

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 distrib-

uting 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,

and its now-notorious acts of civil disobedience. They made it their business to make authority figures nervous. Nervousness, however, is not an exception to the First Amendment. The students knew that, so the lawsuits started flying. The students' case finally made it to the Supreme Court, which held that "the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States applies in full force on the campuses of public colleges and universities." That case, *Healy v. James*, was a win for free speech. Although precedent continues to trend in the right direction, the First Amendment is in danger on the American college campus. From so-called free speech zones to severely restricted speech codes, campus officials are doing their best to ensure that students are protected from anything that may challenge their preexisting notions of right and wrong.

Instead of creating a safe environment, these policies have backfired, creating an atmosphere of fear and violence toward opposing viewpoints.

Just this past April, protesters at the University of Texas at Austin used smoke bombs to shut down a pro-life speaker at a Young Conservatives of Texas event.

In 2017, the editorial staff at Wellesley College's student newspaper threatened hostility toward anyone whose beliefs—their beliefs; not just their words but their beliefs—did not fit into the acceptable liberal mold.

That same year, Middlebury College campus—their left behaved so disgracefully that one progressive columnist begged the students at his alma mater to find a way to protest views they disagree with without shutting down speech entirely.

In the face of such hostility toward free and open debate, I ask this body, what have we done, and what can be done to turn back the tide?

Today, on the eve of National Higher Education Day, I am introducing the Campus Free Speech Resolution of 2019. It is a first step in restoring sanity to free speech for American college students. This resolution first and foremost recognizes that free speech zones and restrictive speech codes contradict the guarantees of the First Amendment. It recognizes that universities should protect the free and open exchange of ideas and that freedom of speech is worth protecting in a world increasingly hostile to democracy.

Through this resolution, I encourage the Secretary of Education to promote policies that encourage intellectual curiosity, viewpoint diversity, and debate. Last but not least, I encourage the Attorney General to defend and protect the First Amendment.

Standing by as universities surrender to activists who value their own comfort over the free exchange of ideas isn't just a mistake; it is a moral inversion.

We have a duty to make sure younger generations understand that protecting the First Amendment means pro-

tecting one another in the public square—even if we want more than anything to shut down what we are hearing. I may disagree with what you have to say, but I will defend your right to say it.

Above all, we have a duty to help them understand that an America where curiosity is replaced by suspicion, where debate is replaced by intimidation, and where speech is replaced by silence is no America at all.

SENATE RESOLUTION 234—AFFIRMING THE UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO THE TWO-STATE SOLUTION TO THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT, AND NOTING THAT ISRAELI ANNEXATION OF TERRITORY IN THE WEST BANK WOULD UNDERMINE PEACE AND ISRAEL'S FUTURE AS A JEWISH AND DEMOCRATIC STATE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 234

Whereas longstanding United States policy has recognized that a two-state solution to achieve peace between the Israelis and Palestinians would serve as the best hope for peace and security in the region;

Whereas roadmaps for peace outlined by President Bill Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President Barack Obama reflected the bipartisan United States policy promoting a negotiated two-state solution that supports the self-determination of both Israelis and Palestinians;

Whereas successive United States administrations of different political parties identified settlement expansion as an impediment to peace;

Whereas Israel's status as a Jewish and democratic state has been indispensable to its national identity throughout its history;

Whereas Israel has built and maintained relationships with its Arab neighbors;

Whereas ongoing security coordination between Israelis and Palestinians promotes stability;

Whereas deep United States-Israel cooperation provides significant mutual benefit to the security and prosperity of both countries and strengthens the unbreakable bond between the people of each country; and

Whereas any resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must guarantee Israel's security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the policy of the United States should be to preserve conditions conducive to a negotiated two-state solution;

(2) United States efforts to promote peace between the Israelis and Palestinians should explicitly endorse a two-state solution as the goal of any process to resolve the conflict's core issues;

(3) unilateral annexation of portions of the West Bank would jeopardize prospects for a two-state solution, harm Israel's relationship with its Arab neighbors, threaten Israel's Jewish and democratic identity, and undermine Israel's security; and

(4) a two-state solution is the best hope to preserve Israel's Jewish and democratic na-

ture while fulfilling the Palestinians' right to self-determination, creating a foundation for just and durable peace and prosperity.

SENATE RESOLUTION 235—DESIGNATING JUNE 12, 2019, AS "WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION DAY"

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 235

Whereas, throughout all periods of the history of the United States, women have proudly served the United States to secure and preserve freedom and liberty for—

- (1) the people of the United States; and
- (2) the allies of the United States;

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901, but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas women have served honorably and with valor, including—

- (1) disguised as male soldiers during the American Revolution and the Civil War;
- (2) as nurses during World War I and World War II; and
- (3) as combat helicopter pilots in Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of May 2019, women constitute approximately 15 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

- (1) nearly 19 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force;
- (2) 18 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;
- (3) 14 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;
- (4) 8 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and
- (5) nearly 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of May 2019, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas by 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans is expected to reach 2,000,000, which represents an exponential increase from 1,100,000 in 1980; and

(2) women veterans are expected to constitute more than 10 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas the United States is proud of and appreciates the service of all women veterans who have demonstrated great skill, sacrifice, and commitment to defending the principles upon which the United States was founded and which the United States continues to uphold;

Whereas women veterans have unique stories and should be encouraged to share their recollections through the Veterans History Project, which has worked since 2000 to collect and share the personal accounts of wartime veterans in the United States; and

Whereas, by designating June 12, 2019, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day", the Senate can—

(1) highlight the growing presence of women in the Armed Forces and the National Guard; and

(2) pay respect to women veterans for their dutiful military service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates June 12, 2019, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day" to recognize the service and sacrifices of women veterans who have served valiantly on behalf of the United States.