

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 572

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 572; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3227

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this moment hardly seems the time for the Senate to engage in debating rhetorical phrases of praise for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency when that agency—better known as ICE—is deeply mired in the scandal of separating children from their parents. It is ICE that partnered with Border Patrol and Health and Human Services in this

diabolical situation. It is ICE that holds the parents in detention camps. It is ICE that has failed to arrange for the knowledge within the system of which parents go with which children. It is ICE that often has prevented individuals from having access to counsel, from being able to even phone their children, and charged them for using the phone.

In this situation, some 2,500-plus kids have been torn out of the arms of their parents, and this particular resolution would engage in nice phrases of praise instead of addressing itself to solving the problem.

We should right now be considering Senator HARRIS's act, the REUNITE Act, which would accelerate the reunification of the children, would ensure that family separation never happens again, would coordinate actions between ICE and the Border Patrol and Health and Human Services, and would set up a family case management system that worked, according to the IG of Homeland Security, to deliver 100 percent of the time when individuals had a date for a hearing—100 percent of the time.

That is why I ask my colleague to modify his request so that the Committee on the Judiciary, instead, be discharged from further consideration of S. 3227, the REUNITE Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana so modify his request?

Mr. DAINES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I strongly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I live in a State—the State of Montana—that has a northern border. ICE agents keep our border secure, and I want to thank them for the very important work they are doing.

Far too many people are coming into our country illegally and putting the safety and security of American citizens at risk. In fact, in Montana, the effects of unsecured borders are very personal. All across our State, communities at this moment are torn apart by the meth and opioids that are trafficked through the southern border. In fact, just last year, ICE seized nearly 50 tons of narcotics, nearly a million pounds of heroin, fentanyl, and other deadly drugs that criminals and cartels are smuggling into our country.

At a time when America is suffering from a drug epidemic, how many more lives would be lost if ICE agents were not protecting our borders? How many

more innocent Americans would be harmed or murdered if we did not have ICE agents to arrest illegal immigrants with criminal convictions? These are the questions that those who call for the abolishment of ICE should be asking.

It is outrageous. It is irresponsible to call for abolishing one of our country's most critical security measures. Abolishing ICE would give terrorists, gang members, drug dealers, and other criminals a field day.

I stand for protecting American security. I stand for upholding the rule of law. That is why I stand with ICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, this resolution being offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is a partisan political stunt to distract the American people from the crisis created by Donald Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Almost 3,000 children were ripped from the arms of their parents and traumatized by the President's cruelty.

Yesterday, the Senate Judiciary Committee had a closed-door briefing with officials from the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Homeland Security. The American people deserve to hear from these officials in public and under oath. All these officials provided at this briefing—not under oath—was more obstruction and obfuscation. The witness from Immigration and Customs Enforcement even claimed that they “did not mess up here.”

Separating almost 3,000 children from their parents, not meeting judicially set deadlines for reunifying these children—the trauma continues. Is there anybody in America paying attention to this issue who actually believes there was no mess-up?

We need a public hearing to hear from these officials under oath.

Donald Trump is weaponizing fear to pursue his anti-immigration agenda, and we are not going to be party to that. We should be focused like laser beams on reuniting the children with their parents.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Ms. HIRONO. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Hawaii for joining in this statement about the agency of ICE, which is in the Department of Homeland Security.

There are certain things that I think Democrats and Republicans can come together to agree on. Let me tell you what I think they are. Border security—the United States needs security at its borders. There is no question about that, whoever the President may be.

The second thing we agree on is, nobody who is dangerous should be allowed to come to this country. Anyone

here who is undocumented and dangerous should leave, should be removed. We all agree on that, do we not?

The third thing, which 68 Senators agreed on, is comprehensive immigration reform. Our immigration laws are a mess—an absolute mess. That is why we continue to debate the topic, and 68 of us came to vote on a bipartisan measure 5 years ago to fix the whole system. It passed the Senate and died in the House.

Where are we today? We are here today debating on the floor the future of ICE. There are parts of the function and responsibility of this agency of ICE that all of us would agree on. ICE has important responsibilities combating serious criminal activities, like smuggling, bulk cash, drugs, weapons, human trafficking, violent criminals and others who would do us harm, and enforcing immigration laws against terrorists. There is no argument about that. But what has become controversial is the Trump administration's new immigration policy.

You see, we don't have the resources to deport 11 million undocumented people nor do we have the resources to arrest all who present themselves at the border. What this administration has done, though, is say that they are going to criminalize—charge as criminals—everyone who shows up at the border. By doing that, they take limited resources and focus them on a mass of people, most of whom are no threat at all to the United States, instead of focusing their resources on the drug smugglers, the traffickers, the would-be terrorists. Those are our priorities for the safety of our homes, our families, and our communities, are they not?

Here we have this resolution that was brought to the floor to commend ICE in all its functions. I can just tell you, I don't join in that resolution. I specifically don't join in it when it comes to the President's zero tolerance policy.

It became the policy of the Trump administration and the U.S. Government to forcibly remove 3,000 children from their parents. That is bad enough, is it not? The notion that you take a baby out of the arms of a mother—a toddler, an infant—separate a young child—we did it under President Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Now let me state what added insult to that injury. At that point, there was no effort made to make certain we could reunite the parents with the children. Time and again, we would meet downstairs for a briefing from ICE and other agencies, and they would tell us: We don't know where the parents are. We really don't know where the kids are. We are going to have to go looking.

Imagine separating up to 3,000 children from their parents, and the U.S. Government did not keep a record of what happened to those kids. Ship something by UPS—they give you a tracking number. Go online, and you

can track that package wherever it may be. Order a pizza from Domino's. Call them after 15 minutes and ask: Where is the pizza? They will tell you. Check your coat at a restaurant before you go to the table. When you come back and hand them that little piece of paper, they give you your coat. It is pretty simple, is it not? But when it came to children and families, this agency, ICE, along with other agencies of this government, lost them. In one agency in Chicago, they told me that the search for the parents of the little kids they had was like a scavenger hunt. They just started calling right and left to try to figure out where the parent might be.

Yesterday, we had a briefing, and finally these agencies came up with some numbers. There are 2,550 children still in our custody who are not reunited with their families; 1,800 parents we haven't linked up with their children. And we want to put a resolution on the floor to commend this activity—to praise them for their great work? Not me.

They do good work in a lot of important areas, and I will be happy to join in that chorus. But we stand here and ignore the obvious—that this zero tolerance policy has given our Nation a black eye, has raised questions about our values as Americans, has created situations we cannot morally defend, such as separating children from their mothers.

Do you know what the American Academy of Pediatrics tells us? The doctors tell us it is an institutional form of child abuse to remove these children.

I have seen them, these poor kids, 5 and 6 years old in these settings. The place I visited in Chicago was doing its best to help the children, but two little girls walked into the room where I was sitting. They were holding hands—cute little kids. It was my opportunity to meet about 10 or 12 kids who were separated from their parents under the zero tolerance policy.

These two little girls were holding hands, and I thought they were sisters. We asked in Spanish. “No, amigas,” she said. They had become friends to one another.

It turns out that the one who was 5 years old was from Guatemala and the one who was 6 years old was from Chiapas, Mexico. They were holding on to one another. All they had was one another because our government had separated them from their mothers.

Now this agency is struggling to find these mothers. In some circumstances, they cannot even link up the children with their parents.

No, I am not going to join in a resolution of congratulations for the work they have done. Many of the things they have done have been courageous and important for the security of this country, but when it comes to the zero tolerance policy, it is not.

I do want to make one last point. Listen to what the top agents at ICE's

Homeland Security Investigations agency, which focuses on serious transnational criminal activity, had to say. Last month, a majority of the agents focusing on transnational criminal activity wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, asking that Homeland Security Investigations be removed from ICE because of “the political nature of civil immigration enforcement.”

These are men and women who are focusing on serious crimes, and they asked to be removed from ICE. They are tired of the politics. I am weary of it as well.

We need to start solving these problems—border security, dangerous people kept out of this country and removed, comprehensive immigration reform. And for goodness' sake, reunite these children with their parents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise in support of the brave men and women of our Immigration Customs Enforcement agency. These are law enforcement officers who risk their lives every day to keep this country safe.

Rising in support of law enforcement used to be a bipartisan issue. It used to be an issue that brought us together, that unified us. Sadly, as we have seen in the preceding minutes, that is no longer the case.

I rise today to urge my Democratic colleagues to say no to the reckless and radical voices within their party that are pulling their party so far out of the mainstream and so far out of touch with the American people that it is barely recognizable. For a long time, when Democrats were debating immigration issues, they used to say “Well, of course, we support enforcing the laws,” almost as an obligatory throw-away. Instead, we are here today, debating the abolishing of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the exact antithesis of where most congressional Democrats claimed they were. All of this started because a few weeks ago, a longtime Democratic incumbent, a Member of the House, found himself beaten in a primary in New York State by an avowed socialist. As a result, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle are suddenly terrified of their left flank. Because her campaign focused on abolishing ICE—abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, more incumbent Democrats have said that they, too, are open to abolishing ICE.

I call on this body to pull back from the abyss. On immigration there are areas of good-faith disagreement that this body has debated and will continue to debate. I have long characterized my views on immigration as being able to be summed up in four words: legal, good; illegal, bad. I think the vast majority of Texans and the vast majority of Americans agree with that. There

are a host of immigration policies that ought to be commonsense bipartisan policies.

The Presiding Officer has shown great leadership in fighting against sanctuary cities, fighting against jurisdictions that defy Federal immigration law and that release violent criminals without being willing to turn them over to immigration officials. Those violent criminals, in turn, go on far too often to commit even more violent crimes.

I am the author of Kate's Law, a commonsense proposal which says that aggravated felons who repeatedly enter the country illegally should face a mandatory minimum prison sentence. It was named for Kate Steinle, a beautiful young woman, 28 years old, murdered on a California pier by an illegal immigrant who had been deported over and over and over again and had been in and out of jail over and over and over again and had multiple felony convictions. Yet, because San Francisco is a sanctuary city, they released him yet again, and he committed murder.

Kate Steinle would be alive if we could come together on Kate's Law, if we could come together on ending sanctuary cities. Yet it turns out that in today's hyperpolarized world, even that is not extreme enough for the modern Democratic Party. Multiple leaders of their party are advocating abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

What does ICE do? ICE men and women—I have met with a great many of them in my home State of Texas. I have met with a great many Border Patrol agents. I have joined them on their midnight muster. I have gone out on patrol with them as they risk their lives securing our border and risk their lives keeping us safe in the interior.

Criminal aliens arrested by ICE in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than 76,000 dangerous drug offenses; yet many Democrats are saying: Abolish their role. They were responsible for over 48,000 assault offenses. They were responsible for over 11,000 weapons offenses. They were responsible for over 5,000 sexual assault offenses. They were responsible for over 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and they were responsible for over 1,800 homicide offenses.

Yet the approach of the modern Democratic Party is not to find a reasonable, commonsense common ground. It is, instead, to say: Abolish the agency that has arrested criminals responsible for over 1,800 murders.

When it comes to drugs—the volume they are dealing with in fighting the narcotics traffickers—ICE in fiscal year 2017 seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics. ICE seized approximately 2,370 pounds of fentanyl, approximately 6,967 pounds of heroin. Yet, today, too many elected Democrats are afraid that they, too, might face a socialist primary and that their far left is so angry, hates President

Trump so much, that their position is not that we should enforce the immigration laws; their position is not that they will stand with law enforcement. Their position has become to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws.

This is not a reasonable position and a public policy debate upon which reasonable minds might differ. There are many of those in the immigration world. This is not one of them. This is a radical and reckless position.

Yet, this resolution—by the way, this resolution says not a word about the issue of family separation. We have heard some of the speeches from my Democratic colleagues focused on family separation. I can state that every Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, agrees that families should not be separated.

Indeed, I have introduced legislation to prohibit family separation, to ensure that children stay with their parents—the best place for a kid is with his or her mom or dad—but to do so in a way that also respects the rule of law, that doesn't return to the failed policy of catch-and-release that only encourages more and more illegal immigration, that only puts more and more children—little boys and girls—in a position of being physically and sexually assaulted by human traffickers.

No one who cares about humanity, no one who cares about compassion should want to incentivize putting little children in the control of global, transnational drug cartels and human traffickers.

For the past several weeks, I have been negotiating with Democratic Members of this body, trying to see if we could reach common ground to unite and say that we will not separate families, but at the same time, we will respect the rule of law and not return to catch-and-release in a way that incentivizes illegal immigration.

We will find out if any Democrats are willing to find common ground. All 100 could join together on ending family release and ending it today, but too many on the Democratic side want to condition ending family release on essentially mandating the release of every illegal alien in custody—those apprehended with children, mandating their release. That is not a reasonable position. That is not a position the American people support, and, critically, this resolution before the Senate says not a word about it.

This resolution does not address that question. Instead, this resolution says that those ICE agents—the ICE agents who right now may be kicking down the door on a meth house and facing violent drug lords, firing weapons at them, risking their lives to keep us safe—we stand with those law enforcement agencies, even if we may disagree on the parameters of illegal immigration.

I am one who believes we should welcome and embrace legal immigrants—

those who follow the rules and wait in line like my father in 1957, when he came as an immigrant from Cuba seeking freedom. Those are debates we can have.

We ought to be coming together in the spirit of bipartisan agreement to stand with law enforcement. I call upon the responsible members of the Democratic Party—and, surely, there must be some left. Surely, in the Democratic Party, there are some voices that are willing to stand up to the reckless and radical left and say: No, we should not abolish the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws, charged with protecting us from vicious and violent criminals.

The fact that Senate Democrats are today objecting to this resolution shows just how captive they are to the fury that rages against President Trump.

Everyone in this Chamber has, at one time or another, had something the President has said or done that we all disagreed with. That is part of the political process, but the rage and fury on the far left is a qualitatively different matter. It is a rage that is demanding Democrats to go after, to undercut, to attack law enforcement agents who keep us safe. That is a mistake. It is a disservice to this institution. It is a disservice to the legacy of many distinguished Senators and a disservice to the American people and the Constitution that we are sworn to protect.

I urge this body to pass this commonsense resolution, standing with law enforcement, enforcing our borders, and stopping violent criminals, murderers, kidnappers, and rapists that ICE arrests every year. Abolishing law enforcement puts all of us at peril. I call upon my Democratic colleagues to reject that radical and reckless position.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Senator came to talk about trade, and I am going to do that, but I think what we have is an example of extremes in politics that is on display before us.

I think, on the one hand, political points are trying to be scored about the abolition of certain law enforcement organizations. On the other hand, there are the political points that a government, especially our government, should not have a policy of separating children from their parents, unless the parents have committed a crime and need to be incarcerated for the purpose of that crime.

Here we have the extremes again going to either side, when, in fact, if there were good will, if there were not such a highly polarized, highly charged, partisan atmosphere, in part, as we say in the South, egged on by various Members of the leadership in the Congress as well as the Executive—if we didn't have all of that, we could get a lot more done.

The genius of American politics is for us to be able to come together, to respect each other, to understand the

other fellow's point of view, and then work out our differences.

It is the same thing on the international stage. That is why we see it is so difficult to reach international agreements when people have gotten hardened into positions because of race or religion or political balance.

So if you note a tone of sadness in this Senator's voice, then you are correct because, again, we are seeing the polarization of American politics.

Why can't we have a law enforcement organization that also doesn't have to operate under a policy of separating children from their parents? That is the commonsense point of view, but, no, we devolve into these extremes.

TARIFFS

Mr. President, I came to talk about trade.

Is the United States taken advantage of by other countries? You bet and especially China. We have been letting them get away with it for years, but you don't try to correct that situation by suddenly saying, I am going to impose a tariff, as the President has, on imported steel and aluminum: 25 percent on steel and 10 percent on aluminum.

What happens then is, for the people who use those products in manufacturing, whatever their business is, that is going to cause the cost of those goods to go up. The consumers are going to be the ones who get hurt. By the way, what that is going to do, again, is the extreme. If you do this, the person who is offended is going to do this and do it more.

That is exactly what is happening in this trade war that is suddenly starting to hurt all of us. In reaction to steel and aluminum tariffs that the United States has imposed, good friends of ours, major trading partners of ours—I am keeping China in a different category. I am talking about the European Union; I am talking about Canada, one of our closest friends; and I am talking about Mexico. In retaliation for what we are doing to them, they are now retaliating and putting tariffs on other goods. They are putting tariffs on everything, not only for steel and aluminum but from washing machines to lobster, whiskey, and cheese.

We are starting to see the consequences of these moves. People are starting to hurt. This Senator has heard from many businesses in his State that are starting to get hurt. In Florida, we are seeing the harmful effects of these tariffs. Mind you, it is not just the Budweiser Brewery that I visited several months ago in Jacksonville that produces 3.3 billion aluminum cans a year. Of course, the cost of those cans are going to go up, and it is going to be the consumer who pays, but it is going to affect others in the restaurant industry, the medical device industry, the marine manufacturing industry, and the auto parts industry.

Let me tell you about the cost of these auto parts that we have to im-

port and those made here domestically. Because of the increased costs of steel or aluminum, the cost of those parts are going up. Maybe the dealer that services your car and replaces parts is one thing, but what about the individual entrepreneur, like the auto mechanic shop that has to buy its parts that all of a sudden has to charge more? The big guys that deal in many more automobile repairs can spread that cost over a lot of people, but that poor individual auto mechanic shop is getting hurt. It is happening right now, and they are losing business.

Take, for example, the marine manufacturing industry. Manufacturing boats is a big industry in Florida. It is worth \$121 billion a year in Florida, which is 650,000 jobs in Florida and tens of thousands of downstream jobs in Florida and nationwide. The industry in our State alone provides over \$10 billion in annual economic activity. All of those businesses are really getting hurt because the European Union, Canada, and Mexico—three big export markets for the boat manufacturers—are getting orders cut because of the retaliatory tariffs of 25 percent from the European Union. They are not going to sell any more boats to European customers if they have to pay an extra 25 percent. They will go elsewhere where they can get it cheap, and that means 10 percent extra costs in Canada; 15 percent in Mexico.

What is that going to do? There are jobs in that boat manufacturing industry that will go away. They are brands that you might recognize like Nautique, Bryant, and Bass Cat. They are all brands of one company, Correct Craft, that I visited in Orlando this week. They manufacture boats and engines in factories across the country, with their headquarters in Orlando.

The President's tariffs have increased the production costs considerably because of the cost of aluminum and steel that goes into those boats. To add insult to the already existing injury, they are being hit with these retaliatory tariffs from other countries where they sell their goods.

There is no sugarcoating it. We are in the midst of a full-blown trade war. If this thing gets out of control, it can take us into an economic recession like the Smoot-Hawley tariffs did in the recession that led to what is known as the Great Depression. If we continue down this path without an exit strategy, we are going to regret it.

Already, our boat manufacturers in Florida have lost tens of millions of dollars in canceled orders. Regal Marine Industries had \$4 million worth of orders fall through. The company estimates it will lose \$13 million this year because of these tariffs, and that will wind up costing people their jobs. It is no small thing.

This is what happens when you get excessively extreme, when you get partisan, when you act like you know it all, when you improvise your way through a complicated world and don't

have a well-thought-out plan of how to get out of this mess. Again, with bipartisan consensus, it is the nature of the politics that we have to rein in.

There is also the story of Micro Stamping, which is the sole supplier of high-grade surgical equipment. That equipment is used in the treatment of breast cancer. Micro Stamping is contemplating shutting down because the President's trade moves are stopping it from getting the specific type of steel it needs to manufacture the equipment.

What about Hale Products? It is up in Ocala. It is also being crushed by the tariffs. It makes fire suppression equipment. Since the cost of the tariffs is passed down to the end consumer, it says the tariffs will make it harder for municipal fire departments—that are already facing stiff budget constraints—to buy the new, lighter weight lifesaving firefighting equipment. This will have repercussions beyond the company's immediate business needs.

It is worth noting that what is going on is doing lasting damage to our strategic alliances. The U.S. Government—this executive branch—is treating our friends like enemies and is giving comfort to our adversaries. This is no way to run a country. We should be working with our allies to address our global challenges. We ought to be advancing our shared interests, not just in trade but in national security and a range of things.

Before we escalate these things and they get out of hand, we need to think a little bit more about what we are doing, why we are doing it, and if we are doing it the right way. This Senator is saying we are not doing it the right way. What we are doing is sending a message that America is closed for business. I don't think that is what we want to do.

I urge my colleagues to join this Senator in shining the light of day on the hard truth of what happens when you go along and make things up without having a clear plan for success, which is exactly what this trade war right now is a product of. That kind of approach doesn't work for the USA; it doesn't work for Florida; and it doesn't work for the vast majority of hard-working everyday Americans. I think it is time to come to our senses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Missouri. COMMEMORATING THE NEGRO NATIONAL LEAGUE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, last night, the Major League Baseball All-Star Game was hosted in Washington. In conjunction with that game, the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum hosted an event to honor the Homestead Grays, which was one of the teams from that league. There were great teams in that league. The Homestead Grays had won the Negro League World Series in 1943, which was 75 years ago. They had a great exhibit here in town about that team and about the history of that league.