

these statues could be placed in the Capitol. It took until about 2000 until there were 100 statues from the States. States are limited to two from each State. With 50 States, there were 100 statues by 2000.

At that point, the Congress passed another law providing a way that the States, for the first time, could take a statue out. Even in 2000, there was no suggestion then or before then that Congress would decide whether the statue that the State wanted to put in could be put into the building.

As a matter of fact, the Presiding Officer's State, Nebraska, just recently replaced Williams Jennings Bryan with Chief Standing Bear under the provisions made to do that.

Congress has been very prescriptive on how this happens. The State would have to pass legislation; the Governor would have to sign it to put a statue in the building; and Congress would determine only if the statue met the requirements that the other statues had been held to. Until now, that has been the congressional part of this agreement with the States to take a statue out of the collection and replace it with another one. My State, Missouri, is replacing Thomas Hart Benton with Harry Truman. The legislature had to agree what statue would go out, what statue would come in, and Congress would then accept that statue if it met the standards.

Again, we can do away with that program. We could do a lot of things. But we have entered into that agreement.

The forts, as an example—and, again, the minority leader mentioned the forts. The forts are named totally by the Congress. I expressed my belief this week and last week that it would be absolutely appropriate, in my view, to review the names that the forts have been named after, including the forts that are named after Confederate military leaders, and change those names. We can do that all on our own. We haven't told North Carolina that a fort has to be named after General Bragg. We haven't told Texas that a fort has to be named after Confederate General Hood. We can change those.

I am very open to looking at that and likely doing that. I just think, for my friend from New Jersey, that this is a more complicated arrangement than activity on the floor today would suggest.

I would also point out that in 2000, since Congress said that you can replace statues with another statue—you have to take a statue out to put a statue in, but you can replace statues, eight of those statues have already been replaced, and eight more are in the process of being replaced. I think four or five of the statues that have been replaced or would be replaced were in the standard of the Confederate statues.

I am encouraged that States are looking at their history, and they are looking at who has come since they put those statues in. Arkansas replaced

Uriah Milton Rose, a Confederate statue, with Daisy Gatson Bates, a civil rights leader. Florida replaced Edmund Kirby-Smith with Mary McLeod Bethune, an educator, a Presidential adviser, and civil rights leader. Arkansas is in the process of replacing one of these statues.

I think that today's action would violate our agreement with the States. I frankly thank my friend from New Jersey for encouraging the Governors, encouraging the speakers of the house to do what they have every right—and the Congress, in fact, in 2000, gave them the right—to do.

The minority leader was the chairman of the committee that determines all of this just a handful of years ago and took no actions to do what the Senate is talking about doing today.

So with that in mind, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, if I could just respond—I know how busy my colleague is. He has a well-earned reputation on both sides of this body for his sincerity, for his decency, and for his honor. I take to heart his words that this is often not a good forum in which to try to push a piece of legislation that might have controversy on both sides. I understand his sincere concerns with that.

I guess he also understands the sincerity with which I bring this up: the hurt and the pain that these statues represent in a place where millions of Americans come to the Capitol and see this as their body.

I say to the Senator, because there are complications in this and there are issues we would have to work through as a Senate, I guess the one last appeal to your more senior status and maybe your friendship is this: Will you join me, at least, on a letter to the appropriate committee, asking them to at least have a hearing on this issue so that we could have a full vetting of all of the complexities and have a real discussion on something that is a pressing concern? I note that you know it is a pressing concern because some States are already taking action.

You see this action being taken across various parts of our country. You see this issue being pushed into the national consciousness. You see Republicans and Democrats, from Nikki Haley to my dear friend, the former mayor of New Orleans, Mayor Landrieu—I think it would be just and right that, perhaps, you and I, in a show of bipartisan concern and sincere awareness of the complexity of this issue, could just join—the two of us—in a letter asking the committee to take up this issue in due time so that we can have an appropriate discussion from all perspectives on this issue.

Mr. BLUNT. If I could have the chance to respond here—

Mr. BOOKER. Of course.

Mr. BLUNT. This bill was just assigned to our committee. This is a discussion that, I guess appropriately, we

might have had before I was asked to come to the floor to assert the rights of the committee, to have the opportunity to think about that. I don't know that I want to negotiate that right here. But as I said, and my friend heard just a moment ago, I would like to hear from the States that are replacing statues and I would like to hear from the States that are thinking about replacing statues if this is a problem in the process of, under the current structure, solving itself.

I am glad to have continued discussions about this. I certainly don't impugn my friend's motives. You know, you can question somebody's decision to maybe bring a bill this quickly to the floor without giving us a chance to talk about it, but I have no interest, then, in impugning my friend's motives and understand some of the concerns my friend would have on this topic.

Mr. BOOKER. Thank you, sir.

If I may, I will make a personal appeal for a hearing on these matters. I hope that we can do that in due time. I know the pace at which the Senate often works, but I am grateful for this open dialogue and I know you had to adjust your schedule so I am grateful for your time and generosity.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DACA

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, 8 years ago almost to the day, President Obama announced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival, otherwise known as DACA. At the time, I remember the conversations a number of us had with President Obama, saying please give us a chance to work this out by passing appropriate legislation in the Congress. He heard those pleas, but in spite of the fact of saying numerous times he did not have the authority to do so, he proceeded to issue a memorandum that gave rise to the DACA program.

Rather than rolling up our sleeves and working together to create lasting immigration policy, President Obama chose to do this through an Executive memorandum. It is that Executive memorandum that has made its way through the courts over the last 8 years and finally to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, this is the bitter fruit of what President Obama did when he attempted to usurp Congress in a way to provide certainty and comfort to hundreds of thousands of young people—a goal that we all share—but to do so in a way that ultimately created more harm. It sent them on a years' long tumultuous journey, which is not over with the Supreme Court decision today. Basically, what the Supreme Court said was, under the Administrative Procedure Act, he didn't do it the right way, so go back and try it again and get it right this time.

Well, I think these young people deserve better. The debate over President

Obama's authority has held these individuals hostage, leaving them wondering if they might ultimately be deported to a country they have no memory of and forced to leave their families, their jobs, and the opportunities they have worked so hard to build here in the United States behind.

Make no mistake about it, today the Supreme Court ruled that the Department of Homeland Security didn't follow the proper procedures to rescind the DACA program and thus allowed the program to continue for now, but this is just a temporary measure. DACA recipients must have a permanent legislative solution. They deserve nothing less. These young men and women have done nothing wrong. They came to the United States as children, and in America, we don't hold children responsible for the mistakes of their parents, in this case, the mistake of not going through the legal immigration process. So these kids—young people, I should say—are innocent.

Texas is home to more than 100,000 DACA recipients who are a vital part of our communities. They have grown up with our kids, attended the same churches, shopped at the same stores, and defended our freedoms in the U.S. military. Many of these young people are in their 30s now with careers, families, plans, hopes and dreams of their own.

So the uncertainty about their status and what will happen to them is no less terrifying for them than it would be for any of us. It is simply unfair for these young people who, again, through no fault of their own, find themselves in this situation to rely solely on an Executive memorandum instead of a law passed by Congress. I believed that when President Obama rejected our request to work with Congress and come up with a permanent solution, and I believe it now.

I believe the Supreme Court has thrust upon us a unique moment and an opportunity. We need to take action and pass legislation that will unequivocally allow these young men and women to stay in the only home in the only country they have ever known.

In the past, I have supported a number of bills that would have allowed these individuals to remain in the United States without the fear of a court decision hanging in the balance, but each time, partisan disagreements have prevented us from turning anything into law. When it comes to immigration laws, Congress, on a bipartisan basis, never fails to fail.

Well, I hope we can all agree, given this opportunity, that it is not time for politics as usual, but it is time to provide some certainty, some compassion, some support for these young men and women. After years of being yanked around from courtroom to courtroom, these young men and women deserve that certainty. They deserve to know that, when they apply to college, grow up with their families, live their lives, and do all the things everybody else

wants to do, that they can do so without a dark cloud hanging over their plans. But, as usual, in order to come up with any solution, it is going to take buy-in from the Senate, House, and White House.

I have been having conversations for years about this topic, but most recently, I have been having conversations about the most efficient and effective way to protect these young people in the long-term, and I am willing to work with anyone, Republican or Democrat, who is interested in solving the problem—not grandstanding, not posturing, not acting like you care when you really don't, elevating politics over a solution. I am not interested in that. If anyone is interested in solving the problem and providing support for these young people, I am all in.

Over the years, I have engaged with the Texas Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, LULAC, Catholic bishops, and a number of other individuals and organizations that share my commitment to providing certainty for these young people. I hope we can come together and help them. These folks want nothing more than to continue to be part of the American dream. I hope we can deliver.

JUNETEENTH

Madam President, on another matter. One of the most defining days in our Nation's history was when President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, finally freeing all slaves in Confederate territory, but slaves in Texas wouldn't learn this life-altering news for 2½ years.

I know it is hard for us to understand. Now, we can tweet and communicate instantaneously, but it took 2½ years for slaves in the South to learn that they were free. That day came on a day we now celebrate as Juneteenth. That was the day that Major General Gordon Granger and the Union troops arrived in Galveston, TX, and shared the news to formerly enslaved people that they were now free. These free men and women set out to spread this news, with many traveling toward Houston, and eventually reaching more than 250,000 slaves throughout Texas.

As we do every year, tomorrow, Texans will celebrate Juneteenth and the 155th anniversary of the end of slavery in our State. It is an opportunity to reflect on our history, the mistakes we have made, but yet how far we have come in the fight for equality and a reminder of just how far we still have to go. That is especially true this year.

Over the last several weeks, Americans of all races, backgrounds, and of all ages have raised their voices in the fight against inequality and injustice that continues to exist in our society, especially those in our criminal justice system. As the list of Black men and women killed by police officers in custody grows, the calls for action are getting louder and louder, as they must and as they should. There is a clear and urgent need for leaders at every level

to come together and to deliver the change that we need to deliver in order to match up with our ideals.

I and others have said before, slavery was the original sin of the United States of America. We said: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and at the same time embraced a system that didn't acknowledge African Americans as being fully human. That was a sin. We have been paying a bitter price throughout our Nation's history. While we have come a long way, we know there is more we need to do.

JUSTICE ACT

In the context of police reforms, our friend Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina has introduced a bill which I have cosponsored, as have many other Members of the Senate. It is called the JUSTICE Act, and it will reform our police departments to provide much-needed transparency and accountability. It takes aim at a number of practices and policies that have led to a number of tragic deaths, that have united these nationwide protests and captured our conscience.

To prevent these tragedies from happening in the first place, this bill emphasizes things such as deescalation training. As I looked at the video of the two police officers in Atlanta, waking up somebody asleep in a fast-food line, then interrogating him for 45 minutes before it then broke out into a violent confrontation, I thought they could have used some deescalation training. Maybe, just maybe, a life would have been saved. Maybe they would have said: Give us your car keys, take a cab, go home, and sleep it off. But that is not what happened.

We also need training for police officers that otherwise haven't had that training or don't know to know when they need to intervene when they see another officer exert excessive force. We need more transparency—things like body cameras—and we need more information on things like use of force and no-knock warrants so that we can hopefully come up with a set of best practices that police departments all across the country should employ.

To gain a better understanding of the problems that exist throughout our criminal justice system—and this is just one of them—the bill establishes two commissions, one to perform a top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system and another to study the challenges facing Black men and boys.

This legislation would also make lynching a Federal crime, it takes aim at the dangerous practice of choke holds, and it strengthens minority hiring. I could go on and on, but I believe these changes have the potential to create real and lasting change in America's police departments and begin to repair the broken relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

Beyond the merits of the bill itself, there is another quality worth noting, and that is it includes a number of