

there to finish his sentences. We talked for a long time last night about the times when we were able to get together—my wife Loretta, Millie, and Danny—and the good times we had and the great people we met in the process. I also talked about the time when Danny came before the Senate Democratic caucus luncheon. We used to have a great tradition, where every few weeks Senators would get up and just tell a little bit about their personal lives—things that don't make the headlines.

I still remember Danny Akaka's presentation. He talked about growing up in a very modest family but having a mother with a very caring heart. His mother just couldn't stand to see someone who was struggling to find a home or a meal. She was always inviting someone in. Even though they didn't have a lot themselves, they were always sharing with people. She would say: Bring them over to dinner, Danny. Let's meet them.

Then, after they met them, they would offer them a room. Danny told a story of people who came and lived in his home with him—perfect strangers who became part of their family and lived with them for months and even years. Some of those people whom they befriended went on to greatness. One was a medical doctor who became famous and never forgot the kindnesses extended by the Akaka family.

His mother's lesson was learned by Danny Akaka. It was shared with us in the Senate. It was an indication of truly a caring heart and a person who was really prepared to serve every day of his life.

I join my colleagues in expressing our condolences to Danny's wife Millie, to their five children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. May your love and memories be a comfort in this time of loss.

To my friend, Senator Danny Akaka: Aloha and mahalo. Farewell and thank you.

DACA

Mr. President, I have come to this floor over 110 different times to introduce to the Senate and to the people who follow our proceedings remarkable people who live in the shadows of America. These are Dreamers—children who were brought to this country by their parents, some at the age of 2 or 3. They were brought into this country perhaps on a visitor's visa and stayed. They grew up in America. Then, when they were 10 or 12, in some cases, their mother and father sat down and said: We need to tell you the truth about who you are and where you are.

These children are undocumented. Their parents didn't file the necessary legal papers. They live lives without a country. They have grown up here. They always believed they were Americans. They went to our schools and stood every day in class and pledged allegiance to that flag. They really believed they were part of America, but legally, no, they were Dreamers.

I have tried for 17 years now to pass legislation to give them a chance to earn their way to legal status and citizenship. I have had some luck from time to time, but we have never quite been able to find the necessary votes in both the House and the Senate in the same year.

A number of years ago, I appealed to my former Senate colleague, Barack Obama, and asked President Obama to do what he could to help these Dreamers. He created a program called DACA by Executive order. Under DACA, these young people could come forward, submit themselves to a criminal background check, pay a filing fee, and be protected from deportation for 2 years at a time. They had to renew this. So if there was any problem, they could lose their protection. That DACA Program finally brought 800,000 Americans—people who live in America—out of the shadows under the protection of DACA.

Initially, we thought new President Trump was going to give these young DACA recipients a break. He said a lot of kind things about them, even though his rhetoric about immigration has been very harsh. He said good things about them because he realized, as all of us do, that many of them are victims of unfairness and injustice and they should be given a chance to prove themselves and be part of America's future.

But then, on September 5 of last year, President Trump reversed himself. He announced that he was eliminating DACA, eliminating the protection these young people have. He challenged Congress and said: Come up with a law that protects DACA and Dreamers. I accepted the challenge and so did LINDSEY GRAHAM, the Republican Senator of South Carolina. We put together a team of six Senators—three Democrats and three Republicans—and worked for months to come up with an alternative that would protect the Dreamers, protect those who are under the DACA Program.

I think it was a good proposal. I think it was balanced. Parts of it I didn't like, and parts of it I did. That is the nature of a political compromise. It was bipartisan. We took it to President Trump, but he rejected it. He just rejected it.

There we were, emptyhanded, coming to the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago for four different votes to try to solve the DACA crisis. None of our proposals passed. The one with the most votes was the one Senator GRAHAM and I worked on and brought to the floor with Senator KING and Senator ROUNDS. It even included the President's wall. Some of us think this is a crazy idea, a waste of taxpayers' dollars, but we were prepared to say to the President: If you would give 1.8 million of these Dreamers a path to citizenship, we will at least start building your wall—one that was supposed to be paid for by Mexico. President Trump rejected it. He rejected it. March 5

came and went. The deadline for DACA ended, and protection under DACA started disappearing.

There were court suits that were brought. Two Federal courts stepped in and issued injunctions. They said to the President: Stop the threat of deportation against these DACA-protected young people. Two of those injunctions now stand, and under those our Federal Government—the Department of Homeland Security—is allowing those who were once protected by DACA to renew their status. Of course, those who were newly eligible—for instance, reaching the age of 15, which is the age of eligibility—can't sign up. But if you were in the 800,000 protected, you can renew your DACA protection by these court orders.

So how long are these young people going to be protected? We don't know. That court protection could end next week, next month, or 6 months from now. We just don't know. So they live in absolute uncertainty with the danger that at any minute DACA protection ends and they can be deported.

When I have come to the floor to tell their stories, people understand that these young people are extraordinary. Think about growing up as a teenager and all the uncertainty and challenges and things that come to your life. Imagine doing that with the knowledge that at any minute you could be deported or some misstep by you might deport your entire family. That is what these young people have grown up with. Yet they are determined. They are resilient. Some of them are nothing short of amazing on what they have done with their lives.

I have come to the floor to tell their stories so you could attach a face to them, to the issue. DACA isn't just another government program. It turns out to be something that is significant in their lives.

Today I wish to tell another one of those stories about another one of these Dreamers. This lovely young lady here is Gloria Rinconi. Gloria Rinconi is the 113th Dreamer whom I have had the honor to introduce to the Senate and to those who follow our proceedings.

Gloria was brought to the United States at the age of 1 from Mexico. She grew up in North Carolina and in Texas. Her family had so little money that at one point her parents slept on the floor of a trailer. Gloria slept on a makeshift bed made out of a piece of cardboard and a blanket.

Gloria's parents told her she was undocumented, but "you are loved by many regardless of what you might hear on TV."

Her family was poor, but Gloria was a hard worker and an extraordinarily good student. In high school, she took advanced placement courses and was a member of the National Technical Honor Society. She received the Tyler Independent School District Student Award. She was active in extracurricular activities, worked on the

school yearbook, was a member of the French club, pom squad, and drill prep. She competed in pageants, winning the National American Miss State Pageant and the National American Miss National Pageant.

Gloria graduated from high school with a medical assistant program certification. She is attending Richland College and majoring in psychology. She also works as a medical assistant for a surgeon. Her dream is to become a clinical psychologist and work with low-income families facing mental health issues.

This lovely and amazing young lady sent me a letter. Here is what she said:

DACA is my entire life. It's the only thing I have that allows me to work, give back to my community and continue with my future plans. Without it, my life as I know it will be gone.

This is what the DACA debate and the Dream Act debate is all about. It is all about the aspirations and hopes of amazing, talented, and dedicated young people who just want to be part of America's future.

Would we be better if we ended up deporting this young lady, sending her back to Mexico—a place she has probably never even visited in her entire life since she came here at the age of 1? I don't think so. I think everyone understands that a young person like this deserves a chance.

We now face the possibility that DACA protection through court order may protect those who are already protected under DACA from deportation but may not protect them for some period of time and allow them to work. That is the second part of DACA—that you can legally work in the United States.

A lot of them have graduated from college and do work today. I have met doctors, lawyers, engineers, and teachers. There are some 20,000 teachers across America who are protected by DACA and allowed to work, but President Trump has said recently that it is over and, as far as he is concerned, they should be deported. I hope his position does not prevail. I hope, for Gloria's sake and for the thousands just like her, that we will do the right thing, the just and fair thing, and that we will do something immediately to provide DACA protection, protection for Dreamers, and a path for citizenship.

How did we get into this crisis? President Trump's decision on September 5, 2017, to end DACA created the crisis we face. We need to work toward a solution.

The President has rejected six bipartisan proposals. I don't know what it will take to bring him around. I am skeptical now of any statement that he makes publicly that he wants to solve this problem. I also know that we face, as Gloria faces every day, the uncertainty for these young people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides, don't quit on this issue; don't quit on these young people. Every time I go

home—every time I go home and meet with these Dreamers—it is an emotional meeting. Few of them can tell me their life stories without breaking down in tears. Then, when they mention their parents—who have been vilified by some—these young DACA recipients break down in tears again. They say: Senator, wouldn't you have done everything in your power to help your children, even if it meant breaking a law?

Yes, I am sure I would have.

Should the parents pay a price? Well, under comprehensive immigration reform, we had a fine they had to pay, and we delayed any eligibility they had to become citizens, but we didn't deport them and break up their families. If they had no criminal record and no difficulties or problems, we gave them a chance—not amnesty, a price had to be paid but a chance to become part of the future of America as well.

This issue is not over because we have failed in the Senate. The issue is still there. The question is whether Senators from both political parties can summon the courage to solve this problem.

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.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

SEIZURE OF INFORMATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday FBI agents, at the direction of the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York, seized information from President Trump's personal attorney, Michael Cohen. It was reported that the referral to the U.S. attorney's office originated with Special Counsel Mueller, but the raid itself was under the direction of the U.S. attorney's office and New York FBI agents.

We don't know the reason for Special Counsel Mueller's referral. We do know that any referral must have been signed off by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. Furthermore, the U.S. attorney's office in New York would have to be convinced that whatever information Mr. Mueller passed along was worth pursuing, and the U.S. attorney would have to convince an independent magistrate or judge—non-partisan—that there was probable cause to believe that seizing information from Mr. Cohen would yield evidence of a crime. That is a serious and high standard that had to be met.

I go through these details because it is important to understand that yesterday's events could only have been the result of a rigorous legal process, with checks every step of the way and with a very high burden of proof. Yet, last night, President Trump said the FBI

raid was a “disgrace,” part of a “witch hunt,” an “attack on our country,” and mentioned that many people have encouraged him to fire Mr. Mueller. “We'll see what happens,” he concluded.

Let's break this down. The President suggests that the latest events are part of the partisan conspiracy against him. I remind the President that the source of the referral, Special Counsel Mueller, is a lifelong Republican. The Deputy Attorney General who signed off on the referral, Rod Rosenstein, is a Republican, appointed by President Trump. The Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, is a Republican, appointed by President Trump. The U.S. attorney for the Southern District in New York, who sought a search warrant based on that information, is a Republican, appointed by President Trump. The agents in New York who carried out the seizure are under the direction of Christopher Wray, a Republican, appointed by President Trump.

If President Trump believes this to be a partisan conspiracy, he once again ignores the fact that every major player is a Republican, and all but the judges are appointed by President Trump himself. The partisan affiliation of those involved really doesn't matter. These are all law enforcement officers simply doing their job—a job enshrined by the Constitution of the United States.

The President also tweeted this morning that “attorney-client privilege is dead.”

Mr. President, attorney-client privilege is alive and well, but there is an exception when the attorney might be involved in a crime or fraud. It is well known as the crime-fraud exception. That exception is obviously in play today. Law enforcement officers believe there is a good chance that the attorney for the President committed a crime or was involved in fraud or they couldn't have gotten the OK from the magistrate to make these seizures.

President Trump also said, the implication of his personal attorney for potentially serious Federal crimes constitutes an “attack on our country.” That is what he said, an “attack on our country.”

With due respect, President Trump, America has been around for over two and a half centuries. An investigation of your personal attorney is not an attack on our country. The Japanese bombing Pearl Harbor was an attack on our country; 9/11 was an attack on our country. When Russia interfered with our elections, that was an attack on our country. Investigating your personal lawyer, with a high standard to be met, is certainly not an attack on our country. It is what America has always been about and still is—the rule of law.

President Trump said the raid was a “disgrace.” I say to the President: Mr. President, you have it wrong. Interfering with the investigation would be a disgrace. Calling it an attack on our