power, there are a whole lot that are not. The President's Cabinet and many other positions within the Federal Government involve people who are appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and who serve at the pleasure of the President who can be fired at any moment for any reason the President might deem appropriate.

Nevertheless, that does not mean that Presidents go around just firing people arbitrarily because Presidents understand that there is a political cost to doing that. We have seen in recent years, and we have seen earlier in American history, how Presidents, even when they have disagreements with members of their Cabinet or other people who serve at the pleasure of the President—Presidents are still reluctant to fire people because there are political costs attached to that, and especially where Congress perceives there might be a partisan political motive in mind, Congress may well take action.

In the case of the Senate, it almost inevitably will at least threaten, if not carry out the threat, to hold up future confirmations of Presidential appointees if Presidents abuse this power.

So it simply isn't true to say that this would open the floodgates and cause all Presidents to just fire people arbitrarily without hesitation in the future. What it would mean is that our elected President would have the power to represent the people and to oversee the executive branch of the Federal Government just as article II already requires.

So all this bill would do would be to rescind and limit unconstitutional restrictions on the President's removal power, and while it may be more convenient to limit this power by statute, convenience and efficiency are not the primary objectives or the hallmarks of a democratic government, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly reminded us.

Another famous catchphrase popularized by an American President is ''the buck stops here,'' which President Truman, of course, displayed on a placard on his desk in the Oval Office at the White House during his Presidency. What it means is, the President is the final decision maker within the executive branch, and, therefore, bears the sole and ultimate responsibility for executing the laws.

In order to fulfill that very special, sacred, important responsibility, the President must have plenary power to direct the President's subordinates in how they carry out their assigned tasks and, if necessary, fire them. That is what the Constitution and, indeed, common sense require. By restoring the original understanding and restoring the removal power to the Presidency, the Take Care Act would give the President this authority.

By taking this step, we would reempower the American people with that which is rightfully theirs to begin with.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 231—CONDEMNING THE HORRIFIC ANTI-SEMITIC ATTACK ON THE CHABAD OF POWAY SYNAGOGUE NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, ON APRIL 27, 2019

Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 231

Whereas on April 27, 2019, a 19-year-old armed with an assault rifle attacked the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, while congregants were celebrating the last day of the Passover holiday;

Whereas the gunman wounded Almog Peretz, Noya Dahan, and Rabbi Yisroel Goldstein;

Whereas Lori Gilbert Kaye, a founding member of the congregation, was killed while bravely saving the life of Rabbi Goldstein;

Whereas, in describing the attack, Rabbi Goldstein said—

(1) ''. . . Lori took the bullet for all of us. She died to protect all of us''; and

(2) ''This is Lori. This is her legacy, and her legacy will continue. It could have been so much worse.'';

Whereas Oscar Stewart, a veteran of the Army, and Jonathan Morales, a border patrol agent, bravely fought back, running toward the perpetrator of the attack;

Whereas law enforcement and first responders, including the San Diego Sheriff's Department, acted quickly and professionally to respond to the attack and care for the victims;

Whereas the perpetrator of the attack, who expressed White supremacist and White nationalist sentiments, entered the synagogue shouting anti-Semitic slurs;

Whereas the attack occurred 6 months to the day after the attack on the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, which killed 11 innocent people and injured 6 others, including 4 law enforcement officers;

Whereas anti-Semitism is an age-old form of prejudice, discrimination, persecution, and marginalization of Jewish people that runs counter to the values of the United States;

Whereas, according to an annual audit conducted by the Anti-Defamation League, in 2018—

(1) anti-Semitic incidents remained at near-historic levels in the United States; and

(2) the number of anti-Semitic incidents with known connections to extremists or inspired by extremist ideology reached the highest levels since 2004;

Whereas, in a manifesto attributed to the perpetrator of the attack, the perpetrator of the attack claimed responsibility for the burning of a mosque in Escondido, California, and demonstrated anti-Muslim bias;

Whereas growing White supremacy and White nationalism is—

(1) a threat to the security of the United States; and

(2) antithetical to the American values of dignity and respect of all people, including Jewish, Muslim, Black, Latino, Asian American, immigrant, and LGBTQ peoples; and

Whereas hate has no place in the United States and there is a duty to condemn all forms of hatred: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific anti-Semitic attack on the Chabad of Poway Synagogue near San Diego, California, on April 27, 2019, which killed 1 individual and injured 3 others;

(2) honors the memory of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who was killed in the attack;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery for the individuals injured in the attack;

(4) offers heartfelt condolences to—

(A) the Chabad of Poway congregation;

(B) the San Diego area Jewish community; and

(C) the friends and family of those individuals affected by the tragedy;

(5) recognizes the dedicated service of the law enforcement emergency response officials and medical professionals who responded to the attack and cared for the victims; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to condemn—

(A) anti-Semitism;

(B) White supremacy;

(C) White nationalism; and

(D) all forms of hatred.

SENATE RESOLUTION 232—CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE EXTRADITION OR EXPULSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CONVICTED FELONS JOANNE CHESIMARD AND WILLIAM MORALES AND ALL OTHER FUGITIVES FROM JUSTICE WHO ARE RECEIVING SAFE HAVEN IN CUBA IN ORDER TO ESCAPE PROSECUTION OR CONFINEMENT FOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES COMMITTED IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 232

Whereas Joanne Chesimard, one of the most wanted terrorists of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was convicted of the May 2, 1973, murder of New Jersey State Trooper Werner Foerster;

Whereas William Morales, leader and chief bomb-maker for the terrorist organization Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional, committed numerous terrorist attacks on United States soil, including the bombings of Fraunces Tavern in lower Manhattan on January 25, 1975, and the Mobil Oil employment office in New York on August 3, 1977, which killed 5 people and injured over 60 others;

Whereas more than 70 fugitives from the United States, charged with offenses ranging from hijacking to kidnapping to drug offenses to murder, are believed to be receiving safe haven in Cuba;

Whereas other fugitives from United States justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba include Charles Hill, wanted for the killing of a State trooper in New Mexico, and Victor Manuel Gerena, on the list of the 10 most wanted fugitives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for carrying out a brutal robbery of a Wells Fargo armored car in Connecticut;

Whereas, according to the Treaty Between the United States and Cuba for the Mutual Extradition of Fugitives from Justice, signed at Washington April 6, 1904 (33 Stat. 2265), and the Additional Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Cuba, signed at Havana, January 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 2392), the United States has a bilateral extradition treaty with Cuba;

Whereas, in January 2002, the Government of Cuba deported to the United States Jesse

James Bell, a United States fugitive wanted on drug charges;

Whereas, in March 2002, the Government of Cuba extradited drug trafficker Luis Hernando Gomez Bustamante to Colombia, and Gomez Bustamante was subsequently extradited to the United States in July 2007 to face drug trafficking charges; and

Whereas it is imperative that the Government of Cuba abide by its extradition treaty with the United States and immediately extradite or expel to the United States those legally indicted or convicted of serious criminal offenses in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls for the immediate extradition or expulsion to the United States of convicted felons Joanne Chesimard and William Morales and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States;

(2) urges the international community to continue to press for the immediate extradition or expulsion of all fugitives from justice who are receiving safe haven in Cuba; and

(3) calls on the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to continue to press for the immediate extradition or expulsion from Cuba or from any other country of all fugitives from United States justice so that they may be tried and, if convicted, serve out their sentences.

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING FREEDOM OF SPEECH, THOUGHT, AND EXPRESSION AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 233

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees that ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech'';

Whereas, in *Healy* v. *James*, 408 U.S. 169 (1972), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States applies in full force on the campuses of public colleges and universities;

Whereas, in *Widmar* v. *Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981), the Supreme Court of the United States observed that ''the campus of a public university, at least for its students, possesses many of the characteristics of a public forum'';

Whereas lower Federal courts have also held that the open, outdoor areas of the campuses of public colleges and universities are public forums;

Whereas section 112(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011a(a)(2)) contains a sense of Congress noting that ''an institution of higher education should facilitate the free and open exchange of ideas'', ''students should not be intimidated, harassed, discouraged from speaking out, or discriminated against'', ''students should be treated equally and fairly'', and ''nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, change, or infringe upon any constitutionally protected religious liberty, freedom, expression, or association'';

Whereas, despite the clarity of the applicable legal precedent and the vital importance of protecting public colleges in the United States as true ''marketplaces of ideas'', the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education has found that approximately 1 in 10 of the top colleges and universities in the United States quarantine student expression to so-called ''free speech zones'', and a survey of 466 schools found that almost 30 percent maintain severely restrictive speech codes that clearly and substantially prohibit constitutionally protected speech;

Whereas, according to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), ''Speech codes adopted by government-financed state colleges and universities amount to government censorship, in violation of the Constitution. And the ACLU believes that all campuses should adhere to First Amendment principles because academic freedom is a bedrock of education in a free society.'';

Whereas the University of Chicago, as part of its commitment ''to free and open inquiry in all matters'', issued a statement in which ''it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn'', and more than 50 university administrations and faculty bodies have endorsed a version of the ''Chicago Statement'';

Whereas, in December 2014, the University of Hawaii at Hilo settled a lawsuit for $50,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting students from protesting the National Security Agency unless those students were standing in the tiny, flood-prone free speech zone at the university;

Whereas, in July 2015, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, settled a lawsuit for $35,000 after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a student from handing out flyers about animal abuse outside of the free speech zone at the university, comprising less than 0.01 percent of campus;

Whereas, in May 2016, a student-plaintiff settled her lawsuit against Blinn College in Texas for $50,000 after administrators told her she needed ''special permission'' to advocate for Second Amendment rights outside of the tiny free speech zone at the college;

Whereas, in February 2017, Georgia Gwinnett College agreed to modify its restrictive speech policies after two students sued in Federal court to challenge a requirement that students obtain prior authorization from administrators to engage in expressive activity within the limits of a tiny free speech zone, comprising less than 0.0015 percent of campus;

Whereas, in March 2017, Middlebury College students and protesters from the community prevented an invited speaker from giving his presentation and then attacked his car and assaulted a professor as the two attempted to leave, resulting in the professor suffering a concussion;

Whereas, in January 2018, Kellogg Community College in Michigan settled a lawsuit for $55,000 for arresting two students for handing out copies of the Constitution of the United States while talking with their fellow students on a sidewalk;

Whereas, in June 2018, the University of Michigan agreed to change its restrictive speech code on the same day the United States Department of Justice filed a statement of interest in support of a lawsuit in Federal court challenging the constitutionality of the speech code of the university;

Whereas, in December 2018, the Los Angeles Community College District, a 9-campus community college district that includes Pierce College, settled a lawsuit for $225,000 and changed its restrictive speech policies after it was sued in Federal court for prohibiting a Pierce College student from distributing Spanish-language copies of the Constitution of the United States on campus unless he stood in the free speech zone, which comprised approximately 0.003 percent of the total area of the 426 acres of the college;

Whereas, in December 2018, the University of California, Berkeley, home of the 1960s campus free speech movement, settled a lawsuit for $70,000 and changed its restrictive policies after it was sued in Federal court for singling out one student group, apart from other student groups, with the imposition of stricter rules for inviting ''high-profile'' public speakers;

Whereas the States of Virginia, Missouri, Arizona, Kentucky, Colorado, Utah, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, South Dakota, and Iowa have passed legislation prohibiting public colleges and universities from quarantining expressive activities on the open outdoor areas of campuses to misleadingly labeled free speech zones; and

Whereas free speech zones have been used to restrict political speech from all parts of the political spectrum and have thus inhibited the free exchange of ideas at campuses across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that free speech zones and restrictive speech codes are inherently at odds with the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(2) recognizes that institutions of higher education should facilitate and recommit themselves to protecting the free and open exchange of ideas;

(3) recognizes that freedom of expression and freedom of speech are sacred ideals of the United States that must be vigorously safeguarded in a world increasingly hostile to democracy;

(4) encourages the Secretary of Education to promote policies that foster spirited debate, academic freedom, intellectual curiosity, and viewpoint diversity on the campuses of public colleges and universities; and

(5) encourages the Attorney General to defend and protect the First Amendment across public colleges and universities.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is so interesting to always come to the floor and speak on topics that are important to Tennesseans and I think also to Americans. As I begin my remarks, I want to kind of build the context for this and take us back to a time I know the Presiding Officer recalls, and so do I. It was the sixties. I was a child who was growing up. I remember it as a decade where bold statements and brash behavior and activists from each side of the aisle set the standard for what we today look at and say is a modern-day political protest. What we saw in this decade was once-sleepy college campuses became the scenes of widespread unrest. Tensions were high and conditions were perfect for what else but a Supreme Court battle.

In September 1969, a group of students attending Central Connecticut State University decided they wanted to organize a local chapter of the organization Students for Democratic Society. The university president rejected the application, claiming that the SDS philosophy was ''antithetical to the school's policies'' and could be a disruptive influence on campus.

Now, I am sure he thought he had a good point. The national SDS organization was known for its fiery protests,