at an unprecedented time of chaos and upheaval—not only at the Justice Department, but also at the White House, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and across much of this administration.

We should all agree that it is more important than ever that the Justice Department be led by public servants with independence and integrity. Unfortunately, President Trump's Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General have failed this test. I did not expect Attorney General Sessions to show independence from the President, which is why I voted against his nomination.

But I had higher hopes for Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. Mr. Rosenstein's role in the dismissal of FBI Director Comey and his willingness to provide pretext for President Trump's interference in the Bureau's ongoing Russia investigation has precipitated a crisis of confidence in the Department.

The Senate must take steps to restore the independence of the Department of Justice. After reviewing her record and hearing her testimony at her confirmation hearing, I am not confident that Rachel Brand is up to that task. Like so many of the President's nominees, she carries a heavily skewed, pro-corporate agenda that would do further harm to the Justice Department and its independence.

Ms. Brand has long championed deregulation and the rolling back of vital environmental, consumer, and labor regulations protecting the American people. Ms. Brand has justified indiscriminate surveillance of Americans and defended broad assertions of Executive power. She even refused to say whether she would recuse herself from matters involving the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber Litigation Center, her current employer. I cannot support a nominee who lacks an independent voice. I will therefore vote against her nomination.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, every day seems to bring new, disturbing revelations involving this President and his administration. I almost hesitate to say "every day" because sometimes it is every hour.

Yesterday's report that the President pressured former FBI Director Comey to terminate the ongoing investigation into Michael Flynn is extraordinary. If true, the President's conduct could warrant charges for obstruction of justice.

Now, the notion that the Russia investigation could be led by a political appointee of this President, who serves at the pleasure of this President, is preposterous; yet Senate Republicans have attempted to justify Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein's failure to appoint a special counsel. Their arguments are wrong. I want to take a few minutes to explain why.

The President says he fired James Comey because James Comey wouldn't pledge loyalty to him. Apparently, pledging loyalty to the rule of law was not as important. Most Americans don't care whether the Director of the FBI is a Republican or Democrat; they just want him or her to be committed to upholding the law, not a political position.

Every lawyer knows that, when you are considering a legal question, you begin with a statute or regulation at issue. The relevant regulation, found in the Code of Federal Regulations, is worth reading in full.

I ask unanimous consent that the regulation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The rule requires that an independent special counsel be appointed if three conditions are met.

The first condition is that a "criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted." This is not an open question in this instance—there is already an active investigation.

The second condition is met when an investigation by the Justice Department "would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances." If Mr. Rosenstein, a political appointee, were to lead this investigation, he may be forced to investigate both his immediate supervisor, the Attorney General, and the President. That is the definition of a conflict of interest. That alone is enough.

But in this investigation, extraordinary circumstances abound. Last week, the President admitted that he fired the official leading this investigation because of "this Russia thing." His Deputy Press Secretary then said, "We want this to come to its conclusion. . . . And we think that we've actually, by removing Director Comey, taken steps to make that happen." Yesterday, we learned that President Trump may have also pressured the FBI Director to close the investigation into Michael Flynn's contacts with Russian officials. If these are not "extraordinary circumstances," then those words have no meaning at all.

The third condition is met when "it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel." I cannot recall a more serious national security investigation. Russian interference in our election, possible collusion with the Trump campaign and administration, and the President's repeated assaults on the rule of law have eroded trust in our democratic institutions like nothing I have seen. According to the President's own statements, this investigation has been repeatedly compromised by political interference.

Because all three conditions are met, the Deputy Attorney General does not have a choice in this matter. It is not discretionary. The regulation requires that Mr. Rosenstein appoint a special counsel. Each minute that he refuses

to follow this rule, he further diminishes the integrity of this investigation, as well as the integrity of the Justice Department itself.

I would ask anyone who still claims that a special counsel is not required to reconcile their opinion with the Justice Department rules. We may disagree on policy matters, but I hope we all agree on the supremacy of the rule of law and that no person and no President should be above it.

I know some Republicans have expressed concerns about the integrity of this investigation in public, and many others have expressed it to me privately. At this critical time, we cannot stand on the sidelines. We have a constitutional requirement to act as a check and balance on the conduct of the President. That starts with joining the call for a special counsel.

Mr. President, I love the Senate. I think of the Senate as a place that can be the conscience of our Nation. But more than that, I love the system of government where we have real checks and balances. I respect the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch, but in my decades here, I have never seen such an assault by the President of the United States on the integrity and the independence of our Federal court system; the assault on our free press, including the suggestion that we should pass new libel laws to go after members of the press who might dare criticize this administration; or the assault, of course, on the Congress; or the pitting of one religion against another—this undermines everything that has kept this nation strong. It is not just our weapons and our military. As General Clapper indicated the other day, if we break down our institutions of government, if we let them attack each other and break each other down, then they lose credibility, and we as a country suffer.

Our Nation is too great for this, and we Senators in both parties have to stand up and help bring the country back together.

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

28 C.F.R. § 600.1 GROUNDS FOR APPOINTING A SPECIAL COUNSEL.

The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General, will appoint a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—

(a) That investigation or prosecution of that person or matter by a United States Attorney's Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and

(b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, over the weekend I heard a story I wanted to

share with everyone here today. The story goes that there were three candles burning on a porch right across the street from the Cornwell Funeral Home in Dardanelle, AR—my hometown, just a couple blocks away from my home. A family had lit them in the memory of the three people who were brutally murdered last week in Chickalah, just a few miles outside of Dardanelle.

One of those slain was Lieutenant Kevin Mainhart of the Yell County Sheriff's Department, who was killed after he stopped a man wanted in a domestic disturbance. In honor of his 5 years of service to Yell County—on top of the 20 years of service he rendered to the West Memphis Police Department—his fellow officers escorted in their cruisers the white hearse carrying his body from the State crime laboratory in Little Rock back to Dardanelle.

The family across the street had lit a green candle, specifically for Lieutenant Mainhart, and the three candles burned all the night. But as the hearse pulled into the funeral home, the green candle suddenly went out.

You could say that it was nothing more than a strange coincidence, but I think there is something especially poignant about the sudden, tragic loss of Lieutenant Mainhart's life so close to National Police Week, which began on Sunday. Like that green candle, Lieutenant Mainhart lit up his community, and, like that flickering flame, his life was too brief.

Like every American this week, I wish to pay my respects to Lieutenant Mainhart and the noble profession he chose. One of the things which struck me about Lieutenant Mainhart's death was that it came so early in the morning. The stop occurred at 7:18 a.m. He had the whole day and his whole life in front of him.

He was only 46 years old, but he had made the most of his time on this Earth. He was a husband, a father, an Air Force vet, a beloved member of our community. Hundreds of people don't line the streets for just anybody. Yet, in a moment, he was gone—his family bereft, our community in mourning. It is a reminder of how precious and fragile every life really is.

It also goes to show just how brave every police officer really is, because this is the risk they take every morning. They put on the uniform, they kiss their families good-bye, and they go to work, never fully certain they will get home that night. Yet the ever-present threat of death doesn't hold them down. It doesn't hold them back. It doesn't dim the brilliance of their service. They give it their all, day after day, without giving it a moment's thought. That, to me, is the ultimate sign of character—when you do the right thing without even thinking about it.

People like this are hard to come by. The sad truth is, we need a lot of them. A free country always does, because

there is no freedom without security. We are so used to this basic fact—that for most of us, most of the time we are safe—that we forget how remarkable it is. Not so many people on God's green Earth can take that safety for granted. We often forget what it takes to secure it. We forget how easily we can lose it—and lose men and women like Lieutenant Mainhart—in an instant.

It is with this in mind—this grave understanding of what our safety requires—that I once again speak against continued efforts to water down Federal sentencing laws. I thought this ill-advised idea had expired last year, especially after Donald Trump's election. But advocates for criminal leniency are at it again, even though violent crime continued to rise in our cities for 2 years straight, and law enforcement officers are being killed in the line of duty.

I have already made my position clear. If we want to take a second look at punishments for first-time drug possession, let's do that. But we should know that fewer than 500 people are in Federal prison for such offenses. If we want to clean up our prisons, rehabilitate felons, and help them achieve redemption, by all means, let's do that, too. I would even consider a bill to speed up review of inmates' applications for pardons and commutations, to help the President exercise this constitutional authority. But we should not—we should not—lower mandatory minimums for violent crimes, repeat offenders, and drug trafficking. There is nothing compassionate about putting the lives of innocent people—and our law enforcement officers—at risk.

Lieutenant Mainhart isn't the only one. There were three police officers killed in the line of duty last year in Arkansas: Robert Barker in the McCrory Police Department, William Cooper in the Sebastian County Sheriff's Office, and Lisa Mauldin in the Miller County Sheriff's Office. Every one of these losses was too steep a price to pay, and unwise criminal leniency policies put at risk their fellow officers and our communities.

I know it is considered old-fashioned to be tough on crime—or, even worse, cold-hearted and mean. But a man doesn't put a lock on his door because he hates those on the outside. He does it because he loves those on the inside—his wife, his kids, all his family—because they are the joy of his life. The men and women of law enforcement don't just protect their own families—they protect all of our families. Every day those men and women put their lives on the line for their fellow citizens. The least we can do is to stand behind them and support them, both for the work they do and for the lives they lead.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.