

[If an investigation is] based on false allegations, the president does not have to sit there constitutionally and allow it to run its course. The president could terminate that proceeding and not have it be corrupt intent because he was falsely accused.

What a statement. If the President himself believes he has been falsely accused, he can terminate any investigation or proceeding against him. Any at all? Is that the determination in the President's own head and in nobody else's? I am sending a letter to the Attorney General this morning and am asking him a whole bunch of questions based on that awful, confounding statement.

First, we know he had a theory of the unitary executive. He issued that letter before he was chosen as Attorney General, and many believe that is why he was chosen. Yet this is the first time he had stated it so crassly and so baldly as Attorney General. Does he stand by that or was it a mistake? That will be my first question.

Does he stand by the statement that he said yesterday, based on false allegations, that the President does not have to sit there constitutionally and allow it to run its course? "The president could terminate that proceeding and not have it be corrupt intent because he was being falsely accused." He could terminate the proceeding. So who is the determiner of what a false allegation is? Is it the President himself solely? I am going to ask Attorney General Barr that question.

What about other proceedings and investigations? Let's say one of the President's family members is being investigated. If the President determines that it is based on false allegations, does he have the unilateral power to terminate the proceeding? What if it is one of the President's business associates, and the President believes they are false allegations? Does he have the ability to terminate? What if it is one of his political allies? Again, does he have the ability to terminate?

I will also ask him: Does that mean that Richard Nixon, who certainly believed he was falsely accused, could have simply dismissed the entire Watergate investigation? Is that what the Attorney General believes?

I mean, my God, what President doesn't believe he is being falsely accused? If this were to become the actual standard, then no President could be guilty of obstructing a Federal investigation, and every President would have the right to terminate any investigation—certainly, about that President and maybe about many others who would have some relationship to the President.

Attorney General Barr's comments are as close as they can get to saying the President should be above the law. So I will be writing him a letter and sending it to him this morning, asking him explicitly these questions and asking him if he stands by his statements. If he does, he should not be Attorney

General. I will await his answers. I hope he doesn't stonewall as he has been doing over in the House.

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH assumed the Chair.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL BARR AND THE MUELLER REPORT

Madam President, on a related matter, one of the clearest takeaways from yesterday's hearing, in addition to the Attorney General's astounding statement that the President could terminate any investigation or procedure against him if he believed it were based on false facts, was the discrepancy between the Attorney General's opinions and the conclusions of the Mueller report.

My colleague Senator HARRIS masterfully also uncovered that the Attorney General did not examine any of the underlying evidence in the Mueller report before making a prosecutorial decision and, to his knowledge, neither did the Deputy Attorney General. The arrogance of these men is amazing. This is one of the most serious issues we face. At least half of the country believes it is very serious—more than half. Yet they don't even bother to look at the underlying evidence before they issue a statement that indicates the President has been exonerated—at least in the President's own mind.

But that is to say nothing of the fact that there are so many unanswered questions about the reasoning behind some of Special Counsel Mueller's decisions, regardless of what Barr thought or did or wrote.

So it is imperative that Mueller come to testify. The result is that we have a gap. We have a gap of understanding of key details in the Mueller probe—a gap that leaves a cloud hanging over this country, over this President, over this Justice Department; a gap that could easily be erased by having the special counsel come to the Senate and testify.

So I was frankly shocked, appalled—I thought it wasn't true; it must have been a misquote—when I read on Twitter that my friend the chairman, LINDSEY GRAHAM, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said that he would not ask Mueller to testify, that he would send Mueller a letter asking him to respond if he disagreed with the Attorney General's testimony, but not invite him to testify.

"It is over," he repeated to the committee and then to me on the floor when I, really, confronted him, even though he is my friend, because I was so amazed about this—when I confronted him here on the floor of the Senate.

He modified his request after we talked to say that if Mueller said that he was misquoted, he could come. That is not the way to do this.

Mueller should come—no ands, ifs, or buts. The American people deserve it. Frankly, my friend LINDSEY GRAHAM is being totally derelict in his responsibilities as chair of the Judiciary Committee not to invite Mr. Mueller.

So I would ask LINDSEY GRAHAM to reconsider, to think about the country, to think about his long history of trying to be fair and often—not so much recently, but often—bipartisan. He is someone I worked with, and he showed great courage on immigration. He must reconsider. He cannot have the Judiciary Committee simply be a political arm of the President, which is where it is devolving under his chairmanship.

Congressional oversight requires that Mueller come. The Constitution, if you read it, would indicate that it is perfectly within our ability and obligation to bring Mueller here.

Please, Senator GRAHAM, reconsider. Invite Mueller. His testimony is desperately needed to clarify what he actually meant and said after Mr. Barr's actions.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Madam President, finally, on women's healthcare, last month the Trump administration proposed instituting a radical title X gag rule, which would have regulated the kinds of conversations women could have with their doctors and risk cutting off family planning clinics from millions of dollars of Federal funding.

The rule was set to go into effect on May 3, but courts around the country have granted preliminary injunctions to prevent it from taking effect, as they should.

Those decisions are great news and should be celebrated as an affirmation of a woman's right to make her own medical choices and not to have some court, some judge, or some legislator tell a woman what to do with her medical choices.

But they are also a reminder that President Trump and congressional Republicans continue to undermine the rights of women to make their own healthcare decisions. Since taking office, President Trump and Republicans across the country have launched an assault on women's reproductive freedoms and women's health. In Mississippi, in Georgia, and in Kentucky, Republican statehouses are forcing through radical proposals that would dramatically limit women's ability to make their own choices.

Here in Washington, the Trump administration continues to seek the total destruction of our healthcare law. Just yesterday the administration issued a brief arguing that the entire Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional—an opinion that would gut protections for the 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions and strip away healthcare from millions of American families.

The House has sent us a bill that would protect people's abilities who have preexisting conditions to continue to get insurance, but the Senate is not acting, and that leads me to my last point.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Madam President, we have just concluded another legislative week in the Senate, but it was a legislative week in

name only. There was no legislation. As you may have seen, we have done little more than process nominations.

Later this afternoon, we will see what the majority leader plans for next week, but I have a suspicion—just more nominations.

Meanwhile, there is no shortage of legislation we could work on. The House of Representatives has passed no fewer than 100 pieces of legislation. Guess how many of those 100 have received consideration on the floor of the Senate. Zero. Zero of the House-passed bills on legislation.

Commonsense background checks, voting rights, paycheck fairness, defending protections for Americans with preexisting conditions—all bipartisan, all supported by the overwhelming majority of the American public, but in the Senate there is no action—nothing. We have become a conveyor belt for nominations and a graveyard for legislation.

I have said again and again to Leader McConnell that if he doesn't like every aspect of the House Democratic bills, that is fine. That is democracy. Let's debate them. Let's have amendments.

If the leader truly wants to start from scratch, we would love to hear his plan. If he doesn't think we should close loopholes in our background check system, then, what is his plan to reduce gun violence and mass shootings?

He doesn't like the Green New Deal—fine. What is his plan to deal with climate change?

Before Leader McConnell became majority leader, he promised that if he were in charge, he would do things differently in the Senate. He would have open debates, an open amendment process. He would have us vote on the issues of the day, no matter which party the ideas come from.

Eventually, the American people are going to take a hard look at this obstructionist Republican majority of the 116th Congress and wonder what the heck we did with our time. When they realize that the Republican Senate has spent nearly all of its time so far rubberstamping nominees—so many of whom are unqualified and so many of whose views, whether they be judicial or executive appointments, are so far out of the American mainstream and ignoring real legislation that could help middle class families—I wouldn't blame them for wanting to change the leadership of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, in the United States, American foreign policy is not determined by just one person. The Constitution makes that clear. Article I grants Congress the power to declare war, not the President.

Consistent with that responsibility, Democrats and Republicans in this

body worked together to pass a bipartisan resolution directing the President to end U.S. support for Saudi-led hostilities in Yemen. I am a proud cosponsor of that bill, which passed both Chambers of Congress in recent months.

We made it unmistakably clear that our involvement in Yemen is not authorized by Congress, but the President has chosen to sidestep the bipartisan majority by not signing this bill into law.

In doing so, he is sustaining the crisis through the continuing refueling of Saudi aircraft and other activities.

The American people are not asking the President for this. Taxpayers, certainly, do not want to pay for it.

I serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I can assure you that supporting Saudi Arabia's operations in Yemen is nowhere—nowhere—to be found in our national defense strategy.

I urge my colleagues to reject continued support for Saudi Arabia's military actions in Yemen. Congress must do its job and vote to override the President's veto.

We have an opportunity this week to help make the suffering in Yemen come to an end. Let's not forget that 22 million people in Yemen still need humanitarian assistance or protection. More than 8 million people still go hungry every single day. Sixteen million Yemenis still don't have clean water, resulting in pervasive disease outbreaks. Children are still dying every single day. Every 10 minutes, a child under 5 dies in Yemen from a preventable cause, according to the United Nations.

For many people, their survival is a daily challenge and struggle. Their future hangs, literally, by a thread.

In addition to disease, starvation, and displacement, the people of Yemen are subjected to indiscriminate bombings led by Saudi Arabia.

Let me be clear. Bombs will not resolve this conflict. All parties must come together and work toward a peaceful solution that places the dignity of all Yemeni people at the center of those negotiations, and we can help facilitate that. That is what the American people want.

If you go to Michigan, you can meet with some of the Yemeni Americans who just want the same thing that everybody else does—help for those who are suffering and meaningful steps toward peace.

American diplomacy can help to resolve this tragedy, and we must make every effort to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the country lost one of its elder statesmen this week with the death of former Senator Richard Lugar.

As Members of Congress, one of the most important parts of our job is keeping our Nation secure. We only

hope that when we leave Congress, we will have left our Nation a little safer than when we found it.

Richard Lugar never had to wonder if he had done that. As the Soviet Union was collapsing, Dick stepped forward and shepherded the passage of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which supported the dismantling and decommissioning of nuclear weapons in former Soviet countries before the weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue nations.

As a direct result of his efforts, over the years, thousands of weapons have been destroyed—from warheads to missiles to chemical weapons. Thanks to his work, our Nation and our world are more secure.

Dick's achievements on global security are the kind of legacy most of us can only hope to have, but, of course, that is not all that Dick Lugar did in his Senate career.

As Indiana's longest serving Senator, he also served as a leader on agricultural issues and on food security. Even after he had left the Senate, he continued to advocate for the issues that he cared about as president of the Lugar Center, which, among other things, focuses on global food security and preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Dick will be sorely missed. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, particularly his wife, Char, and their four sons, Mark, Bob, John, and David.

TAX REFORM

Madam President, over the Easter break, I got to visit a number of South Dakota businesses, like Persona Signs in Madison and Energy Dynamics in Carthage.

Visiting with South Dakotans is the best part of my job, and it is the best way to learn how government policies are affecting South Dakotans and what South Dakotans need from Washington.

One thing that has been wonderful to see over the past year is how tax reform is benefiting South Dakota businesses. Businesses are benefiting directly from things like rate cuts and enhanced expensing, and they are also benefitting from the economic growth that tax reform has helped produce.

I was excited to see that DeGeest Steel Works in Tea, Valley Queen Cheese in Milbank, and Royal Canin pet food in North Sioux City are all in the process of expanding.

Tax reform was a huge step forward in creating an economy where businesses can grow, expand, and create jobs, but there is more work to be done to ensure that South Dakota businesses have all the resources they need to thrive.

One big priority for Republicans is passing the United States-Mexico-Canada free trade agreement, which would help to grow our economy, raise wages, and create 176,000 new jobs. Canada and Mexico are top markets for U.S. agricultural products, and South Dakota