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Headlines assignment No. 2.

Online/SEO hed exercise. *This time, you can submit the headlines on a separate sheet—no need to print out all of the stories*.

**Story 1**. Write the article hed (about 12 words) and the summary hed (the one on the home page that links to the article; about nine words).

The Senate likely now has enough votes to pass a measure blocking President Donald Trump's national emergency declaration after Sen. Rand Paul signaled his support for the resolution of disapproval.

"I can't vote to give extraconstitutional powers to the President," the Kentucky Republican said Saturday, according to the [Bowling Green Daily News](https://www.bgdailynews.com/news/sen-paul-vows-to-vote-against-giving-trump-extra-constitutional/article_07a8adb1-e02d-5add-9b0f-d3e4aef3513e.html).

"I can't vote to give the President the power to spend money that hasn't been appropriated by Congress," Paul said at a Warren County Republican Party fundraising dinner, according to the newspaper. "We may want more money for border security, but Congress didn't authorize it. If we take away those checks and balances, it's a dangerous thing."

[](https://www.cnn.com/2019/03/02/politics/trump-presidents-veto-congress-history-override-national-emergency/index.html)

[Mitch McConnell can't protect Trump from vetoes anymore](https://www.cnn.com/2019/03/02/politics/trump-presidents-veto-congress-history-override-national-emergency/index.html)

The [resolution introduced in the House](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/26/politics/house-vote-trump-national-emergency/index.html) passed the chamber on Tuesday, with 13 Republicans voting with Democrats.

Senate Democrats need four of their Republican colleagues to vote with them for the measure to pass there. Along with Paul, Republican Sens. Susan Collins of Maine, Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Thom Tillis of North Carolina have indicated they'll vote in favor of the resolution.

So unless one of the Senate's 47 Democrats unexpectedly votes against it, the resolution now has enough votes to be sent to the President's desk, where it will face a [promised veto](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/22/politics/house-democrats-trump-national-emergency-vote/index.html) -- Trump's first in office.

Trump had said in February that he will veto the resolution "100%."

"We have too many smart people that want border security, so I can't imagine it can survive a veto," the President told reporters in the Oval Office. "But I will veto it, yes."

Congress would then need an overwhelming majority -- two-thirds of its members -- in both chambers to overrule Trump's veto, which is unlikely.

Trump signed a spending bill last month that kept the government open and provided $1.375 billion for a border wall. But he [quickly declared a national emergency](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/15/politics/donald-trump-border-national-emergency-immigration/index.html) to unlock billions of dollars in federal funds to build the border wall, bypassing Congress after lawmakers refused to meet his multibillion-dollar request for his top domestic priority.

The President and his administration have argued that there's a "crisis" on the southern border, claiming there's an "invasion" of drugs and undocumented immigrants.

Some Republicans have expressed concerns that Trump's declaration is executive overreach, sets a precedent for a Democratic president to do the same and will face legal challenges, which is [already the case](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/18/politics/xavier-becerra-lawsuit-national-emergency/index.html).

While they support border security, Republicans Sens. Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, Mitt Romney of Utah, Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania and Roger Wicker of Mississippi have been outspoken against the national emergency declaration, but have withheld their decisions on whether they'll vote to block it.

When the Senate will vote on the resolution is unclear. It has 18 days from the day the House approved the resolution on Tuesday. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, a Kentucky Republican, said the vote will occur before a recess later this month.

**Story 2**. Write the article hed (about eight words) and the summary hed (on the home page).

President Donald Trump has a perfect veto-free record so far, the result of support from Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and, until they lost their majority, Republicans in the US House.

But that could change now that the Democrats in charge of the House have [rebuked the President over his declaration of a national emergency](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/26/politics/house-vote-trump-national-emergency/index.html)at the US border.

McConnell won't be able to make the bill go away by tabling it or rallying a filibuster and it's likely that enough Senate Republicans will vote with Democrats to send the measure of disapproval for the national emergency to the President's desk.

So the President might be faced with finally issuing a veto in order to continue his effort to get around lawmakers of both parties to gather more money for his wall on the southern border.

It's been almost 140 years since a US president didn't veto anything during his time in the White House. And that President, James Garfield, was assassinated before he could serve a full year in office in 1881.

If he issues a veto soon, Trump will fall somewhere after Garfield and George W. Bush, who served a full four-year term without issuing a veto. But Bush made up for lost time in his second term, especially when Democrats took control of the House and the Senate in 2007.

A number of Republican senators have expressed a willingness to break with Trump over the national emergency declaration. And 13 Republican representatives have already sided with Democrats on the issue.

That's enough to force his veto, but not nearly enough to overturn it.

The vote overturning the national emergency declaration is not subject to filibuster rules, so a simple majority can pass the measure through the Senate. There are 53 Republicans, 45 Democrats and two independents who vote with Democrats. Four Republican senators, two of whom are up for re-election in 2020, have said they will vote with Democrats and against Trump:

* Sen. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska
* Sen. Susan Collins of Maine
* Sen. Thom Tillis of North Carolina
* Sen. Rand Paul of Kentucky

What happens after a Trump veto?

There's a big difference between forcing a veto and overturning it. Vetoes can be overridden only by a two-thirds supermajority vote in both chambers on Capitol Hill. In the House, Democrats have 235 seats, Republicans have 197 and there are three vacancies. Since the measure overturning the national emergency won 245 votes there, that means Democrats would have to pick up an additional 43 to 45 House Republican votes to get to 288-290 and a two-thirds majority, depending on how many lawmakers vote. Assuming the bill passes in the Senate with four Republicans, they'd need to pick up an additional 16 Republican votes.

How uncommon is Trump's veto-free streak?

We're taking for granted that presidents would not *want* to use the veto, but some clearly relish their fights against Congress. Harry Truman, who issued 250 vetoes, ran a successful re-election campaign in 1948 against the "do nothing" Congress. The most veto-happy President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, read a veto message aloud to Congress.

In Trump's case, though, if he must veto his national emergency declaration, it will underline that he is pushing a policy opposed by most of the country.

Still, presidential vetoes occur more often than you might think. Every president since Garfield has vetoed at least one bill. The younger Bush was the first president since John Quincy Adams to go a full four years without a veto, according to the Congressional Research Service. The House, which was Republican-led for Bush's entire first term, was protecting him from bills he opposed. Barack Obama, similarly, had help on Capitol Hill for most of his presidency, just as Trump has. But Obama [did veto two bills](https://www.senate.gov/reference/Legislation/Vetoes/ObamaBH.htm) even when Democrats controlled both chambers of Congress.

The President with the most vetoes was Democrat Roosevelt, with 635, although he also served the longest in the White House (12 years). All those vetoes came even though Roosevelt enjoyed Democratic majorities for his entire time in the White House.

If you plot vetoes alongside how closely aligned Congress is to the president, it used to be quite common for a president to veto bills from a House and Senate aligned with him. This data comes from [The American Presidency Project at the University of California at Santa Barbara](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/statistics/data/presidential-vetoes).

But that's changed in modern history. If you look only at vetoes since 1972, when Richard Nixon faced a Democratic-led Congress, most of the vetoes have come when at least one chamber was not aligned with the President.

Veto overrides, of course, are much more rare than vetoes. There have been only 111 in the history of the country, and they have impact.

One of the country's few impeachments, Andrew Johnson's, was [precipitated by a veto override](https://millercenter.org/president/andrew-johnson/key-events).

In more recent history, the Clean Water Act in 1972 and an expansion of the Freedom of Information Act in 1974 both passed despite presidential vetoes. The last time an appropriations bill was overridden was during Ronald Reagan's administration in 1982, [according to The American Presidency Project](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/statistics/data/presidential-vetoes).

George W. Bush vetoed 12 bills during his presidency and [Congress overrode a quarter of them](https://www.senate.gov/reference/Legislation/Vetoes/BushGW.htm).

**Story 3**. Write the article hed (about six words) and the summary hed (on the home page).

There's no politician -- not one -- who has risen further faster than [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez](https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/27/politics/who-is-alexandria-ocasio-cortez/index.html). Two years ago at this time, she was bartending and waitressing in New York. Now the New York congresswoman is the face of the liberal left in the Democratic Party nationally.

When a politician -- or, really, anyone -- becomes a star overnight, there's an inevitable backlash that grows in opposition to the rise. And less than three months into her first term in Congress, the AOC backlash has begun in earnest.

The spark came last week when, in a closed-door meeting of House Democrats, [Ocasio-Cortez warned colleagues](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/centrist-democrats-push-back-against-partys-liberal-surge/2019/03/01/a6674430-3c38-11e9-a2cd-307b06d0257b_story.html?utm_term=.dcb494d73a62) that if they continued to vote with Republicans on procedural motions in the chamber they could wind up "on a list" of incumbents ripe for a liberal primary challenge. (Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who has found herself on the other side of AOC a few times during the early months of this Congress, was making the same case to members.)

Members -- especially those holding swing districts that look nothing like AOC's solidly Democratic Bronx/Queens seat -- took umbrage.

"There is, without a doubt, a myth that Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez somehow represents the narrative of Democratic primary voters in the country," Alabama-based Democratic pollster John Anzalone, who polled for Barack Obama's 2012 re-election race, [told The Washington Post over the weekend](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/centrist-democrats-push-back-against-partys-liberal-surge/2019/03/01/a6674430-3c38-11e9-a2cd-307b06d0257b_story.html?utm_term=.dcb494d73a62). "Almost half of them identify themselves as moderates or conservative."

Is Anzalone right about the makeup of Democrats? He is, [according to Gallup polling of Democrats in 2018](https://news.gallup.com/poll/245813/leans-conservative-liberals-keep-recent-gains.aspx).  That data showed that 51% of Democrats identified themselves as liberal last year, while 47% call themselves either moderate (34%) or conservative (13%).

Here's the problem for the likes of Anzalone and 2020ers like former Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper, who is running as a pragmatic problem-solver: The energy, activism and, yes, money is all coming from the mad-as-hell-and-not-going-to-take-it-anymore liberal base at the moment. That reality incentivizes candidates -- particularly in the presidential race -- to run as far left as possible, because it's way over there on the left where they will get what they want in terms of political outcomes.

The real question then is not which part of the party is on the rise -- it's the AOC/Bernie Sanders wing for sure -- but rather how those moderates and conservatives are treated by the liberals in the party. Will they be driven out as insufficiently loyal to the cause -- as tea party (and Trump) Republicans have done to their own centrist wing over the last decade? Or will liberals find a way to incorporate the views of their more moderate party members as they try to find a candidate who can oust President Donald Trump in 2020?

Again, Anzalone hits the nail on the head. "My main gripe about AOC is that while I respect her voice in the party, I don't think she respects mine or anyone else's who differs with her on policy or comes from a different political electoral reality," he tweeted.

**Story 4**. Write the article hed (about eight words) and the summary hed (on the home page).

Corey Feldman, who has said he was molested as a child, has slammed the documentary alleging that Michael Jackson was a child sexual predator as "one-sided."

The former child star tweeted a lengthy statement Monday giving his thoughts about HBO's "Leaving Neverland." (HBO is owned by CNN's parent company, WarnerMedia.)

The film examines disturbing claims by James Safechuck and Wade Robson that Jackson sexually abused them over a period of several years when they were children.

Jackson's family has denied the allegations and condemned the documentary, calling it a "public lynching" and Jackson's accusers "admitted liars" in reference to sworn statements they both made while Jackson was alive that he did not molest them.

Feldman was friends with Jackson as a youngster and said he had fond memories of the late pop star.

"My memories. And thank god 4 me, my memories of MJ were mostly fond, aside from r 1 & only fight because he incorrectly feared i would turn on him, & make up lies," Feldman tweeted. "I never did. I never would! I pray those boys can sleep w that same clarity of consciousness! Let god b thy judge!"

Feldman said he "took issue" with the documentary given that Jackson, who died in 2009, is not around to defend himself and added that he believes Safechuck and Robson were motivated by money.

"So given the opportunity which he certainly had w me & others, being alone, w no parents around, how did he control those urges so well, while so blatantly sexual w those 2 boys?," Feldman tweeted. "It doesnt really fit the profile. But what motive besides $ do they hav? Abandonment is a strong 1!"

Both men filed suits -- Robson in 2013 and Safechuck in 2014 -- against the singer's estate. (Jackson's estate denied the accusations. Their cases were initially dismissed but reportedly remain under appeal.)

During the ["After Neverland" special hosted by Oprah Winfrey](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/27/entertainment/oprah-winfrey-after-neverland/index.html), "Leaving Neverland" director Dan Reed said the men were not compensated to appear in the documentary.

The "Goonies" star said that while he wasn't present when Safechuck and Robson were with Jackson, he was friends with the singer around the same time as Safechuck.

"Giv ppl a real look @ what a 30 yr old man/child & a 13 yr old boy would discuss, so every1 could hear the innocence of r relationship," Feldman tweeted. "Again iI wasnt there when those boys were. But I was there around the same time as Jimmy, & iI saw many kids around (girls included) who i am still friends with 2 this day, & none of us were ever approached by him in a sexual way at all!"

Feldman added, "So as much as those 2 men deserve 2 hav their voices heard, so do the thousands of kids who hung around him, that dont agree! Most pedos r serial offenders. They dont hav self control."

In 2017 Feldman [went public with what he said is Hollywood's problem with pedophilia.](https://www.cnn.com/2017/11/09/entertainment/corey-feldman-pedophilia/index.html)

**Story 5**. Write the article hed (about 12 words) and the summary hed (on the home page).

Republican Sen. Susan Collins said Tuesday she will vote against Chad Readler, President Donald Trump's nominee for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals who has come under fire from Democrats for being a lead lawyer for the Justice Department when it declined to defend key provisions of the Affordable Care Act in response to a lawsuit filed by Republican state attorneys general.

Collins, a rare GOP defender of Obamacare, cited in her statement announcing her decision Readler's role in the case as reason for opposing him.

"As the Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Justice Department's Civil Division, Mr. Readler was both a lead attorney and policy advisor in the Department's decision not to defend the Affordable Care Act, including its provisions protecting individuals with pre-existing conditions," she said. "Rather than defend the law and its protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions -- such as asthma, arthritis, cancer, diabetes, and heart disease -- Mr. Readler's brief in Texas v. United States argued that they should be invalidated."

Readler faces a key procedural vote at 4 p.m. ET on Tuesday when Republicans will try to break a Democratic filibuster of him. It's not clear if any other GOP senators will join her in opposing Readler. When Sen. John Thune of South Dakota, the Republican whip, was asked if Republicans would hold together to advance the nominee, he replied, "hopefully we'll have enough."

He later said he expects to get the simple majority needed.

All Democrats are expected to oppose Readler.

"One of the most dangerous decision to come out of the Trump administration in the last two years, was to not defend the Constitutionality of protecting pre-existing conditions in court," said Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, a Democrat of New York, at a news conference.

Schumer warned Republicans who argue they support coverage for pre-existing conditions will pay a price on Election Day if they vote for Readler.

"A vote to confirm Mr. Readler is very simply an endorsement of the law suit to eliminate pre-existing conditions," he said.

Schumer was asked if he regrets that Democrats used the "nuclear option" in 2013 to lower the 60-vote threshold to break a filibuster for most judicial picks -- except those for the Supreme Court -- because it's unlikely Readler could get 60 votes right now.

"I think without question this nominee would not get on the bench," Schumer said. "The 60-vote threshold brought parties together and picked more judges to be moderate."

But he said then-Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid resorted to that rule change -- forced over the objections of Republicans -- because Republicans, led by then-Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, were blocking President Barack Obama's picks to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

Schumer added that Senate comity was further damaged when McConnell's refused to consider Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court and when he allowed the "blue slip" tradition, which fosters bipartisan judicial picks, to wane.

McConnell, who later used the nuclear option to make it easier to confirm Supreme Court nominees, is now considering using it to speed debate of all but the most senior executive and judicial branch appointees. Schumer said he might be open to reducing debate time but only after the blue slips were restored.