

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

country is a disgrace. What matters is the rule of law. In this country, no man is above the law, not even the President. Mr. President, your comments were the disgrace.

If the President is thinking of using this raid to fire Special Counsel Mueller or otherwise interfere with the chain of command in the Russia probe, we have one simple message for him: Don't even think about it.

Special Counsel Mueller has uncovered a deep and detailed pattern of Russian interference in our elections. It has led to several indictments and guilty pleas. It has also led the Trump administration itself to level sanctions against Russian individuals for meddling in our elections. That is proof positive that Mueller's investigation is not a so-called witch hunt.

If the President's own administration has leveled sanctions against Russian individuals for meddling in our elections, how can the President say it is a witch hunt? It is being pursued by his own administration, independent of the Mueller investigation. The investigation by Special Counsel Mueller is critical to the health of our democracy and the security of future elections. It must—it must—be allowed to continue.

The President seems to have a view that the Department of Justice's sole purpose is to protect the President and go after his enemies. I emphatically state to the President, that is not the role of the Department of Justice. Their role is to enforce the law and go after anyone who breaks it. That is their role, and it is not subject to the President's political interests in any way.

President Trump should not have any contact—any contact—with the new U.S. attorney in the Southern District, with his office, or the Department of Justice officials overseeing an investigation of Mr. Cohen. Any attempted contact by the President or the White House should be reported to the Department of Justice immediately.

One final point. When President Trump implies that the Mueller investigation is an assault on our country and our values, he is not only dead wrong, he is wrong in a very dangerous way. Special Counsel Mueller, the FBI, Federal prosecutors, and U.S. attorneys are following the due process of our legal system. Calling that an attack on our country undermines the rule of law—a bedrock principle of this great Nation for centuries, the reason, above all, the rest of the world looks up to these great United States of America.

The only person engaging in an attack on American values, what we all stand for—the rule of law—is, unfortunately, President Trump. It needs to stop. It is gnawing at the core of America.

It is difficult to know when you are living through a historic time in this country. Our Nation has prevailed through many dark times. We all hope that, in the sweep of history, our cur-

rent moment is not one of peril, but we have witnessed a sustained attack by the President of the United States on the rule of law in this country, and we may be getting to that point.

We have seen that any institution with the power to check the President's power—the Federal Judiciary, the Department of Justice, the FBI, the Congress, the press—suffers his disdain and derision. If we fail to defend these institutions, which represent the rule of law, the Constitution, and the balance of power in our country the Founding Fathers so brilliantly enshrined, then we are letting our grand democracy diminish.

I beseech my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up and say what the President is doing is wrong. Make it clear that firing Mueller or interfering in his investigation crosses a redline and is a threat to our constitutional order. Let us also be clear that the President does not have the authority to order the special counsel's firing without cause.

Finally, let us take steps to protect the special counsel from political interference. We have several bipartisan bills designed to do just that. Majority Leader MCCONNELL should bring them to the floor and let us debate them very soon.

For months, Republicans have said that legislation to protect the special counsel is not needed because they have been assured by nameless people that the President will not fire the special counsel. That assurance has been shaken by the President's comments last night. By his own words, it is clear the President may—may—be considering firing the special counsel. This Congress must respond forcefully, and on a bipartisan basis, by reaffirming our belief that the President cannot fire the special counsel without cause and by passing legislation to ensure that any attempts to remove Robert Mueller will be unsuccessful.

We should not abide the President's attempted assault on the rule of law in America. The eyes of history are upon us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ONLINE PRIVACY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today we have a joint Commerce and Judiciary Committee hearing on online privacy and the abuse of data obtained by social media platforms. Ordinarily, I wouldn't come to the Senate floor to talk about an individual legislative hearing, but this is no run-of-the-mill event. The CEO of Facebook will be testifying, and I believe his company and other parties have some important explaining to do.

One question is what Facebook's priorities are and whether they are what they should be. Facebook, of course, is a publicly traded company, and it has a fiduciary duty to its shareholders that it shares in common with every other shareholder-owned enterprise. Its busi-

ness model is unique. It collects information on billions of people and uses that data to help drive its profits. One wonders whether, and at what point, that profit motive has come to be at odds with protecting the privacy of individual users. To me, that is one of the fundamental questions Mr. Zuckerberg is going to have to answer today.

From testimony released yesterday, we know Facebook will admit it made mistakes; that it didn't take a broad enough view of its responsibility and prevent its tools from being used in ways that it says it did not intend. That act of contrition is one we all welcome, of course, but it will not matter much without additional action, some of which might be even foundational to Facebook's entire business model.

Those changes, we are told, can take some time. Meanwhile, Americans will continue to wonder about their privacy, about who is acquiring data about their political opinions, their personal taste, and their preferences without their informed consent.

How much have any of us read of the terms of service for the social media platforms that we use? They are written by lawyers for legal purposes, which is basically to prevent any lawsuits from being successfully filed against the company. Yet, in terms of informed consent, which is what we ought to be focused on here, how much do consumers really understand about how the data is used that they turn over to these social media platforms?

Mr. Zuckerberg has an opportunity today to explain whether consumers are really being protected in any meaningful way. It is good that Facebook has, in recent months, shut down accounts that have had links to the Russian Government—accounts that were used to meddle in our last election. That is surely one actor we know who has used Facebook in improper ways, but it never should have reached that point. The company should have spotted this attempt of foreign influence much earlier and contained its spread.

In our moving forward, now is the time to demand a comprehensive accounting of internal monitoring efforts as well as the full extent of the infiltration and manipulation of that and other social media platforms in the past, not just by Russia but by other foreign actors, including rogue actors.

In addition to its response to the Russia allegations, Facebook, we have been told, has limited which online apps can literally vacuum up information from users' profiles. Once again, this announcement only tells us so much. We need to understand which apps are still being allowed to mine that data and under what conditions.

We have all heard about one egregious case of this happening—a political consulting firm, using Facebook, that improperly accessed the private data of some 87 million users. This data was used to assemble a psychological