The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland led the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

Mr. ABRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and ultimate sacrifice of West Feliciana Deputy Fire Chief Russell Achord, who died Wednesday while responding to a car accident.

Chief Achord served for 24 years and earned Officer of the Year and Valor in the Line of Duty recognitions during that time. He has also helped the community by implementing programs to teach high school students emergency care and improving the fire district’s standard of care.

It is because of the sacrifices of first responders like Chief Achord that we...
enjoy the lives we are able to lead. Our first responders put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe, and for that we can never say “thank you” enough.

Louisiana and West Feliciana Parish are home of Chief Achord, and I ask that you keep his family and his firehouse in your prayers as they grieve.

PRESSING ISSUES FACING THE NATION

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, enough is enough. Congress has a huge list of urgent, overdue bipartisan priorities for the American people, and we can’t keep kicking the can down the road.

The short-term funding bill congressional Republicans passed yesterday ignores the pressing issues facing our Nation: funding the Children’s Health Insurance Program and Community Health Centers; delivering needed resources to fight the deadly opioid epidemic; protecting our DREAMers from deportation; and providing disaster relief for Americans ravaged by hurricanes, mudslides, and wildfires.

These issues aren’t going away. We must work together to address them immediately. Yet House Republicans have passed a fourth short-term funding measure in 4 months.

This short-term-trick approach is reckless and dangerous for the entire Nation. It hinders our military, medical research, and infrastructure investments. It hurts seniors who depend on Social Security and Medicare and veterans getting care at the VA.

We need to stop the gimmicks and the cycle of delay. This is no way to run the government.

Madam Speaker, let’s stop putting off tomorrow the things we need to do today. Let’s get to work.

REQUESTING THE RELEASE OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, yesterday I went to the Capitol basement, where I read a classified document that angered me. It was frustrating. It was disappointing. It was also greatly enlightening.

The American people deserve, they must, they want to know what is in this document. Release the memo. Release the memo and all of the related material sourced in the memo. Release the file.

There is no concern—there should not be no compromising any good sources and methods by releasing the memo and releasing the file. What it would reveal is the Fed’s reliance on bad sources and methods.

The American public deserves the truth. We should not hide the truth from them. They have waited too long. Do not pull the wool over their eyes. Show them the facts. They deserve nothing less.

HONORING PAUL BOOTH

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and mourn the loss of a precious friend and mentor, Paul Booth.

Paul was a lifelong happy warrior for justice and a renowned progressive champion. For decades, he was a top leader in his union, AFSCME, fighting every day for working women and men.

From his youth as a student leader until the very day he died, he fought for equality and opportunity. Paul Booth made things happen. He was a strategist and, above all, an organizer. With his life partner, Heather Booth, Paul inspired and taught us to work smarter and be better.

Paul Booth will be sorely missed by all those he touched, including my husband, Bob, and me. We were cherished friends for decades.

Our hearts go out to Heather and his sons, Gene and Dan, and all those whose lives he inspired and that he touched. We are so sorry. We are heartbroken.

NORTHAMPTON TOWNSHIP NAMED ONE OF THE 25 SAFEST CITIES

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Northampton Township in my district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for being named the safest community in Pennsylvania.

Northampton rose to the top of the list of 25 safest cities with over 39,000 residents with a score of 90.97, the top fifth percentile in the entire Nation. The rankings are run by SafeHome, a professional security organization dedicated to making communities safer.

This recognition would not have been possible without the dedicated work of the entire Northampton Township Police Department and the leadership of Police Chief Mike Clark. Every day, these men and women put their lives on the line to protect their family, their friends, and their neighbors.

Quoting Chief Clark, who said it best:

It is not just us; it is working hand in hand with our residents, our administration and board of supervisors, our fire department, our rescue squads, our school district. It is everyone working together that makes this a great place to live.

Well said, Chief Clark. We are so proud of the emergency services, governmental officials, and residents of Northampton Township. A job well done.

ON DACA AND DREAMERS

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, as Republicans demonstrate their inability to fund the Federal Government, 700,000 young people are left with an uncertain future. DREAMers exemplify what is best about America. They have served in our military. They have built businesses and contributed to our communities.

This administration has waged an all-out assault on these young people, placing them in jeopardy and sowing fear that they will be sent back to countries that they do not even know. And now Republicans in Congress are turning their back on these young people as well.

We could have passed a fix to this problem as part of a government funding bill. That would have been a bipartisan solution, and it would have been supported by the vast majority of the American people.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans say DREAMers should be allowed to stay in the United States, yet President Trump is holding these young people hostage for a useless and offensive border wall. This is unconscionable.

We have a moral obligation to act. Congress needs to stay here and have an open vote on a clean DREAM Act. That is our moral obligation.

THE FILIBUSTER NEEDS TO END

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, as you just heard from the previous speaker and you read often in the press about a potential government shutdown, let me just tell you how this works.

The House passes a bill, then the Senate considers a bill. In the Senate, you either vote on the bill with majority vote or the minority party may choose to filibuster that bill. If the minority party chooses to filibuster the bill, which requires 60 votes for cloture, that shuts down that bill from passing.

We have passed 12 appropriations bills out of this Chamber right here that are still sitting in the Senate waiting to be taken up. One, the Democracy Act, needed to drop the filibuster.

I wish the majority party over there would actually put the bills on the floor and make the country see the filibuster live for all to view. You might see that over the weekend. I hope the majority leader does that.

What would cause a lack of funding for the government is simply the minority party, which is the Democrats, in the Senate abusing the filibuster and refusing the government not to be funded. That is what is causing it. That is a fact.

You may have different opinions on other issues, but the fact of the matter
RECOGNIZING MCCLYMONDS HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM
(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable accomplishment of the McClymonds High School football team located in my congressional district.

McClymonds High School capped off a 14–0 season on December 10, 2017, with its second consecutive 5AA championship, after defeating Visalia’s Golden West 42–12.

By winning two State championships in consecutive years, McClymonds became the first team in the Oakland Athletic League to achieve this impressive feat.

Now, McClymonds High School is a historic public high school in the West Oakland community of my district, with a strong history of athletic excellence. NBA legend Bill Russell and Major League Baseball Hall of Famer Frank Robinson have graced the halls of McClymonds High School.

Coach Michael Peters has carried forth the same tradition of excellence since 1992 and has continuously worked to ensure that his athletes succeed on the field but, most importantly, succeed in the classroom.

These young athletes represent the spirit, the resilience, and the passion of Oakland. Please join me in congratulating their historic championship win.

CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DIVISION
(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the Department of Health and Human Services under this new administration for doing something that should have been done a long time ago.

The agency is now opening a Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within its Office for Civil Rights. This new office will be devoted solely to treating people fairly, regardless of race, religion, or creed.

It is part of a broader theme in America where people, lately, from all religions and walks of life have been persecuted for their views and for not conforming to the views of others. How is that in the name of tolerance?

Recently I led an amicus brief on behalf of 144 Representatives and Senators for a Supreme Court case involving pregnancy clinics in California who, under California law, are being forced to violate their own faith and effectively advertise for abortions, against their own will.

This is wrong, and it is evidence of the religious persecution in America today, religious freedom being one of the founding cornerstones that have formed this country by our Founders.

This new DHS office is a positive sign for people of all faiths who are being bullied into adhering to a leftist agenda and are essentially being told their beliefs don’t matter because they disagree with a conservative viewpoint.

REACH ACROSS THE AISLE TO FIND LONG-TERM FUNDING SOLUTION
(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, we are 111 days into the current budget year and yet no closer to a budget than we were in months ago. We face a long to-do list, including funding our military, funding the Children’s Health Insurance Program and community health centers, protecting DREAMers, repealing the medical device tax, supporting disaster relief, and the list goes on.

We simply can’t continue kicking the can down the road with irresponsible temporary fixes like the ones this House passed last night. They hamper rather than help our military and other government agencies by forcing them to function in uncertainty, unable to make key strategic decisions and investments. This is no way to run our government.

Three times in the past year I crossed the aisle to vote for these short-term extensions, but I have seen no willingness to work with Democrats, no evidence of progress, and no reason to believe we won’t be in the exact same position 1 month from now after yet another CR.

Enough is enough. That is why last night I voted too late. I urge my Republican colleagues to reach across the aisle and work with Democrats to find a long-term funding solution that addresses our country’s needs.

Madam Speaker, I am committed and ready to work with my colleagues as long as it takes to achieve that responsible resolution.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE
(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows: Resolution, impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

Resolved, that Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is unfit to be President, unfit to represent the American values of decency and morality, respectability and civility, honesty and propriety, reputation and integ-
as follows: After consulting with my generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. military. Our military must be disciplined and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender individuals in the military would entail, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statement into United States policy, associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt on transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of gender.


On October 7, 2017, hate groups returned to Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting, “You will not replace us!” after having chanted in their August Charlottesville rally that “Jews will not replace us!” Since this event on October 7, the President has made multiple published statements about many issues, including the National Football League, but has not made one widely published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

On January 11, 2018, Donald John Trump held a meeting with a bipartisan group of congressional leaders that focused primarily on legislation that would provide a statutory protection for individuals brought to the United States without documentation. At this meeting, as has been widely published, Donald John Trump made references to people from s-h-i-t-h-o-u-s-e (or s-h-i-t-h-o-u-s-e) countries. He also questioned why we need more Haitians or people from African countries, proclaiming that we should take them out. Donald John Trump then suggested that Norwegians were better suited to be immigrants to this country. He continued by contempt of citizens and noncitizens who were welcomed here by previous Presidents due to natural disaster and civil unrest, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statements into United States policy, associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of national origin.

In light of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace and disrepute, has sown discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President, and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump by causing such harm to the society of the United States is unfit to be President and warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under Rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the Record at this point.

The Chair notes at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

"1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion of an infant born alive, a health care practitioner shall ensure that:

"(1) a health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

"(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to a child born alive at the same gestational age; and

"(B) the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

"(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician’s office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a violation of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

"(b) PENALTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

"(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

"(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

"(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed, or attempted, may bring a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

"(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

"(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a); and

"(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion and

"(C) punitive damages.

"(e) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize a civil action against a health care practitioner for the performance of an abortion in compliance with the law of the State in which the woman is located.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

"(1) ABORTION.—The term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

"(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant, or

"(B) to attempt to perform an intentional abortion of the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—"
When I supported the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act in 2002, my reasoning and the reasoning of my pro-choice colleagues was simple: Klling an infant who is born alive either by an act of omission or commission is infanticide. It was, is, and always should be against the law, and we have seen no harm in reaffirming that fact.

That law passed Congress with bipartisan support precisely because it was harmless, even if it was also useless, since it did not change the preexisting law. Technically just reiterated existing law in florid language and did nothing to interfere with a doctor’s medical judgment or to cause needless harm.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today puts children’s lives and health at risk. It requires doctors to immediately ensure transportation and admission of the infant to a hospital in all cases, with no regard as to whether doing so is in the best interest of the child’s health and well-being.

This mandate effectively overrides the case-by-case exercise of professional medical judgment by healthcare providers and replaces it with a blanket rule enforceable with criminal penalties. That is a这其中 approach fails to consider the fact that, in many cases, it may be safer and more conducive for the infant’s health to care for the infant where it was born rather than transporting it many miles away. But this bill assumes that Congress knows better, and it imposes a new obligation on providers that, rather than saving lives, could put infants at risk.

I am sure that such a result is not what the bill’s supporters intend, but all too often, this is what happens when Members of Congress try to dictate a physician’s exercise of professional medical judgment.

Perhaps if this bill had gone through regular order, we could have avoided this unfortunate situation, but there has never been a committee markup or a hearing on this bill. I would have welcomed the opportunity to hear from expert witnesses on best practices and standards of care for infants. Members could have offered amendments and perfected the bill to ensure that it achieves our common goal of providing the best, most medically appropriate care to infants and their mothers. I am disappointed but not surprised that my colleagues rushed this bill to the floor when there was no chance at all that doctors currently are failing to provide an appropriate level of care and a chorus of provider groups oppose the bill.

This is clearly an effort to have this vote coincide with the presence of many anti-choice demonstrators in Washington. Sadly, rather than protecting infants, my Republican colleagues are putting them at greater risk in the service of politics.

I cannot support H.R. 4712 because it mandates a particular course of treatment: immediate transport to a hospital, which may not be appropriate in
every case and may be medically dangerous in certain cases. It abandons the practice of considering the best medical interest of infants and their mothers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this ill-conceived legislation and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, this bill is yet another inflammatory and unnecessary attack on women’s rights, namely, a woman’s constitutionally protected right to an abortion.

Of course we support proper care for infants who are born. Those of us who are mothers know that we want what is best for our children, but that is not what this bill is about.

This so-called Born-Alive bill seeks to further politicize abortion and criminalize providers. It is clearly unnecessary because states already have guidelines that require them to provide emergency care when facing life-threatening circumstances.

Abortion care providers, including Planned Parenthood, are highly skilled and highly professional. They do not deserve to be criminalized. This is pure political theater.

Instead of ensuring that women have access to comprehensive healthcare, the Republican bill is attempting to interfere with patients’ relationships with their doctors, a provider’s ability to practice medicine, and our constitutionally protected right to make choices about our own bodies.

And let’s also be clear about this: Roe v. Wade gave women the right to access an abortion, and 7 in 10 Americans support that right across rural and urban America.

The vast majority on both sides of the aisle see through these cynical attempts to strip women’s access to healthcare from the 20-week and 6-week abortion bans to these attempts to cut funding to Planned Parenthood. Our focus, Madam Speaker, should be on ensuring that every person in America has access to comprehensive healthcare, rather than harmful bills that strip healthcare or the Republican obsession with undermining the Affordable Care Act, which the American people have already said a loud “no” to.

We have so much real work to do: passing a real budget, passing a clean Dream Act, and fighting climate change.

Madam Speaker, I reject this bill. Let’s do that real work instead.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, a member of the Judiciary Committee, for her outstanding work on this issue.

Today, thousands of people are rallying in the Nation’s Capital to be part of the March for Life and to join a celebration of hope and compassion for those who do not yet have a voice and to save the lives of the unborn.

Many millions more have viewed videos of representatives of Planned Parenthood, which performs some 40 percent of all abortions each year. Those videos, recorded undercover, sadly portray a much darker side of our society. They show discussions of the exchange of money for the body parts of aborted babies. They show instances during which in course of an attempted abortion, a baby is born intact and then shipped to a lab for the use of its body parts.

Congress must move immediately to protect any children born alive during the course of a failed abortion.

The bill before us today provides that in the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive, any healthcare practitioner present must exercise the same degree of professional care to preserve the life of the child as he or she would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age.

The bill also provides that the child must be immediately—immediately—transported and admitted to a hospital. If a baby alive is left to die, the penalty can be up to 5 years in jail. If the child is cut open for its body parts or if the mother overtly causes the punishment is that for first-degree murder, which must include life in prison or the death penalty.

Babies are born alive during failed abortions. The House Judiciary Committee heard direct testimony by two grown women who, as babies, survived attempted abortions. Gianna Jessen’s mother was advised by Planned Parenthood to have an abortion. But as Ms. Jessen testified: “Instead of dying, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles.” Her medical records state clearly that she was born alive during an abortion.

She continued to say: “Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. I was later diagnosed with cerebral palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And cerebral palsy is a great gift to me.”

Just think of that for a moment. Ms. Jessen says cerebral palsy was a gift to her because it came with the gift of life. She forgave her mother long ago and gives praise each day for that gift of life, which she enjoys to its fullest to this day.

Ms. Jessen presented a picture at the hearing showing the results of the sort of abortion she survived.

I urge my colleagues to support the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act so other women who survive failed abortions can have the same chance to be as thankful as Ms. Jessen and to support all efforts to save the unborn as well.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for his leadership on this issue.

Over 26 years ago I graduated from medical school and took an oath—an oath that hundreds of thousands of doctors have taken over the years—to do good, to do no harm, and to help our patients make the best healthcare decisions that affect their own circumstances.

But this bill, Mr. Speaker, would criminalize the practice of medicine and questions doctors’ judgments. This bill attempts to intimidate doctors from providing safe, evidence-based healthcare. It would set the precedent that those without medical training can make choices for patients and dictate medical practices.
Why are we having politicians fill in for doctors?

Get the politicians out of the delivery room and let doctors care for their patients.

There is no disagreement that every baby born should receive all the medical care and treatment to survive. We are all in agreement. That is not what this bill is about. This bill is an attempt to undermine a woman’s access to safe and legal reproductive health services. It is a blatant attempt to intimidate the abortion providers that is in the best interest of their patients.

That is why I, along with my colleague and fellow physician, Dr. Ruiz, attempted to offer an amendment that uphold existing law that healthcare providers must exercise the same skill, care, and diligence as they would any other child born at the same gestational age.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mitchell). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DERICA. It would have stopped Members of Congress, most of whom have no medical training, from interfering with how doctors practice medicine, because these decisions should be between a doctor and their patients. I have always said that a woman’s health care decision should be between her and her doctor, and that being a woman is not a preexisting condition.

As one of the few doctors who serves in this Chamber, listen to your doctor. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.” That is what this doctor orders. Listen to him.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mrs. Roy, for being a leader in this area.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This is common-sense legislation to strengthen, under penalty of law, the protection of infants who enter the world alive after attempted abortions.

We agree, as my colleagues on the other side have pointed out, that an infant born alive rightly has protection under law. In fact, a person. This was established by the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, signed into law by President Bush in 2002 after it was passed by voice vote in this Chamber and by unanimous consent in the Senate.

We need this bill because, in practice, babies fighting for their lives after an attempted abortion are being denied treatment at the hands of so-called physicians.

This law affirms and protects the survivors of abortions and ensures that, just like every other baby who is born, these persons become hospital patients and receive the same medical care as any other child born in the United States, not left in the very hands of those who sought to terminate their life.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunately necessary bill to ensure healthcare professionals comply with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote to protect our Nation’s most vulnerable children and to affirm life by voting to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking Democrat on the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this moment in time in this previously resected and hallowed Hall is being diminished in the same manner in which the White House has recently been diminished. President Trump recently had a meeting and he referred to the Roosevelt Room, where he had a meeting with Cabinet members and other Senators from the studio. “The studio,” as if this is all theater, “Theatre of the Absurd.”

Now, the President has a history in entertainment, and he may be trying to get a lifetime Oscar for the most farcical decision of his presidency since Governor Lepetomane of Mel Brooks fame.

But this House should not follow in those footsteps and make this Congress a studio for a show being presented for the nation that is marching on this anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

This bill violates regular order, which we were supposed to be implementing. There was no hearing in the subcommittee, there was no hearing in the committee, and there have been no amendments allowed. This is irregular. This is not regular order.

This is a theater, a show put on and produced by Trent Frankis, who left this House under disgrace, and continued by this Republican administration while this government possibly could go into shutdown. Yet we are acting like this is not the situation. We have a bill that will go nowhere in the Senate, that is unnecessary, and that violates the principles of federalism because most of the principles herein are reserved to the States and are unnecessary and are an impediment to a woman’s health, in many cases making the Members of Congress doctors and nurses who are marchng in the image of their Creator with inherent dignity.

I am appalled when my friends from the other side of the aisle say it would endanger a child to take them to a hospital and to actually provide emergency care where all of the services are provided in an ambulance and take them to a hospital where they would have the best chance to survive.

As a grandmother and a nurse, it is utterly appalling that we have to pass legislation to save babies that are left to die.

Whether or not we agree that life begins at conception—and I truly hope that one day we will—this bill is merciful, it is humane, and it is just.

Abortion is brutal for both the mother and the child, and providing care for babies who have survived this horrific practice should never be a question. No one should be against this. We all should come together and say that if a healthcare professional does not help to save the life of that baby that is born of a botched abortion, they should be held criminally liable just as they would for any other life that they refuse to save.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership in serving on this committee, and I thank Mr. COHEN for his very eloquent explanation.

Let me say that I stand with these women, Jenny R., Kathy L., Lindsey, and Taisa, women who have experienced the tragedy of losing a child, wanting a child, and wanting the protection of Roe v. Wade. I stand with these women.

I rise today to again ask the question: Why do we divide over the wonderment of birth?

I am reminded of H.R. 2175, passed in 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which was widely supported.
Now, we come on the eve of a failed administration in its first year to stand as if we are doing something for those who are coming here—and I have great respect for their position of pro-life—but it doesn’t mean that we must undermine the Constitution, add mandatory minimums to make up needs where there are no needs. That is what this particular bill does.

This amendment to H.R. 4712 is clearly involving and intruding into a process between the mother, the doctor, the family unit. There is no evidence of lawbreaking that has been uncovered that necessitates congressional involvement.

Abortion is a proven safe, legal, and humane practice. It has to be that way under the law. But we are in the middle of violating the Constitution and the Supreme Court cases by passing this legislation: up to 5 years in prison, a threat of financially crippling lawsuits, and, of course, shutting down those health facilities that we absolutely need.

Let me be very clear: we should be dealing with this shutdown that the Republicans are planning and moving forward. The reason we should be dealing with this shutdown is because law enforcement officers have no money, our clinics have no money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, passing by the Capitol Police, it made me think of my own law enforcement officers in Houston, Texas. Because we do not have a budget, we do not have appropriations, we are about to shut down the government. We have a CR. There is no funding for police officers.

We would not tolerate similar intrusion by the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can easily conclude instead that it is designed to intimidate doctors out of practice. This interference in medical care could also cause tremendous additional grief to some families making difficult decisions in heart-breaking cases.

We would not tolerate similar intrusion by politicians into any other medical specialty; abortion care is no different.

Finally, it is important to point out that we are in the middle of a lawsuit that has ended access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive health care, often couched in those same terms.

But we know that's not really the case. If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question of ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicable issue of legality, lies with provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses.
just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country. To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that powers those services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood. Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history doctoring and manipulating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman’s right to choose, but on women’s health care across the board.

Hundreds have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them choose what they want, what doctors are trained to do, and I personally find offensive the fact that there is a suggestion that Democrats are not for saving the lives of born children. Of course, we are. We all are.

This is not a necessary piece of legislation. It is already on the books.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, while

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Of course, if a baby is born alive, everything must be done to protect that life. No one disagrees with that. Perhaps more importantly, it is already the law. To suggest otherwise is just wrong.

So don’t be fooled. This bill is yet another effort to erode women’s rights to obtain safe, legal abortions and a cynical attempt to appease those who have come to D.C. to advocate for the reversal of Roe v. Wade.

H.R. 4712 would insert the opinions of politicians into medical practice and individual rights of women to make their own decisions. This is not what women want, what doctors were trained to do, and personally find offensive the fact that there is a suggestion that Democrats are not for saving the lives of born children. Of course, we are. We all are.

The legislation today requires a significant penalty for healthcare practitioners present at the time the child survives the abortion, exercise the same degree of skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child, and then get them to a hospital.

This is humane legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Of course, if a baby is born alive, everything must be done to protect that life. No one disagrees with that. Perhaps more importantly, it is already the law. To suggest otherwise is just wrong.

So don’t be fooled. This bill is yet another effort to erode women’s rights to obtain safe, legal abortions and a cynical attempt to appease those who have come to D.C. to advocate for the reversal of Roe v. Wade.

H.R. 4712 would insert the opinions of politicians into medical practice and individual rights of women to make their own decisions. This is not what women want, what doctors were trained to do, and personally find offensive the fact that there is a suggestion that Democrats are not for saving the lives of born children. Of course, we are. We all are.

This is not a necessary piece of legislation. It is already on the books.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, while...
is a legal person for all purposes under our laws. However, this law didn’t create additional protections for these surviving children.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to support Mrs. BLACKBURN’s bill to create additional protections. Whether it is making sure an infant is immediately taken to a hospital or mandating these doctors do everything they can to save their life, these survivors need our protection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, last year, we voted on a bill to ban abortions after 20 weeks. While I supported that bill, many of my colleagues chose not to, but I urge them to at least support this commonsense bill to protect the lives of abortion survivors.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker. I yield the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this legislation. Infants born alive deserve healthcare. As Dr. BERA just explained, doctors are already obligated to provide that. But this bill threatens to send healthcare providers to jail and women to back alleys.

Instead of debating this bill, we should be working to reduce the rate of unintended pregnancies which, of course, reduces the number of abortions. History shows that when abortions are restricted or banned, they do not go away. They become dangerous and unsafe. Look at countries that restrict abortion. Every year, thousands of women die from unsafe procedures.

Yet here we are debating a bill that will make criminals out of doctors and will live more women to hazardous self-help methods.

There are effective ways to reduce unintended pregnancies and improve maternal health, which is what we should be doing. Instead, this bill disregards the professional judgment of trained medical professionals. It imposes extreme new standards of care. That is why providers like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists strongly oppose this legislation.

Madam Speaker, women in this country will continue rejecting archaic and counterproductive policies like this, just as my colleagues should reject this bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewomen from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

The whole experience of being a first-time parent can be really overwhelming. I remember feeling this incredible sense of joy. But there are always so many questions, too. How are we going to provide for this baby? What kind of person will they become? What if something goes wrong?

There is no doubt a lot of things can go wrong in a pregnancy, but we find comfort in the fact that there is a whole team of healthcare professionals there to help. But what if they stepped back and refused to deliver care to your child? It would be unacceptable.

Yet when a baby is born alive after a failed abortion, that same healthcare professional may not deliver the lifesaving care that that baby deserves.

Melissa Ohden from Sioux City, Iowa, was born alive after an abortion attempt. By God’s grace and the work of an incredible nurse, Melissa survived. As she tells it, there were demands made to leave her there to die in the hospital room that day. She says that ultimately a nurse rushed her off to the NICU because, in the nurse’s words, “Melissa just kept gasping for breath.” That nurse wasn’t going to leave her there to die.

Madam Speaker, every life has dignity and every life deserves respect. We ultimately need to ban abortion and protect life from the moment of conception. But until that is done, we must fight to protect every single precious little life that we can. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act will do that and help us be successful in that mission.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712.

This bill would allow the Federal Government to override a doctor’s medical judgment, without exception. It is motivated by politics, not science.

First, this bill reiterates current law, which already protects all newborns from medical negligence. Second, the criminal penalties in this bill go above and beyond current law and are clearly intended to intimidate doctors. This isn’t sound medical practice. This is politics impeding a doctor’s medical judgment.

And what is more, this intimidation would endanger newborns. This bill would require all newborn infants to be immediately transferred to the nearest hospital, but not all hospitals have neonatal units, or it might be harmful to move the infant immediately. Clearly, the intent is not to protect newborns but to stir outrage.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. It is unnecessary, redundant, and a backhand attack on women’s health and reproductive rights from this Chamber and the Trump administration.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Today, by this bill, we do protect these children who are born after a botched abortion attempt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on so many issues.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this bill, which is really just another attempt to criminalize abortion and limit access to the full range of reproductive healthcare for women.

This so-called Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is another cynical attack on a woman’s right to make her own healthcare decisions. It is unnecessary and it simply pitches a false narrative to the American people in order to intimidate women and providers.

Madam Speaker, in 2002, Congress passed a bill with broad bipartisan support that acknowledges the rights of any child born alive in this country, and affirms that any infant should receive appropriate medical care. That is a given, and everyone believes that.

Republicans are distorting the truth about current law. This legislation before us is a step too far. It interferes with medical practice by enforcing extreme new standards of care through criminal and civil penalties on providers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.
Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. In conclusion, I would just like to say that no woman should have a politician interfering in her personal health decisions. They should be made between her and her medical provider, period.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this very cynical and sinister bill and to get out of the business of interfering in women's health.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, as have many of my colleagues.

I find it interesting to hear from the party that brought us the Affordable Care Act about the government interfering with healthcare decisions. But that isn't what I want to talk about today.

I want to talk about the horrendous practice of sitting and watching a child that was born alive die and not providing them care. The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 says every infant who is born alive, at any stage of development, is a human being. However, there is no law right now that criminalizes the act of abortionists who deny care to babies who survive abortions.

These fragile young lives need care immediately once they are born, which is why I strongly support this legislation. It not only requires appropriate care for children who survive abortions, but it also establishes strong criminal penalties for those who violate the law, including punishing those who intentionally kill a child born alive. Again, I think that is a violation of the Federal murder laws. You are intentionally letting a child die, and you could help. You are a doctor. You are trained.

As a strong supporter of life, it is important that we hold those who kill innocent children accountable for what they do. I believe this law will do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to please join me in supporting this important legislation to protect the lives of our newborn babies.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

This should not be a controversial vote. This bill should pass unanimously.

If a little girl is born alive, she should be protected. It is that simple.

Everyone in this House, everyone hears the voice, as at a point of just having been born, and all of us had a right to live at that point, whether we were wanted or not.

I wonder what the great pro-life Democrats of yesterday would think of what we are hearing from the other side today, pro-life leaders like Eunice Kennedy Shriver; Sargent Shriver; Thomas Eagleton; and, of course, the late great Governor Casey of Pennsylvania. Their rhetoric reminds me of what Governor Casey said 25 years ago:

"It is a bitter irony that abortion has found a home within the Democratic Party, which claims to be a champion of the poor, despite the fact that the interests of the poor are in direct conflict with the interests and the agenda of the abortion industry.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple bill. Please vote for humanity. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his extraordinary leadership and for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712.

In the past year, the usual Republican stream of anti-woman, anti-choice rhetoric has turned into a flood. Today's vile bill is based on myths and lies and is designed to intimidate doctors from providing abortions.

I would like to remind my colleagues that for 45 years, the Supreme Court has upheld a woman's constitutional right to choose legal abortion, and that current law already protects infants, as well it should.

But Republicans would rather play politics with women's lives than rely on science and the law. This bill seeks to criminalize legal medical services and put extreme, anti-choice ideology between a woman and her doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, in what other circumstance would we ever tolerate denying, delaying, or interfering with legitimate and legal medical care?

This must stop.

Protect women from this political charade. Allow doctors to take care of their patients.

Please vote "no" on this unfair, vile bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McCaINCH).

Mr. McCaINCH. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4712.

This act is a continuation of the House Republicans' decade-long attempt to rob women of their constitutional right to safe, legal abortion care. The bill we are considering today, however, takes these attacks on women a step further.

H.R. 4712 seeks to supersede doctors' professional judgments, imposing unnecessary, and potentially harmful, new standards of care. Violation of these extreme standards will result in harsh criminal penalties.

This bill seeks to intimidate doctors. If passed, it will discourage them from providing the care and access for patients to receive the help they need.

That is why it is opposed by respected medical organizations, such as the American College of Obstetricians...
and Gynecologists, the American Society of Reproductive Medicine, the National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women’s Health, and many others.

It is simple: healthcare decisions should be between a woman and her doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. McCUSICK. Madam Speaker, again, it is simple: healthcare decisions should be between a woman and her doctor.

Politicians are not medical experts and have no place interfering with the provision of compassionate, evidence-based care.

Madam Speaker, I am an attorney and you can trust me with a lot of things, but a medical decision on someone else’s behalf is not one of them.

As we mark the 45th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, we should be advancing policies that help women and families, rather than restricting access to healthcare they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4712.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, as a father of 4 and now 16 grandchildren, I strongly support the sanctity of human life, and I believe that life begins at conception. Madam Speaker, a person is a person, no matter how small.

Whether a baby is still in the womb, if a child is born prematurely, or even if a child is born alive following an attempted abortion, they still have a life that is worth protecting.

Therefore, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sponsored by my good friend, Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN. This bill will be so much to protect our most vulnerable. I will continue to support legislation and advocate for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand here to oppose this deadly legislation being proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

When I was 15 years old—and that was in the days before abortion was legal—I found a friend bleeding to death because of a back-alley abortion. Those were the days that when a woman needed an abortion, she would rely on coat hangers and poison.

This bill is going to take us back to those deadly days. Its aim is to intimidate doctors and threaten their own freedom if they dare to use their own medical judgment, with the consent of a patient, to perform what is now a legal medical procedure.

Madam Speaker, I stand and I urge my colleagues to oppose this deadly legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the lead sponsor of this important bill, who has been such a fierce advocate for the unborn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for her leadership on this issue.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to say I would be hopeful that you all would take a few minutes and actually read this legislation. It is not a lengthy bill. It doesn’t take that long to read. Quite precisely, it does a few simple things, and that is what we need to be done to build on the 2002 law that this body chose to pass and put on the books.

Now, the reason that we chose to do this is because of what we have learned since 2002. If you go in and look at the Kermit Gosnell trial and that house of horrors, and if you take the time to listen to some of this testimony, there was a healthcare worker who said, during the years of working in that facility, that there had been as many as 100 babies who survived a botched abortion. And what happened? They lost their life.

So this bill is about protecting women and babies. It is not about Roe v. Wade. It is all about protecting women and babies. It gives that mother who has that abortion, and it is botched, and that baby survives—it gives her that civil right of action that she ought to have. It does set that standard that you have got to have medical care provided to these precious, precious babies who survive that. You do that immediately. They deserve that standard of care.

It says if a healthcare professional does not provide that care, they are going to face those criminal penalties.

So, yes, the bill is there to protect women and these babies. I just had a conversation with a young lady who survived an abortion. She is an adult now. She stands for life. I encourage this body to support the bill and to pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the other side is ready to close?

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I end this debate by reiterating the point I made at the beginning. This legislation would do nothing to protect the quality of healthcare if an infant is born after an attempted abortion.

The 2002 law reaffirmed that it has always been, and is now, against the law to intentionally kill or harm a newborn infant, whatever the circumstances of its birth.

The other side has referred several times to the case of Dr. Gosnell. Dr. Gosnell is now in jail under a sentence of life imprisonment without parole, plus 30 years, convicted of first-degree murder without this bill, because it is already against the law not to give proper care or, God forbid, to murder a baby born alive.

The law already requires the highest standard of care for all newborns. This bill does nothing new to protect infants in any respect.

The bill, however, is not harmless. Republicans demanding the immediate transportation of the newborn to a hospital, regardless of the medical or other circumstances, it would place the lives and health of some newborn infants at risk.

The bill directly interferes with a doctor’s medical judgment and dictates a particular course of action that may be harmful to the newborn in the particular circumstances. That is why a coalition of 13 healthcare provider groups, joined by a coalition of 25 additional health, civil rights, and women’s rights groups, strongly opposes this bill.

As the providers note, the bill wrongly “injects politicians into the patient-physician relationship, disregarding providers’ training and clinical judgment and undermining their ability to determine the best course of action with their patients.”

Let me add one other thing. This bill does not interfere, in any way, with the rights secured by the Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade. It guarantees the right of a woman to choose an abortion if she wishes.

It does not, nor does any other law or any other provision, negate the command of the law that everyone respects that any newborn child, whatever the circumstances of its birth, must be cared for in the best possible medical way, and, of course, deliberately killing it would be first-degree murder.

This bill does not change this, but the bill does do something by compelling the immediate transportation of the newborn in the hospital when it may be harmful to their health to do so.

We should listen to the healthcare professionals, we should respect their judgment, and the House must reject this seriously flawed bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Of course, like so many of my colleagues, I support this measure, but it feels really strange standing here today in defense of living, breathing children, to have to make a case that a baby who survives an abortion and is born into this world should be treated just like a baby born any other way, but, unfortunately, we must.

There is currently no law mandating that a baby born alive after a failed abortion receive medical treatment instead of being left to die. That is why we are here, to require, under Federal law nationwide, that a baby born alive after an abortion attempt receives the
same care that any other baby would receive.

So finally my question, Madam Speaker, to those who would oppose such a measure is this: How is the life of one baby any different or less valuable than the life of another baby? How does anyone justify that?

I know that, as Members of Congress, part of our job is to debate with each other about issues facing our Nation. I take the responsibility very seriously. I just don’t believe this particular issue is up for debate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4712. I yield the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAUNAY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. With this bill, the Majority has declared war on the health and well-being of millions of women, rolling back women's health care. The bill's inflammatory language is an insult to and the doctors who provide them with care.

This legislation is redundant, and would criminalize the work that doctors do legally today. This would unnecessarily intimidate health care providers at Planned Parenthood, who serve 2.4 million Americans every year with lifesaving services like pap tests, breast exams, and screenings for sexually transmitted infections. For many low-income families, Planned Parenthood is their only option.

Family planning is a critical component of women's economic security. Being able to determine when and how to have children has a direct effect on a working woman's ability to support her family. The Congress should not stop women from charting their course in terms of schooling, career, and family. These decisions should be left to women, their loved ones, and doctors. This bill is spiteful, mean-spirited, and dangerous. It limits women's healthcare choices and interferes with the patient doctor relationship—in fact, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists call this legislation, and I quote “a gross interference in the practice of medicine.”

The Congress should not stop women from accessing care, and we certainly should not be hindering a woman's ability to make her own healthcare decisions. We ought to be protecting the liberty of any woman to make her own family planning decisions, and to have access to a full range of healthcare services. I urge my colleagues to reject this partisan, cruel bill.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

There is no question that the rule of law should require medical practitioners to treat babies born alive after a failed abortion with the same care they would treat any baby born at that same gestational age. Everyone in this body should agree that it is inhumane to willingly kill a baby who has been born alive. It's time to end this repugnant practice.

Unfortunately, the left spread the lie that pro-life Republicans only care about life when it's in the womb and not once it's born—However, the bill before us is about protecting the born and alive and nearly all of its support comes from Republicans.

No baby, being born should be treated with such violence.

Let's pass this bill and end this horrendous and unthinkable act.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4712, the latest attempt by House Republicans to come between physicians and their patients.


H.R. 4712 would overrule medical professionals by forcing that a newborn infant be transported to a hospital regardless of whether the infant's life would be best served by leaving the scene. Not only is this a dangerous intrusion into the medical decision-making of doctors, but it also may endanger infant health. Even if it is in the best interest of the infant's health, if a doctor violates this law's mandate, automatic criminal penalties of prison time, crippling fines, or both would be applied to medical professional.

Although supporters of this bill claim that their intentions are only to protect newborn infants from medical negligence, the true objectives of this legislation are clear: spread misinformation about women's reproductive health, and to dissuade medical professionals from entering the practice of abortion services.

This legislation is unnecessary. Today, abortion practice is safe, legal, and highly regulated to ensure that the best possible care is provided to a woman. Existing law ensures that medical professionals meet these standards. Let me be clear, an individual who performs illegal abortion services should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I join all Members of Congress and all Americans in opposition to the horrific actions of Dr. Kermit Gosnell. There is no dispute that Dr. Gosnell deserved to be prosecuted, found guilty, and face the multiple life sentences that he is now serving due to the laws already in place in Pennsylvania and throughout the nation.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4712 is yet another assault by the Trump Administration and Congressional Republicans on women's reproductive health. Congress' most basic responsibility is funding the government and today we are facing a government shutdown. I urge my Republican colleagues to stop playing politics with women's health and get back to addressing the urgent needs of the American people like keeping the government open.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4712.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.
any capacity in the U.S. Military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruptions that transgendere the military would entail, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statement into United States policy, associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt on transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of national origin.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace and disrepute, has sown discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President, has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States with bigotry, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States without documentation.

At this meeting, as has been widely-published statement condemning the hate and bigoted statements of Donald John Trump, but has not made one widely-published resolution on the table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 4712, and

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

**DEMOCRATS ARE AVAILABLE TO DO THE PEOPLE’S WORK**

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we are confronting a very serious situation, as all of us know, and that is we have not reached agreement on how to fund the government between now and September 30 of this year.

Almost one-third of fiscal year 2018 is gone. At some point in time—the majority leader is not available right now, therefore, I am not asking him to yield, because he has something important that he is doing now—but at some point in time, Madam Speaker, I am hoping that the majority leader will come before us and we can have a colloquy on what we intend to do during the course of this day, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps Sunday, perhaps Monday, perhaps Tuesday, in order to get the business of the country done.

I am urging my Members to be available on very short notice so that they can complete the work of funding our government for fiscal year 2018. I hope that all other Members will be available to do so as well. That is our responsibility. We are about to confront a very serious situation, as all of us know, and that is we have not reached agreement on how to fund the government between now and September 30 of this year.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1**

By unanimous consent, the following Members were granted leave to be excused from the Chamber:

**HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS EMMANUEL MENSAH**

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, last month, 12 people died in a raging inferno that tore through an apartment building in the Bronx. Among the dead was a 28-year-old man who repeatedly ran into that burning building to rescue his neighbors. This decorated young American soldier lived by the Army’s values: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage.

Private Mensah lived and died by these values in selfless service to his community.

Madam Speaker, Private Mensah’s life exemplifies the best of our Nation. His tragic death teaches us that every life has value, every life has meaning, and every life is worth protecting.

Madam Speaker, Private First Class Emmanuel Mensah was not only a brave and courageous American soldier, he was also an immigrant from the African nation of Ghana. Let us honor his life by keeping the gates of liberty open to immigrants like him.

**MARCH FOR LIFE**

(Ms. TENNEY, Mr. Speaker, today, thousands from across the country will descend on our Nation’s Capital for the 45th annual March for Life, the largest pro-life rally in the world.

The March for Life is held annually in response to the Supreme Court ruling in Roe v. Wade, a decision that altered the course of our American culture. On January 22, 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court decided in a 7–2 opinion to roll back restrictions on abortion in the U.S. Since that ruling, over 58 million human lives have been lost to abortion nationwide.

While a number of States have enacted regulations preventing late-term abortions, the United States is one of only seven countries, which includes the dictatorships of North Korea and China, that allows abortions after 20 weeks from the date of gestation. Earlier this year, the House passed the
Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to end this egregious practice.

One of the most important struggles we face as a compassionate society, as legislators, and as citizens is to protect the sanctity of life and defend future generations. As a mother, it is among my top two priorities to advance pro-life and pro-women policies in Congress, and I will continue to promote a culture that respects the most precious gift of all, the gift of life.

**HONORING STEPHANIE OHIGASHI, MILDRED OKUDA, AND TOM FUJITA, JAPANESE CULTURAL SOCIETY OF MAUI.**

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD, Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has long enjoyed a special and unique relationship with Japan, and Hawaii’s Japanese-American community has been integral in shaping our history and collective story.

I rise today to recognize three special leaders: Stephanie Ohigashi, Mildred Okuda, and Tom Fujita, three members of the Japanese Cultural Society of Maui, whose efforts have been dedicated to preserving Japanese culture and heritage in the County of Maui.

These three leaders have gone above and beyond working to strengthen ties between Hawaii and Japan and their service to Maui’s community. They have worked to create a sister-city relationship between Maui County and Fukuyma City, organize cross-cultural and educational opportunities, cultivate the stories and history of the first Japanese immigrants to Hawaii, and so much more.

In recognition of their many contributions and legacies, they have each been selected for awards from the Japanese Cultural Society of Maui.

"Thanks," `Mahalo," to Stephanie, Mildred, and Tom for your service to the people of Hawaii.

**DETECTIVE MICHAEL R. DOTY, SOUTH CAROLINA LAWMAN**

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, bruised and battered Christian McCaffrey was released from the police, reporting that her husband was engaging in domestic abuse.

So, on January 17, Detective Michael Doty and three other deputies who wear the badge responded to the call for help. After beating up his wife, the sound of the overdrive took off, running away from the police. What followed was a 3-hour manhunt for the outlaw.

As the law officers closed in on the trail, shots rang out from McCall. Sergeant Randy Clinton, Buddy Brown, and Kyle Cummings were all shot during the chase. We thank the good Lord that they are expected to make a full recovery. Detective Michael Doty was also shot and killed. This is his photograph.

Detective Doty was a member of the thin blue line leaving the world too soon. He was 37 years old and a 12-year veteran of the York County Sheriff’s Department in South Carolina. He and his twin brother enlisted in the force at the same time. Doty dedicated his life to protecting and serving. He previously worked in the drug enforcement unit as a member of the SWAT team.

As his body was transported to the medical center, fellow officers lined the streets in tribute to him. He was an officer every agency would be proud to have. Each and every day, we are grateful to have officers like Michael Doty.

The shooter was captured and he will face justice.

America’s peace officers do America’s dirty work. They root out evil and go after those who would do us harm. Officers like Michael Doty are the rare breed who give their lives for the rest of us. And for that, we are grateful. And that is just the way it is.

**SAVE THIS NATION**

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear to my colleagues and the American people why there is a major debate in the other body.

This is not a shutdown campaign. What we need to understand is that this is not a shutdown for illegal immigration. I am offended by that terminology.

The DREAMers have status. Their status was taken away by the President. What we are trying to do is ensure individuals who are in the United States, in the United States military, teaching, and committed to this Nation, have dignity.

Relatives of my friends on the other side of the aisle may have come in undocumented status. Therefore, this is not about illegal immigration. It is about dignity and respect for people here in the United States.

It is about my constituents who are suffering after Hurricane Harvey with no heat and their homes not being rehabilitated because we do not have disaster supplemental funding.

It is about federally qualified health clinics. Mr. Speaker, that will be shut down because of funding zero—in the CR so babies can go and get care.

Finally, it is about the Department of Education, teachers, and our law enforcement, whom we have such respect for.

This shutdown is not a campaign; it is a high calling to save this Nation. I stand with them.

**THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD REMAIN OPEN FOR ALL**

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. Speaker, the cause of any government shutdown now will be the same as in the past: Republican intransigence. If they continue to insist upon an entirely partisan bill that excludes DREAMers, they should not expect Democratic votes.

I want the government to remain open for everyone, including our DREAMers. While Republicans firmly control all levers of government, they can’t keep it open.

They will make history, celebrating the first anniversary of Donald Trump’s incompetence by shutting down the government that they totally control themselves. Instead of staying here to work toward a bipartisan solution, they are moving to shut down the House first.

It is the height of irresponsibility. It shows the depths of mismanagement that has failed to produce a simple one-year resolution to continue the operation of our government.

We must speak out about the wrong that is being committed here. Defend our DREAMers. Defend the continuation of our government and a more responsible approach in this new year.

**NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK**

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROKITA, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National School Choice Week and talk about the importance of choice for parents when deciding where to send their kids.
For millions of families, their local public school simply cannot provide the education that their child needs. For instance, recovery schools create a safe environment for students who are struggling with addiction to drugs and alcohol.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood and Secondary Education, I accompanied Secretary DeVos last September when she visited the H.O.P.E. Academy, a recovery school located in Indianapolis, Indiana. I heard the story of Jeremy, who, like many kids, wanted to fit in. One day, Jeremy reconnected with an old friend, who offered him marijuana. Before long, he was using and selling even harder drugs. Eventually, he was blacking out and was arrested. He could not find the help he needed at his local school.

Thankfully, he and his parents found and enrolled in H.O.P.E. Academy. Because of H.O.P.E. Academy, Jeremy got clean, enrolled in seminary, and met his wife. Just 1 year ago, they welcomed their first child.

It is because of these stories, and so many others, Mr. Speaker, that I fully support the right of parents to find the school that works best for them and their kids.

ABORTION BAN

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are close to a government shutdown. The Republicans’ top priority, however, is taking away a woman’s right to choose.

The abortion survivors bill is nothing but an insensitive, insulting, and unconstitutional attack against a woman’s right to make her own healthcare decisions. No matter how sneaky the Republicans are in drafting this bill, it is still, plain and simple, an abortion ban. It criminalizes doctors and intrudes into the doctor-patient relationship.

Politicians are choosing what is best for a woman’s health, instead of a woman making a choice with her doctor. This bill is part of the Republicans’ agenda to take healthcare away from women.

On the eve of the Women’s March, we say again: Enough is enough. This bill will close and close down reproductive health clinics across the country, leaving women who truly need help with no choices at all.

READING EAGLE HISTORY

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a pillar of journalistic integrity in our democracy, the Reading Eagle, a newspaper in my district in Berks County, Pennsylvania.

This month, the paper celebrates its 150th anniversary. On January 28, 1868, the Reading Eagle published its first daily paper and is now one of the oldest family-owned newspapers in our country. Today, it operates its headquarters in downtown Reading and serves as a valuable resource for news to many of my constituents.

Congratulations to the Reading Eagle and its staff on this exciting milestone and thank you for providing community news, great local content, national news, and providing transparency and accountability of government at all levels for the betterment of our democracy.

In spite of all of the competing sources of information and evolving technology of today, the Reading Eagle remains the greater Berks region’s go-to source for reliable local news and information.

IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the many people around the country who have supported the cause of impeachment.

I rise to thank the many Members of the House. Today, 66 voted to advance the cause of impeachment. Previously, 58 voted to advance the cause.

I rise to thank all who have been supportive and who are advancing the cause to protect democracy, to protect the Republic, and to make sure that what we have is never eliminated from the face of the Earth, and that is the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

PROTECTING LIFE

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day where tens of thousands of people come to Washington, D.C., to march for the sanctity of life for the real purpose of speaking up for those who can’t speak for themselves.

Each year, we see an unbelievable number of people coming to not only proclaim what a pro-life position is, but to make sure that we once again return to our roots of protecting life and knowing that every life is precious.

Sadly, much of the Main Street media will not be covering this today; but in this House, on this day, let us know that, indeed, we are still one nation under God and willing to protect life.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives to carry on some of the discussion that is taking place around this city and around this country today on March for Life day.

It would take you back 45 years ago to January 22, 1973, when the case of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton came before the United States Supreme Court. They manufactured a legal opinion out of the emanations and conundrums to quote the decision that resulted in abortion on demand in this country. Some say abortions soared to as many as 6 million a year in some of those years in the 1970s.

America wasn’t ready for such a decision. We didn’t understand, in 1973, the magnitude of the decision the Supreme Court handed down. Yet, we were going to open up abortion. We suspected it would be abortion on demand. We did not expect that, 45 years later, we would be here in this city still marching, marching for life, marching to protect the lives of the unborn, and praying in most, if not every single church in America, to defend innocent, unborn human life.

Some of the questions that have come before us in that period of time as two generations of Americans have grown up with the guilt of abortion, with the shadow hanging over our heads, two generations of Americans have grown up having to answer this question: Is human life sacred? Is it the value, is it the measure that we put up when we evaluate all things we do?

Our Founding Fathers understood that when they laid out the original founding document of the Declaration of Independence. They wrote that we have the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, it is no coincidence that life is first in that list, Mr. Speaker. Our Founding Fathers understood that they were prioritized rights, that the right to life is paramount and that the right to life is sacred, but that liberty comes from God. He confers his God-given liberty on us, and we have to handle it responsibly. And behind that came pursuit of happiness.

Now I will take it from the bottom up, Mr. Speaker.

Pursuit of happiness was understood differently by our Founders than I think we understand it today. It seems to me that, if you go into a high school classroom, those who have been studying our founding documents—our Declaration and our Constitution and the Federalist Papers—and ask them what does “pursuit of happiness” mean, they
might say: "Well, a good tailgate party," or "a fun time with your friends," or any one of a number of other things that they do for recreation.

But, truthfully, Mr. Speaker, that is not how our Founding Fathers looked at that pursuit of happiness. They don't even call it the rich things when we draw from our families, exclusively. But they understood "pursuit of happiness" as the term is understood in Greek, which is the foundation for that term that they used to be our values.

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

Now, here is the comparison that I have drawn. The meter stick is the measure itself of distance, but human life we are taught to value. It is a relatively vague moment of conception, that instant of conception, and we have to protect that life from that moment.

Anybody who has picked up a little baby, especially if it is your own, in awe at the miracle of this little child created in God's image from the DNA of mom and dad, to be nurtured and shaped, to live, to love, to learn, to lamp worship, to have children of his or her own, understands that miracle and how precious it is to us.

There are at least 500,000 couples in America that are waiting to adopt because they want a baby to love so badly. Yet we have had a million babies have been aborted since 1973, in the last 45 years: 60 million babies weighing on the conscience of America, a sin committed by the government of our country. There have been people complicit in this that have advocated for it.

Just a little bit ago, we had the vote on the Born-Alive bill here on the floor that enhances the penalty. If an abortionist isn't successful on the first try, what they often do is put that baby in a cold room and close the door and let that baby die in that cold room. There are other more ghastly methods that get used as well.

We moved legislation here on the floor to statutorily protect that baby that survives the abortion. In essence, what it really says in the end is this: If you try to end the life of this baby through abortion and fail, we are going to punish you if you try again. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is nearly enough. I think it is a start, but it is not nearly enough. Actually, we need to be accelerating our pace in incrementalism, not taking our foot off the throttle on the incremental approach to ending abortion.

So in 45 years, 2 generations, 60 million babies. I am glad we have passed the legislation that is a premier piece of legislation that is going to end even one abortion. Instead, it might end some of the killing of babies. So it is a step forward in keeping our defense of life, but it doesn't say nearly enough about our defense of life.

Through the time that I have been here in this pro-life movement in Iowa and here in this Congress, 2 decades altogether, I have gone from trying to get legislation passed that required that if a young mother was
seeking an abortion—a minor mother was seeking an abortion—that she needed to have parental notification. That was about all we could get back when I started on this in 1996. Notify a parent, even then they defined the parent as, well, she can notify a mom or a dad, a stepparent, a grandmother, a father or a grandfather, an aunt or an uncle, a brother or a sister in the whole or half blood.

That is how Planned Parenthood lobbied to define that parent who would be notified. Child mother was going to get an abortion. There is still not parental consent in my State, but, instead, it is parental notification with this long list of what a parent is: a father, a mother, a guardian, a legal guardian—those are okay—then grandparents, aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters in the whole or half blood.

I said: You left out the neighbor, the family cat or the family dog. Couldn’t you just name everything as a parent? Maybe you can tell an ethical and arthritic and a snoring neighbor and put it in a safety deposit box, and they could open up the archives in 100 years, and that would be the notice, for all the impact they had.

They did everything to restrict anything that would protect an innocent unborn baby. That is what it was like in 1996 for me in my State.

So through that time, we have marched through this march of incrementalism.

Prior to that, God bless Henry Hyde. From where I stand and from the floor of this House, time after time he stood up and he defended life. The Hyde amendment, along with the Mexico City policy, over the effect of these many years along the way, has cumulatively saved somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 million lives. Now, that sounds like a big number, 2 million lives, and it makes me feel good about Henry Hyde.

I remember going to his funeral and saying good-bye to Henry. I know that if there is anybody who has stood here and talked at the podium who is in heaven, it is Henry Hyde. The number one pro-life activist, effective worker here as a former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, he used the tools of his job and his character and his faith to save roughly 2 million lives.

Then I try to figure out: How many others did we save with the incrementalism that we have? I was involved in the effort. I want to tip my hat to STEVE CHABOT, who was the chairman of the Constitution Committee at that time when I came to this Congress, and we had the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. That was passed out of this Congress and written into law, but they litigated that to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court came down and turned it down in a decision that said you can’t ban partial-birth abortion because that procedure is written too vaguely within the law; therefore, the physician—put that in quotes, the “physician”—can’t determine exactly what is lawful and what isn’t. On top of that, we hadn’t determined that a partial-birth abortion is never necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we went back to work and we rewrote that legislation to conform with the Supreme Court’s “no” decision. We wrote that legislation to conform with the ghastly act of partial-birth abortion in law. We held multiple hearings. Through the course of that, we established congressional findings that a partial-birth abortion was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we went back to work on the House. The Hyde amendment, and that went back out again, where it was litigated, that was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother. So we went back to work on the House. The Hyde amendment, and that went back out again, where it was litigated, and that went back out again, where it was litigated.

We also have legislation waiting here in the Senate, Senate Democrats are blocking piece after piece of legislation, but a couple of months ago we passed the legislation over to the Senate that, as we call it, Pain-Capable, or the 20-week abortion ban, and that legislation is the legislation I mentioned a few minutes ago. We have determined that a baby can feel pain. We have evidence of them screaming and struggling to get away from the surgeon’s tools, and we have got the testimony of abortionists that tell us how a baby struggles and exhibits pain.

Many of you, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have seen the surgery that was being conducted on about a 7-month gestation. You mentioned an abortion, and that legislation is the legislation I mentioned a few minutes ago. We have determined that a baby can feel pain. We have evidence of them screaming and struggling to get away from the surgeon’s tools, and we have got the testimony of abortionists that tell us how a baby struggles and exhibits pain.

Many of you, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have seen the surgery that was being conducted on about a 7-month gestation. You mentioned an abortion, and that legislation is the legislation I mentioned a few minutes ago. We have determined that a baby can feel pain. We have evidence of them screaming and struggling to get away from the surgeon’s tools, and we have got the testimony of abortionists that tell us how a baby struggles and exhibits pain.

Of course they are.

So we in this House banned abortion after 20 weeks under the definition that they are capable of feeling pain. That is a step in the right direction and it is a pretty big chunk of incrementalism as well that goes further than maybe anything that has come off the floor of this House so far.

We also have legislation waiting here that has pieces of incrementalism, but the Born-Alive legislation that passed this morning here is incrementalism, and it is a small incrementalism that actually doesn’t stop a single abortion, but does put a statement down on the value of that baby.

The incrementalism here that prohibits sex-selected abortion, because we are seeing now with ultrasound that you can determine at an early stage whether it is a boy or whether it is a girl. We have people who say: Well, I think I will abort the girl because I want my first child to be a boy. I will take my chances the next time.

How do you do that? How do you do that? If you believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms, how can you take the life of a little baby and say, “I don’t want this child to be the sibling to my next child because it is a girl instead of a boy?” or, and less often, “a boy instead of a girl.”

We know what that has done statistically in China with the one-child policy in China, which they have just lifted to some degree, and you have family after family that will abort any pregnancy that is not a boy because they want a boy to carry on the name.

I have a former constituent named Gill Copper, now passed away. Gill Copper was one of Merrill’s Marauders who fought down out of the Asian subcontinent in the Second World War. For a while, he was stationed in India, and there, under the Ganges River that goes through New Delhi, India, I believe that is the river—but he would go down and wait under that bridge, especially towards evening, and he would just stand in the water, say, up to here, and he would listen and watch and listen for the splash. When he heard the splash, he knew what brought that about. The splash was, many times, a little girl baby who was being thrown off the bridge into the river because they didn’t want a little girl. Gill Copper would swim out there, in that dirty river, get aboard that little baby, bring that baby and swim back to shore with that baby, dry that baby off, get that baby breathing, and carry that baby down to the orphanage and start that baby’s life there.

He saved dozens and dozens of little girl babies by posting himself in that river in India, as a warrior defending our freedom in the Second World War, and he became a pro-life activist. He already was. He came back to America a pro-life activist.

I want to do all we can to support his sacrifice in his memory, and in Henry Hyde’s, and in Joe Pitts’, and in CHINTS SMITH’s, and in TRENT FRANKS’. Those are the names of the people who have led on this issue since I have been in this Congress and before. All of them deserve a special place in all of our heads and hearts for the work that they have done.

We are also place now where the pieces of legislation that have come through this House of Representatives and have been sent to the Senate, or are poised to come through this House and sent to the Senate, now it comes through this House: to write the bill that puts an end to sex-selected abortion. Let’s see. We have no sex-selected abortion, and Pain-Capable legislation has already passed.
And then Chris Smith has legislation that prohibits abortion on the dismemberment. To describe this, Mr. Speaker, is also ghoulish and ghastly, and that is the process of the dismemberment abortion, where the surgeon with a special scalpel, and forceps and grips a part of a baby and pulls—we had a doctor who had committed I don’t know how many thousands of abortions describes this before the Judiciary Committee—and pull with very strong force, pull hard and come out with an arm or a leg or a part of a torso, and arrange those pieces in a stainless steel pan to see if he got all the pieces of the baby who he was tearing apart.

Chris Smith’s legislation stops that ghastly process. It doesn’t end abortion, but it ends the ghastly process of dismemberment abortion, and I support that legislation. In fact, I have signed on to every piece of pro-life legislation that has gone through this House of Representatives, unless I just missed one somewhere. I believe it is every single one.

But as I watched this incrementalism take place, I have always looked for, when do the stars align themselves right? How do we get to this place where we do what we know is true, and right, and just? When will it be aligned right?

And the alignment, we have known this for 45 years. We can save these lives, those who will be aborted in the future; we can save them if we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives that is willing to take action, if we have a pro-life majority in the United States Senate that can figure out how to get past the 60-vote filibuster rule, if we have a President who will sign the legislation, and if we have a Supreme Court that will uphold that legislation.

Four windows, Mr. Speaker, four windows we need to have open. And they almost have to be open, they have to be open in sequence, and they have to be open in the right time.

So, today, we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives that is willing to take action, if we have a pro-life majority in the United States Senate that can figure out how to get past the 60-vote filibuster rule, if we have a President who will sign the legislation, and if we have a Supreme Court that will uphold that legislation.

The Senate has a pro-life majority. They don’t have, yet, a way to get past that roadblock of the filibuster; except, all Mitch McConnell needs to do is go out there and make a motion to amend the rule, by suspending or deleting the filibuster rule, and that can pass by a simple majority in the United States Senate. So he needs is 51 votes. And I will bet you Mike Pence would fly back from the Middle East to cast that 51st vote if it meant opening up the door to save these lives and put an end to the discretion of aborting babies because they happen to be inconvenient, or for other purposes.

So the House is ready. The Senate has a pro-life majority. They have got to get past the filibuster. The President will sign legislation to save lives; and he is giving a speech, maybe about now, talking about the value of innocent, unborn human life.

We have never had such a pro-life President. I will say this twice—we have never, never had such a pro-life Vice President, Mike Pence, who sat next to me on my elbow on the Judiciary Committee for, I believe it was, 10 years. I understand his convictions, and I know where he stands. He understands the President. I understand the President’s convictions.

We need to get legislation to the President’s desk. What a tragedy if we failed to move when we had the chance to move. What a tragedy if we weren’t bold when we had the opportunity to be bold. What a tragedy if we are stuck in the rut of incrementalism and this little, dinky war of attrition that goes on between factions here within the House and within the Senate. When do we know what is the true, right, and just thing to do.

But I have described how we have to be precise in the way we draft legislation that prohibits practices; it prohibits all of his other favorite things. And we have to determine the rationale for our decisions here in the House and in the Senate.

So I drafted legislation a year and a half ago, and it is called the Heartbeat Protection Act. The Heartbeat Protection Act is H.R. 430, and it does this: it directs that, if an abortionist is planning to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is the center of the legislation. It is only a few pages. It is not complex. We stripped it down so it was clean and everybody could understand it.

We define the check for the heartbeat to be within the parameters of modern medicine. We can determine a heartbeat, we know the heart will beat as early as 18 days, but it can be determined with confidence at about 6 weeks. So the 20-week bill is the Pain-Capable. This Heartbeat bill can be thought of in, say, roughly 6 weeks from conception. But our definition is the heartbeat, not any time frame. The heartbeat is precise.

You can say then to the Supreme Court, we are not going to change the life of the baby if their heart is beating. We can determine whether the heart is beating or not.

One hundred percent of the time that a baby’s heart is beating, you have got a live baby; and so we know if we stop that beating heart, we have ended the life of a baby. It is really clear and simple, and it doesn’t take a Rhodes Scholar to figure that out, even at the Supreme Court level.

It is within our hearts, and I look across the country, w在这里面, and the miles and thousands and thousands of miles, that I have driven over the last 45 years, and each year, I see more and more of the billboards up, many of them put up by the Knights of Columbus, that say, “Abortion Stops a Beating Heart,” or “We All Start Small.”

They have gotten into our heads and into our conscience and into the culture of America. Those billboards, we know what that says. It defines these little innocents. They might be the ones who produce the miracles going forward. Every one of them is a miracle; every one of them created in God’s image.

We have never had a law where abortion stops a beating heart, and we have all heard that rhythm of the ultrasound. We have all heard that sound of a beating heart. If the rules didn’t prohibit it, I would take out my iPhone and play this into the microphone because I have got one of those glorious things that is really close to me in my iPhone right now, the beating of that little heart, 158 beats per minute, a healthy, healthy little child. I have had them played to me by constituents who want me to listen, and they will show me the ultrasound.

I have a district representative who framed the first ultrasound for his firstborn, and that little guy now—that that ultrasound has been in his home for all these years. That little guy now, his name is Joseph Dean Anderson, is 9 years old, and he is my godson. His first picture is of his ultrasound. It is still framed, it is still cherished by his parents, and he is a cute little boy. These lives are utterly precious.

They are the future of our country. Today, we have 102 million Americans who are working, they are of working-age, simply not in the workforce.

We are hearing debates here and in the Senate going on this week and next week, and many weeks thereafter, about how we don’t have a workforce in America to do the work; so we have to go to foreign countries and bring people who bring with them a different culture, which, if they embrace ours, is fine. They will assimilate to Americanism.

But we have got a large segment of America that is coaching them not to do that, to stick with the old ways, rather than our ways. There is a consequence to that that is for another discussion, another time, Mr. Speaker. But I will submit this: 60 million babies aborted since Roe v. Wade in 1973. Roughly half of those women went back through this decade by decade and did the math to calculate how many babies would those 30 million girls who would have grown by now, many of them into women, how many babies would they have had?

By my measure—and it is back-of-the-envelope only, but it is all we really need to understand the concept—another 60 million. We are not only missing 60 million babies in this country who were aborted since Roe v. Wade, we are missing another 60 million babies who were not born because their mothers were aborted. Now that is 120 million Americans who are missing,
and they weigh on our conscience. That is a third of our population, or 320 million Americans.

So I can say to a school auditorium, to two girls, two boys, or to a boy and a girl, I can say: You two look at each other and that look at each other.

And then I will say: Do you know what’s missing? Your classmate. Your friend would be sitting between you now if it had not been for abortion.

For every two we have, there is another. They would be sitting between two Americans we have, there is another one that would be sitting in between that would have needed a pair of shoes and a ball glove and maybe a dance contest costume, all the little things that come from little boys and girls, all the joy and all the laughter.

Can you imagine shutting down a third of the laughter in a country? Or can you think about what America would be like if we were a country that we just stopped having babies? I mean, it is gone and we would not get new babies in America. That means the 1-year-olds would be where we get the giggles and the laughs from. They laugh and giggle for a few more years, and by the time they get into their twenties, that would have gone.

They don’t have any children, remember. They don’t have children to love; so their joy is going to be less. And as they get older, the hope would been gone because what would you be preparing for, except your own death?

But we live for the next generation, and I want that next generation, all of them, to be born. I want them to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to play, to work, to be parents, to have children of their own, to raise those siblings, to broker the disagreements that come along with that, to develop themselves and feel how full you are when you are a person that is completely gifted by the blessings of children and grandchildren.

But that has been snuffed out by shortsightedness because of the permissibility of the Supreme Court decision in 1973, Roe v. Wade, and Doe v. Bolton. And we are here in this town today marching from the Mall to the Supreme Court Building for. I guess it would be technically, the 44th time.

What did we accomplish? Some things. We supported Henry Hyde, the Hyde amendment. The Mexico City policy has saved about 2 million lives. We banned partial-birth abortion. We have passed a bill out of the House of Representatives that bans abortion after 20 weeks, when we believe that they are—and they are—pain-capable of suffering the greatest pain of abortion. We have done that.

But we sit here with the Heartbeat bill. It is the strongest, best supported pro-life bill at this stage of it that is before the United States House of Representatives ever. Even Pain-Capable came in to the announcement that there would be a floor vote on it with about 151 or 153 signatures on it.

The Heartbeat bill—which requires the abortionist to check for a beating heart, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected—has today 170 cosponsors on it. It has another good, long list of people who say: I am not ready to sign on, but if you put it on the floor, I will vote for it.

We can pass that bill off the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate. And if there are those who think, “Well, we don’t want to let the Heartbeat bill get ahead of the Pain-Capable bill,” I don’t know why we wouldn’t do that. I think that is a better policy, actually, and anybody who wants to save lives ought to be for that. But if that is their decision, fine. The Heartbeat bill can push the Pain-Capable bill out onto the floor of the Senate and there can be a debate and a vote on Pain-Capable, the 20-week bill, in the Senate.

But there is no debate going on over there today. They don’t have pro-life legislation moving through the United States Senate today. It is blocked up and balled up because they have a filibuster, a little protection of life, by the way. But if all this United States Senate can do on March for Life day is to bring a bill that deals with post-abortion, born-alive, saving those babies, I am glad we did it. We should have done another bill. We should have done the Heartbeat bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances are this. The whip team for the Heartbeat bill deserves a lot of credit. Janet Porter, Faith2Action, deserves a lot of credit. She’s a driving force on this, Mr. Speaker.

Our former whip and majority leader, Tom DeLay from Texas, has been working pro bono on this case for a long time, for a good year. He has been strategizing on that. He has been pulling votes together on it. His greatest regret as a now-retired majority leader in the United States House of Representatives is that he wasn’t able to end abortion while he was the leader here in the House.

And his word to our leadership here and to all of us is: Don’t let this opportunity get away from you. This is the best opportunity. This is the best scenario. The window is open with a pro-life majority, and they are a pro-life majority in the Senate. The President will sign the bill, and the Vice President will stand next to him, feeling good about it.

By the way, the Vice President and his wife, Karen, will probably hold hands and get married right before an act like that would happen.

And the Supreme Court is poised for one or two more appointments to that Supreme Court; and those appointments being, I expect, consistent with President Trump’s pledge that he will make those nominations out of the list that was produced by The Federalist Society and confirmed and supported by The Heritage Foundation and by other people, pro-life activists within this Congress and across this country. The selection that President Trump made out of those 21 potential Justices to the Supreme Court was excellent.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better choice, in my view. And one of the things that I think is important that goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is some, I will say, very solidly confirmed back-channel information is this: that the White House interviewed all 20 or 21 of those candidates for the Supreme Court. Out of those, they asked the same question of each one of them. And it was this, Mr. Speaker: If it is not going to be you as the nominee to the Supreme Court, who is the best possible person?

Every other candidate, every other Judge under consideration for appointment to become a Supreme Court Justice, said: If it is not to be me, it needs to be Neil Gorsuch.

We are going to be very happy with his process and his finish that he makes for us, and I have a lot of reasons to have great confidence in him. But I offer that for consideration, Mr. Speaker.

But our job here needs to be all we can do. When the window is open, we have got to go through that window. The window is open to pass the Heartbeat bill now. 170 cosponsors. We have 129 national organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is close to unanimous across the entire movement in this country as it could possibly be.

So with 170 cosponsors and another high number of those who say, “I will vote for it, put it on the floor,” the vast majority of the Pro-Life Caucus wants it to come to the floor, the vast majority of the Values Action Team wants it to come to the floor. I actually don’t know who the dissenters are here in the House that say it is a bad idea to have the Heartbeat bill in law.

There are a couple here that disagree with the strategy, but they don’t disagree with the policy, at least on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

So when the leadership tells the top pro-life organizations in the country, “You must be unanimous in this and be on the same page,” and when one organization says, “I don’t want to see this moved,” then we have a problem. We have a problem because the will of the people needs to be reflected here in the House of Representatives.

This is a republican form of government by constitution. The Constitution guarantees a republican form of
government, which means a representative form of government. That is, each one of us who have been elected here has a district of about 750,000 people, and it is our job to draw from them their best ideas and couple them with the principle that we have a duty to stand firm on here and bring those ideas into the House of Representatives, and then let those ideas, out of 435 congressional districts, compete against each other so that the best ideas rise to the top.

The other organization is National Right to Life. National Right to Life is unanimously supported by the top three pro-life organizations in the country. I will name them. I count them all as friends— people who are go-to people who I can talk to the next election. If we get to the point where we have to wait until the Supreme Court is ready. It wasn't our fault that the window closed in the House or the Senate, or the Presidency.

When you have the opportunity to move the agenda, you move the agenda. We have the opportunity to do that. And it is de facto veto power right now that the National Right to Life has become. That is the de facto veto that arrises put together some years ago that says these top three pro-life organizations have to all be in agreement before we are going to move any legislation off the floor of the House.

Why would any Speaker grant de facto authority to an outside organization, none of whom have been elected in this republican form of government? Why would that be allowed to trump the will of the people? Why would that even be considered an управляемый over the judgment of the vast majority of the Republican Conference in the House of Representatives? How can we say to any one of those 170: Your opinion doesn't matter at all because you don't have the unanimous enthusiasm of the top three pro-life organizations in the country?

It comes back to National Right to Life. They put out a statement that says: We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. The other side of that coin is, and it is the same coin: We do not support the Heartbeat bill. That is the message.

That is the message that Speaker Ryan gets, and that is why this bill wasn't on the floor today. It is the blockage that comes from inactivity. And all that needs to happen is David O'Steen or Carol Tobias needs to pick up the phone, call Speaker Paul Ryan and say: Call my office if you like, and I will patch you through—and say: Do you know what? We want to move it while we have got the chance.

The window is open in the House of Representatives. You don't have to do a single thing beyond that. You don't have to whip the bill. You don't have to go visit any Members. You don't have to spend a single dime of those hard-earned dollars that are being raised in the pro-life movement except for the cost of the phone call, and I will pay for it.

Call the Speaker. Call Leader McCarthy and say: Do you know what? We do think it is a good idea.

Instead of saying: We do not oppose, when really it is you do not support, all you have to do is say: Let that bill go.

Just like Charlton Heston as Moses, let our people go. Let those little babies with heartbeats live. Get a bill out of the House to the Senate, and then let's turn the pressure up in the Senate. It isn't going to happen unless we take the first step like a little baby that is wobbling and tottering. They
learn to walk. They need a chance to get that chance to walk.

We need to be able to move the bill off the floor of the House of Representatives. This isn’t a stretch for public opinion. The public opinion is with us. In fact, the polling has been a little higher in support for H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill. It is even a little higher than it is on the 20-week Pain-Capable one, which has been out there. They have been working on it for years, and I respect that and appreciate it.

But there isn’t some kind of a rule that says you have to struggle for years before your bill can be heard. The strongest and best ideas that have weathered the debate need to come forward and be moved off the floor of the House of Representatives.

Here is what it is: 170 Members signed on; 129 organizations or leaders support the bill. I don’t know why one group has veto power, de facto veto authority over this bill. We need a vote on the Heartbeat bill, and it is now being blocked because of that inaction.

One phone call, or, if they just wanted to post on their website, instead of “we do not oppose the Heartbeat bill,” just post on there “we now support the Heartbeat bill.” God bless them if they will do that, because things will move.

Now, this Heartbeat bill is the most popular pro-life bill that is pending in the House of Representatives today, and it has been for a long time, for almost this whole Congress. It prevents about 95 percent of the abortions. And this does push the Senate. It pushes Pain-Capable off of Mr. McClintock’s desk and perhaps to the floor of the Senate for a vote. It moves the agenda. It helps the other pieces of legislation as well.

Here is a polling, though, Mr. Speaker, that I think should give people some indication that is pending in the House of Representatives today, and it has been for a long time, for almost this whole Congress. It prevents about 95 percent of the abortions. And this does push the Senate. It pushes Pain-Capable off of Mr. McClintock’s desk and perhaps to the floor of the Senate for a vote. It moves the agenda. It helps the other pieces of legislation as well.

This is a Barna poll that took place last year—not that long ago—and here is how it breaks down by party, in case people are worried about that: 86 percent of Republicans support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. 55 percent of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. A majority of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, 55 percent, and 61 percent of Independents.

When you put that all together and you match it up for the demographics—so the percentages that are Democrat versus Independents and Republicans—and you merge that together, 69 percent support the Heartbeat bill. That is a little better than the 20-week Pain-Capable bill. People understand this.

That beating heart is in our hearts, and we are worried about that. I would say to National Right to Life, whose mission statement almost commands them to support the Heartbeat bill, you ought to amend your mission statement or support the Heartbeat bill.

Here is one of their founders, a founder of the pro-life movement and the founder and former president of National Right to Life. He has been passionate—sadly—he surely did his part, Dr. John C. Willke. Here is what he had to say:

“When I founded the pro-life movement, it wasn’t to regulate how abortions would be done. It hadn’t brought the abortion killing to an end. We have waited too long, and that wait has cost us too much”—Dr. John C. Willke.

Take this back to 1973. The missions there were to end abortion. And yet we are stuck in a rut of incrementalism, moving a tiny little bit at a time. We saved 2 million lives in all of this—maybe a few more than 2 million lives, no more—and we watched 60 million babies be aborted. And I am hearing the argument of, well, we really can’t move Heartbeat because it is not ready, and we don’t know if there are going to be any retirements in the Supreme Court.

I know there will be retirements in the Supreme Court. I am certain of it. There will be that. There are these three ways out of the Supreme Court, and those folks who were there 100 years ago aren’t there now. So we know there is going to be a change in the Court.

What we will know is this Court may well uphold Heartbeat because it is more precisely written and more carefully drafted, and it answers the right kind of questions. I think it has a better chance of being upheld before the Supreme Court than Pain-Capable.

But those who pushed Pain-Capable, 20-week didn’t have those reservations on their bill, but they seem to wonder about this one and say we shouldn’t move Heartbeat until we have another appointment to the Supreme Court. What do they want? Well, perhaps the window closes in the House or the Senate or Presidency. Sitting here twiddling our thumbs and watching babies be aborted at a rate of—oh, by the way, I did get this piece from National Right to Life in a conversation just yesterday that, when they began this effort, there were as many as 6 million abortions a year in America—I hadn’t heard that number before, and I didn’t go back to verify it, but that is what my ears heard yesterday—and we have now gotten that number down to under 1 million abortions a year. That is considered progress, and it is progress.

Then he gave me the exact number 900-and-some thousand abortions last year. I didn’t commit that number to memory, but it means something different to me. That is 1 million abortions a year, every year. That means, in 45 years, we will have another 45 million young lives on our conscience.

And that 60 million abortions for today turns into 105 million abortions if we just double the time span from Roe v. Wade another 45 years.

And to take pride in getting it down to less than 1 million, as if that is a milestone, troubles me considerably. It might not have if I had just only heard it in that context, but I heard it in a different context 4 or 5 months ago, standing over here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

There is a gentlewoman from the Democratic Party who is one who really, there are only a couple of pro-life people over here anymore, so you know that she is not pro-life. She and I have the same reason why I haven’t my thumb on my lapel, and I told her it was for the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, and I want to protect these babies. From the moment a heartbeat can be detected, the baby must be protected. And she said: I don’t know why you want to do that, STEVE. We have got abortions down to under 1 million a year.

I said: I want to save them all. I want to save every single one of them. That is why I am going to wear this on my lapel. We will get them.

But it was stunning to me that she would say that, being a pro-choice Representative here in the United States House of Representatives. And when I match that up with almost the same thing from a leadership in the Democratic Right to Life, I think: We have got to take a fresh look. They are too stuck in their ways. We will never get to the end of abortion if we are married to tiny incrementalism. We have an obligation to take the opportunity that God has given us and the voters have given us and act on them.

I would go to personhood, the moment of conception, and do that in an instant if we could get that done, but we can’t define medically and precisely that moment of conception. But we have defined medically and precisely the heartbeat. That is our marker, the heartbeat in that ultrasound.

We had a little witness come before the Constitution subcommittee, which I chair. We held a hearing on the Heartbeat bill. And this little guy was the youngest witness to testify in the history of the United States Congress, I believe. He is an 18-week developed little boy in his mother’s womb. And we had the ultrasound sitting next to his mother, but the tape of the ultrasound that they had taken hours before.

This little boy’s name is Lincoln Glenn Miller. And this little guy, we showed his ultrasound and we showed him there in his mother’s womb, and we listened to his heartbeat. His arm was out like this. And I said into the microphone, “Lincoln, will you move your arm?” and, in an instant, he jerked his arm toward his mouth. And I said, “Lincoln, can you suck your thumb?” and, in a moment, he put his thumb in his mouth and began to suck his thumb.

And I said, a little bit later, “Lincoln, can you talk to us?” and you can see his mouth moving as if he is trying to talk in this ultrasound on the big screen in the United States Congress in
the House Judiciary Committee, the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee. We watched this little guy, Lincoln Glenn Miller, testify to the humanity of an 18-week developed little child. We know this life begins at the moment of conception. We know that, if you have to check for that heartbeat, it is awfully hard to lie about it when you have to keep the records. We know that it has gotten into our conscience that abortion stops a beating heart, and we all, in our mind’s ear, can hear that rhythm of that beating heart.

I used 158 beats per minute. That is what is in my iPhone right now. And I can listen to that little baby as that little baby grows and develops. I want to see all of these babies grow and develop. I want to see every one of them come to birth and full term. I pray that they are mentally healthy and that they are physically healthy, and I don’t have any more asks after that.

Boys or girls, God, bring them to me in whatever order they might come, but let’s get them born and let’s take care of them and nurture them in mind, in body, and in faith, as our Founding Fathers envisioned when they wrote the language into our Declaration of Independence and prioritized life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

God bless them. Let’s do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 001

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 1 o’clock and 1 minute a.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for Friday, January 19, 2018, after 6 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of family illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 17, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:
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BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. Davis of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. D’ANGELO, Mr. D’ALTON, Mr. DIETETTE, Mr. AL. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JACKSON of Michigan, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEES, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MCGROROR, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SIEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana)

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the requirements for secure geological storage of carbon dioxide in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. SAMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALAZZO):
H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that amounts received by insured depository institutions, to exempt insured depository institutions and insured credit unions from the payday lending market, to clarify the ability of a State to adopt a one touch due process in order to prevent the enactment of certain provisions as part of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ESCH (for herself and Mr. MCKINLEY):
H.R. 4858. A bill to clarify section 224 of the Communications Act of 1934 as not limiting the ability of a State to adopt a one touch make ready policy for pole attachments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINTER (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):
H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make certain payments made by public service employees to qualify for public service repayment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 4860. A bill to relocate the headquarters of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLLSWORTH:
H.R. 4861. A bill to nullify certain guidance on deposit advance products, to require the Federal banking agencies to establish standards for short-term, small-dollar loans made by insured depository institutions, to exempt insured depository institutions and insured credit unions from the payday lending rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 4862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow section 529 education accounts to be used for homeschooling expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 4863. A bill to establish a competitive bidding process for the relocation of the headquarters of revolving funds to a Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. DAVIES):
H.R. 4864. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize unlawful flight to avoid prosecution into or from Indian country, to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NOLAN:
H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to establish a conservation practice-based pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4866. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage for medical assistance during periods in which the District of Columbia under the Medicaid Program to 80 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4867. A bill to clarify the definitions of certain terms relating to marriage under Federal law to prevent child marriages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SABLAN:
H.R. 4869. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. BERNIE SANDERS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. BUDD):
H.R. 4870. A bill to prohibit the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):
H.J. Res. 126. A joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Czechoslovakia on November 28, 1918; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AL. GREEN of Texas:
H. Res. 705. A resolution impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DANNY K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LAWRENCE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. MULITO):
H. Res. 706. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Women's Health Research Day" to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H. Res. 707. A resolution recognizing the growth and transformation of the Republic of Korea and its significant contributions to the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:
H.R. 4844. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 5—Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KILDEE:
H.R. 4845. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 4846. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Congress shall have power to establish post Offices and post Roads.

By Mr. OGLES:
H.R. 4847. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2—The Congress shall have power to regulate the Tribune of the States, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. GOHMERT:
H.R. 4848. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law."

By Mr. KILDEE:
H.R. 4849. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 8—"The Congress shall have power . . . [t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

By Mr. OGLES:
H.R. 4850. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereo.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 4850. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so constructed as to invest Congress with any Power to dispose of such Property, unless by专有 Grant of Congress.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCSALLY:
H.R. 4852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. RABIN:
H.R. 4853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:
H.R. 4854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power . . . Clause 17: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MESSIER:
H.R. 4862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSIER:
H.R. 4863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power . . . Clause 17: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 4865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARTwright:
H.R. 4855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CRAMER:
H.R. 4857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ESHHO:
H.R. 4858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 4859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 4860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 4861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the general welfare of the United States . . ." Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 4869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 4, 18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TENNEY:
H.R. 4870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, as set forth in the bill, as amended by the House of Representatives, and as approved by the Senate.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.J. Res. 126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 3 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:
H.J. Res. 127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Mrs. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 291: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 398: Mr. TIPPON.
H.R. 467: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 564: Ms. HANABURGER.
H.R. 630: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 719: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Ms. BERNACCI.
H.R. 731: Mr. CORREIA.
H.R. 807: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 820: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 850: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. RICK of South Carolina.
H.R. 858: Mrs. ARNOLD.
H.R. 911: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1149: Mr. PALAZZUCCO.
H.R. 1227: Mr. HECK and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1257: Mr. TEO LIU of California.
H.R. 1259: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1437: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1444: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1495: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1519: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1536: Mr. BEBA, Mrs. BEBA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. FAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1563: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. KOKITA.
H.R. 1596: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1696: Mr. LOBO.
H.R. 1883: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1789: Mr. WELCH, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1794: Mr. KILDNER, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1928: Mr. BEYER, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. HANABURGER, Ms. BARRA SAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. CRIST, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROBIN SCHUSTER, Mr. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. McKEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. NORTON, Mr. BEBA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSMER SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. MCMINN.
H.R. 1957: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1970: Mr. ROSSERT-DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2002: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 204: Mr. VRESEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KERTING, and Mr. KENT of Connecticut.
H.R. 2143: Mr. DESaulnier.
H.R. 2166: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GARZIT, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2215: Mr. CUREFOLO of Florida.
H.R. 2220: Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. GABBAD.
The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on us. As the clock ticks toward another deadline, inspire our lawmakers to be instruments of Your purposes. May they humbly seek to do what is best for our Nation and world, achieving together what cannot be done without allies.

Lord, give them the wisdom to see that there is a practical morality based on absolutes that they should follow. Remind them that they are accountable to You for their thoughts, words, and deeds. May they speak truth as You give them the ability to comprehend it, finding workable solutions to challenging problems.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITTO). The majority leader is recognized.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the deadline to fund the government is nearly upon us. The Senate is now just hours away from an entirely avoidable government shutdown. At midnight tonight, funding for programs that millions of Americans rely on—veterans services, opioid treatment centers, death benefits for the families of fallen soldiers, and health insurance for 9 million vulnerable children—would be thrown into limbo.

Last night the Senate began consideration of a bill passed by the House that would erase all of these threats. The bill keeps the Federal Government open. It extends the State Children’s Health Insurance Program, which provides coverage for 9 million children and low-income families for 6 years. This vote should be a no-brainer, and it would be, except that the Democratic leader has convinced his Members to filibuster any funding bill that doesn’t include legislation they are demanding for people who came into the United States illegally. What has been shoehorned into this discussion is an insistence that we deal with an illegal immigration issue.

He has insisted that he will not support any legislation at all for the American people no matter how non-controversial or how bipartisan unless we pass a bill on illegal immigration first. If that means shutting down the funding for veterans, military families, opioid treatment centers, and even Federal grants to his home State of New York, so be it. If it means throwing a wrench into the gears of the U.S. economy, just as Americans are starting to feel the benefits of historic tax reform, so be it. If it means failing to renew the Children’s Health Insurance Program, which the House-passed bill funded for a full 6 years, apparently that is just fine with those on the other side.

Nearly every Democrat in the House made the same demand. That has been their stated position: Nothing for hundreds of millions of Americans and no healthcare for 9 million vulnerable children until we solve a non-imminent issue related to illegal immigration. To even repeat this position out loud is to see how completely ridiculous it is.

Now that we are 13 hours away from a government shutdown that the Democrats would initiate and Democrats would own, the craziness of this seems to be dawning on my friend the Democratic leader. Perhaps it is remembering his own words from 2013. Here is what he said back then about threatening a government shutdown.

No matter how strongly one feels about an issue, you shouldn’t hold millions of people hostage. . . that’s wrong.

A few days later, the Democratic leader added:

It’s sort of like this. Someone goes into your house, takes your wife and children hostage, and then says, “Let’s negotiate over the price of your house.”

He went on to say.

We’re shutting down the government, we’re not gonna raise the debt ceiling until you pass immigration reform. It would be governmental chaos.

Now maybe he is remembering those words today because now he is saying: Never mind, I really didn’t mean it, and he himself is calling for an even shorter short-term funding bill. Of course, his last-ditch proposals would do nothing for the Children’s Health Insurance Program or the 9 million children who are waiting on us to renew it. What is more, the incredibly short-term continuing resolutions he is now proposing do not meet any of the demands—none of them—that he and his own conference and Democrats in the House have been making for weeks. None of that would be solved in a short-term CR—the stuff they have been calling for.

So apparently now he wants his Members to default on their own demands. He has spent days apparently persuading all of his colleagues to insist that we cannot pass another continuing resolution. Now he wants them to pass one. He spent weeks getting his Members to proclaim that we should not do anything to fund the government unless we address the DACA issue, and now apparently he is calling
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on them to do just that. These incred-

ibly short-term extensions would not
even give us enough time to actually
write the legislation the Democratic
leader is demanding. One extremely
short-term CR would lead to another
and another—exactly the outcome
Democrats have declared they cannot
accept.

Now, I wish for all of our sakes that
the Democratic leader would figure out
what he actually wants. I feel bad for
his one Mem. It has been painted them
into a corner, but still very exactly for
the American people whose govern-
ment the Democrats are threatening to
shut down and the 9 million children
whose health insurance could be
thrown into jeopardy because Senate
Democrats cannot get their story
straight.

Now, my friend the Democratic lead-
er now wants his Members to pass a
bill that allows SCHIP to expire. Ap-
parently he wants every Demo-
crat in the House of Representatives to
break their word and pass a separate
funding bill of his own that does not
address the illegal immigration issue
they said they must have. So let’s
think about this for a minute. First, he
leads his own troops into a box canyon,
and then tells them it was really all
for nothing. Maybe it is time to come
back to reality.

We already have a bill that we know
can pass the House because it already
did. We have a bill that we know the
President will sign into law because he
has already committed to do just that.
We know that with one noncontrover-
sial and bipartisan vote we can keep
the government up and running. We

House, the Republicans, through their
appointees, have a pretty decisive edge
when it comes to the U.S. Supreme
Court. In other words, when you look
across the spectrum of the three
branches of government, the Repub-
licans are in control.

What are they offering us? The
forth CR. Now, CR is Washington
talk. It is a continuing resolution.
What does it mean? It means that the
Republican majority has failed in 119
days to produce a budget for the United
States of America. The Republican ma-
jority in the House of Representatives
with their President—has failed to come
up with a blueprint for spending for this
great Nation that we serve and are
pride to be part of.

Their fourth failure to produce a
budget in this fiscal year, which began
last year, is before us now. Was it
negotiated between as well as Republicans
and Democrats? No. It was produced in the
House of Representatives and with the
Senate. It was passed there by the

We well, you say, at least we are going
to keep the lights on. And that is all a
continuing resolution does—keeps the
lights on. It doesn’t allow agencies to
make important decisions that invest
taxpayer’s dollars wisely and save tax-
payers’ dollars.

If we are going to change this men-
tality of never producing a budget,
ever producing appropriations bills—
kinds of stumbling into the fiscal year
for month after weary month—if that
is the new normal, we are done on
us. And shame on the majority party,
the Republicans, for saying that is the
best they can do. We can do better.

We need to get beyond this world of
continuing resolutions, and we need to
get into a world where we actually
make a decision that is good for the
taxpayers, as well as the security of

Once, the current debate isn’t just
about it.

If we are going to change this men-
tality of never producing a budget,
ever producing appropriations bills—
kind of stumbling into the fiscal year
for month after weary month—if that
is the new norm, we are done on
us. And shame on the majority party,
the Republicans, for saying that is the
best they can do. We can do better.

We need to get beyond this world of
continuing resolutions, and we need to
get into a world where we actually
make a decision that is good for the
taxpayers, as well as the security of

Once, the current debate isn’t just
about it.
Donald Trump announced he was eliminating this program. As that protection is eliminated, as their 2-year protection expires, yes, they move into illegal categories. So are they illegal technically after they have lost DACA? Yes. Does the President have the authority? President Trump caused it by his announcement on September 5 that this program is finished by March 5. That is the reality.

Do you know what he also told us? I am going to end this program. Now I challenge you in Congress to pass a law to replace it.

So what has the Republican majorities in the House and Senate done in the 4½ months since we received that challenge from President Trump? Nothing.

Then I hear Senator McCONNELL say: We haven’t even seen a written proposal from the Democrats on this.

The Senator knows better. A group of us—a group of Democrats and three Republicans—accepted President Trump’s challenge and produced a bipartisan solution. We have described it to everyone, Democrat and Republican alike, as a good-faith effort, a real compromise and an option on both sides. It is ready. It is ready to be brought to the floor of the Senate. It is ready to be passed into law. For Senator McCONNELL to say he doesn’t know anything about it—I am sorry, but we have been very open about what is included in there. He knows it is a product of long and hard bipartisan work.

I would like to address another aspect of what he has said about these so-called illegal immigrants. Last night, after using that term, I noticed the Gallery was filled over here with young people who appeared to be, at first glance, here to watch the debate on the Dream Act, the debate on DACA. After the meeting of the Senate Democrats on September 5 to end a program that allowed these young people to go to school and to work in the United States of America. It was President Trump who challenged us to do something about it, and we have done nothing—nothing. And that is the challenge we face. To say we are in no hurry—well, we may not be as Senators and Congressmen, but these young people are in a hurry to find out whether they have a life. That is what it comes down to.

There was an announcement just a few minutes ago from the House side. The Republican leadership in the House of Representatives—despite the fact that we do not have an agreement moving forward. They are going to leave Washington. I don’t know for how long, and I don’t know what they are going to do when they leave, but I would beg them: Don’t turn your backs on your responsibility right here in Washington. Work with us, to find a way to move forward.

We have come up with a proposal. It is a short-term, last-step continuing resolution of just a few days. I have been here for a while. If you give us the Senate and House a couple of weeks, it turns into a couple of months. If we do this in a matter of 3 or 4 days to reach an agreement on these key issues—everything included in the CR that we have before us and everything that should be—I think we will roll up our sleeves, get down to work, and do it. We don’t want to shut down this government. We want to solve the problems facing this government and this Nation. That means working together. Some Senator McCORNELL is not engaged in when it comes to this CR.

It is time for us as Democrats and Republicans to sit down in a room together and think about this great Nation and the frustration they have with our political system and those of us in political life. Nine out of ten—maybe even more—would say to us: For goodness’ sake, will you stop your fighting? Will you stop your bickering? Will you stop your debating? Will you go into a room together, like grownups and do something together for the good of this Nation?

That is what we are proposing—to sit down together for the good of this Nation and to move forward.

When he was asked just a few days ago, Senator McCONNELL said his biggest problem was that he didn’t know what President Trump wants. I can understand that. I have been in meetings with the President where he said one thing on a Thursday and a different thing on a Thursday and then he tweeted something entirely different the next morning. He is a moving target. When it comes to the policies and direction and leadership of this administration. We need to do our job, and I hope he will be part of it. I hope the President will join us. If he will, we can solve this problem. If he stands on the sidelines, we can’t.

I think we can find common ground. That is what the American people expect. We should give them nothing less. And of course we should solve the problems involving the Children’s Health Insurance Program, community clinics—especially in the opioid crisis, defense spending, and a sane approach, a reasonable approach when it comes to these young people who have become illegal because of the decision by President Trump on September 5 of last year.

Together, we can get this done but not if the House Republicans leave town. We need to continue to be here in Washington doing our job and making sure that we spend every waking moment serving the people who elected us.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I listened to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The Democrats never do anything wrong, do they? They are always right. I have to tell you, they do a lot of things that are wrong, and they are not always right. And this is a situation where they have literally pushed everybody in this country into the corner. Republicans want to do DACA. They want to take care of these young people. They have even interfered with that. I could go on and on.

All I can say is, I get a little sick of hearing some of these arguments that are made like they are holier than thou. They are not holier than thou; they are more political than thou.

I think it is time that we work together and get some things done here that make a difference in people’s lives and especially in these young DACA kids’ lives. We can do that, but we can’t do it by just Democrats saying: Well, we are just going to give them everything they want. We are not going to worry about U.S. laws or immigration laws or anything else, for that matter.

It is incredible to me. I have put up with this all these years in the Senate, and they get away with it because the media in this country is primarily focused on them and basically supports them. And they admit it. That is the thing that is really mind-boggling—the media admits it. And the reason they do it because they know they would be laughed out of town if they didn’t admit it.

All I can say is, we have a desire to resolve these problems in a reasonable and good manner. The majority leader has indicated that time after time. Politics always takes preference with our colleagues on the other side. They are good at it. They are really good at it, even though, if you really look at the
facts and you look behind what they are saying, it is a lot of bunk. Not all—I have worked with really top-notch Democrats in this body to do some of the most important legislation in this country’s history when they were willing to work together and really work with you. But politics sometimes is its ugly head almost every time in such a way that it is almost impossible to get anything done around here. I have to admit, we have some on our side who fit that mode, as well.

I just wish we could do a better job. There are some of us who would do a better job if we knew that there was a way of bringing both sides together.

Having said that, we are now just a few hours away from a government shutdown, unless, of course, enough Senators can find a way to come together in order to avert it. Unfortunately, it appears that our Democratic colleagues would prefer a shutdown to compromise. The Democrats have actively been working to get a result. They have their Members in line to vote against the alternative.

They have set the stage for a grand demonstration of their commitment. But for the life of me, I can’t see what they are doing. This is their latest gesture to their political base.

First of all, most of them don’t object to the substance of the House-passed continuing resolution. That bill would keep the government open and address a number of bipartisan healthcare priorities. I don’t know any Democrats who are against those. I am sure there may be some, but the rest of them, I think, are pretty much for it.

The bill before us includes what would be the longest extension of the Children’s Health Insurance Program in history. CHIP has given children and their families access to quality healthcare. Maybe I have a right to speak on CHIP since I am the author of the CHIP bill and I believe in it. I believe it has done so much good for our young people in this society. I really resent it being played politics with all the time, which our friends on the other side just can’t resist.

CHIP has given children and their families access to quality healthcare coverage for over two decades. It was founded on the belief that the health of our future is too important to be dragged down by the political bickering of the day. Approximately 9 million children depend on this critical program. It is important to me. After several months of uncertainty, those 9 million children deserve the peace of mind that comes with a long-term CHIP extension.

As I noted here on the floor the other day, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I have been working with my Democratic counterparts on a bipartisan CHIP extension bill for months now. The committee’s ranking member, Senator Wyden, and I introduced our initial bill earlier, last fall. That bill would have reauthorized CHIP for 5 years. It was promptly reported out of the Finance Committee with near-unanimous support. Then the Democrats decided to pretend that bill never existed.

As we worked through a crowded legislative calendar at the end of last year, aware of that efforts to reauthorize CHIP were ongoing. Yet many of our colleagues accused Republicans of neglecting vulnerable children.

I was leading the fight as one of the leading Republicans, as chairman of the Finance Committee, the author of the original bill, the one who has always voted for it. I just want a bill that works and not the political brouhaha that it always becomes whenever some of the Democrats think they can score some political points. The attacks on this front were fierce and usually high volume. I was personally attacked by colleagues in committee, here on the floor, and in the media. All kinds of vitriol was thrown in my direction both here in the Senate and out in the political intelligentsia. No one needs to worry about me, Madam President. I can take it and throw it right back, if it is necessary. But for months, colleagues have been cornered, being asked: where are you? And pretty much anywhere with a camera—to accuse Republicans of wanting to take away health insurance for vulnerable children. Total BS. Yet they do it all the time because they, with their friends in the media, know they can get away with it in spite of the wrong they are doing.

Throughout all of this time, they conveniently neglected to mention that bipartisan efforts with regard to CHIP were moving forward, even though they clearly knew that such was the case. In fact, one of the harshest critics was an original cosponsor of our bill and a Senator who voted in support of our bill in committee.

The problem is this President has reauthorized CHIP for 6 years—something that has never been done before. A 6-year extension would be the largest and longest in the history of the program. We had already done that in the Finance Committee. In all other respects, the bill is identical to the one the Finance Committee reported with broad bipartisan support.

So where are our colleagues today? Is Senator Wyden, who coauthored the CHIP bill, prepared to vote for an even longer extension of the CHIP program? Apparently not. Are other Democrats on the Finance Committee, including those who publicly touted their support for the committee bill, prepared to vote for this extension? Apparently not. What about those Senate Democrats—both on and off the Finance Committee—who have been on their own righteous crusades with respect to CHIP? Are they prepared to vote for it today? Apparently not.

What has changed? Do they oppose something in the broader bill? No. Most Democrats have supported the other healthcare elements in the package, including delays on the medical device tax, the health insurance tax, and the so-called Cadillac tax from ObamaCare. The bill would accomplish those goals as well. Think about that. Have they prepared to vote in favor of this bill? Apparently not. The question is, Why? Why are Democrats willing to filibuster this continuing resolution and shut down the government? What is their crazy, right-wing fantasy have we inserted into the bill? Of course I am being sarcastic. There is really nothing wrong with the substance of the bill, or at least very few of our Democratic colleagues are complaining about what is actually in the bill. Instead, they are complaining about what is not in it.

The Democrats think they have struck political gold with immigration this week, so they are holding everything hostage so that they can stage another “righteous” crusade on the floor and in TV interviews.

It should go without saying that I personally would like to see a legislative fix for the so-called Dreamers—undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as children. This is an important matter that needs to be addressed. Not only are there myriad elements to our Nation’s immigration system that are in dire need of reform, immigration isn’t something that can be solved with a few roundtables with the President and some quick negotiations behind the scenes. It certainly isn’t something we can or should try to solve under the threat of an imminent government shutdown. Unless you have been hiding in a cave or trapped under something very heavy for the past 15 years, you know that immigration reform—even piecemeal reform—is an extremely difficult lift. There are Members of both parties willing to work on this. The President has indicated his willingness as well. But some don’t want to go the reasonable route, so here we are.

I get that there is an adage in this town that no one should let a good crisis go to waste, and I certainly understand the desire to strike when a political iron is hot. And in the eyes of most Democrats, that time is now. However, if they filibuster this legislation, they will be filibustering authorized funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program. They will be voting to prevent this bipartisan effort—the one we have been talking about for years now—from moving forward; the one they have been harping about for years now from moving forward.

There is another political adage that goes around this town, one that horribly misquotes Napoleon. That axiom goes something like this: Never interrupt your opponent when they are making a mistake. Truthfully, I don’t consider my Democratic colleagues to be my opponents, but a number of people, unfortunately, view Congress that way.
Setting those semantics aside, by urging my Democratic colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, I may very well be ignoring Napoleon’s advice. Still, my colleagues have to know that if they vote to block this legislation, they will be unequivocally be voting against the health and well-being of all the children—including those with disabilities who depend on CHIP. We all know that, and I have had a lot to do with that. They will be voting to prolong the very crisis—that is their word, not mine—that I have been lamenting for the past several months. If they don’t know that, the CHIP’s advocates and stakeholders throughout the country know it, and the families and children who depend on CHIP will know it as well.

There is no reason for my colleagues to pit their righteous crusade on immigration against their righteous crusade for CHIP. This is simply a matter of priorities. Today, the priority should be to work the government open and ensure funding for CHIP well into the future.

As I said, offering my colleagues this advice may amount to stepping in the way of an opponent’s mistake, but the politics that are often played in this place are so much ado about nothing. The right answer in this case is pretty obvious. The right vote is one in favor of the House-passed continuing resolution.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill. Look, I get so tired of the cheap politics that are played. When they are played on a bill like CHIP—virtually everybody is going to vote for it. Everybody agrees with or wants to agree with or has claimed credit for it. That makes you wonder what is going on.

I think I have the right to speak on this because I am the original author of CHIP. I wrote the original language. I was the one who got the committee to go and work on this bill. I was the one who went to Ted Kennedy—representing the Democrats—to come on board, and he did, and it brought both sides together. I am sure he is up there wondering, what is the matter with my side down there? And he ought to be.

It hasn’t been easy to do all that, but we did it. It works. It has helped millions of children. It will help 9 million children now. It is something everybody in this Senate ought to be for and ought to quit playing games with. Unfortunately, some people think they can score points by playing games with something like CHIP. It is not only wrong, it is abysmal.

I love my colleagues. There are some I love more than others but I love all of them. I have to say, the ones I love more than others are those who really are honest and deliberative, who really want to do what is right while they are here and who are willing to work with others to get there, who are willing to work in a bipartisan manner to be able to bring these things to pass.

I understand the differences between the two parties. I understand the politics that are constantly being played around here. But if we are going to play politics, play it on something other than CHIP. Play it on something that deserves the political ramifications. CHIP does not.

CHIP is so valuable that we all know works and works in the best interests of our children. It is something that we as Federal employees can all work on and do, that we go home and feel really good about it and know we have done something really worthwhile. I can say that because I am the original author of the CHIP bill, and I have been for it ever since. I was the one who got Senator Kennedy to come on board and to help with it, and that brought a lot of Democrats on board, as well, because if Kennedy was on board, they could be on board. I was the one who got a lot of Republicans on board, like he was getting Democrats. In other words, the two of us made this system work—and not just the two of us but people in the House, and let’s quit playing these silly games together and get this matter resolved, that the House of Representatives here in the Senate. A lot of people deserve a lot of credit for the CHIP bill.

Now we are sitting here arguing about something that we shouldn’t have to argue about. It is disappointing to me, for obvious reasons. We are fighting one of the politics that are being played around CHIP. There are better arguments on other bills than there are on the CHIP bill. Everybody knows that CHIP is going to pass one way or the other, so naturally our friends on the other side—maybe what we ought to do is hang whatever they can on the CHIP bill, knowing that the American people want it, that Senators want it, that the House of Representatives has proven that they want it, and they might be able to score a few political points.

Well, I want the two leaders to get together and get this matter resolved, and let’s quit playing these silly games that are so often played around here. I don’t mind them maybe on the bills that are lesser in import and nature, but to do it on the CHIP bill, my gosh, it is incredible to me.

This is the greatest country in the world, but we do have some really stupid people representing it from time to time. With that—I probably have gone too far saying that, but it is true, and it is disappointing to me.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, let me start by agreeing with the Senator from Utah that we should extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We should do it for 6 years. I want to commend the Senator from Utah for his work in creating the CHIP program, along with Senator Kennedy. It is good work, and we need to extend it.

We also have an obligation as Senators, on a bipartisan basis, to get together and put together a budget for the United States of America. We are now 4 months into the current fiscal year, and we do not have a budget that provides the resources necessary for the Department of Defense. We do not have a budget that provides resources to fight the opioid epidemic. There has been a lot of talk here in the U.S. Senate about fighting the opioid epidemic, but there has been no vote on CHIP. That is that. We need a budget to get that done.

So, yes, we should extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We need to do that. But we also need to do our job—which we should have done by now—by the first of October 1 this fiscal year—and actually adopt a bipartisan budget for the United States of America.

The tragedy right now is that at midnight tonight the government will shut down unless the Senate Republican leadership comes to its senses and supports a bipartisan budget agreement—a bipartisan agreement, which is really in plain sight right here in the U.S. Senate. Let the American people understand very clearly that Republicans control the White House, Republicans control both Houses of Congress, and that with that committee responsibility to govern for the good of the entire country, Republicans on board, like he was get on board. I was the one who got a lot of Republicans on board, like he was getting Democrats. In other words, the two of us made this system work—and not just the two of us but people in the House of Representatives here in the Senate. A lot of people deserve a lot of credit for the CHIP bill.

Now we are sitting here arguing about something that we shouldn’t have to argue about. It is disappointing to me, for obvious reasons. We are fighting one of the politics that are being played around CHIP. There are better arguments on other bills than there are on the CHIP bill. Everybody knows that CHIP is going to pass one way or the other, so naturally our friends on the other side—maybe what we ought to do is hang whatever they can on the CHIP bill, knowing that the American people want it, that Senators want it, that the House of Representatives has proven that they want it, and they might be able to score a few political points.

Well, I want the two leaders to get together and get this matter resolved, and let’s quit playing these silly games that are so often played around here. I don’t mind them maybe on the bills that are lesser in import and nature, but to do it on the CHIP bill, my gosh, it is incredible to me.

This is the greatest country in the world, but we do have some really stupid people representing it from time to time. With that—I probably have gone too far saying that, but it is true, and it is disappointing to me.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to urge our colleagues to support the bipartisan budget agreement that was passed by the House last week and which was supported by President Trump. This agreement prevents a government shutdown, provides resources to fight the opioid epidemic, and provides for veterans health care. It is a win-win situation for all Americans.

A small business could not survive without putting together its budget. It does great harm to our country and to
our government when this Congress cannot get its act together and put together a budget in time. We have now been kicking the can down the road month by month since October 1. That is why Senator GRAHAM said this morning: ‘‘I am not going to support continuing resolutions any longer. It’s time Congress stop the cycle of dysfunction, grow up, and act consistent with the values of a great nation.’’

Amen to that. That is our constitutional duty. That is what we need to do in order to protect our military and other vital investments important to our country and our economy.

Here is what the Pentagon’s chief spokesperson said about continuing resolutions: ‘‘They are wasteful, they are destructive, and the longer they go the worse it is.’’

She went on to say that these continuing resolutions erode our defense capabilities and have negative consequences for the military. ‘‘Why in the world do we want to kick the can down the road another 30 days when we can get it done right now and avert a government shutdown?’’

We need to get a budget to support our military. We also need it to support the critical investment in our kids’ education. We need a budget plan that is going to provide veterans the healthcare they deserve. We need a budget that is going to fight the opioid epidemic—one that keeps community health centers open. The Social Security Administration has faced hundreds of millions of dollars of cuts. They are not going to be able to do their job in making sure folks get their Social Security benefits on time if we continue to strangle their budget.

The sad thing is, we have known about all of these issues since last September. I am glad we have come to some resolution on the issue of the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We have known about that since last September. But we have also known about the need to fight the opioid epidemic. We have known about the need to fund community health centers. We have known about the need to make sure our veterans have the healthcare they deserve. And we have known about the need to address the DACA issue—the Dreamers—because it was last September when President Trump revoked the DACA program, effective a very short time from now. That program had made sure that Dreamers could be here legally in the United States, contributing to our country. So when President Trump took that action, he manufactured the crisis we are in now.

But he also said: ‘‘OK, I am going to revoke this legal status—this program—but I want Congress, on a bipartisan basis, to come up with a long-term solution. That is what he said back then, and he said the same thing just a few weeks ago. I think the Nation saw him on TV, when he invited a bipartisan group of Senators and Members of the House to the White House, and he invited everybody come to come up with a solution.

A number of our Senators, on a bipartisan basis, took the President up on his request. That is when Senator GRAHAM and Senator DURBIN and two other Republicans and two other Democrats came up with a plan, which now has very broad support, including the support of seven Republican Senators. So they did exactly what President Trump asked them to do, and they addressed all the issues that President Trump outlined.

I think we know what happened after that. Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN went to the White House to present their bipartisan agreement to the President, and, meanwhile, he invited some other Senators over. They sabotaged the deal, and the President made repulsive, racist remarks at that meeting. So the President, who had asked Senators to come up with a solution on a bipartisan basis, when they did what he asked, threw it back in their face.

Why is the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, now saying to the Senate that we can’t do our job here until I know what is going to happen at the White House? We have been outsourcing our constitutional responsibilities to the White House when we have an agreement which, if it were put on the floor of the Senate today, would pass? It is a bipartisan solution.

I really believe it is time for us to do our job here, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Here is what President Trump said at the time of the last government shutdown. That is when we had a 16-day shutdown because some of the Republican Senators didn’t want to fund the Affordable Care Act at the time and shut down the government for 16 days. Then Citizen Trump said: ‘‘It always happens to be the top, I mean, the problems start from the top and have to get solved.’’

This is what Citizen Donald Trump was saying about President Obama at the time of the last shutdown. He went on to say: ‘‘The president is the leader, and he’s got to get everybody in a room, and he’s got to lead.’’

How times change when Citizen Trump becomes President Trump. You have a White House in chaos, dysfunction. Senator GRAHAM himself said it: an unreliable negotiating partner.

Yet, the Republican leader wants this Senate to outsource our job to the President of the United States and says that we are going to shut down the government here because we don’t know what President Trump thinks about all this. That is a dereliction of the duty of the Senate, and we need to do our job today and avoid a government shutdown.

The answer is in plain sight. Let’s get to work. Let’s get it done. I yield.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chair now recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are here today because Republicans and President Trump have failed in their most basic responsibility as the governing party, bringing us mere hours away from an unnecessary and consequential government shutdown.

Let’s be clear. With Republicans in control of the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, the only person to blame if the government shuts down will be President Donald Trump.

Later today, I plan to vote no on the government funding bill that the House of Representatives has sent over to the Senate because it provides no certainty or resolution for Dreamers, pensioners, veterans, the people of Puerto Rico, or vulnerable children and patients across the country. I cannot support legislation that fails to ensure that we are fulfilling our moral and constitutional obligation to the American people.

Sadly, this budget process is just a continuation of a pattern from Republicans in Congress: Draft major policy in secret, with no debate, no Democrats, no real opportunity to negotiate. First, they did it on healthcare. Then, they did it on tax reform. Now, they are doing it again on the continuing budget resolution.

There is a great song in the musical ‘‘Hamilton’’ titled ‘‘The Room Where It Happens.’’ Well, the Democrats aren’t even told where the room is. Republicans aren’t negotiating deals. They are delivering fiats, not just to the Democrats but to the American people, and the American people are the ones paying the price.

We cannot let this craven, half-measure of a bill fool us. Yes, this legislation does finally reauthorize and fund a program that provides healthcare for 9 million children across this country, known as the Children’s Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. But remember, just like they are abdicating their role in governing today and have been throughout the budget negotiations, Republicans in Congress allowed CHIP to expire at the end of September—more than 100 days ago.

Why would Republicans do such a thing for a program they now say is so vital and bipartisan? Because 100 days ago the Republican caucus was preoccupied with their unsuccessful attempt at repealing the Affordable Care Act. For weeks on end, they held America in suspension as they secretly wrote and rewrote a bill that would rip healthcare coverage from millions of Americans while taking a machete to Medicaid.

Thankfully, this dangerous bill failed to gain support from enough Senate
Republicans to pass. But when that irresponsible bill failed, instead of immediately returning to the important business of providing low- and middle-income children healthcare, the Republicans decided to use their energy to jam through a massive tax scam with giveaways for millionaires and billionaires, once again leaving children’s health and working families in limbo. Republicans were more interested in a tax bill of corporate welfare than in children’s healthcare. Congress had forced a Band-Aid for CHIP at the end of last year, enough funding to support some States through today. Yet the absence of a real solution has consequences. CHIP families remain worried about paying for their children’s medications, getting them a checkup, or receiving that unexpected, devastating, and expensive diagnosis for their young child. Healthcare providers remain terrified that they will have to cut services to medically fragile and other pediatric patients they serve. States still lack the certainty and assurances needed to fully operate CHIP for their residents. Many are still contemplating contingency plans should the Federal Government not meet their end of the bargain and provide funds needed for CHIP to succeed.

These last 100 days of anxiety and uncertainty represent uncharted territory for this popular program. For two decades, CHIP has provided affordable, comprehensive health insurance to children of working families and pregnant women. In 2016, CHIP covered nearly 9 million children throughout the United States. Some 2 million of them are chronically ill, with asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, or developmental disorders. In Massachusetts, CHIP has been instrumental in getting nearly all of our children covered. Without continued Federal funding, Massachusetts would lose approximately $295 million annually in Federal CHIP dollars. That would be devastating for the 172,000 Bay State children who rely on CHIP for their health coverage.

Ironically, over 3 months ago, Senate leaders in both parties came up with a bipartisan agreement that the next 5 years of CHIP would look like. But Republicans insisted we had to pay for CHIP by raiding other important programs at the request of the opioid lobby, the Foundation for Accountability and Community Health, which is used to help prevent child illness by providing vaccines, among things. The stopgap funding measure passed in December cut $750 million from the Prevention and Public Health Fund for a short-term spending patch. It was robbing Peter to pay Paul.

So we are hours away from shutting down the government, with the superrich still celebrating their $1 trillion tax break and congressional Republicans prepping at ways to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and still putting a solution for Dreamers, veterans, pensioners, and for the people of Puerto Rico. While I remain supportive of the CHIP program, I do not support the legislative malpractice Republicans performed on the continuing resolution.

But that wasn’t the first time Republicans tried to pay for children’s healthcare need without CHIP. And CHIP is not the only victim of Republican political games. I cannot support the House legislation because it provides no funding to address the greatest public health crisis facing our Nation today—the opioid epidemic. When President Trump declared the opioid crisis a national public health emergency in October, he laid out his vision that “we can be the generation that ends the epidemic.” On that, he is right. But we know that a vision without funding is a hallucination. We need real funding to implement real solutions.

The White House Council of Economic Advisers estimated that the opioid epidemic cost the country $500 billion in 2015. How much has the Trump administration devoted to this crisis? Zero dollars, not a nickel, since Donald Trump was sworn in as President. Now there is news that the Trump administration will dash the budget of the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent. That isn’t a commitment to the crisis. That is an abdication.

Asking our States, our cities, and towns to continue fighting this scourge of opioid overdoses without additional Federal funding is irresponsible, it is cruel, and it will come back to haunt us as a Nation. These budget negotiations were an ideal opportunity to fund what my colleagues in both parties have said publicly is important—combating the opioid crisis. Instead, we are leaving families without hope or help. We owe it to them and the millions like them across the country to fight as hard as possible for the funding they need.

We should also remember as we look at this House legislation that so many of the patients seeking treatment and recovery services for opioid addiction rely on their community health centers. But if this funding measure passes, Republicans will have irresponsibly and unfairly left funding for community health centers in limbo. That funding also expired more than 100 days ago.

For more than 50 years, community health centers have been an integral component of our social safety net. This movement, which started in Massachusetts, has transformed how we treat some of our most medically vulnerable citizens, while also improving the health and wellness of our communities. In fact, for many Americans, community health centers are the only access point for affordable healthcare.

In Massachusetts, it treats more than 75,000 patients a year, and of these patients are uninsured and nearly half are on Medicaid. In addition to the quality, comprehensive care they provide, community health centers play a key economic role in many regions across the country. Community health centers in Massachusetts have created more than 12,000 jobs, including more than 8,500 direct full-time employees. Much like CHIP, unfortunately, Republicans are shedding crocodile tears about our military and national security being at risk during a government shutdown. Do you know what is harmful to our national defense—month-to-month budgets and operating by way of continuing resolutions. That is the way to run the Department, but that is exactly what the Republicans have done with these short-term budget fixes. Spare me, spare America your crocodile tears because it is time to sit down, on a bipartisan basis, and get a budget done—a budget that would take care of the Defense Department, the opioid crisis, pensions, veterans, CHIP, community health centers, and it would give some certitude to the American people that this body knows how to govern. Instead of engaging in the budget hostage-taking, the need Republicans and President Trump to engage in bipartisanship. It is time we end this waiting game now and provide
the certainty and funding necessary so all of these critical priorities are addressed, not just the ones Republicans care about.

The Republican paradox is that they don’t believe in government, but they have run government in order to be sure the government doesn’t work, and now that they control the House, the Senate, and Presidency, we have reached their perfect state where the government cannot work because it is being paralyzed by the party that controls all of these branches. They refuse to talk to Democrats. They refuse to ensure that the Constitution is implemented, where Democrats and Republicans, working together on both sides of this building, plus the President, sit down in the room in order to cut the deals. Until President Trump is willing to sit down with CHUCK SCHUMER and NANCY PELOSI and MITCH MCCONNELL and PAUL RYAN in the room, we will not get a resolution on these issues.

Mr. President, come to the Hill. Mr. President, sit down with all of the people who want to resolve these issues for the American people. Mr. President, do your job.

Bill Belichick says to the New England Patriots: If you want to win, do your job.

The same thing is true for you. Mr. President. Do your job. Come together with Democrats and Republicans. Stop carping critically from the outside at any move Democrats or Republicans make. Instead, get in the room. We can resolve these issues for the American people. The time is now. Mr. President. Do your job.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The able Senator from Utah.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today hundreds of thousands of Americans from all walks of life will participate in the 45th annual March for Life. This begs the question, Why do all these citizens march year after year? It certainly isn’t for their health or for the media coverage. No, these Americans march on behalf of those who cannot. They march for uniquely vulnerable members of the human family. They march for the unborn, for those threatened by abortion, and for the countless millions of innocent lives already lost. These Americans protest the legal regime that sustains abortion.

The cornerstone of that crumbling edifice is Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court case that invented a right to abortion in the Constitution, and in so doing, it stripped the unborn of their right to life. The principal effect of Roe v. Wade on our culture has been to cheapen the value of humanity itself. Roe has insinuated into the law a poisonous notion, the notion that some human beings are to be treated as things, as objects to be discarded when they are inconvenient. We have seen this before in human history, but an unintended effect of Roe has been to kick-start a movement that has lasted four and one-half decades. Roe did not resolve the abortion debate, although it tried to. Rather, it intensified that very debate.

The Nation’s conscience was not deadened by Roe’s euphemisms and evasions. Rather, it was brought to life. Like a firebell in the night, Roe awakened a generation of Americans to the injustice of abortion. Countless thousands of Americans, from Washington, DC, in Salt Lake City, and in cities all across the country today, but the institution of abortion still has its stalwart defenders—vociferous defenders even.

One may ask, Why does this issue arouse such anger and such passion, as it so often does? I argue that it is because the pro-life and pro-abortion movements offer competing and mutually inconsistent visions, moral visions that cannot be united. Arguments about human dignity and even about what it means to be human in the first place. Both moral visions are, in one sense, as old as the Nation. They have appeared in various guises throughout our history.

There is a consistent trend in how the clash of visions has played out in every era. The vision advanced by the pro-life movement has inspired righteous protests. The other vision has been used to rationalize hideous injustices. The pro-life vision embraces our country’s noblest truth. The pro-abortion vision twists it.

Let me explain what I mean. Our Declaration of Independence contains some of the most succinct, profound, and revolutionary statements in human history. “We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

We know the United States has not always acted on this high principle. It has not always behaved in a manner consistent with it. We have, at times, denied life, liberty, and opportunity to our fellow beings in countless cruel and unfortunate ways, but even in the darkest times, patriots and reformers have looked to this passage as a guiding light because it is, in many respects, the conscience of our Nation.

Abraham Lincoln referred to the Declaration of Independence constantly in his speeches, calling it the “sheet anchor of Americanism” and the “Father of all moral principle.” He called the Declaration of Independence a statement on human equality, the “electric cord that links Patriotic Americans through the ages. Now that electric cord is a direct line that runs from the founding generation to the very heart of the pro-life movement today. The core conviction of the pro-life movement is that all men are created equal and that all have a right to life. We believe that every human being has dignity and merits protection simply by virtue of being human.

You will often hear pro-lifers emphasize the human features of unborn children, as well we should. We point out that the human heart begins to beat as early as 16 days after conception. We point out that the unborn child can yawn, react to pain, and even suck her thumb. We point out that even has a unique one-of-a-kind fingerprint.

We don’t mention these characteristics because they are what give children worth, not just fingers and thumbprints or even our beating hearts or our ability to yawn that make us human, that make us people. Rather, we point to these characteristics because they in turn point to something far more fundamental. They point to the inescapable fact that the unborn child is a human being, just like us. It is that endowment, it is that shared humanity that gives us all moral worth.

To summarize the pro-life position, we have only to repeat those five words from the Declaration of Independence: “All men are created equal.” All, therefore, are entitled to life, but to be sure, not everyone shares all men are created equal. At various times, this very belief that is so much at the core of who we are and what we believe as Americans has been called an “error[r] of the past generation.” It has even been called a “self-evident lie!”

Few today would denounce the Declaration of Independence in such terms, but defenders of abortion still repudiate the declaration by their very actions and by the arguments they advance to protect abortion. Defenders of abortion no longer dispute that unborn children are living human beings. How could they? Science testifies unequivocally to our shared humanity. Most sophisticated defenders of abortion do not even dispute that abortion is a violent act.

If you don’t believe me on this point, perhaps your vote will be influenced by Donald Dworkin, a prominent apologist for the pro-choice position: “Abortion.” Dworkin writes, “[is] deliberately killing a developing human embryo.” He goes on to describe abortion as a “choic[e] for death.”

If abortion defenders do not deny the humanity of the fetus, and if they do not deny that abortion kills the fetus, how then do they defend abortion? In short, they do it by segregating the fetus from the family into human beings who are worthy of life—sometimes called human persons—and human beings who are unworthy of life, human nonpersons.

According to this view, human beings do not deserve protection on the basis of their humanity alone. Rather, they acquire the right to life when they attain certain characteristics—usually some level of cognitive ability or bodily development. Since the unborn lack these magical personhood qualities, they lack all rights. They may be dismembered in the womb. They are human nonpersons or so the argument goes.
There are many problems with this chilling view. It has been rebutted at length by smarter men and women than I. For the purposes of today, it is enough to point out the track record of this argument is dubious. It just so happens that time mankind has been artificially divided into persons and nonpersons—based on their race, sex, genetic fitness, or any other attribute—the result has been calamity, which leads to a very simple question that has never been satisfactorily answered: Why should we believe that this time is any different?

Abortion is a very difficult subject matter for so many reasons, but on another level, it is really quite simple. Our society has to choose between the two visions of human dignity described above.

Put simply, do we believe that all men are created equal or that some, perhaps, are somehow more equal than others?

This simple question deserves a simple response. We must choose the first of these options and affirm that all human beings are created with dignity, and we must reject all attempts to separate human family into upper and lower classes. Let us see these attempts for what they are—crueal fictions that cheapen life itself.

Just as there is no such thing as life unworthy of life, there is no such thing as a human nonperson. There are just people, and we are easily fearfully and wonderfully made.

Yes, dignity was ours before we stirred in the womb. It is stamped onto the very fabric of our genome. It is printed onto our souls. This is the truth so brilliantly proclaimed in our Nation’s founding documents, even as it is denied by our legal system, starting with Roe v. Wade. Yet, even though the laws of man are against us for now, the truth is with us, and the truth can erode even the most formidable edifice of lies.

So, on this 45th anniversary of Roe v. Wade, let’s respond to Roe as Frederick Douglass thundered, “their rights have pily for the whole human family,” Douglass responded to a similar indignity in Dred Scott v. Sandford: “Hap-pily for the whole human family,” Douglass thundered, “their rights have been defined, declared, and decided in a court higher than the Supreme Court.”

Those words are as true today as they were when they were spoken. They call on us to continue the winning march for justice and for life until the unalienable rights of every human being are respected in our land.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I come before my colleagues in the Senate to urge in the strongest possible terms that the Republican leadership here accept its responsibility and must allow the Government of the United States of America to shut down. Republicans control the Senate. They control the U.S. House. And a Republican is in the White House. Please do not shut the government down.

A government shutdown will be extremely distressing and difficult for millions of people in every State in our country who utilize government services. A government shutdown will be extremely painful for millions of Federal employees who depend upon their paychecks to provide for their families. A government shutdown will make it much more difficult for U.S. military personnel, the men and women who are putting their lives on the line to defend us, to do their jobs.

The American people do not want a government shutdown. I do not want a government shutdown, and I believe that most of my Republican colleagues do not want a government shutdown. It is imperative that President Trump understand that despite what he said in May, that statement is wrong. When he said our country needs a good shutdown, that is wrong. Our country does not need a government shutdown. It is imperative that President Trump understand that what we need is an annual budget that addresses the many needs of the American people.

Just last night, this is what a spokesperson from the Pentagon stated: We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

This afternoon, I say to Senator McConnell, the Republican leader here in the Senate: Please do not shut the government down. You know, Senator McConnell, the political reality as well as anybody in our country. In the Senate, you need 60 votes to pass this budget agreement. You don’t have 60 votes. Please, sit down with Democrats, and start negotiating in good faith. Please, do not shut the government down.

More and more Democrats are sick and tired of kicking the can down the road, tired of our not addressing the major crises that are facing this country, tired of running a $4 trillion operation, which is what the U.S. Government is on, on a month-to-month basis.

Yet it is not just the Democrats who are demanding that we finally have an annual budget. It is the Republicans as well. My understanding—what I have heard from the news media—is that there are now five Republicans who are prepared to vote against this continuing resolution and even more who have voiced deep concerns about the lack of an annual budget. They know and I know that just passing another temporary budget is totally irresponsible and is abdicating the job that we were elected to do.

What the American people understand—what every businessperson in this country understands, what every family in America understands—is that government, given the many crises that we face, on a month-to-month basis. We cannot continue to abdicate our responsibility. Finally, we must address the problems that are facing the American people.

Last night, the Pentagon told us correctly—and I state again that this is what was said: “We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.”

Let’s not forget that we are 3½ months into the fiscal year. There are 3½ months that have come and gone, and the Republican leadership here has still not given us an annual budget. It is not just the military that faces a crisis situation because of the lack of an annual budget. Today, 27 million Americans get their primary healthcare, dental care, mental health counseling, and low-cost prescription drugs through the community health center program. In my State of Vermont, one out of four Vermonters gets his primary healthcare through a community health center. There are 3½ months that have come and gone since the beginning of this fiscal year, and the Republicans are still not authorizing funding for the community health center program, which is now facing a severe crisis in terms of recruiting and retaining the doctors, nurses, and other medical staff it needs to sustain the quality of service it must maintain.

What doctor or what nurse is going to go to a community health center when he or she doesn’t even know if that facility is going to receive funding? There are more than 27 million Americans who depend upon community health centers. As I understand it—and I am glad—the Republicans are now prepared to reauthorize the CHIP program. There are 9 million kids who need that program. In the 3½ months that have come and gone, finally, they are talking about reauthorizing CHIP. That is good, but you cannot forget the community health centers.

The community health center program in this country is 50 years old. It was developed in the 1960s. It is supported by virtually every Democrat and, I think, the vast majority of the Republicans. Yet it has not been reauthorized. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed and addressed now.

On Veterans Day, everybody here goes running all over the country, giving great speeches about how much they love the veterans, but the Veterans Administration can’t continue to provide decent, quality care to those of our veterans who put their lives on the line to defend us when they have over 30,000 vacancies. In Vermont and around the country, the VA provides good, quality care, but you cannot provide care in a timely manner when you have 30,000 vacancies at the VA. This issue cannot be kicked down the road. It must be addressed now, not next year.

As everybody knows, in Louisiana and Vermont and all over this country, there is a horrible, horrific opioid and heroin epidemic that is sweeping this country. It has hit my State of
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Vermont hard. It has hit States all over America. Last year, 60,000 people in our country died as a result of opioid or heroin overdoses. We need to help State governments, local communities, families, and police departments to address the opioid and heroin epidemic. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It must be addressed now, not through a continuing resolution that absolutely ignores this crisis. It must be addressed now.

Last year, unbelievably, some 10,000 people with disabilities died while waiting for decisions. Many of them died because the Social Security Administration is, today, grossly underfunded, understaffed, and simply not able to deal with the volume of claims they have received.

It is not just people with disabilities. In my State of Vermont—I hear this every day—there are older Americans who are not getting the quality of service they expect from the Social Security Administration. Our job is to adequately fund the Social Security Administration so it can protect the needs of senior citizens and people with disabilities in our country. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed now, and this continuing resolution, which I presume we are going to vote on later today, does not deal with it.

Mr. President, 1.5 million Americans are in danger of seeing their pensions cut by up to 60 percent. These are truckdrivers, construction workers, machinists, and others who have worked their entire careers with the expectation that they would receive a decent pension when they retired. We have a responsibility to protect the pensions of these hard-working Americans and keep the promises that were made to them. This is another crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed now, and the continuing resolution that is going to come before us has not one word to say about that.

Then we have a child care crisis in this country. Millions of working families are saying that they can no longer afford child care. We have a student debt crisis in this country—40 million people, many of them deeply in debt, unable to get on with their lives for the crime of having gone to college. That is a crisis that we have to deal with. We have an infrastructure crisis in this country. All over America, roads, bridges, water systems, waste water plants are collapsing. How do we continue to ignore these crises? At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, when the rich are getting richer and everybody else is getting poorer, our job in Congress is not just to give tax breaks to billionaires. Our job is not just to try to throw 32 million Americans off the health insurance they have or deny the reality of climate change or to end net neutrality or make racist comments about countries throughout the world. Our job is to represent the needs of ordinary Americans. We cannot continue to ignore these crises. We cannot continue to kick the can down the road.

Once again, I say to the majority leader: Let us begin to negotiate in good faith. Let us reach decisions that are fair, that help the American people, not simply ignore their needs.

When we talk about the crises facing this country, we are also talking about a crisis precipitated by President Trump in September of last year. As a result of President Trump's rescinding of President Obama's Executive order on DACA, some 800,000 young people in our country are today living in fear, uncertainty, and anxiety. If we do not act—and act now—it is possible that many of these people will lose their legal status and be subjected to the possibility of deportation. This must not be allowed to happen.

This issue to my mind is one of the great moral issues of our time. These young people, who were brought into this country, some at 2 years of age, 3 years, 5 years of age, are people who have lived virtually their entire lives in the United States of America. They are working, they are in school, they are the heart and soul of these communities. These young DACA people are now teaching in schools throughout the country. It would be one of the cruelest acts in modern American history or our history in general if we said to these young people, who know no other country but the United States of America, that they could be deported from our shores. It would be an unspeakable crime, and we must not allow that to happen. That is not just the opinion of a few liberal senators; that is the overwhelming point of view of the American people, of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

A poll just came out last night from CBS. The poll showed that 87 percent of the American people believe that we should protect the legal status of the Dreamers—87 percent—and that poll is consistent with poll after poll after poll. The people of the United States across the political spectrum are saying that they cannot turn their backs on these Dreamers. The overwhelming majority of people believe we must provide a path toward citizenship.

There is now bipartisan legislation that has been written by Senator Durbin, Senator Graham, and others, and I say to Senator McConnell: If 97 percent of the American people think we should provide legal status to the Dreamers, let us do our job. Let us pass this legislation. This is not a profile in courage. This is what the American people want, and let us do what the American people want.

As we well know, terrible, terrible hurricanes struck Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands months and months ago, and people there are still suffering. Many people in Puerto Rico today still do not have electricity. Then there are devastating wildfires and mud slides that have taken place in California. How long does it take for the Senate Majority leader to stand up and say that, to stand up for the people of Vermont, the people of California, the people of our country, all over America, roads, bridges, water systems are crumbling. It has to be addressed now, and the continuing resolution that is going to come before us has not one word to say about that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today, as they do every year at this time, tens of thousands of Americans from across the country, including from my home State of South Dakota, will march for life. The National Right to Life Committee will take their stand at the U.S. Supreme Court to stand up for the right to life. The march is always inspiring with the huge crowds who come year after year, the commitment and enthusiasm of the participants, and most of all, the young people—teenagers, college students, young adults.

Abortion has been an ugly scar on our Nation for a long while now, but seeing all these young people at the March for Life every year fills me with hope because I know that these young people get it. They know that life matters, and they are ready and willing to stand up and say that, to stand up for the hundreds of thousands of unborn Americans who are killed every year in this country by abortion.

This year, I hope to see the Congress consider the Pain- Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would protect unborn children who have reached the age of 20 weeks—that is 5 months of pregnancy—from being killed in the womb. Right now, there are only seven countries in the world that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Among those
countries are China, North Korea, and the United States of America. I would like to suggest that is not the company Americans want to be keeping when it comes to protecting human rights.

Mr. President, 63 percent of the American people support a lifetime abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy, and that doesn’t surprise me. Take a look at a 5-month-old unborn baby on an ultrasound. It is pretty darn obvious that is a human being in there. I think most people instinctively know that human life matter how small they are, are worthy of protection.

Five months into a pregnancy, babies are doing a lot. They are sucking their thumbs. They are yawning and stretching. They are actively moving around. They are responding to noises, and they feel and respond to pain. The scientific evidence on this point is clear: 5 months into a pregnancy, unborn babies feel pain. Yet, in our country, it is legal to abort these babies. The procedures used to perform these abortions are so brutal and inhumane that it is difficult to even talk about them. Most Americans would rightly shrink from treating an animal the way we treat unborn human beings.

Every year, there are hundreds of thousands of abortions in this country. Planned Parenthood reports that it performed 321,384 abortions in 2016. That number is so large that it is hard to fathom. To put that into some kind of perspective, that is equivalent to more than one-third of the population of my home State of South Dakota. Unfortunately, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would not eliminate all of these abortions, but it would make a difference, and it would bring us one step closer to the day when every child born and unborn is protected in law.

To all those who are marching for life today, thank you for being here. Thank you for reminding all of us about that it is just too easy for us to ignore. Thank you for standing up for all those babies. The fight may be long, but I know that at the end of the day, it is life that will win.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. President, before coming to Washington today, I went to Annapolis. The Maryland General Assembly is in session. I had a chance to meet with several of our regional delegations in the Maryland General Assembly, our senators and members of the House. One of the questions that was asked the most is, What is happening in regard to the Federal Government? What is happening in regard to the fiscal year 2018 budget? Will the government be funded past midnight tonight?

I must tell you, I was talking to both Democratic and Republican members of the Maryland General Assembly, and in every case, there was a uniform agreement that the Maryland General Assembly will shortly be receiving from Governor Hogan the fiscal year 2019 budget. A good part of any State’s budget is the Federal funding programs. Neither the State of Maryland nor any of our local jurisdictions in the fiscal year 2018 budget, let alone a blueprint for likely action by Congress for the fiscal year 2019 budget.

The budget should have been passed by October 1 of last year. That is the beginning of the fiscal year. We have been operating under continuing resolutions during the entire part of this year. In fact, we have been operating under continuing resolutions for years, and it is causing significant damage to this country.

The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they can’t pass a budget for our country. So when the Republican leadership asked us in September of last year for a continuing resolution, we have more time to negotiate a budget for fiscal year 2018, we had no choice but to go along with the continuing resolution to give more time. But then on three additional occasions the Republican leadership has stood up and said: We need additional time.

I remember the debate we had in December before the holidays. The leadership was very clear that this would be the last continuing resolution that was going to be needed. They were close to working out deals, et cetera, only to find out today that we are still no closer to getting it resolved.

Here is the tragedy: Our agencies cannot exist on continuing resolutions. They have a budget, or at least they are no longer able to carry out their mission in the best interests of the American people. We heard that last night on the floor of the Senate when the representative of the Department of Defense indicated that our Nation’s preparedness, readiness, cannot be maintained by a continuing resolution with last year’s budget.

You see, a continuing resolution does not reflect our current priorities. It is where we were the last time we passed the budget, which was over a year ago. Those are the spending priorities an agency must comply with.

For the Department of Defense, a lot has happened during that period of time. Look at what is happening in North Korea. Look at what is happening with Russia. Look at what is happening around the world. Our Department of Defense needs to have a current-year budget, not another continuing resolution. We have to reach this agreement.

So here is our concern: If we just continue to go along with these continuing resolutions, we are going to hurt our national security. We are going to hurt our agencies’ ability to get their work done. It is going to cost the taxpayers of this country more money, and they are not going to get the services they need.

Now, there is an alternative to this date that we need to consider, and that is, let’s complete our work. I know we have a deadline of midnight tonight. I know the government will shut down unless we get something done. I must tell you, we should do the right thing. We should stop the government stays open. No one wins when there is a government shutdown. But we are not doing anyone any favors if we don’t commit ourselves to get the job done.

Senator, I would urge Leader McConnell to do is to allow us to vote on a very short-term continuing resolution and keep us here over this weekend; keep us here until we get the basics of the fiscal year 2018 budget. That, we can do.

We know that there have been reported conversations between the leadership on the Appropriations Committee and the leadership in the Senate and House, and there is a deal here. There is a deal that can be made, but we have to have a deadline.

Here is the danger of another long-term CR, another month CR, without having that. We hear that there is a group in the House of Representatives that is controlling the debate over there. They don’t represent a majority in the House—far from it. They certainly don’t represent the views of the majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate or the American people. But unless we have a deadline now and get this done, we are going to be faced with the same concerns a month from now, and we are not going to be able to get a budget done so that we can deal with the problems of this country.

We should not have a shutdown. All of us should be committed to pass a short-term CR to keep us here and avoid a government shutdown. Every- one loses on a shutdown.

I have the honor of representing one of the largest numbers of Federal employees of any State in the country. Maryland is the proud home to many incredibly important Federal facilities and installations and many talented Federal workers who are on the forefront of public service. They work very hard for the American people every single day. I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.

Our Federal workforce has already sacrificed on behalf of our budget. They have gone through too many continuing resolutions that compromise their ability to get the job done. They have gone through too many threats of sequestration, too many pay freezes or pay adjustments that are inadequate, at additional costs to their pensions. They have contributed. What they expect from us is to keep the government open and to give them a budget so that they can get their mission done.

For the sake of our Federal workforce, let’s keep the government open.
It is a real hardship if we miss this deadline. It is not without cost. Let me make that clear to my colleagues.

If there is a government shutdown, hard-working Federal workers aren’t going to get a paycheck, yet they still have to make their mortgage payments and pay for their families. Those who are not excepted will go on unpaid leave. That is wrong.

People who depend on Federal contracts in order to keep their businesses going need to know that assurance and will be faced with the prospect of laying off workers.

Individuals who need government services are going to find it much more difficult, if not impossible, to be able to get those Federal services, whether it is tracking down a check they desperately need, getting the type of assistance they need in order to process a concern with the VA, or whether it is a matter of security and they need to contact our government. All of that is going to be at risk, and the taxpayers of this country will be left holding the bill.

We have gone through government shutdowns before, and we have done analyses each time, and every time it costs the taxpayers more. It costs the taxpayers more. All of us who are concerned about fiscal responsibility need to find a path forward to make sure we don’t shut down the Federal Government. It makes no sense.

I have introduced legislation that I urge my colleagues to make sure we pass. You may be surprised to find out that if we miss the deadline and we go a few days and then we get it done, those Federal workers who are put on furlough will not be paid for our negligence in not keeping the Federal Government open. That is not right. Each time we have corrected that by legislation, but there shouldn’t be that uncertainty for the Federal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to pass the legislation I have authored. I have the support of over 20 of my colleagues who have cosponsored this legislation to make sure that our Federal workforce knows they will receive their full compensation.

It is also important that we move forward on getting this budget done and getting work done. If we just take the House’s approach and we say “OK, everything is fine,” we will be back in 28 days, and we will see this movie again. We have issues that cannot wait to be resolved. We have to resolve these issues.

There are a lot of issues out there, but the one that’s gotten a good deal of attention is the Dreamers. This shouldn’t be a problem. I agree with some of my colleagues who say: Where is the problem? Well, the problem was created by the President of the United States last September when he set a 6-month deadline on the removal of the Dreamers.

We didn’t have a problem until then. We needed to fix our immigration system; don’t get me wrong. But we didn’t have a date on the backs of individuals who know no other country but the United States. As to their shelf life here in the United States, we didn’t have that until the President initiated this problem.

When the President did that in September, I applauded colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, who said: Let us come together and fix it in the legislation. We need that, and I agree with that. We need to have the Dreamers, so they have a pathway to citizenship and know that America is their home and their future is here. That should be done.

We had bipartisan legislation ready to go. We were ready to move forward on it, only to find out that while the President said that he was for legislation, he then said: Well, we have to deal with other issues. I have this wall. I am concerned about—and border security really is important to me.

So the bipartisan group entered into good-faith negotiations with the President, and they narrowed the issues that needed to be resolved to a few. They talked about border security. They talked about the families, the family and family reunification and dealing with the lottery system on diversity visas. They took up those issues, and they reached a bipartisan agreement as requested by the President, and they thought, with the support of the President of the United States. Yes, it does protect the Dreamers, and I am proud to say it also protects those in temporary protected status.

Maryland has a large population from El Salvador and Haiti that are on TPS status. They are all protected under this compromise that was reached. Everybody thought “Oh, my goodness, we have finally resolved this issue; we can go on to the next issue,” until the President of the United States flipped his position on it.

I want to be engaged with the President. As the majority leader said, he has to sign bills. I get it. But it is tough to negotiate with someone who tells you one thing on one day and then does the exact opposite on the next day.

We have a responsibility to act. We have a bill that is bipartisan and has enough support to clearly pass the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. It protects for 3 years. It protects the Dreamers. It protects those with TPS status, and it deals with border security. We need to get that done now also.

We all know we have healthcare extenders that need to be completed in addition to CHIP. CHIP is very important to get done. It should be made permanent, I might tell you. We also have community health centers and many other issues that need to be dealt with in this legislation.

We have disaster relief. We have talked about this many times. We have come together as a nation to help those who have been distressed through natural disasters—the people of Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico and those who have been affected by the wildfires.

Then, of course, the issue I hear the most about is the opioid crisis. We need to make sure that the Federal partners are strong enough to deal with this national crisis.

What should we do? Well, let’s work together. I must tell you, my constituents, your constituents are not interested in a blame game. I am interested in making sure that their Federal workers have a check to pay their mortgage payments. If they are in need of VA services, they want to make sure those services are available to them. They want to make sure they are getting the best value for their federal dollar, and they want the U.S. Senate and the Congress to work and resolve these issues.

They expect us to pass a budget, and they expect us to deal with these issues. We have a game plan to get all that done in a matter of days if we make the commitment to get it done. That is why I have suggested to the majority leader that there is support for us to stay and get the job done. Keep us in session. Keep government open, and we will get the work done.

Let us come together with a truly bipartisan budget that reflects the will of the American people and the input of all Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, a budget that makes sense for our Department of Defense, makes sense for those doing the research at the National Institutes of Health, those who are keeping our food safe at FDA, and those who are on the frontlines of the Social Security Administration, handling the issues of our seniors. Let’s give them the tools they need in a budget that makes sense for this country.

Let’s make sure that we pass these open issues that are urgent, some of which have been created by the President, such as the immigration issues. We have a path forward to resolve those issues now. Let’s do that. If we do all of that, then I think we are serving the interests of the American people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that our first responsibility is to the people of this country. Let’s not blame each other. Let’s stay together and do something that we don’t do enough of: Let’s listen to each other. Let’s get our work done, keep the government open, and do what is right for the American people.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
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floor a bit ago talking about the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Because his remarks were greatly misleading, I thought it was important—having heard my good friend, my longtime friend, earlier, I thought it was important to come to the floor this afternoon and set the record straight about the Children’s Health Insurance Program.

The fact is, the chairman and I did negotiate an important Children’s Health Insurance Program extension back in August—bipartisan—and I put in a lot of time, both inside this Congress and outside the Halls of Congress, in order to line up bipartisan support for that effort. And we did, in fact, in the Finance Committee, have near unanimous bipartisan support. That was months and months ago.

The fact is, at that point, the Children’s Health Insurance Program could have passed the Congress within days, but unfortunately the Republicans in the end put some other idea first. From the moment the Senate Finance Committee passed the bill in a bipartisan way, the kids became hostage to the Republican political agenda.

First, the House Republicans tried to force ideological cuts in important health programs, including Medicare, in order to allow this deal to go forward. Then they conditioned helping the vulnerable kids on kicking Americans off their private health insurance. When that didn’t work, they took yet another hostage: vaccines and preventive health. For some reason, the other body, the House, wanted to cut off programs that make Americans healthier by preventing disease in the first place. For obvious reasons, Democrats weren’t willing to sacrifice that hostage, either.

Now, months after there was a bipartisan deal to finally give peace of mind to these parents and children, the House Republicans have taken yet another hostage. This time, we are talking about the proper functioning of the Federal Government.

The Republicans have been stumbling from one continuing resolution to another continuing resolution since they took power, sacrificing the readiness of the military, impeding the Federal response to natural disasters, and handcapping rural hospitals that don’t know when they are going to get paid for the care they provide. We are not going to go back to that.

The minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, has made a good-faith offer to give the Senate a week to actually come to an agreement to keep the government functioning. I think this makes sense because the country needs constructive, nackedly political, bad-faith governing can’t continue.

What we have is a display of the worst of American politics. The fact is, Republicans control the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. That means that you get to set the agenda, and you get to set the schedule. But Republican leaders watched and did nothing as the deadline for CHIP funding passed in the fall. So what we had at the end of the year was this picture of how millions of American kids were lower on the list of the Republican priorities than borrowing $1.5 trillion in order to give additional money to multinational corporations and the political donor class, when the multinational corporations were already awash in cash.

Since the fall, there has been a near constant stream of Republicans appearing on television and in print saying again and again that they are all for the Children’s Health Insurance Program—by God, they just want to take care of the kids. The fact is, those Republicans speaking out on television had months to act. They had almost a year. The program expired 111 days ago, and the Finance Committee passed a bipartisan bill that really kicked this all off. I felt very strongly about doing that. The chairman has a long history of wanting to work with me. So I make sure that we were coming right out of the box and getting a strong, bipartisan bill, knowing that perhaps the chairman of the committee would re-tire. So if there was an up-or-down vote on the Children’s Health Insurance Program in the Senate after we moved last fall, it would have gotten 80 votes—probably more—and probably 300 votes in the other body, if that bipartisan measure that came out of the Finance Committee in the fall had had an up-or-down vote. The only reason that hasn’t happened is the cynical political strategy which I have described that evolved over the months since the Finance Committee acted in a bipartisan way and which has produced this crisis this body faces now.

Even the President, apparently in a moment of unsupervised so-called executive time, said that a long-term CHIP bill ought to move forward unobstructed. A few weeks ago, the Congress learned—and I made a special push for this because it was clear, as a result of these ill-advised changes that were part of the tax bill, that coverage would be more expensive in the private exchanges and that CHIP would lock like an even better investment than it already was. As a result of that information we obtained, it, in fact, saves money to make the Children’s Health Insurance Program permanent. Making it permanent, as amazing as it sounds, is better deal than a 6-year extension and less of an expense for the taxpayers.

True fiscal conservatives, in my view, ought to be tripping over themselves in order to pass a permanent Children’s Health Insurance Program without preconditions. Yet, at every turn in this program for the future of so many vulnerable kids—9 million kids—what we saw was not action but Republican leaders taking yet another hostage.

So I want to be clear. I think what we have seen over the last few months is the exploitation of children by the governing party here in the Nation’s Capital. It is wrong. It is causing needless panic among millions of families who are caring for sick kids. This is a crisis made over the last few months by the governing party here in Washington, and it is about to end here today, with the governing party, the Republicans, releasing the hostage, passing—all of us together—a clean, very short spending bill that would allow this continuing resolution nonsense to end once and for all.

I believe it is in the country’s interest to have a permanent extension of the Children’s Health Insurance Program. It is an extension that saves the taxpayers money. What you do by making this program permanent is you give more youngsters in America the opportunity for better health, which gives them more opportunity to achieve their full potential in the years ahead.

I will close with this. More than anything else, what I have tried to do is dedicate my time in public service to working in a bipartisan way on healthcare. I have always felt that healthcare was the most important of all directions for our citizens for almost 7 years. The group was called the Gray Panthers. I ran the legal aid office. I decided then that if you and your loved ones—one’s good friend, the Presiding Officer, has worked with me and did such good work with us on the veterans bill, another important issue—I always felt that if you and your family didn’t have your health, then everything else didn’t matter. You couldn’t go to the football game. You couldn’t find a way to pick up a new skill and have some exciting job options in the future because if you didn’t have your health, it went by the board.

Everything I have tried to do in healthcare—everything—I have tried to say ought to be bipartisan. Usually there is a set of options for finding common ground. So often, for example, I felt that my party was right about wanting to expand coverage because if you don’t get everybody covered, you have a lot of cost-shifting and not much prevention. I thought Republicans had some valid points, as well, with respect to a role for the private sector.

When it came time to get the Children’s Health Insurance Program extended and do it in a bipartisan way, I was very pleased to meet the chairman of our committee, my friend Senator HATCH, in a bipartisan way for a long-term extension with additional funds. That could have been done in the fall. Yet, over the months since then—I have described all of the hurdles, all of the obstacles that Republicans have put in front of making that bipartisan effort, which, as I just indicated, has worked with me and did such good work with us on the veterans bill, another important issue. I always felt that if you and your family didn’t have your health, then everything else didn’t matter. You couldn’t go to the football game. You couldn’t find a way to pick up a new skill and have some exciting job options in the future because if you didn’t have your health, it went by the board.

Everything I have tried to do in healthcare—everything—I have tried to say ought to be bipartisan. Usually there is a set of options for finding common ground. So often, for example, I felt that my party was right about wanting to expand coverage because if you don’t get everybody covered, you have a lot of cost-shifting and not much prevention. I thought Republicans had some valid points, as well, with respect to a role for the private sector.

When it came time to get the Children’s Health Insurance Program extended and do it in a bipartisan way, I was very pleased to meet the chairman of our committee, my friend Senator HATCH, in a bipartisan way for a long-term extension with additional funds. That could have been done in the fall. Yet, over the months since then—I have described all of the hurdles, all of the obstacles that Republicans have put in front of making that bipartisan effort, which, as I just indicated, has worked with me and did such good work with us on the veterans bill, another important issue. I always felt that if you and your family didn’t have your health, then everything else didn’t matter. You couldn’t go to the football game. You couldn’t find a way to pick up a new skill and have some exciting job options in the future because if you didn’t have your health, it went by the board.
work, which was part of what I have always thought was the way to do health policy, in the fall and make it law. There is still time to do that. The way we are going to do it is not through the kinds of misleading statements, unfortunately, we heard this morning on the floor. We are going to do it by working in a bipartisan fashion.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will now call the roll.

**Mr. SULLIVAN.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be rescinded.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**REMEMBERING GEORGE BROWN**

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I try to get down on the Senate floor every week and talk about someone in my State who is making or who has made our State a better place for all of us. It is, actually, one of my favorite parts of the whole week. I know the pages really enjoy it. It is what I call our Alaskan of the Week. It is one of the most fulfilling things that I do.

No one is more here in the Chamber and people watching from home and from up in the Gallery have seen pictures or television shows about Alaska. Hopefully, they have been up there. My State has captured the country’s imagination. They are cable shows about Alaska, wonderful shows, and for good reason. There is so much about Alaska that is awe-inspiring—our long expanses of tundra, mountain ranges, glaciers, our salmon-filled streams. To everybody watching back home or listening, we want them to go to Alaska if they haven’t already been or to go again. It will be the trip of a lifetime, I guarantee you. Yet a State is different from a community. A State is where people go, and a community is where people live. It takes great, strong, and generous people to build a community.

This week, I recognize someone in Alaska who spent his entire adult lifetime building community. His name was George Brown, who, with his wife, Peggy, had run one of the most popular diners—one of the greatest restaurants in Anchorage—since 1955. The Lucky Wishbone is that place that for decades, I walked of life gone—veterans, politicians, oil workers, hospital employees. You name it, they have gone to the Lucky Wishbone. They have converged on this wonderful establishment in Anchorage for some of the best fried chicken and best strawberry shakes ever. I guarantee it if you go. I know from firsthand experience. Trust me.

George Brown was born in rural Wisconsin in 1922. He joined the National Guard at the tender age of 17, and his unit went to Alcatraz Island to guard the Golden Gate Bridge. At 21, he had already risen to the rank of master sergeant when he qualified for Officer Candidate School. In 1943, he finished flight school at Luke Field, AZ, as a second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps. In that same year, George met the love of his life, Peggy, and married soon after.

After he was married, George received orders to fly B-24s across the Himalayas during World War II—a mission in an area famously known simply as the Hump. George earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal for his bravery and service during World War II.

Incidentally, the late, great Senator Ted Stevens from Alaska, whose desk I occupy here on the floor, also flew the Hump with the Army Air Corps during World War II, and I know he was a friend of George’s.

After the war, George and Peggy and their two children made their way to Alaska to forge a new life. Eventually, that life took shape in a building that George built by hand in downtown Anchorage—the Wishbone. Its doors opened on November 30, 1955, and a kinds of living room for the community—where you could also get great food—was born in Anchorage.

As you know, most walls don’t talk, but the walls of the Lucky Wishbone do talk. They are filled with pictures that chart Anchorage and Alaska’s history throughout the decades. These photos tell the story of a hardscrabble territory—Alaska—that fought for self-determination and gained citizenship and statehood in 1959. They tell a story of the town of Anchorage, rebuilt after being hit by the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in North America—9.2 on the Richter scale. It lasted for 5 minutes. The walls of the Lucky Wishbone tell the story of a State brimming with excitement when the largest oilfield in North America, Prudhoe Bay, was discovered on the North Slope, and tens of thousands of jobs for Alaskans and Americans. They tell the story of the crash in oil prices in the 1980s and of the hard and long recovery. They tell the story of how, through it all, a community and our citizens in Alaska relied on each other.

As all of this history was in the making, George and his wife, Peggy—who by then had four children—went to work every day. They knew their customers by name, and they continued to make them feel at home. Sadly, Peggy died in 2011 after she and George celebrated 67 years together. George continued to go to work every day. I saw him there. He continued to fly his plane until he was 91 years old—a wonderful, gracious, tough, patriotic Alaskan and a great American.

George passed away earlier this week—an amazing life. He was 96 years old. He left behind two of his four children—Patricia and Corky—lots of grandchildren, nieces, and nephews. The Lucky Wishbone, one of his many legacies, will live on. This great restaurant has now been passed down to his daughter Patricia and two long-term employees. George and Peggy’s memory will also live on with them.

Mr. President, in a few hours, we are likely going to have a simple choice to make here on the floor. Do either pass the House’s continuing resolution that passed yesterday so as to continue to fund our government and our military and, importantly, to reauthorize the Children’s Health Insurance Program, CHIP, for 6 years or to shut down the Federal Government. Yet, if you are watching the Senate floor debates about all of this from home or in the Gallery, you might be a bit confused. Actually, I was almost confused last night. Particularly, if you were listening to the minority leader and minority whip’s new talking points that they were using last night in their remarks and have been using over the past few days, you might really be confused. Let me give you a little backgoniast as to why.

Like the Presiding Officer—actually, more than the Presiding Officer. He has been around the Senate for quite some time. As someone who is relatively new, I sit in that Presiding Officer’s seat most mornings during the 11 a.m. hour on Wednesdays and Thursdays—so I get to listen to the majority and minority leaders and the majority and minority whips give their opening statements. A couple of times a week, I watch it on C-SPAN—like a lot—and you get to hear the different priorities of the different leaders of the parties. Every day, I hear this. I respect everybody, and I respect our Members on the other side of the aisle, as we all have different areas that we focus on. I will tell you this, rebuilding the military, increasing military readiness, increasing defense funding has not been a key area of focus for the minority leader or minority whip. It is not a fact—a good or good—just a different priority.

I also sit on the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans Affairs’ Committee, and there is a lot that we focus on in those committees, particularly Armed Services, and a lot of us have been concerned about the dramatic cuts in spending. From 2010 to 2016, the military has been cut by 25 percent, even though we have had a dramatic increase in national security challenges.

There is a certain group of Senators, I would say led by the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. McCain, who focus on military issues, military readiness, increasing funding for the troops, who really care about these issues and focus on them daily. I consider myself one of them—a lot of Republicans, some Democrats. The Members of this body know who they are, and we focus on this a lot. Imagine my surprise yesterday and last night when I listened to the majority leader and minority whip started with new talking points emphasizing that this impasse we are
getting ready to see here and the impending possible shutdown is all about their concerns about the military. Their concerns about the military? How the CR was going to hurt the military? Well, with all due respect, that is the last several months, have been saying that has hit the military funding, when, to be truthful, that is the first I have heard in 3 years an emphasis in that area. Let’s fund the military, certainly. Let’s fund the government, but let’s not shut down the government tonight. That is not going to happen. And certainly—certainly—is not going to help our troops.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I get into my prepared remarks I want to say, we have been at war for 16 years, and the Senator from Alaska is correct, we do need to rebuild our military. There are cuts, but about it. It is not something that just came about last night. It is something we should have been doing with this budget that should have been passed to go into effect the end of September.

If you really want to talk about the hypocrisies and I believe there is plenty of it, the fact that we have folks coming to the floor who haven’t said a peep about CHIP—it also, by the way, ran out of money the end of September—and talk about how important it is for those kids. By the way, it is very important for those kids. It is the first time we have heard a peep out of them. That is interesting.

The fact is, we do need to come together, and we do need a long-term budget deal. By the way, when I am talking about long term, I am not talking about years and years, I am talking about until the end of September of this year. That is all we have to have is a budget deal to the end of September of this year that addresses more than just CHIP, and CHIP is important. It needs to address our military. It needs to address our southern border security. The chairman knows this. We work together on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security. He understands how important this is.

We have to make sure our borders are secure. We have to make sure we have domestic programs that working families and businesses depend upon in this country and works for my home State of Montana.

Now, today we are about 9 hours before the government is set to run out of money. Folks on the other side of the aisle are pointing their finger over here and saying: We have to reauthorize CHIP. If we don’t, all these kids—guess what, the same argument could have been made 6 months ago and was not. We have 24,000 kids in Montana who, I am telling you, have been watching. Those families have been watching. They ask: Why? Why hasn’t it already been done?

Why are we 111 days after the budget has been passed, and we still have nothing? There is a CHIP bill that has been sitting on the majority leader’s desk for many a month to reauthorize CHIP. For 111 days, they have failed to do the most basic and fundamental aspect of our job; that is, pass a long-term budget that works for this country and works for my home State of Montana.

Now, today we are about 9 hours before the government is set to run out of money. Folks on the other side of the aisle are pointing their finger over here and saying: We have to reauthorize CHIP. If we don’t, all these kids—guess what, the same argument could have been made 6 months ago and was not. We have 24,000 kids in Montana who, I am telling you, have been watching. Those families have been watching. They ask: Why? Why hasn’t it already been done?

We have an incredible failure of leadership here. I think we have had three patches to this budget—three of them. This was supposed to be done 111 days ago. Over 111 days ago, we were supposed to have a budget that lasted for the fiscal year 2018. We were supposed to have a bill that kept services for the U.S. Government running and operating so Montanans and Americans could have the certainty they elected us to create, but for 111 days, the leadership on the other side of the aisle—and I mean intentionally so. I believe—have played politics and kicked the can down the road.

This is not nuclear physics, folks. This is about funding our government. It is not just CHIP, it is about funding for our military then. We will get an agreement. Oh, we will extend out another month or two, and then we will get an agreement.

At Christmas time, I was ready to work here through Christmas to get this done because families in this country deserve the certainty of the basic job of setting up a budget. This is the basic job we are elected for in this body. I believe on December 19, once again, we kicked the can down the road, and it was said: You know what, we are going to have a deal by January 19. Well, guess what. It is January 19, and now we are going to move the goal post again.

Each of those previous patches I voted for. Why? Because I believed them. I expected the leaders of this body to work in good faith and get the job done. I was wrong because, for 111 days, they have provided short-term funding for the military but have failed to do the most basic and fundamental aspect of our job; that is, pass a long-term budget that works for this country and works for my home State of Montana.
the Senator from Alaska talked about, only on a different level.

This dysfunction here is way, way, way too deep. This bill also fails to fund community health centers. I will state, I talked to the administrators of the health centers in places like RiverStone and Flathead, up in Kalispell and Bullock and Havre. I tell you what, these folks are sweating bullets. They are afraid they are going to have to close their facilities down. They provide primary healthcare to 100,000 folks. That may not sound like a lot of people, but in Montana, a State of just over 1 million folks, it is a big deal. These are essential facilities to our communities across the state. They provide basic healthcare, and they keep families alive. The folks who run these community health centers have told me face-to-face: If we don’t get the funding, we are going to have to close in the bill before us today.

It has been 111 days, and we should have had a budget to fund community health centers, and we are still standing here today saying: Guess what. When we come back here in February, things seem to be just fine, just like they said in December. I have news for you, nothing is going to change between now and February so let’s get a long-term budget deal today that addresses some of these issues.

This bill also fails to make our borders secure. As I said earlier, the Presiding Officer and I have worked on the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee to draft a bill that works. It invests in a wall where a wall makes sense. It hires more Border Patrol agents. That bill was never brought up to full committee. I am sorry that never happened because it would have been great, and it is not included in the bill before us today.

Time and again, over the last 4 months, good bipartisan bills have been piled up on the leadership’s desk. Rather than bring these bipartisan bills to the floor, rather than pass a long-term budget, which is fiscally responsible, the Senate has just said: No. Guess what. We will do it next month—and we will do it the month after that and we will do it the month after that. It is time to stop putting the bandaid on our budget because in 4 weeks we will be back here again if this passes, and it will be the same problems. In fact, we can solve them today, and we need to solve them today. Enough is enough.

Congress has three times passed short-term, stopgap, crisis-funding bills. These bills fail my constituents, and they waste taxpayer dollars. Enough is enough. People are tired of this. They are tired on the other side of the aisle because they have told me. They told me it is time to do our job here. They are as frustrated as I am. They are as frustrated as Montanans are when I meet them face-to-face in townhalls and coffee shops. They tell me it is time for Congress to get off their duff and do their jobs.

Montanans don’t run their businesses like this, and our government should not run like this, especially after I hear promises to drain the swamp. This is exactly the opposite. Bringing this garbage bill to the floor is a dereliction of duty. It is incompetent, and mostly it is a failure of leadership. It is a failure of vision.

In any other business in this country, if managers acted like the leadership of this body, they would lose their jobs. It is almost as if the majority had planned this thing to get us to this point for political purposes. Well, guess what, we should not be here for political purposes; we should be here as Americans doing our best to give people the certainty they need rather than playing with a hot potato, saying: You know what, we will do it next month.

We were sent here to govern. We ought to govern and put politics in the closet. We have 9 hours to do a job, and we need to do it. If the majority leadership and the other side are going to continue to sit back and twiddle their thumbs, let’s bypass them and let’s get a deal. There are good people in this body. We need to sit down and get a deal that works for the rest of this year—that is until the end of September, not until the 19th of February—that strengthens our borders, reauthorizes CHIP, funds our community health centers, supports rural hospitals, and fixes DACA.

I know there are scores and scores of folks on the other side of the aisle who want to do this. Nobody should leave their desk in this body until this job is done. We are nearly 4 months into this fiscal year. At some point in time, the Appropriations Committee should be starting to work on the 2019 fiscal year budget, but we are not because we can’t even get through 2018. We need to stop governing from crisis to crisis. Nobody wants a shutdown, and that is why we need to stay here and do our jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Murkowski). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I realized a long time ago something unique and unfortunate about the way Congress can work. It seems sometimes that in Washington, and only in Washington, the more people agree on something, the less likely it is to get done. In the real world, in Colorado and in Alaska, where the Presiding Officer is from, the more people agree on something, the more likely it is to get done and the more likely you will see progress on an important issue to the people of Colorado and to the people of Alaska. But here in Washington, the more you agree, the more people seem to want to push back to fight and to divide.

So here we are approaching the zero hour of a government shutdown, and I must say my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—where is the good faith, they say. It has been 111 days, and these programs haven’t been permanently reauthorized? Where is the good faith, they say. They say that we just make it worse by passing a 4-week continuing resolution. Where is the good faith?

Let me just talk a little bit about what we are right now. I have been part of a bipartisan working group—very proud of the work we are doing—trying to find a solution on a very important issue dealing with many thousands of children around our country. I helped get our Senate to pass this issue of DACA, of Dreamers, is incredibly important, not just to part of the State, not just to Denver or the Front Range. Two kids of mine go to school with people who were brought here at a very young age through no fault of their own, and we all agree there needs to be a solution for those kids.

We agree we should address the opiate crisis that is gripping this Nation, that is tearing families apart, and that is resulting in the deaths of far too many people. When you have a crisis that is resulting in the age and life expectancy of Americans declining, like the opiate crisis has, we should address that.

We have men and women in uniform around the country defending this Nation. There are hundreds of thousands in Korea facing down a threat from North Korea. An article in the Wall Street Journal today talked about the special operators who are now in the Philippines directly intervening in the War on Terror in the Philippines, fighting radical Islamic terrorists. Of course we all know about the work that is being done in the Middle East, the conflict in Syria, the conflict in Iraq, the conflict in Afghanistan, and the progress we have made fighting back on ISIS, fighting back on terrorists, and the progress we have made fighting back on terrorism.

We agree we should be funding our health centers, supports rural hospitals, and fixes DACA. We agree we should address the opioid crisis. This bill also fails to make our borders secure. As I said earlier, the Presiding Officer and I have worked on the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee to draft a bill that works. It invests in a wall where a wall makes sense. It hires more Border Patrol agents. That bill was never brought up to full committee. I am sorry that never happened because it would have been great, and it is not included in the bill before us today.

There is not a thing in there that people support. There is not a thing in there that represents policies that people support. There is not a thing in there that people disagree with that they would vote against—at least that is what we have been told.

In fact, let’s look at the CHIP reauthorization. I heard my colleague from...
Montana say that this is a garbage bill. A garbage bill that reauthorizes CHIP for 6 years? A garbage bill that will provide healthcare for 8.9 million women and children on SCHIP coverage! This is a garbage bill that provides the longest extension of women and children’s healthcare since it was created?

I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Well, they didn’t talk about it. They didn’t care.

I have been a cosponsor of that bill for months because I believe it is important. It is important to the people of my State.

The fact is, people across this country are tired of the finger-pointing; they are tired of the blame game; and they are tired of the shutdown politics that we are just hours away from seeing played out because people would take this country, this government hostage to the politics of their choice. I am old enough to remember back in 2013 when President Obama thought a government shutdown was a bad idea. When the Democratic leader believed it was a bad idea, when the Democratic leader thought that a government shutdown could result in governmental chaos, when you shut down the government you shut down the politics of our choice. Yet here we are—six hours away from people wishing to do just that.

We can find solutions to our Nation’s biggest challenges. I am part of a bipartisan group trying to work on these solutions, but it makes it more difficult, not less difficult, to find solutions when people shut down the government, and not only that—collateral damage occurs as a result.

There is collateral damage on the men and women across this country who are hurt because of what this government cannot do to help them. We are in one of the most severe flu seasons this country has seen. The CDC has a lot of work to do. If you shut down the CDC, the CDC can no longer get information from the States about where that flu epidemic is heading, and that makes a difference on where they send vaccines. If you don’t vote for this bill to keep the government open, 8.9 million women and children could be affected because of the risk it puts to SCHIP.

Let me talk about a story from my hometown. There are five military bases in the city of Colorado Springs. Here is a story from a local newspaper: “Potential shutdown would hit hardest at Colorado Springs military bases.” There are men and women at Fort Carson, CO, and across Colorado Springs, overseas, deployed on our War on Terror, protecting us at home so we can come to work each and every day so we can have debates on the Senate floor. Some 6,000 civilians are going to be furloughed if this government shutdown occurs. These are civilians who support the War on Terror, who support soldiers and women in uniform around the globe. Yet, somehow, shutting down the government and furloughing 6,000 civilians is deemed to be better than a 4-week CR? Only in Washington can people claim that a bad bill should be replaced by a worse bill. Only in Washington can people decide that bad policy shouldn’t be preferred over something that is worse. And when you put Naylor in charge, it seems to be. They don’t like it, so make it worse. That is not fair to the American people. It is not fair that collateral damage hurts men, women, and children across this country when we can take action that brings it a solution to our immigration crisis, we can bring a solution to the challenge our military faces, and we can bring a solution to the opiate crisis.

Let me tell you about a business in Fort Collins called Indivior. They have made a breakthrough in the way that treatment is delivered for people who are addicted to opiates. It is a liquid medication, and when it is injected, it solidifies. It is time-released over a one-month period and allows for regular injections. It doesn’t rely on a person faithfully taking their medication because if they have a relapse, it can disrupt their medication and what they are doing in their treatment. This takes time, and it gives them that treatment for a month. That was approved through an FDA emergency expedited review process, but there is legislation that this body needs to pass this year that makes sure it is available in a way that will help the American people. Shut down the government, and we can’t get that done. Committees can’t meet and the work can’t proceed. But I guess that is the solution that we have. I guess shutting down the government seems to be the cure-all for them. Take a hostage, push it off, and somehow that makes it better.

The American people just want us to find an answer. They want us to have good-faith solutions to our problems, and men and women of good faith in this body and the House of Representatives are trying each and every day to do that. But it damn sure is not the American people’s worst suspicions that Washington doesn’t care. Pass the continuing resolution. Continue negotiations. We have time to talk. We have time to communicate. We have time to pass the bill to the Senate. The American people deserve better.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRON. Madam President, as I come to the floor today, we are facing the prospect of a government shutdown. At midnight tonight, funding runs out, the lights will go dark, and when that happens, everyone suffers. Not just Congress. I know that, and you know that. Republicans know that, and we have offered a solution that keeps the government open and extends the Children’s Health Insurance Program. As a doctor, I will tell you how valuable that program is for children all across the country.

The House has already passed this legislation. Democrats in the Senate have promised to block it, to stand in the way. Some have actually been bragging that they can shut down the government and that they want to shut down the government. Why would someone want to do that? Well, here is what the New York Times said on its front page this morning: “Senate Shutdown Looms As Spending Bill Advances. House approves a stopgap measure while Democrats dig in on immigration.” That is the reason the New York Times said it. What the New York Times said is that the Democrats don’t want to shut down the government of this entire country—over the issue of immigration. That is the New York Times. Here is the Washington Post this morning: “Shutdown looms despite House action. Democrats tie ‘dreamers’ to passage of budget deal.”

There it is—the New York Times and the Washington Post. The minority leader is forcing a shutdown over the issue of illegal immigration. Democrats are ready to set aside all other issues, all other deadlines, all other priorities.

Republicans have written and passed legislation that funds the government. That means funding for our military, funding for our veterans. It means funding for opioid treatment. It means funding for everything that our Federal Government does now, and it funds the Children’s Health Insurance Program—not just for a week or a month, it funds it for the next 6 years. This is a program that helped provide medical care for almost 9 million children and their families across the country. There are more than 7,300 people in my home State of Wyoming who benefit from this program. The money for this program is going to start running out in some places very soon. The funding has been in limbo since last fall. Some States are getting ready to send letters to families—letters that tell those families their coverage is going to be discontinued because this Senate didn’t act.

States have been asking for certainty, and that is what we are doing with this legislation. We are providing that certainty. We are taking care of this program, which is so vital to families across every State in this country, for the next 6 years. Democrats are blocking it. It does seem to be that what they really want to do is make a political point at the expense of everything else and everyone else. They are willing to hold 9 million children and their families hostage to it. They are willing to hold hostage more than 300 million Americans who could be harmed by a prolonged government shutdown. And it is all over the immigration issue, as they talk about in the Washington Post and the New York Times, an issue known as DACA, which stands for “deferred action for childhood arrivals.” It was intended as a temporary program to deal with the problem of people who were brought to this country illegally when they were just young children. The program was set up by an Executive action by President Obama. It wasn’t done by law. It
wasn't a bipartisan program. It was a Democratic President acting on his own to kick the can down the road on this issue.

These issues related to immigration—and specifically illegal immigration—are very tough, and we need to keep working toward a solution. There are discussions going on every day within the Senate—Republican and Democrat—between the House and the Senate. Why do people want to risk blowing up these discussions?

Well, it seems that whatever we agree to needs to include important matters of border security because, to me, border security is national security, and that has to be included in that discussion and deliberation. Any solution is going to have to include real fixes to our broken immigration system so that we are not just having the same argument again in a couple of years.

I think coming up with a solution like this does continue to take time. Certainly, it is not something we can do by midnight tonight. There is not even a good reason we need to rush to solve this problem in a few hours. The fact is, no current DACA recipients are going to lose their benefits under the program for 6 months.

Democrats are setting an arbitrary deadline of midnight tonight, and they are threatening to shut down the government if their deadline is not met. The legislation Republicans have offered leaves room for an emergency, and it gives negotiators time to reach consensus on this separate and unrelated subject.

The continuing resolution already passed by the House provides certainty to the Children's Health Insurance Program, and it allows us the chance to work out some certainty on the DACA issue.

Some Democrats are saying that they refuse to do that. Well, it is interesting. In 2013, the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, thought that a government shutdown at that time was a terrible idea. He said:
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I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia?

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to talk about why we are here, but I will just begin with a definitive statement: There is not one of the 49 Democrats in this Chamber who wants the government to shut down. And I will just conclude with this, but I will just state that if the government of the United States shuts down, it is for one reason and one reason only, and that is that the majority leadership does not want to work weekends. I will come back to that in a minute.

Why are we here? We are here debating on a House continuing resolution drafted without Democratic support or consultation at the eleventh hour and sent over to us on the last day of a spending authorization period.

Most folks in the Chamber know—but those watching on television may not—we were supposed to have a budget and an appropriations bill by October 1. That did not happen. So the leadership suggested that we agree to work and find an appropriations bill and a budget by December 8. That didn't happen. Then there was the suggestion that we delay until December 22, and that didn't happen. Then there was a vote on December 19—today. Apparently, that is not going to happen.

The request today is that we pass a continuing resolution that would put this matter to the 16th of February, and we would then be in the fifth month of the fiscal year without a budget deal. Why would we want to do that? What we should want to do is not budget by continuing resolution, but actually do a budget deal.

For folks who aren't schooled in the ins and outs of a continuing resolution...
We want to do what a veteran told me yesterday in Arlington. I had a veteran’s roundtable. I was listening to their concerns about VA and mental health—issues we care about. One veteran said: I am a veteran, but I want to talk to you about being a Federal employee for 35 years. I am a Federal employee in civilian service. I live in Quinlan. Don’t make us live under continuing resolutions. The uncertainty of it is just too great. Find a final budget deal.

That is the task that is really before us right now on January 19. Can we find a final budget deal? What should we do? It is not that hard. The deadline tonight is completely artificial. There is nothing magic about January 19.

What we should do is commit, as Senators and House Members, to stay here and get a final budget deal done. There are a series of discrete items. There are the budgetary numbers for defense and other important priorities—healthcare, education, transportation, mental health. There are emergency relief packages for the hurricanes and wildfires of the last few months. Those are important.

There are a number of healthcare priorities like the CHIP program. That is important.

I would argue that a resolution of the issue with Dreamers is important. Why do I say it is important? Because President Trump told us to do it in September. He said: I am going to end the Dreamer program in 6 months. I will end DACA in 6 months. I disagreed with that, but what I did agree with was when he said that this was for Congress to fix. He put a burden on our shoulders to fix it in September.

It is 5 months later, and there is a bipartisan proposal on the table. President Trump said: Send me a proposal, and I am going to sign it. You work it out, and I am going to sign it. We now have a proposal that I believe is real, to be voted on and, I believe, would pass in both bodies.

What we should do is avoid the short-term—avoid the continuing resolutions that the Secretary of Defense has told us not to pass, follow his advice and stay here at the table over the weekend and into next week, and find a final budget deal. That is how we can best serve our constituents.

I think there is only one person who has talked about shutdown with glee and that is President Trump. This is a tweet from May: “Our country needs a good ‘shut down.’”

I remember the tweet well because I am on the Budget Committee, and I was having budget hearings then. We had a Trump administration nominee before us for a key position—OMB, I believe. I asked him: Do you think there is such a thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government? I have been asking that question to many witnesses on the committee. Most say no. No, there is in never such a thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government. That is what we believe, and I think that is what our Republican colleagues believe. There is no such thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government. We all believe that.

In this instance, we don’t even need to entertain the thought. If we are willing to have Federal employees of the next few days to try to do what Secretary Mattis asked and find a final budget deal, I believe we can find one, especially if the President were to say: Congress, stay at your job. Find a final budget deal, and I will support it. If the President were to say those things, we could find a deal. That would be the best thing for all concerned.

Instead of kicking it down the road for a month, we might have to say that we are going to kick it down for 3 days or 4 days or 5 days while we negotiate. Let’s put the pressure on to negotiate and not do this month-long extension that we have done since October 1, which has gone.

That is what I meant when I said that the only reason this government would shut down over this is if the leadership decides they don’t want to work on weekends. We can work on weekends. Go out to Dulles and look at TSA employees doing their jobs as people are traveling around. A whole lot of folks who are my constituents in Virginia, our neighbors in Richmond, workers we see in my Senate colleagues work hard in their districts. We work on weekends.

We can work on weekends here. We can scrap some plans for the weekend. We can commit to finding a final budget deal that would meet what Secretary Mattis asked us to do. We should do that.

No one wants to shut this government down. There is only one person who has been talking about it with glee. But even today, when President Trump asked Senator SCHUMER to come and have a dialogue, I think that was a tacit admission that he now realizes it would be a bad idea. If it is a bad idea, let’s pass it and get a budget deal done. That is what the folks sent us here to do, and I know we can do it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I rise today to discuss two important issues: keeping our government running and providing important tools in the fight against the opioid epidemic. I know how strong the President is on that as well.

Today we face a deadline to fund the government. It is the most basic duty of Congress to keep our government running.

I was elected by the people of Indiana to work every day on behalf of Hoosiers to do my job as a U.S. Senator. Keeping the government running is our job, and I will vote to keep the government open.

I hope that Republicans and Democrats will join together to reach an agreement that avoids a shutdown. We still have that opportunity to prevent a shutdown. I stand ready to work with anyone.

I share the frustration of many Hoosiers and Americans. We have been down this road before, but Congress does not need to follow that path again.

As a potential shutdown looms, the President’s opioid public health emergency declaration is on the verge of expiring. According to reports today, the administration is planning to cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent. Let me say that again. The President’s opioid public health emergency declaration is on the verge of expiring, and according to reports today, the administration is planning to cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent.

ONDPC coordinates Federal efforts to combat opioid abuse and heroin use, as well as drug trafficking in Indiana and across the country. In addition, ONDPC administers the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program, or HIDTA, which supports and enhances cooperation between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to combat drug trafficking. It is a program that effectively brings together critical law enforcement partners in Indiana, and the reported cuts to ONDPC could upend the good progress that is being made.

As we work to confront the opioid crisis, we should be investing in critical tools for Hoosier law enforcement and communities to combat drug abuse and trafficking. This is a crisis. It is not a time for the Federal Government to take critical tools for Hoosiers communities off the table. We should be doubling down on effective efforts. We must confront the opioid epidemic with all possible tools available and everyone working together to address this public health emergency.

I yield back.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, we are here to talk a little bit about immigration reform and maybe a little bit about the looming government shutdown. I want to start with the government shutdown because it is intrinsically linked with some of the arguments that are being made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

What we are trying to do is fairly simple. We are trying to fund our servicemembers. We are trying to fund our veterans. We want to get a long-term authorization for the CHIP program. The CHIP program actually expired last year, but there were sufficient funds for one year, but they are running out. In States like North Carolina and other States, this program is going to start being
shutdown if we don’t get much needed resources. We are talking about a multiyear reauthorization for the plan and, of course, continuing to fund the National Institutes of Health, which is a critically important part of combating diseases, finding treatments, and cures. That is all we are trying to do with this spending bill.

The other thing we are trying to do is make some progress. We got together with about 10 people in the meeting as Members, and we told the President we have not yet reached an agreement on immigration reform. The idea that comprehensive immigration reform sounds good, except it has failed every time they attempted it. We decided we should start with a more focused effort to address some of the border security concerns and certainty in terms of funding going into next year—if it were up to me and I think up to Senator LANKFORD, for several years, but it would be good to get some long-term certainty in the funding process because right now these continuing resolutions are killing us. We are living paycheck to paycheck. It creates all kinds of inefficient processes. It is wasting taxpayer dollars.

We have to at least start with funding the government tonight. At midnight tonight, if we don’t act on a continuing resolution, then we will be shutting down the government. I, for one, am going to vote for the continuing resolution like I have every resolution last 3 years because I have been here because I believe we need to pay our bills. I believe we need to fund our servicemembers. I believe the civilian employees should know they can pay their bills. I believe we need to fund our Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, the Veterans. What is going to happen? We are going to have to accept positions that are unacceptable to many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle talking and hopefully get some long-term certainty in the funding process because right now these continuing resolutions are killing us. We are living paycheck to paycheck. It creates all kinds of inefficient processes. It is wasting taxpayer dollars.

Senator LANKFORD and I have spent a lot of time on this. In September of last year, we introduced the SUCCEED Act, which was an honest effort to get into the discussion on how we could come up with a long-term solution for the DACA population. We got together with Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and a number of other Members to try and negotiate out our differences. We made some progress.

Now I want to talk about why we are at the shutdown. We are mainly at the shutdown because some Members want to put all of our government funding at risk—all the funding I was talking about here at risk—because we have not yet reached an agreement on immigration reform. We have the DACA population. We have the special situation in New Mexico where we have a lot of migrants coming across the border. We also have the Border Patrol agents. We also have the CIS agents safe. There is also a compassionate case for knowing who is crossing the border and where they are. Why? Because 10,000 people have died crossing that border over the last 20 years. Almost 1,000 of them were kids or minors. That doesn’t include the number who get killed or die long before they get ever get to the southern border.

The way it works is they have these human traffickers, or human smugglers, who charge thousands of dollars to get somebody across the border. Sometimes they get across; oftentimes they don’t. It is a moneymaker. As a matter of fact, the cartels that run the different plazas throughout the geography along the southern border. It is sort of like if you go through this plaza, you better be paying a toll or you are probably going to die. We have one example where 72 people were all murdered, one family—men, women, and children—because the person who was smuggling them apparently got crosswise with the cartel. So to send a message, they killed these people. They died because we didn’t know they were there. We didn’t know they had crossed the border. We didn’t have the situational awareness that we are trying to get done with the border security provisions that are in a compromise bill that we offered.

I can also talk about the millions of doses of drugs that cross our border every week. Every week millions of doses of poison cross our border. We talk about the opioid epidemic, and we know a vast majority of the opioids—like 80% or 90%—are the opioids that are coming across the border—are coming from south of the border, either by water or by land. If that is not a compelling case, a compassionate case, for American border security with what we are trying to do with immigration reform, I don’t know what is. We are not talking about a wall. We are not talking about a 2,300-mile wall.

I have been criticized for several years because I sit on the Judiciary Committee. We have had a number of hearings that would have never made sense. The President has been briefed by Border Patrol. He understands it is
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a series of structures, people, technology. Infrastructure is what border security call it. We are asking for the baseline funding and build it out over time—walls where it makes sense, fences and roads, reconnaissance, and just intelligence-gathering devices in some places. The point is to have a deal here. There is a deal to be struck here very quickly, but you don’t do it by going around a process that, 2 days before, you agreed to participate in.

I thank Senator LANKFORD because Senator LANKFORD has done an extraordinary job. I also want to thank our staffs because they have done an amazing amount of work to really come up with something that had been well received, to a certain extent, by Senator DURBIN and others. In fact, they embraced some of the provisions, but then things just broke down because all they wanted to talk about was the DACA component. They didn’t want to talk about the other things that would be an enduring, impactful and compassionate solution for which, I think, we could easily get 60 votes.

I would appreciate Senator LANKFORD’s thoughts and comments on this.

I yield the floor to Senator LANKFORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, Senator TILLIS and I have come to the floor today because we have just some incredible frustration and wanted to be able to bring some facts to this conversation.

I absolutely grieve for the Federal workers in my State. I mean, there are some phenomenal people who do an amazing job. Most people will never know their names, but, every day, they are getting up to serve the American people.

Every day, there are folks who are in our military who are serving the American people. The civilians who surround them, though they are not listed as Federal employees, are intimately connected to what we are doing for the Federal task—for people. They are trying to figure out this afternoon what is going to happen to them this weekend and next week. They are frantically getting together in offices all over Oklahoma and, quite frankly, all over America to figure out their jobs. We are trying to piece together the “what’s next?” of a government shutdown, which is distracting them from getting all of the things done that they already need to get done that they are backlogged on now.

For what?

The frustration of this whole focus on “let’s do a government shutdown over not having to have real discussions about DACA and immigration” is not only not accurate, but it is also something that is already in the process of being short-circuited. All of these Federal workers and all of these civilian employees who are going through all of this turmoil in trying to figure out why DACA is not resolved and why the deadline for DACA is in the first week of March, yet it forces them to be out and have all of this chaos now, at the end of January, has brought utter confusion to everyone, especially when you know the history of how this is going to happen. Everyone is walking everyone backward through a span of a few months here.

In September, the Nation was surprised when President Trump announced that he was not going to renew DACA and that he wanted a legislative, long-term fix for DACA. The very day that he made that announcement, I released a statement, saying: In America, we do not hold children accountable for the acts of their parents. We don’t do that in American law.

Just a couple of days after that, the President called me late one night. He said: Hey, I saw your statement in a report about that. Can we talk about it? We spent about 20 minutes late that evening just talking about immigration policy and his interest in getting a legislative, long-term resolution for DACA, for these kids who have to renew every 2 or 3 years, and they have no idea what is going to happen. He was looking for some semblance of permanence for them but, at the same time, also resolve some of the issues around border security that were not controversial a few years ago. He said that we need to deal with some issues with border security, and we need to deal with the issue of DACA and give them some semblance of permanence. Can we put this together?

Actually, at that time, Senator TILLIS and I were already working to get something together because, for the last 15 years, the DREAM Act has come up before the House and the Senate, and for 15 years, it has failed every single time. The DREAM Act failed when there was a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. That bill was not going to pass. We knew that, so we went to work, asking: What is a better solution that will provide some semblance of permanence on this?

Our conversation was about a lot of the pushback as to why the DREAM Act had not passed in the past. A lot of Americans feel like: I understand this, but it had to be resolved with border security. Thankfully, in our conversation, Senator TILLIS and I were already working to get something together, and he agreed we needed to have a legislative, long-term fix for DACA. Yet our caveat was very consistent. We wanted to be able to resolve this, but it had to be resolved with border security attached to it.

I didn’t think that was an unreasonable request. I was surprised to hear that it might have been since, in the previous Gang of 8 versions several years ago that had come out of the Senate, there had been a large section in it about border security. I assumed that Senator TILLIS would be able to pair those issues together. It seems irresponsible to deal with the DACA issue and to not address: How did that happen in the first place? To say that we have a secure border and that we needed to address DACA, to ignore 12 million examples in our country of that rule being violated either through visa overstays or through individuals coming across the border who want to be in our country but who feel like they can come through the legal process.

We are a very open, receiving country. Every day, a half a million people cross our southern border legally—a half a million every day. A million people a year legally become citizens of the United States. We are not a country that is anti-immigration. We just want it done the right way. We think the law should apply to everyone equally all the time and don’t like any other convention.

So here is a history lesson.

On September 5, the President makes that announcement. Within days, we have conversations with the President about it. He agrees we need to be able to have something that is a long-term solution for border security and for DACA. Within about 2 weeks, Senator TILLIS and I release the SUCCESS Act and say this has to be part of our border security. Thankfully, in our conversations, Senator CORNYN said that he is also working through border security to be able to partner it with this. At the same time, Senator COTTON and Senator PERDUE are also working on other areas dealing with chain migration, knowing these could all be part of a comprehensive law.

So there is a history lesson.

In October, the President of the United States released a long report, saying here is what he would like to have in a bill. He put great detail into it and said that this is what he expects the bill to be like when it is resolved.
So now it is October. He said that we have to get this resolved. We release three different bills, and the President releases something. We want to start negotiations.

In November, we are in negotiations in a bipartisan group, and every day every subgroup of the bipartisan group team, our Democratic colleagues want to talk about is DACA—every day. Our staffs meet every day. We are meeting every other day as Members, going through this—every day, going through it. Every day, it is DACA and, every day, we bring up: Hey, there are other aspects of this that we have agreed to. Yet, every day, they say: Well, let's work on DACA some more.

It finally hits a point in December that I ask: When are we going to get to talking about border security? We have to talk about that. Well, guess what happened. The next meeting I was not invited to attend. Neither was Senator Tillis who hosted the trip that I made down to the border that gave me an incredible perspective on the case for border security. I appreciate his input in that.

We didn’t walk away from the negotiations. We were kicked out of the negotiations because we believed that this deal needed to have border security in it and DACA. For a group that said, basically, we want to deal with border security, they were no longer interested in us, which took us to a stalemate of really getting this resolved, which took us to 2 weeks ago.

On Tuesday, the President invites us over in a bipartisan, bicameral conference to say: We have to get a plan here. This is stuck. During that meeting with the President, with 26 House Members and Senators together from both parties, we make an agreement that there will be four areas of this final agreement and that these will be the negotiators to be able to pull it together—the Republican and Democratic whips from both the House and Senate. Those four individuals will be the individuals to pull it together, and they are going to get that done. That was on Tuesday.

By Thursday of that week, a smaller subgroup of the group that I had been kicked out of went back to the President. We have this idea. Let’s try to do this instead. I know, on Tuesday, we agreed to the other process, but we have another idea to kind of end-run that whole process.

Clearly, it upset a lot of us to say that we are trying to do a bipartisan deal, that we are trying to work this through the process, that we are trying to be of good faith in this. So far, there have not been good faith negotiations on border security at all. We cannot deal with the issues individually. There are those who call illegal aliens criminals, even if we as Americans see them as neighbors and friends and future citizens of our country, and ignore how it happened in the first place. That would not be responsible of us.

Now, there are some who want to say, “This is because you are just, simply, a racist,” which is infuriating and inaccurate and belittles the conversation. They are the only way you think this is because you are a racist is trying to shut down the conversation, not engage in it. These are my friends and neighbors as well, but we are legislators, and we have a responsibility to solve issues, not to belittle each other and not to make false accusations.

There are millions of people who have crossed our border to be able to work or connect with family. I fully understand that. Many of them live around my place, go to church with me. I get that completely. There are also many people who cross our borders because of crime, and we would be foolish to ignore that reality as well. There are people who cross that border to be able to traffic in terrorism, to be able to move people—human trafficking, labor trafficking. We should have a secure border set up for that.

Again, this used to not be a partisan issue. In 2006, Senator Schumer and, at that time, Senator Obama voted for the Secure Fence Act, which put in 650 miles of fencing on the southern border. Let me say that again. Senator Schumer and Senator Obama and a lot of other Democratic Senators, who are still here, voted for the Secure Fence Act in 2006 to put in 650 miles of fencing on our southern border. This didn’t use to be a partisan issue, and it shouldn’t be today. Border security is not partisan. It is national security.

The proposals that have come out at times amaze me. Let’s actually get serious about trying to resolve these issues. Basic border security issues should involve not just some fencing in some areas or walls in some areas or technology in some other areas or adding additional manpower in other areas. Those are reasonable things along our border that every country in the world has organized.

It also involves dealing with some of the gaps in our law if someone crosses into the United States. These are things that need to be addressed—for instance, the removal of multiple felony criminal illegal aliens. Why is this a controversy at all? We have talked about the insanity of allowing convicted criminals to be able to move across our border in the face of, to traffic in terrorism, to be able to move people—human trafficking, labor trafficking. Should we have a secure border set up for that?

Again, this used to not be a partisan issue. In 2006, Senator Schumer and, at that time, Senator Obama voted for the Secure Fence Act, which put in 650 miles of fencing on the southern border. Let me say that again. Senator Schumer and Senator Obama and a lot of other Democratic Senators, who are still here, voted for the Secure Fence Act in 2006 to put in 650 miles of fencing on our southern border. This didn’t use to be a partisan issue, and it shouldn’t be today. Border security is not partisan. It is national security.

The proposals that have come out at times amaze me. Let’s actually get serious about trying to resolve these issues. Basic border security issues should involve not just some fencing in some areas or walls in some areas or technology in some other areas or adding additional manpower in other areas. Those are reasonable things along our border that every country in the world has organized.

It also involves dealing with some of the gaps in our law if someone crosses into the United States. These are things that need to be addressed—for instance, the removal of multiple felony criminal illegal aliens. Why is this a controversy at all? We have talked about the insanity of allowing convicted criminals to be able to move across our border in the face of, to traffic in terrorism, to be able to move people—human trafficking, labor trafficking. Should we have a secure border set up for that?

I understand that every single day you wake up, that day seems like today. I know we need to move more quickly on these issues. Obviously, we could have gotten this done a couple of months ago if people had engaged, recognized their differences, and accepted a compromise. We are doing everything we can to get done much sooner than March 5 because we understand that they are our teachers, our EMTs. There are 900 serving in the military. They are hard-working people. They are kids in school. There are hundreds of thousands of good people—in a proposal that we put together, over a million—to do this—20 years in a backlog. Why would that be controversial to say that we need to divert some of our attention to catching up on the backlog?

There are a lot of issues that we need to deal with, and this is a complicated issue. But for other Members, can I ask, can we finish the process? Can we agree that we have actually acted in good faith in negotiations. But saying “We will shut down the government until you do it our way”—and their way was an end run around the whole stated process that we all agreed on—absolutely absurds certain—certainly seems absurd to the Federal workers in my State who are now going through chaos this afternoon because some people wanted to make an end run around the process that was already in place.

Let’s finish the process and not create some artificial cliff and chaos to try to say “Do it my way, or I will shut down the government.” Let’s finish the process. There are willing partners on both sides, and they are reasonable. Let’s work with the proposals to finish out what we have already started and worked on for months to get through this process.

I thank Senator Tillis for the engagement he has on this because he and his team have worked exceptionally hard. My team and I, both in my State and here, have worked exceptionally hard on these issues, and we want to get them right. Senator Cornyn and his team have worked exceptionally hard.

Let’s do it, and let’s get it right, but let’s not shut down the government while in the middle of negotiations because people want to have it their way and not actually finish the negotiations we started.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. Tillis, Madam President, I am pleased to see Senator Cornyn here. He has done an extraordinary job. As a matter of fact, it was Senator Cornyn who hosted the trip that I made down to the border that gave me an incredibly important perspective on the case for border security. I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

I want to leave a final comment for the DACA population. Some people say: What is the crisis? We have until March 5.

I understand that every single day you wake up, that day seems like today. I know we need to move more quickly on these issues. Obviously, we could have gotten this done a couple of months ago if people had engaged, recognized their differences, and accepted a compromise. We are doing everything we can to get done much sooner than March 5 because we understand that they are our teachers, our EMTs. There are 900 serving in the military. They are hard-working people. They are kids in school. There are hundreds of thousands of good people—in a proposal that we put together, over a million—to do this—20 years in a backlog. Why would that be controversial to say that we need to divert some of our attention to catching up on the backlog?
know that we know that, I want them to know that there are dozens of Republicans prepared to vote on a compromise bill that is balanced, that brings border security and provides certainty to the DACA population. We are going to do everything we do every day that we are here to make sure that we deliver on that promise.

Madam President, thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority Whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, let me say publicly what I have said privately to Senator TILLIS and Senator LANKFORD.

Thank you for your leadership.

They have done an extraordinary job trying to come up with a solution to the issue, the problem, the challenge that they have already described. I would like to add a little color to some of that, but they have done extraordinary things to come up with a compassionate but legal framework by which we can resolve this issue.

I have been in the Senate since 2002, and I have been through the immigration wars more times than I care to count. We keep working very hard on this issue, and we always seem to come up short. I come from a State that is one of the most diverse States ethnically in the country, and that is because we have been a big job creator, and a lot of people have been moving there looking for opportunities. We have a large Hispanic population. It makes sense. We are Texas, after all—used to be a part of Mexico. About 38 percent of my constituents are Hispanic, and I know that is a large part of the population we are looking at when it comes to the Dreamers. There are about 124,000 Dreamers in my State and others who are eligible who, frankly, are in a little bit of a box, not knowing how to deal with their situation.

When I think about immigration, I think about the two great pillars that have made our country great. No. 1, we are a nation of immigrants. We have benefited from the fact that people have fled religious persecution. They have fled poverty. They have come to the United States to experience the sort of freedom that our country has guaranteed to each and every one of us and the opportunity to pursue the American dream, to me, is one of the great things that have made our country the envy of the world. The other part and the part that I think sometimes people tend to overlook and forget is, what makes America great? We are a nation of laws. We are a nation of laws. We are a nation of laws. When we forget either one of those pillars, I think we risk damaging this wonderful inheritance that we have gotten from our parents and grandparents and people who have gone before us.

I view this responsibility that we all share together here in the Congress as a sacred trust. We are the stewards of that inheritance. Shame on us if we don’t do everything within our power to pass that on to the next generation and beyond.

By way of a little bit of background, I think sometimes people get—it is just natural. We become familiar with these terms like “DACA.” People may be listening on TV, saying: What in the heck is DACA?

We say: That is a easy. It is deferred action for children. They ask: What is that?

We say: We are talking about the Dreamers. That is what Senator DURBIN and others have talked about because there is something called the Dream Act that has been introduced and has been advocated for. Basically, what we are talking about are children—now young adults—who were brought into the United States by their parents, and their parents came into the country illegally—that is, they didn’t comply with the normal process of applying for citizenship; they came into the country. We all understand why, what motivated and reinforced people to think, well, I am going to short-circuit the process, jump to the head of the line.

The fact is—and I think Senator LANKFORD said this—in the United States, we don’t hold children responsible for the mistakes of their parents. So these children—now young adults—who maybe are able to pursue an education, many of whom have become very accomplished, simply are in a box. I think we have a moral obligation. We have an obligation to ourselves and to our great country to try to take advantage of the talent they have to offer and to help them become full-fledged participants in this great country of ours.

I remember being over at the White House in 2012 after the November election. Speaker Boehner was there. Congressman McCarthy, the majority leader; Senator McConnell, the Senate majority leader, was there. I was there. President Obama was there, along with his staff. The President had for some time threatened to try to deal with this population, this sympathetic population that we are talking about, that we want to try to provide some assistance to. He was frustrated with the slow pace of Congress, and so he was just going to do it by himself. That is what we mean when we talk about deferred action for childhood arrivals. President Obama decided to make an end run around Congress, which has the primary responsibility on immigration matters under the Constitution, and to do it by himself.

Well, haste makes waste sometimes. What happened is that these 690,000—I think at one point it was as many as 700,000 or 800,000 who have actually qualified. Many have dropped off. About 690,000 young adults signed up for deferred action for childhood arrivals, which allowed them some security but also gave them access to work permits.

Can you imagine what their reaction was when the Federal courts held that what President Obama did was not legal? It was illegal.

When President Trump came into office, he did, I believe, the right thing and said: The courts have spoken. This is not something the President can do by himself or herself; this is something in which Congress needs to get involved.

So he kicked it over to Congress. Thankfully, he gave us some time to act. I believe the date is March 5, after which DACA beneficiaries or recipients can no longer apply for a 2-year period of deferred action. That is exactly the right thing to do because it has precipitated this debate, it has precipitated these negotiations, and it has precipitated a reality check for many of our Democratic friends that, you know, we are a nation of immigrants but we are also a nation of laws.

One reason why I believe this President was elected was because people were enormously frustrated with the lack of border security, with the failure of our laws, and with President Obama’s end run around Congress to try to do this unilaterally. This is what precipitated the sorts of negotiations in which we have all been engaged. Senator Tillis and Senator Lankford have been leaders in that effort, putting together an incredible effort to come up with a compassionate and lawful solution and one that respects both of those pillars of our legacy—a nation of immigrants and a nation of law.

That is why it is so offensive to me for the Democratic leader to decide he is going to ignore the needs of all the children. I think there are roughly 9 million children who benefit from the Children’s Health Insurance Program. He is going to give our military the back of his hand—and military families—by holding our needed support for them hostage so that they can somehow force us to deal with this DACA situation today or last night, and if we don’t do it, they are going to shut down the U.S. Government.

These 690,000 young men and women truly should be the subject of our compassion, but why would we hold 320 million people hostage to try to get a solution for these 690,000, when we are already hard at work to try to negotiate in good faith an outcome? It just makes no sense at all to me.

I appreciate the meetings that we had that Senator Tillis alluded to. The one at the White House—I think it was Tuesday. Was it last week? It seems like a year ago. President Trump invited the press into this bipartisan, bicameral meeting. One of the things that we had was the most incredible experience I have ever had, certainly, in that sort of context dealing with sensitive issues like immigration.
I think it was a very positive meeting because it provoked instruction by the President for Majority Leader McCarthy; the Democratic whip, Senator Durbin; the majority whip, Senator Cornyn; and Steny Hoyer, the minority leader in the House. We were instructed by Senator Tillis described earlier: come up with a solution to this problem and address the DACA population.

How do we show some compassion? How do we show some understanding of a quandary of not their making but also dealing with border security? I happen to come from a State that has 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico. Senator Tillis described his experience with Senator Heller. I was happy to host them because I think seeing it is worth a thousand words. Hopefully, they enjoyed the experience and learned something from it as well.

The Texas-Mexico border is about 2,000 miles long. What the Border Patrol has decided is that they need various tools to secure the border. They need infrastructure like the Secure Fence Act that we voted on in 2006. Then-Senator Obama and then-Senator Clinton and Senator Schumer, the Democratic whip, voted against that. The Secure Fence Act. Some people call it a wall. Some people call it a fence. Some people call it a tactical infrastructure. Whatever you call it, it is a barrier. It is an essential component of border security at some parts of the border, but it is only part of the system.

The system needs to include technology—whether it is unmanned aerial vehicles, ground sensors, radars, aerostats that we saw high in the sky—to try to protect our country against transnational criminal organizations that exploit our porous border to import poison, illegal drugs; that traffic in children for sex or other illicit purposes; or that their gangs and members into the United States, only to wreak havoc on communities here in the United States. The object of most of the mayhem associated with that porous border is the immigrant communities in the United States. People act as if there is no negative downside to this porous border and illegal immigration, but I will tell you that frequently the devastation that is wreaked on Americans and on people living here in the United States is in those communities, where these folks do most of their harm.

We are working very hard to try to come up with a solution, and it is frankly insulting that the Democratic leader would try to jam this through and hold hostage all of these other very important programs when we are working in good faith to try to meet that March 5 deadline, and I have every confidence we will. But the border is a little more complicated.

One other thing Secretary Nielsen, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, has pointed out is that because of a provision in the U.S. law, if you immigrate illegally into the United States from Mexico, for example, the Border Patrol can offer you the opportunity to go back rather than process you for illegal immigration and later deport you, but not if you come from a noncontiguous country, like Central America, El Salvador, for example, Honduras. So what we have seen is thousands of people coming across our southern border exploiting that loophole in our law.

How do we fix that? How do we fix that? Your Excellency is by definition a Federal responsibility, but the taxpayers in Texas are required to pick up the tab when the Federal Government doesn’t live up to its responsibilities, and that has been the status quo for as long as I can remember.

It is frankly galling to hear politicians here in Washington, DC, say: Well, we need to do something to help immigrants—and I am happy to do it as well—because they are sick and tired of the Federal Government failing to do its job on the border. They are 17 years old, only to be deported as soon as we can because frankly they are a danger to the rest of the law-abiding communities here in the country.

It is frustrating to hear people talk about just one of those two pillars I mentioned. They say: Yeah, we are a nation of immigrants, and we should welcome immigrants. But they don’t want to do anything about our porous borders, and they couldn’t care less about making sure we have enough border security to protect us from the drugs, the traffickers, and the violence that finds its way into communities all across our country.

So here is the problem: Funding for the Federal Government expires at midnight tonight, and a partial government shutdown will occur if we don’t pass a continuing resolution. Our colleagues in the House did their job; they passed a continuing resolution to keep the government up and running until February 16.

I really had a hard time believing what I heard my friend Senator Schumer say last night. He said we need to kill this continuing resolution because we need to pass another continuing resolution because continuing resolutions are bad for the military. Well, he lost me on that argument because it makes no sense. It is true that continuing resolutions are bad for the military. That is why we need to get our appropriations process. But does he think a shutdown is good for the military? Does he think a shutdown is good for the 9 million children who depend upon the Children’s Health Insurance Program? I think his priorities are completely out of whack.

In my home State, just to take one example, the Army Medical Command said that 2,539 civilian employees at Joint Base San Antonio will be subject to furlough, representing $188 million in salaries. Some 12,000 Texas Guardsmen won’t be able to drill either. I am aware of the Presiding Officer’s distinguished service in the Guard, and she
knows what I am talking about. They won’t be able to train, they won’t be able to prepare for deployments to protect the homeland, and, of course, they won’t get paid.

It is estimated that 200,000 Texans will be furloughed with the government shutdown, so it is not just the folks who live in the DC area here in Washington, Virginia, and Maryland, where we have a lot of government employees; people across the country will be negatively affected too.

Our Democratic colleagues’ strategy to hold the military funding and children’s health insurance hostage is a complete and shameless reversal of what they claimed in the past. It is a complete and shameless reversal. In 2013, the senior Senator from Illinois said that a shutdown is “no way to run a country.” He decreed what he called “political brinkmanship,” saying we need to stop “manufacturing one crisis after the next.” Well, I wish he and his colleagues would look in the mirror and listen to their own previous comments. America needs them to.

The truth is, the Senate majority leader has said, our friends on the other side do not operate a single thing in this bill that the House passed yesterday. They don’t oppose anything in the bill. The Senate majority leader is right that this should be an easy “yes” vote for every Senator in the Chamber. The bill continues government funding; it prevents a needless shutdown, and, as I said, extends a key health insurance program for vulnerable children.

How in the heck did we get here? How did the Democrats decide that no was the right answer? Well, we worked hard last month and all this month to try to negotiate long-term spending caps that would bring stability back to government funding. One of the biggest issues was to try to make sure we funded our military in a way that helped them prepare and get ready to fight our Nation’s wars or, better yet, to prevent future wars by demonstrating the kind of strength and leadership the people have come to expect from the U.S. military. But our Democratic leadership made it clear that they would stall a final agreement on those spending caps until this unrelated issue of deferred action for childhood arrivals that we have been talking about, the security needs of the American people. I think that after they had a good night’s sleep last night, they probably woke up this morning thinking: What have we done? How do we get out of this? That is why I know the President is working with the Democratic leader, over to the White House earlier today. The report I got was that Senator SCHUMER said: Let’s have another short-term continuing resolution, maybe until next Tuesday.

Well, that wouldn’t solve anything. That would make none of this better. It would just continue the chaos and leave all the things we need to settle, unsettled.

Well, the President did the right thing. He told him: Look, you go back and you talk to the Speaker and the Senate majority leader and you guys work that out. This is what you get paid for. Get her done.

That is good advice.

The threat of a shutdown by the Democratic leader and his colleagues ignores the overwhelming majority of this country that suddenly feels they are not as important as the few they are focused on—the DACA recipients. All the Senate Finance Committee Democrats voted for a 5-year SCHIP extension in October, so they are now actually threatening to vote against a program that Senate Democrats on the Finance Committee voted for. I guess, in the immortal words of John Kerry, they were for it before they were against it. Have they forgotten that if Democrats shut down the government, nearly 9 million kids could lose their CHIP coverage? And why? Because we haven’t yet been able to come up with an agreement on something—an immigration issue—but our deadline isn’t until March. It is not yesterday. It is not today. It is not until March 5. We hope to get it done earlier. I expect we will.

Have they forgotten the 78 percent of defense workers who could be furloughed, laid off; that Active-Duty troops, as well as Guard and Reserve members, would not get paid? In Virginia, they would lose 178,000 Federal workers. In Maryland, there are 145,000. I hope they are on the phone calling their Senators and their Congressional people. Those are two States that are both represented by Members prepared to shut down the government tonight. In Texas, as I said, there are some 200,000 Federal employees. All of them will be affected, and everybody else who depends on them to protect this country and to provide services that benefit everybody else—they are going to be negatively impacted too. Paychecks could cease, services will be disrupted, all because of an unrelated immigration issue that we are determined to resolve with them in due course.

Let’s recall that the 2013 shutdown resulted in the furlough of 850,000 employees and billions of dollars of lost economic productivity. Then the Senator from California said yesterday that the results of a shutdown are extremely dire, she wasn’t being hyperbolic. She wasn’t exaggerating when she talked about the big risks that lie ahead if we don’t act. Well, I pray she and her Democratic colleagues will stop stalling, stop playing favorites, and stop daring us to engage in a game of chicken.

I will say it again one last time. We have been negotiating in good faith on a solution for the DACA recipients, and we will continue to do so, but shutting down the government will not solve that problem, and millions of people, including our military, law enforcement, and emergency personnel, could lose their paycheck if Democrats follow through on their threat.

The time to stop playing games is now. We urge them—no—we implore them: Do not shut down the government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas—

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise to express my support and to highlight the importance of reauthorizing the Children’s Health Insurance Program, CHIP.

CHIP expired in September, causing great concern and worry for families and providers who depend on this program to care for our Nation’s neediest children. Many States have been operating on reserve funds, which will soon run out. It is time we provide the program with the necessary fund to keep this program alive. In 2013, the House voted not to extend CHIP, and the bipartisan Senate voted to include a 2-year reauthorization in the legislation before this Chamber. This was the only extension for CHIP since its inception.
I thank Chairman HATCH, the original author of CHIP, for his dedication to the health of our Nation’s children, and his bipartisan effort with Ranking Member WYDEN that brought a 5-year CHIP reauthorization out of the Senate Finance Committee last fall.

Approximately, 50,000 children in Arkansas—and nearly 9 million low-income children nationwide—receive healthcare through CHIP. Currently, these children, their families, and providers are living in a cloud of anxious uncertainty.

Take for instance this story of a young Arkansan:

In Little Rock, a precious little girl marks the milestone of turning 8 months old tomorrow in the care of Arkansas Children’s Hospital fighting an infection. She has been in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit and other floors there since the day she turned 2 months old.

Her mother has four other children and spends every hour she can at her daughter’s bedside. Every one of those hours is an hour spent away from her baby’s brothers and sisters, two and a half hours away in Fort Smith.

Again, she has other children she is trying to take care of at the present time.

In addition to her child’s medical condition, her mother is worried because her daughter’s care is covered by CHIP.

As much as she looks forward to bringing her daughter home, this mother knows that even those supplies she needs to make that happen—the tubes, the medicines, the fluids—all of those are at risk without that coverage.

This story highlights the reality so many families are currently facing. Failing to reauthorize this important program would have real, direct, and serious consequences.

Failing to reauthorize CHIP will leave these families peace of mind and coverage.

Arkansans recognize how important this program is. My office has received significant amounts of inquiries on the issue. Our response has always been the same: Everyone in Congress is working in good faith to find a solution—at the end of the day, either we aim to use the power of our offices for good. Supporting children’s healthcare and passing this continuing resolution is certainly a component of that goal.

I hope my colleagues remember the story I shared today—and the stories I know they have heard from their constituents—and vote in favor of children’s health.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, midnight is approaching and a government shutdown is looming in front of us. I would say—as we can tell in this city—there are not a lot of things Senators will agree on, but I think there is one thing that just about every Senator I have spoken with does agree on; that is, we have a budgeting and spending process that is broken.

In fact, the first bill I introduced in Congress was that simply said: If Members of Congress can’t pass a balanced budget, they shouldn’t get paid. Nobody here likes to see CR after CR. CR stands for continuing resolution.

Think about it. We have a government that starts its fiscal year every year on October 1. I spent 28 years in the private sector, and 13 of those years were with Procter & Gamble, a Fortune 500 company. I spent time in a small family business, and I spent time in a part of the company that grew over 1,000 jobs. We took the company public. So I have had a lot of experience in budgets, management spending, and ensuring that you actually take in more money than you spend because that is all profit in business.

Here in Washington, DC, we are now—October, November, December, middle of January—we are 3½ months into the fiscal year without having nailed down a spending plan. It is broken. That needs to be reformed.

On a more optimistic note, there is a group of Republican and Democratic Senators who are having discussions about how to change the way the budgeting and spending works in Washington. We are still trying to deliver a better outcome for the American people.

Here we are at this moment, just hours away from a looming government shutdown. So whether we are in business or dealing with issues in personal life, we have a choice to make right here in front of us—a choice we have to make in less than 7 hours. We can either keep the Federal Government open and fund health insurance for 24,000 Montana children—it is about 9 million American children. The idea was, let’s put something in play that ought to be agreeable to both sides—something pretty clean, not a tax with a bunch of political, divisive kind of stuff. None of us want to extend the funding of the government, avoid a government shutdown, and let’s permanently reauthorize, for 6 years, the Children’s Health Insurance Program. It is very popular with the American public and that is what the Senate voted to do that or we shut the government down.

Here is where we are. There will be a lot of folks spinning a lot of different messages, but let me try to articulate exactly where we are in as simple terms as possible. The House has passed an agreement to keep the lights on and to fund Children’s Health Insurance. They passed it. The President has said he will sign that agreement to keep the lights on and to fund Children’s Health Insurance. The House has passed it, the President will sign it, and now it is up to this body.

Will we get 60 Senators—it will take Republicans and Democrats—because there are only 51 Republican Senators, and the rules of the Senate require 60. Will we get 60 Senators—a good bipartisan vote—to keep the lights on and fund Children’s Health Insurance? That is the question. We have less than 7 hours to figure that out.

I implore my Democratic colleagues not to follow their leader, who insists that DACA and illegal immigration get fixed today, in the next 7 hours. We all know illegal immigration is a very important issue for our Nation. It has to be addressed. We must secure our borders, and we must resolve this issue, but let’s keep it all in perspective.

In my home State of Montana, there are less than 100 DACA recipients versus 1 million Montanans who would be hurt by a government shutdown. A shutdown hurts our men and women who wear the uniform. To say it another way, the choice is between 100,000 or 1 million Montanans or the 24,000 children who depend on the Children’s Health Insurance Program.

Don’t let these issues get confused by smoke and mirrors. That is the fundamental issue right now that. Chuck SCHUMER and the leaders of our friends across the aisle are talking about shutting down the government over.

The right thing to do here is to vote yes today. Let’s continue to fund the government while we work to address these issues related to illegal immigration and border security.

Senator LANKFORD was here earlier. There are good bipartisan discussions going on as we speak. These are difficult issues to get sorted out. They are divisive issues, but I think there is a path forward. To me, the path forward is say they have to get resolved tonight or shut down the government is the wrong position to take.
A shutdown means no long-term certainty for Montana’s children. A shutdown hurts our military. A shutdown hurts our veterans.

I don’t like another CR. I would rather not have another CR. But guess what? You paid to own stock in the government. You made a choice. Sometimes it is between two options; neither one is very appealing. I don’t like the idea of having another CR. It is just an example of a broken budgeting process. But the choice is that either we buy some more time by agreeing to illegal immigration or we shut down the government, harming our military, our veterans, our seniors, and compromising national security. I believe a government shutdown is a mistake.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to talk about some of the issues we are facing as we approach a deadline tonight, but I really wanted to start with one observation about where we are and where we could be in the next couple of days.

Some of the debate is focused on simply what could happen at midnight were there to be a shutdown of the Federal Government, but there is another alternative, of course, and that is—well, two, really: to have an agreement that would forward us before the deadline. That is, in my judgment, less likely to happen, I don’t think anybody believes that would happen, necessarily, but the other option, of course, is to have a number of days ahead of us—3 days, 4 days, whatever the leadership on the two sides can agree to—to continue negotiations because, of course, we have a range of issues. Sometimes we haven’t talked enough about the long list of issues. I will go tonight, but there is a rather long list of issues, some of which have already been the subject of not just consensus but a bipartisan piece of legislation, actual bill text that has been introduced or could be introduced in short order, in the next few days or even the next couple of hours.

Then there are other issues where there have been ongoing issues for a long period of time, haven’t reached consensus all give way, two different deadlines and stay here—and I hope people in both parties will stay for the next few days no matter what happens tonight. If there is an extension of 3 or 4 days, that doesn’t make it any less challenging because that just means there will be a short-term deadline. I don’t think it makes any sense to go another month because that just means there will be a short-term deadline. I don’t think we have the option to drop out.

We need to make decisions about some big issues. There are some who have observed that even if you were in favor of the measure that came over from the House last night, which I have real trouble with—a lot of gaping holes in that proposal, a lot of urgent matters for many Americans that have not been addressed in that proposal—but even if you favor that, you can also still hold the position you don’t favor continuing resolution after continuing resolution. It is the fourth resolution, if we have the right count, since October 1—not that long ago.

So that is at least my sense of where we could be in the next couple of days: not leaving Washington and staying at the negotiating table on a range of issues. That is the reasonable thing to do, not only to keep the government operating and open but also to finally resolve some major issues, which I think most of both parties want to solve.

Let me start tonight with some personal letters. One of the major issues which is not resolved, but there has been a lot of effort made which is bipartisan, is the issue of pensions. I have received from a lot of Pennsylvanians who say: Look, it is up to you and up to the people in both parties to solve this pension crisis which has engulfed so many families. In Pennsylvania, if you add up the categories of people affected—retirees and their families—you are talking about at least 35,000 families, usually because the largest share of retirees are coal miners in Pennsylvania. I am sure it is true in other states as well.

I got a letter from a man in Washington County, PA, right in the southwestern corner of our State. I will not read the whole letter, but she was talking about her husband who is a retired miner. She said: ‘He worked for many years in the coal mines and endured dangerous conditions, unsafe work hazards, and a mine fire which he narrowly escaped and closed the mine forcing him to lose his job.’

She concludes by saying: ‘This pension is so important to him, to him and to us’—and she goes on from there. That is one person talking about her husband doing the most dangerous work imaginable. I am not sure there is a more dangerous job in the world than coal mining, and I know of what I speak because of the corner of Pennsylvania I am from, the anthracite coal region.

Here is another letter from the same corner of the State, Southwestern Pennsylvania. Mr. Casey, as I mentioned in this case, in particular, talking about the pension legislation which is before the Senate right now, the so-called Butch Lewis Act. Here is what this man says about his family, talking about the way he earned a pension. He said:

We gave up pay raises, to get a meager pension, and as we get older we can’t start over. Please [pass . . .] the Butch Lewis Act.

A third letter, also from Southwestern Pennsylvania—in this case from Westmoreland County, one county over, just to the south of where I am from, Pittsburgh. This individual talks about the pension he received. He said: ‘I am facing pension cuts that will have an immediate and devastating impact on my family.’ He goes on from there.

We have even more letters. A letter from the same corner of the State, Fayette County—one of the great counties of Pennsylvania in the most southwestern corner, right next to Greene County, right on the Ohio or West Virginia border, depending on which side you are looking at.

This individual said to me in the letter:

There are so many retired miners, widows and families that rely upon those benefits each month. Including my mother and me, she is a widow and I have cerebral palsy and we depend on my dad’s pension to survive on the limited income.

So the miner is speaking about the pension they earned and their hope and expectation, which is a reasonable expectation that the promise made in that pension would be fulfilled or it is the perspective of a son or a daughter or a wife or even, unfortunately, in many cases, a widow talking about a miner who had passed away.

Here is another letter from Southwestern Pennsylvania, talking about that word I just used, “promise.”

This [pension] was a promise made by the government . . . we kept ours . . . and now we hope that you will continue to KEEP THE PROMISE.

‘KEEP THE PROMISE,’ all in capital letters, by this individual.

I am 73 years old and if I was to lose my pension, my wife & I would be forced to live in poverty.

Here is another pension letter. This is not from a coal miner but from a retired truck driver—another group of Americans affected when the U.S. Senate doesn’t get pension legislation done, like we can do in the next couple of days: ‘I am a retired truck driver . . . spent 25 years of my life in this occupation . . .’ and asking me as his Senator “if you could do whatever you can do to preserve that pension for my wife and me.”

Another letter from the northeastern corner of Pennsylvania, not far from where I live, talks about the same act, the Butch Lewis Act. In this case, the letter is about his father: My father, for over 25 years, was paying into a pension. He was a dock worker, physically loading trucks by hand. He did this to provide for my family and to ensure we had medical coverage and also a pension.

This letter talks about a pension. His dad was told at one point that the pension was wiped out, that everything he had worked for was taken away. He worked hard for 25 years—nights, weekends, double shifts sometimes, on and on and on. I heard from the majority leader last night that somehow these kinds of issues that are part of this larger debate are not urgent. He said the only urgent matter is the government funding bill. I would agree that is urgent, but I would also agree that if you are a retired coal miner or the family of a retired coal miner or a retired truck driver or you are owed a pension of any
kind for all the work you did in your life, your situation is urgent. It is not something we can put off and say: Well, why don’t you wait another 6 months? Wait for a couple more CRs—continuing resolutions—and we will get to you later.

The pension issue is as urgent as any other. There is a lot of talk around here as if it isn’t. It is very, very urgent.

I will give you another urgent issue—the issue of community health centers. Here is a letter I received from South-eastern Pennsylvania—just outside of Philadelphia—about funding for community health centers, which, just like the pension issue, is not addressed in the House proposal or the House bill that passed. They don’t address pensions. They don’t address community health centers. By the way, the deadline for community health centers, just like children’s health, was way back in October.

I am glad that some Republicans are finally—finally, after more than 100 days—starting to clue in a little bit to children’s health insurance. They are talking about it. It is great that they are finally talking about children’s healthcare, which they have not talked about much since they let the deadline expire months ago. The majority party allowed that to happen. Maybe by midnight tonight they will start talking about community health centers, which serve 900,000 people in Pennsylvania. I hope they start talking about it at least, and maybe we can come together and get something done.

Here is what she says about community health centers: We serve hundreds of thousands of underserved people who deserve the quality of care we provide. They have lives filled with trauma and in turn suffer from social, physical, and behavioral issues that will go untreated if funding for community health centers go away.

I guess that is not urgent. If you rely upon a community health center for your healthcare, it is urgent. It is every bit as urgent as anything we have talked about in the last couple of days and weeks. The House bill does nothing on that, nothing on miners’ pensions, nothing on pensions, nothing on community health centers. And we are supposed to just accept that and move on and have another continuing resolution. Even worse, they don’t even address it in their proposal.

Here is another letter about community health centers. This one is about the patients who live in rural and underserved areas, who are in areas where there is a great need for health centers. I guess it is not urgent for those folks in rural areas who depend upon those health centers. I guess we should just wait—wait another month, wait another 6 months, wait another year—for community health centers to be funded. The majority allowed funding for those to expire, just as they allowed funding for children’s health insurance to expire.

Here is another letter that talks about community health centers. This individual says:

If Congress kicks this can down the road one more time, it will be a signal to health centers that we need to implement measures that will result in site closures, layoffs and reduced services.

I guess community health centers are not urgent. How about this program that is also not addressed in the House legislation—the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program. This is an evidenced-based home visiting program that supports at-risk pregnant women and their families. It is a great program that has been in place for the last couple of years. In fiscal year 2017, funding was about $400 million. That is not addressed either. I guess that is not urgent, just like community health centers. Just like pensions for retired coal miners and truckdrivers and others. None of this, apparently, according to the majority, is urgent. None of this is urgent.

I will tell you what was urgent for the majority at the end of last year. November and December: an obsession with getting a tax bill passed, which did pretty well for the superrich and big corporations. There was all kinds of time for that—negotiations between and among Republicans, discussions and changes in the bill, between and among Republicans only, for a tax bill. That was very urgent. To get that tax bill rammed through—that was very urgent, so children’s health insurance had to wait even though in December it was still overdue, 2 months after expiration. Community health centers had to wait, as well, because you had to get your Republican tax bill done. All of that had to wait. Coal miners’ pensions had to wait, too, because you had to get the tax bill done for the rich and for corporations.

How about the issue that received a lot of attention, the so-called DACA Program, the Dreamers? Right now, we have seven Senate Republicans, at last count—no, at last count there were eight—we have seven Senate Republicans who have joined with Senate Democrats on a bipartisan bill to do a lot of things but principally improve border security and help young Dreamers. That is a bill that is ready to go right now, and it is urgent because people have been deported, and both parties assert that they are concerned about these Dreamers. We could get it done right now. One Republican Senator said he could get it done in half an hour. Let’s say it is off until tomorrow and certainly a few days. We could get that done as well.

There is a lot that is urgent, and there is a lot that is left on the table with this House bill that came over last night.

I hope both parties continue to negotiate. I hope we will heed the words that were sent out last night by the Defense Department. Here is what Dana White said:

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Meaning the Defense Department.

Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and does not help.

She hopes and I think our military obligations that we don’t keep kicking the can down the road. Let’s come together and get so much done for the American people that we can get done tonight, tomorrow morning, tomorrow night, Sunday morning, Sunday night, Monday morning, Monday afternoon, Monday night, Tuesday. We can stay here and get a lot of this done, and then we can move on to other things. I can get a list of priorities solved, not this House bill full of holes that leaves so many Americans out, leaves coal miners out, leaves truckdrivers out. It leaves millions out. By one estimate, 27 million people in the US will not get their healthcare at community health centers, 800,000 in Pennsylvania. We could do all that, bring the country together, and then move on to other issues that we haven’t discussed yet, such as infrastructure, fixing roads and bridges, and bringing broadband to rural America. Fill in the blank with whatever else you want to work on, but there is a lot we could do.

The President said that he wanted to make infrastructure a priority. It is going to be difficult to get to that if we keep getting stuck on these 3-week or 2-month continuing resolutions.

I know there has been a lot of chatter today about blame games. Look, according to my count, there might be only one politician in the country who has spoken directly and I think repeatedly, but at least once that we know of, about a government shutdown, and that happens to be the President. Make sure retirees have the pension they have been waiting for. For a long time. Coal miners have been coming to this town for years now trying to get their healthcare. They were promised that in early 2016. It didn’t happen because the majority made them wait. They were promised in 2016—later in the year—that it would happen in the fall. The Finance Committee got the coal miners healthcare bill done. It didn’t happen in the fall. The majority made them wait. Then, of course, they said: Oh, no, but after the election, in December of 2016, maybe we could do it. But the majority made them wait. After months and months of pressing, these coal miners finally got the promise fulfilled by
getting their healthcare in April of 2017. At the time, they said: We appreciate the fact that we got the healthcare problem solved. Now we need to work on the pensions.

So the pensions for coal miners didn't start in April of 2017. That was part of the original bill, but we were only able to get the healthcare part of it done. So miners' pensions goes back much further than the early part of 2017; it goes back to 2016 and 2015 and years before that.

I would hope that before we move to bringing the sides together, that we would make those pensions and those retirees a priority. I would hope we would make community health centers a priority, as well as getting done for children what we should get done.

One point about the Children's Health Insurance Program. I am glad that my Republican friends are finally talking about the program. They were rather quiet the last couple of months when they refused to bring it up on the floor. Of course, everyone knows that if you put a CHIP bill on this floor tonight, it would pass in minutes. We would have awhelming vote. The majority really cares about it, they would do just that, just as we have been asking for months. But, of course, children weren't a priority because they had to get a tax bill done. That was the big priority. They had to get that big tax bill through so that the corporations would be happy with Republican Senators.

Let me make one point about children's health. We have to get that done as well, but the problem is, for a lot of reasons, the cost has changed a good bit. Here is the reality. The CHIP program, according to this proposal, is limited in time to 6 years. If Republicans included a 10-year extension, it would actually save billions of dollars and, consequently, would remove us from the cycle of funding crises to which we have grown accustomed.

If it is less expensive and provides more certainty, why don't we do CHIP for 10 years? I would like to make it permanent. That would be the best result, the optimal result. But why not 10 years? Because of a whole series of dynamics that happened over the last couple of months, the cost has actually gone down. If you can get a cheaper rate, a lower rate, for a 10-year extension, why not make it 10 years? I know the Freedom Caucus and House Republicans came up with 6, but I thought they wanted to save money, and I hope they want to save money and help kids. I hope we can come together on that as well. Let's make it a 10-year commitment to our kids. I think the Senate Republicans passed a tax bill that had a corporate tax break that is permanent—permanent tax relief for big corporations. Why not at least give children—permanent tax relief for big corporations. Why not at least give children—and young people, who only know one flag, the flag of the United States, its stars and stripes; who only sing one national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner; and who only know one country, the United States of America, have, and should have, the opportunity to ultimately realize their dream. They responded to the Federal Government's requests that they come forward for themselves, give us all types of information, trust us, and they did. Now the government must respond to them, but what is going on here is beyond Dreamers.

This is the Federal Government hurrying from short-term funding resolution to short-term funding resolution instead of having the appropriate appropriations pass when they were due last October—last October—instead of having to pass the necessary appropriations to keep the government not just operating but to do it efficiently, on an annual basis, so our institutions can appropriately plan and so we can save money instead of spending more money because of things that it costs for short-term preparations.

Our Republican colleagues were busy, yes, but they were busy in October and November and December not preparing for the government's needs but to have a government in ecstasy congratulating for the wealthiest people in the country and large corporations on the backs of middle class and working families. That is what they spent their time on. Then they come and say: Oh, but it is urgent that we do this now. You had months in which you did nothing—nothing.

Now, I must say to my friends—and I have heard many of them who are budget hawks and deficits hawks—this is no way to run a government, much less the greatest country on the face of the Earth. Who wants to dictate to countries about being responsible, when we want to give them assistance or we are trying of what it costs for short-term preparations.

Our Republican colleagues were busy, yes, but they were busy in October and November and December not preparing for the government's needs but to have a government in ecstasy congratulating for the wealthiest people in the country and large corporations on the backs of middle class and working families. That is what they spent their time on. Then they come and say: Oh, but it is urgent that we do this now. You had months in which you did nothing—nothing.

Now, I must say to my friends—and I have heard many of them who are budget hawks and deficits hawks—this is no way to run a government, much less the greatest country on the face of the Earth. Who wants to dictate to countries about being responsible, when we want to give them assistance or we are trying of what it costs for short-term preparations.

Now, I must say to my friends—and I have heard many of them who are budget hawks and deficits hawks—this is no way to run a government, much less the greatest country on the face of the Earth. Who wants to dictate to countries about being responsible, when we want to give them assistance or we are trying of what it costs for short-term preparations.

Now, I must say to my friends—and I have heard many of them who are budget hawks and deficits hawks—this is no way to run a government, much less the greatest country on the face of the Earth. Who wants to dictate to countries about being responsible, when we want to give them assistance or we are trying of what it costs for short-term preparations.
here. You needed to have a budget done on time. Maybe you might lapse a day—what would have been for us last October—but you couldn’t get beyond that. You couldn’t do that in the State legislature for the State budget, couldn’t do it in the city budget, couldn’t do it on the school board. Families can’t do it in their own lives. We shouldn’t do it on behalf of the 320-some-odd million people who call America home.

Now, the CR—this continuing resolution to keep the government open one more time, for the fourth time; not the first time, not the second time, not the third time but the fourth time because we are all basically about tax cuts for the wealthy but not taking care of everybody in terms of government funding—kicks the can down the road again without making the necessary investments into our communities. It continues the chaos and the dysfunction that has defined the last year of Republican control. We don’t fund community health centers, something I am so proud of in my home State of New Jersey—federally qualified health centers. They take everybody who comes through the door—all taken. You have insurance? You don’t have insurance? We will take care of you. You have Medicare or Medicaid? Fine. Bottom line, a system that delivers quality healthcare. This doesn’t do it. It leaves them in the lurch out there. The CR sets budget numbers to fund national security or domestic investment priorities. We talk about our national defense—and, yes, I am one of those who is willing to plus-up national defense—but guess what, the nondefense side of the budget is about homeland security, the FBI, the Secret Service, the Treasury Department, the National Institutes of Health that protects us in terms of illnesses, the CDC—all of these elements are in the domestic discretionary side of the budget so they are important, too, but we don’t fund budget numbers that allow the national security or domestic investment priorities to take place.

I heard Leader McConnell say last night that the CR is about helping all Americans. Well, I will tell you, it doesn’t do squat for the 3.5 million Americans who call Puerto Rico their home and who are suffering in an appalling human catastrophe in the wake of disaster. It doesn’t adequately assist communities in Texas and Florida and Western States that are ravaged by fires that are still awaiting for Congress to act on disaster relief. Even the Secretary of Defense’s spokesperson said we have been working under a continuing resolution for 3 years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow. This is wasteful. This is the Secretary of Defense’s spokesperson: This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully funded fiscal year 2018 budget or face ramifications for our military.

I would add that these young people—many of them who wear the uniform of the United States and are willing to risk their lives and die for the country that seems to want to reject them—they deserve an opportunity to have a resolution at last.

Let me just say, I know the President wants to give the country what we referred to as a country’s to-do list to do a good shut-down. I don’t ever think there is a good shut-down. I know, in the past, when President Obama was in the White House, and then Mr. Trump said: Oh, it is the President who is the leader. It is the President who needs every-body into the room. It is the President who has to get people to come to a conclusion.

Well, you showed up late in the game—very late in the game—the final hours.

Finally, I think all of us who have been around either this institution or the Congress know that you need 60 votes in the U.S. Senate. I have compromised many times on foreign policy. I have compromised on our domestic priorities to try to achieve a solution for the DACA legislation. There were hard choices to be made and things I don’t like, but I compromised. Let me tell you something. Sixty votes, you don’t have it. Five of our Republican colleagues have said—I understand why because they don’t want to keep kicking the can down the road: No, we are not going to vote for this. One of our colleagues is infirm, not here. So they are not anywhere even near their numbers.

So that means, when you need 60 and you are far from it, that you have to engage in a negotiation and a compromise. It is not just stick it and accept it because when that happens, then we are on the dangerous path that when this short-term resolution doesn’t solve itself—if we agree to a month—then ultimately we will have another CR, and maybe we will like even less what is in that CR. Maybe there will be language that we will find particularly problematic. Maybe there will even be numbers we don’t care for.

The point is, if you know you need 60, you don’t wait until the final hours to try to come to a negotiation. I would rather live a day on my feet than a life on my knees, in defense of the 9 million people who call New Jersey home, to make sure they get what they need, not what I am shoved to try to have to accept.

So I personally am for a very short-term resolution that makes leadership and the White House and all of us, as far as I am concerned, stay here working to achieve what the American people deserve, which is a full funding of their government—no more short-term lurching from crisis to crisis. This is an opportunity to take care of those Americans who have been hurt in hurricanes and storms and fires and the people of Puerto Rico; an opportunity to give back to those who dreamed; an opportunity to fund our public health centers; an opportunity to fund the Children’s Health Insurance Program not for 6 years but for a decade. We have seen study after study that says we could save millions if we funded it over a decade. Why should we not save millions?

This is an opportunity to deal with the pensions that people who worked a lifetime and, through no fault of their own, now find themselves possibly shortchanged. Let’s help them retire with the dignity they deserve.

This is an opportunity to make sure the National Institutes of Health—which is doing groundbreaking research on the Alzheimer’s that took my mother’s life, on the Parkinson’s that affects our neighbors, on the diseases that affect our people, but you can’t do long-term trials if you don’t know what your funding is going to be. The list goes on and on.

The people of America deserve far better than what they are getting, and I reject the proposition that you can just stick it to us and suggest that we have to accept it. You create the crisis and then you want us to accept it. Well, it is time to get the job done on behalf of the American people. That is why some of us will not support a longer term funding resolution, because all it will do is get us right back to where we are today. The American people deserve much more than that. They deserve that, and there is no reason we can’t deliver that.

With that, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of David J. Ryden, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint, PN1135.

My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Ryden in any way. However, the Department of the Treasury has failed to respond to a letter I sent on September 29, 2017, to a bureau within the Department seeking documents relevant to an ongoing investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Despite several phone calls between committee staff and Treasury personnel to prioritize particular requests within that letter, the Treasury Department has to date failed to provide any documents.

My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Ryden in any way. However, the Department of the Treasury has failed to respond to a letter I sent on September 29, 2017, to a bureau within the Department seeking documents relevant to an ongoing investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Despite several phone calls between committee staff and Treasury personnel to prioritize particular requests within that letter, the Treasury Department has to date failed to provide any documents.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the Iowans who have traveled to the Capitol today to be with us for the March for Life.

I commend them and the many other Americans who have traveled here...
from every corner of the country to embrace the sanctity of life. Their participation in this march symbolizes their compassion and concern for the most innocent and vulnerable among us.

I also want to call on my colleagues to join us in supporting the immediate passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This common-sense measure, which I have cosponsored, recognizes that the government has an interest in protecting the unborn from the excruciating pain they are capable of experiencing during a late-term abortion.

Some people call this measure "Micah’s Law," in honor of an Iowa boy, Micah Pickering, who was born at 20 weeks postfertilization. I have met Micah and his parents. Micah didn’t just survive. He is a beautiful little boy who is thriving.

Research suggests that, after the fifth month of pregnancy, the nervous systems of human infants are developed to the point where that child is capable of detecting and responding to painful stimuli. This also is around the time when the unborn child is soothed by the mother’s voice. We are hearing that babies may learn within the womb, absorbing language sooner than we previously thought, so it should surprise no one that these same unborn babies can experience intense pain during a late-term abortion when their limbs are torn apart in their mother’s womb.

Currently, the United States is one of only about seven countries in the world that permit elective abortions past 5 months. Among the very few that embrace late-term abortions are Vietnam, Singapore, and North Korea. Passing this bill, which imposes restrictions only on elective abortions and only after the fifth month of pregnancy, would bring the United States in line with the majority of countries around the globe. Lawmakers in these other countries have grasped the concept that late-term abortions are essentially barbaric and often unnecessary.

Many of my colleagues actively supported the Americans with Disability Act. How could you support a measure like that and not also seek to protect the unborn babies whose parents might choose to end their lives late in pregnancy merely because of a disability like Down syndrome? I believe that the lives of unborn babies with this condition have the same value as those of other unborn babies.

If you do not support restrictions on abortions after the fifth month of pregnancy, you find yourself sharing the stage of development being born prematurely and, like Micah Pickering, surviving long term, then what, exactly, is your limit—if any—on abortion?

I remind my colleagues that the American people overwhelmingly support restrictions on late-term abortions. Numerous States, including Iowa, already have passed similar legislation to protect the unborn baby who is capable of experiencing pain.

In 2016, I convened a congressional hearing at which two doctors testified in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. We learned that about a quarter of the babies born prematurely, around 5 months, will survive long term if given proper medical assistance.

One of the doctors who testified, Colleen Malloy, is an associate professor in the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Northwestern University’s School of Medicine. According to Dr. Malloy, by 20 weeks of development, the unborn baby’s pain receptors are present and linked. As further explained by Dr. Malloy, at 20 weeks’ fetal age, premature babies are “kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. We can easily witness their humanity, as well as their experiences with pain.”

Dr. Anthony Levatino, a practicing gynecologist with decades of experience, testified similarly at a House hearing several years ago. Dr. Levatino estimates that he performed over 1,000 abortions in private practice, until his adopted daughter died in a car crash. His child’s death was a life-changing event that led him to stop performing abortions. Performing an abortion on a 24-week-old unborn child is undoubtedly painful for that baby. Dr. Levatino testified. Scientific studies confirm that the unborn can experience pain after the fifth month.

The Judiciary Committee in 2016 also heard testimony from Dr. Kathi Aultman, a former abortion provider. She told us, an “abortionist knows exactly what he or she is doing because they must count the body parts after each procedure” to make sure they have cut the whole baby out of the mother.

Dr. Aultman also questioned why an unborn baby who can live outside the womb should be given no consideration, no protection, and no rights just because the child is unwanted, and she is right. Why shouldn’t we have compassion for babies whose nervous systems are developed enough for them to experience pain? Why shouldn’t we protect them from dismemberment with steel tools?

This is a measure that the majority of Americans—including a majority of women—broadly support. Once again, I urge my colleagues to embrace the sanctity of innocent human life and vote for this landmark legislation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CAPTAIN JOHN YOUNG

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we are on the eve of a new era of space exploration. We are constructing the world’s largest rocket and a deep space capsule to send humans to Mars. Two new commercial crew capsules are under construction to ferry astronauts to and from the International Space Station starting later this year. Huge industrial complexes to manufacture and process new rockets and satellites are being built at record speed to further advance America’s leadership in space. The successes of space exploration today are built upon the brave efforts of NASA’s past pioneers. I am saddened to note that, on January 5 of this year, we lost one of our most celebrated astronauts and retired U.S. Navy CAPT John Young.

Captain Young has been called the astronaut’s astronaut. Indeed, if you ask around the astronaut corps who they most looked up to, my guess is John Young’s name would come up quite a bit.

Captain Young was among the second group of astronauts chosen for the early space program. He flew to space twice, the only astronaut to fly in the Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle programs. In addition to walking and driving a rover on the surface of the moon, Captain Young commanded the very first space shuttle mission.

To travel on the rocket ship like a plane or landing like an airplane, the space shuttle could not be tested in space without a crew. It was perhaps the riskiest flight, spaceflight ever endeavored; yet whether it was landing on the Moon or returning off the planet, the space shuttle, Captain Young was the essence of cool, his heart never topping 90 beats per minute.

By the time John Young retired, he had spent over four decades at NASA. First at the Navy and later at NASA, Young dedicated his entire career to public service.

Throughout his career, Captain Young was a tireless advocate for safety at the agency. He was a brilliant rocket scientist and astronaut engineer renowned for writing scathing memos regarding safety problems at the agency, asking penetrating technical questions at reviews, and doing it all with a simple "tell it like it is" country-boy mentality that he never lost from his central Florida upbringing.

It may seem a contradiction that the man who commanded perhaps the riskiest space mission in history was also one of the agency’s most outspoken advocates for safety, but it is not.

Captain Young strongly believed we must explore the unknown and push further out into the cosmos, but he also believed the men and women who bravely venture into space on all our behalves deserve the very best we can do to bring them home safely.

We are seeing the fruits of nearly a decade of transformation and renewal, while at the same time reenvisioning the roles of the next generation of space explorers. Just in the last few years, in addition to John Young, we have lost John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, Gene Cernan, Dick Gordon,
Edgar Mitchell, and Neil Armstrong. We have also lost the great Sally Ride. While we mourn the loss of these American heroes, we are forever indebted to them for their extraordinary contributions to humanity.

I am grateful NASA has had over the years the kinds of wisdom, experience, and technical skills in its leadership that were so embodied by heroes like Captain Young. We are extremely fortunate to have, in NASA Acting Administrator Robert Lightfoot, a leader who is uniquely acclaimed for his competence and professionalism. I have the utmost confidence in Acting Administrator Lightfoot and am thankful to have his steady hand on the tiller. I will continue to fight to see that NASA has leadership that carries on the tradition of having true space professionals at the helm of such an important agency.

RECOGNIZING TAMARACK AEROSPACE GROUP

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, over the past 20 years the aerospace industry in my home State of Idaho has grown by an astounding 40 percent, with a number of small business firms leading the way. As you may know, the aerospace industry is a complex field that requires a passion for innovation and great attention to detail. I am pleased to say that, in my home State of Idaho, these qualities have found in small business all across the State. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my privilege to honor Tamarack Aerospace Group as the Small Business of the Month for January 2018.

Tamarack Aerospace is a pioneer in a variety of aerospace engineering products that are used in airplanes across the Nation and the world. This small business contributes significantly to Idaho’s reputation as a destination for trailblazers in the aerospace industry and is a remarkable example of entrepreneurial innovation.

In 2010, Mr. Nicholas Guida founded Tamarack Aerospace Group in Sandpoint, ID. Mr. Guida has over 25 years of experience in the aerospace industry, including time spent as an aerospace engineer, a safety consultant, and as a test pilot. Since Tamarack’s founding, Mr. Guida assembled an impressive team of diverse professionals with years of experience across various sectors of the aerospace industry. From veteran Navy pilots to skilled mechanical engineers, the team at Tamarack combines experience with a passion for innovation.

Tamarack Aerospace specializes in something called active winglet innovation with their product, ATLAS, which actively reduces the load placed on each wing of an aircraft. Tamarack’s winglets allow for optimal efficiency without compromising an aircraft’s structural integrity. As a result, aircraft equipped with this technology have lower operating costs, as well as increased fuel efficiency and life of the aircraft’s wings. This technology makes air travel cheaper and more efficient, without compromising the safety of pilots or passengers. Tamarack will soon be representing Idaho internationally at the Singapore Airshow, showcasing their new technological innovations in collaboration with the Idaho Department of Commerce’s exhibit at the airshow. It is very exciting to see these accomplished entrepreneurs represent Idaho and the United States on the international stage.

The Tamarack Aerospace Group is making an outsized impact in a highly technical field and recently received much deserved recognition for these contributions by being named a winner of the 61st Annual Laureate Award by Aviation Week & Space Technology. The award recognizes those who inspire innovation and show leadership in the world of aviation. It is this kind of innovation that continues to set our great Nation apart and propel us forward. Mr. Guida and the team at Tamarack have also shown tremendous resourcefulness, resilience, and perseverance in navigating the certification and regulatory processes to bring their winglets to market, which is no easy feat.

I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Mr. Guida and all of the employees at Tamarack Aerospace Group for being selected as the January 2018 Small Business of the Month. You make Idaho proud, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1660. An act to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency.

H.R. 2954. An act to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1660. An act to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2954. An act to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 19, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as “Alex Diekmann Peak.”

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorial were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

S. 83. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas urging the United States Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Texas to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to 200 nautical miles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2954. An act to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes.

Whereas, in recent years, the Gulf of Mexico has contained the highest total allowable catch of red snapper in decades, but in 2016, anglers experienced the shortest recreational fishing season to date, lasting less than two weeks; and

Whereas, the U.S. government has overseen the Gulf recreational red snapper fishery for nearly four decades; today, federal management systems attempt to regulate red snapper fishing by the pound with tools specifically designed to manage the commercial sector, despite the fact that federal data collection systems are incapable of accounting to such a level of specificity for recreational harvests; and

Whereas, the U.S. government has, moreover, neglected to use recent data to provide meaningful guidelines and requirements for a systematic reallocation of federal fisheries; and

Whereas, in 2016, errors in its own data collection system, the Gulf red snapper fishery allocation is based on highly suspect data from 1979–1986 and has been promoting a management strategy to
privatize the Gulf red snapper fishery; approximately 50 percent of the fishery is already held by private businesses, while another 20 percent has been designated to be sold; public resources have been given away for free, based on a commercial operator’s past catch history; and whereas, because of extraordinarily restrictive requirements and regulations, the federal fisheries management system allows commercial operators who already own red snapper shares or who may be gifted shares to serve on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and to cast votes on issues that will result in direct financial benefit for them; and whereas, by virtue of a prohibitive environment for anglers and ethical issues among user groups and stakeholders, the U.S. government has proved itself incapable of properly managing red snapper fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, and all five states along the Gulf Coast have increasingly needed to implement regulations and seasons that are not consistent with the federal management plan; and whereas, numerous studies, including some funded by NOAA Fisheries, indicate that the greatest commercial value in the red snapper fishery is the recreational angling sector, and federal control should be relinquished to the Gulf states, which depend on this vital fishery resource; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 83rd Legislature of the State of Texas hereby encourage Congress to pass and adopt policies allowing Texas to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to 200 nautical miles; and be it further

Resolved, That the Texas secretary of state forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and to the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

POM–157. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the celebration of the Republic of China’s (Taiwan) 106th National Day on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Whereas, the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the United States are marked by strong bilateral trade, education, and cultural exchanges. In 2016, bilateral trade (exports plus imports) reached $65.4 billion in exchanged goods, making the U.S. the third-largest trading partner of Taiwan, and Taiwan the tenth-largest trading partner of the United States; and whereas, Taiwan and the state of Michigan have long benefited from this relationship. In 2016 Taiwan was Michigan’s sixth-largest market and Michigan exports to Taiwan amounted to $288.59 million, a 20 percent increase from 2015. From 2013 to 2016, Michigan imports from Taiwan increased by $706 million, a 23 percent increase, making the outlook for joint economic and cultural growth in the future bright; and whereas, Taiwan is capable of and willing to fulfill its role in the conflict of interest rate with the world to deal with the challenges of humanitarian aids and disease control. Taiwan’s meaningful participation in international organizations benefits the international community as a whole, including the state of Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body congratulate the government and people of the Republic of China (Taiwan) on their 106th National Day on October 10, 2017; and be it further

Resolved, That we continue to support Taiwan’s meaningful participation in international organizations to protect the health, safety and well-being of its people, and support its aspiration to make more contributions in international societies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of State; the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Chicago; the Michigan House of Representatives; the Michigan Senate; and to the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–158. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing their opposition to violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declaring these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–159. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing atomic veterans for their service and sacrifice for our nation; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

POM–160. A resolution adopted by the Township Council of Livingston, New Jersey, urging their delegation to the United States Congress to do all it can to support atomic veterans, their spouses, and dependents in receiving medical care and disability compensation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the National Associations of Atomic Veterans, the Michigan Veteran’s Affairs Agency, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–161. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the celebration of the Republic of China’s (Taiwan) 106th National Day on October 10, 2017; and be it further

Resolved, That we continue to support Taiwan’s meaningful participation in international organizations to protect the health, safety and well-being of its people, and support its aspiration to make more contributions in international societies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of State; the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Chicago; the Michigan House of Representatives; the Michigan Senate; and to the Michigan congressional delegation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first
and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:
S. 2325. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
S. 2326. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Tester, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Brown, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Smith, Mr. Peters, and Mr. Casey):
S. 2327. A bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Warner, Ms. Cortez Masto, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Brown, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Carper, Mr. Casey, Mr. Coons, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Duckworth, Mrs. Feinstein, Mrs. Gillibrand, Ms. Harris, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Jones, Mr. King, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Markey, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Murray, Ms. Nelson, Mr. Peters, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Schumer, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Smith, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Udall, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Warren, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Booker, Mr. Cardin, and Mr. Sanders):
S. 2328. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay and death benefits in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 114
At the request of Mr. Heller, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. Ernst) was added as a cosponsor of S. 114, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 299
At the request of Mr. Lee, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cruz) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes.

S. 792
At the request of Mr. Tillis, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts) was added as a cosponsor of S. 792, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish an H-2B temporary non-agricultural work visa program, and for other purposes.

S. 915
At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 918
At the request of Mr. Portman, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) were added as cosponsors of S. 918, a bill to amend title III, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 1168
At the request of Mr. Warner, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 1218
At the request of Ms. Heitkamp, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to promote Federal employment for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1304
At the request of Mr. Roberts, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Burr) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1304, a bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude customary prompt pay discounts from manufacturers to wholesale from the average sales price for drugs and biologicals under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1676
At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide grants for access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1719
At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Cortez Masto) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outboard engines and motors.

S. 1809
At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Florida (Ms. Stabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1809, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation’s cities.

S. 2114
At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2114, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill’s Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 2173
At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2173, a bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend State court funding for child welfare, and for other purposes.

S. 2208
At the request of Mr. Markey, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Booker) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer’s Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2235
At the request of Mr. Donnelly, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2274
At the request of Mr. Cardin, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. RES. 367
At the request of Mr. Cruz, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Heller) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Lankford) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 367, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its violence against demonstrators and calling for peaceful resolution to the concerns of the citizens of Iran.
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pay Our Military and Civilian Workers Act of 2018.”

SEC. 2. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2018, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018 are not in effect—

(1) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code), including reserve components thereof, who perform active service, including drill, during such period;

(2) such sums as are necessary for the payment of death benefits authorized by subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, for individuals who die during such period;

(3) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2); and

(4) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to contractors of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2).

(b) PAYMENT TERMINATION.—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION.

Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following occurs first: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in section 2; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1908. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1909. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1910. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1911. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1912. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1913. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1914. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1915. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1916. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COTSTE MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONALD, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Ms. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HETKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHALEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by amendment SA 1913 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER and intended to be proposed by the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1917. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1918. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1908. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1909. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

(b) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any communication related to a particular United States person or person inside the United States if—

(1) such United States person or person inside the United States is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805, 1804, 1804b, and 1804d), without title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

(2) the entity carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person or person inside the United States is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person;

(3) such United States person or person in the United States is a corporation; or

(4) such United States person or person inside the United States has consented to the query.

(c) QUERIES OF FEDERATED DATA SETS AND MIXED DATA.—In addition to subsection (a), none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to conduct a query of a data set, or of federated data sets, that includes any information acquired or evidence derived from a query conducted and no order is issued approving the query, none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used—

(1) to introduce or otherwise disclose information obtained or evidence derived from such query in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof; or

(2) to use or disclose information concerning any United States person acquired from such query to any other officer or employee by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

SA 1909. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations on the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 6005, at any time before the end of that period.

SEC. 6005. DETERMINATIONS.

(a) Senate.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations on the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6005 and whether Senators may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under section 6005; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) House of Representatives.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6003 and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under section 6003; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6006. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect on February 1, 2019.

SA 1912. Mr. CARDO M submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION F.—NO BUDGET, NO PAY

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “No Budget, No Pay Act”.

SEC. 6002. DEFINITION.

In this division, the term “Member of Congress” means—

(1) has the meaning given the term under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

SEC. 6003. TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

SA 1913. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

EXTENSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

SEC. 101. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division D of Public Law 115-56) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(a) and inserting “January 20, 2018”.

SA 1914. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AFFECTED BY A LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1341 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a), by striking “An officer” and inserting “Except as specified in this subchapter or any other provision of law, an officer”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered lapse in appropriations’ means any lapse in appropriations that begins on or after October 1 of the fiscal year; and

“(B) the term ‘excepted employee’ means an excepted employee or an employee performing emergency work, as such terms are defined by the Office of Personnel Management.

“(2) Each Federal employee furloughed as a result of a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for the period of the lapse in appropriations, and each excepted employee who is required to perform work during a lapse in appropriations shall be paid for such work, at the employee’s standard rate of pay, at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates.

“(3) During a covered lapse in appropriations, each excepted employee who is required to perform work shall be entitled to leave under chapter 63 of title 5, or any other applicable law governing the use of leave by the excepted employee, for which compensation shall be paid at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates.”.

SA 1910. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 6005.

(b) No Pay.—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 6005, at any time before the end of that period.

SEC. 6005. DETERMINATIONS.

(a) Senate.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations on the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6003 and whether Senators may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under section 6003; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) House of Representatives.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6003 and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under section 6003; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6006. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect on February 1, 2018.

SA 1911. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION F.—NO BUDGET, NO PAY

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “No Budget, No Pay Act”.

SEC. 6002. DEFINITION.

In this division, the term “Member of Congress” means—

(1) has the meaning given the term under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

SEC. 6003. TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.
Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1913 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title I of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the Senate, for the purpose of restoring funds to the Department of Veterans Affairs for that fiscal year have not been enacted.

SA 1915. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title I, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE—EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY AND SUPPORTING CONTRACTOR PAY

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act”.

SEC. 02. EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE PAY AND ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DURING FUNDING GAP IMPACTING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(a) Appropriation of Funds for Military Pay and Allowances.—During a funding gap impacting the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard), out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) determines are necessary to continue to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces during such period.

(b) Funding Gap Defined.—In this section, the term “funding gap” means any period of time after the beginning of a fiscal year for which interim or full-year appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs for that fiscal year have not been enacted.

SA 1916. Mr. DURBin (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIROMO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOHUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURTHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1913 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title I, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 6 of the House Amendment to section 12, page 8, line 2 of the Senate Amendment to section 12, amend paragraph (1) by striking “in fiscal years 2018 and 2019” and inserting “in fiscal year 2018”.

SA 1917. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title I, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 6 of the House Amendment Strike “February 16” and insert “February 8”.

SA 1918. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title I, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

TITLE—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Pay Our Military Act of 2018”.

SEC. 02. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

(a) In General.—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2018, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018 are not in effect—

(1) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code), including reserve components thereof, who perform active service, including drill, during such period;

(2) such sums as are necessary for the payment of death benefits authorized by subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, for individuals who die during such period;

(3) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2); and

(b) Secretary Concerned Defined.—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

SEC. 03. TERMINATION.

Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in section 02; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) September 30, 2018.
Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 185.


The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 185 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The ayes and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollocall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

**YEAS—50**

Alexander             Ernst             Murkowski
Barrasso              Fischer           Perdue
Blunt                 Gardner           Portman
Boozman              Grassley           Risch
Burg                  Harris            Rounds
Capito                Hektkamp          Rubio
Cassidy               Heller            Sasse
Coakley               Hoeven            Scott
Collins               Inhofe             Stark
Corker                Isakson           Stabenow
Cornyn                Johnson           Shelby
Cotton                Jones             Sullivan
Crapo                 Kennedy           Thune
Cruz                  Lankford         Tillis
Daines                Manchin           Toomey
Donnelly              McCaskill         Wicker
Enzi                  Moran             Young

**NAYS—49**

Baldwin               Harris            Peters
Bennet                Hassan            Reed
Blumenthal            Heinrich          Sanders
Boozman              Hickenlooper         Schatz
Brown                 Kaine            Schumer
Cantwell             King               Shaheen
Cardin                Klobuchar          Smith
Carper                Leahy             Stabenow
Casey                 Lee               Tester
Coons                 Markley           Udall
Cortez Masto          McConnell         Van Hollen
Duckworth             Menendez           Warner
Durbin                Merkley           Whitehouse
Feinstein             Murphy           Wyden
Flake                 Murray
Gillibrand
Graham                 Paul

**NOT VOTING—1**

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader is recognized. Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a part of the statement of the White House Press Secretary tonight, presumably on behalf of the administration. It simply says: We will not negotiate the status of unlawful immigrants while Democrats hold our lawful citizens hostage over their reckless demands.

That appropriately represents the White House view of where we are. And what we have just witnessed on the floor was a cynical decision by Senate Democrats to shelve aide millions of Americans for the sake of irresponsible political gains. A government shutdown was 100 percent avoidable—completely avoidable. Now it is imminent, all because Senate Democrats chose to filibuster a noncontroversial funding bill that contains nothing, not a thing, they do not support—nothing they do not support.

Perhaps across the aisle some of our Democratic colleagues are feeling proud of themselves, but what has their leader accomplished? What has he accomplished? Has he accomplished anything?

The answer is simple: their very own government shutdown.

The shutdown effects on the American people will come as no surprise. All week, as we have stood on the floor and begged our colleagues to come to their senses, Senate Republicans have described exactly what this will mean.

For America’s men and women in uniform, shutting down the government means delayed pay. For the many millions of civilian employees who support their missions, it means furloughs. And for the families of fallen heroes, it may well mean a freeze on survivor death benefits. For veterans who rely on our promise of care, shutting down the government means threatening their access to treatment. For so many Americans struggling with opioid addiction, the same is true.

Thanks to the Democratic leader’s decision and filibuster leader, Mr. SCHUMER, the American people should expect better from us than this.

The American people should expect better from us than this. And when our friends across the aisle take some of these actions, I will respond with an appropriate sense of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn’t understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoehorning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.

The American people believe that shutting down the government over this issue, which doesn’t even ripen until March, is irresponsible. And I have just listed all of the people who are going to be adversely impacted by this action.

So we are going to keep on voting, and the government may be heading into a shutdown, but the Senate is not shutting down.

We have been talking about it for 3 months. But the one reason we are here is because we couldn’t close out any of these other component parts because our friends on the other side said: You have to deal with this issue. This issue is the key to getting defense spending, this is the key to getting help for SCHIP kids, and on and on and on.

I think most of the American people believe that shutting down the government over this issue, which doesn’t even ripen until March, is irresponsible. And I have just listed all of the people who are going to be adversely impacted by this action.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn’t understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoehorning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn’t understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoehorning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn’t understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoehorning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn’t understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoehorning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that.
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the border. Many Republicans don’t either. But we were willing to compromise with the President to get an agreement. In the room, it sounded like the President was open to accept it. This afternoon, in my heart, I thought we might have a deal tonight. That was how far we had come. That is how positive our discussion felt. We had a good meeting, but what has transpired since that meeting in the Oval Office is indicative of the entire tumultuous and chaotic process Republicans have engaged in during the negotiations thus far.

Even though President Trump seemed to like an outline of a deal in the room, he did not press his party in Congress to accept it. Speaker Ryan and Leader McConnell, without the commitment of the President, would not agree to accept anything either.

What happened to the President Trump who asked us to come up with a deal and promised that he would take heat for the deal? What happened to that President? He backed off at the first sign of pressure.

We had the outline of a deal on caps. We had the outline of a deal on immigration, the toughest issue. It was real, and it was an honest-to-goodness breakthrough. We could have passed a short-term extension of funding so that we could cross the t’s, dot the i’s, and be done with it all, but the dynamic of the past few weeks—during which the congressional Republicans looked to the President for guidance and the President provided none prevailed again today, unfortunately. The same chaos, the same disarray, the same division and discord on the Republican side that has been in the background of these negotiations for months unfortunately appears endemic, and it is standing in the way of bipartisan solutions to all of the issues now before us.

Every American knows the Republican Party controls the White House, the Senate, and the House. It is their job to keep the government open. It is their job to work with us on a way to move things forward. But they didn’t reach out to us once on this CR—no discussion, no debate, nothing at all. It was produced without an ounce of Democratic input and dropped in our laps. Meanwhile, they can’t even get on the schedule. They control every branch of the legislative process, and it is their responsibility to govern, and here they have failed.

Several Republicans voted against the CR, as well as Democrats, for the same reason we voted against it. One of the most serious consequences of having continuing resolution after continuing resolution is the damage it does to our military. As the Pentagon spokesman said last night, another CR would be wasteful and destructive to our military. The Navy Secretary told me that because of CRs, “(the Navy has) put $4 billion in the trash can, poured lighter fluid on it, and burned it.” That is the Navy Secretary—because of what you have done.

This is no way to conduct the Nation’s business. Republicans know it. Democrats know it. The American people know that this party is not capable of governing.

So where do we go from here? I believe many of my Republican colleagues sincerely want to get a deal. I know their hearts are in the right place. It was important that we now accept brinksmanship where bipartisanship used to be. In the past, there was always discussions on these issues. Everyone knew in the Senate you needed both parties to work together. None of that happened here today.

Now, all of this problem is because Republican leadership can’t get to yes because President Trump refuses to.

President Trump, if you are listening. I encase myself, of the thos you for an answer. The way things went today, the way you turned from a bipartisan deal, it is almost as if you were rooting for a shutdown, and now we will have one, and the blame should crash entirely on President Trump’s shoulders.

This will be called a Trump shutdown. This will be called a Trump shutdown because there is no one—one who deserves the blame for the position we find ourselves in more than President Trump. He walked away from two bipartisan deals, including one today in which I even put the border wall on the table. What will it take for President Trump to say yes and learn how to execute the rudiments of government?

Tomorrow marks a year to the day President Trump took the oath of office on the Capitol steps. Unfortunately, a Trump shutdown would be a perfect encapsulation of the thos he has unleashed on our government. Instead of bringing us all together, he has pulled us apart. Instead of governing from the middle, he has outsourced his Presidency to the extremes. Instead of living up to the great dealmaker he marketed himself to be, he has been the single driving force in scuttling bipartisan deals in Congress.

Now, at this late hour, his behavior is on the verge of grinding our government to a halt—a Trump shutdown. Democrats will continue to strive for a bipartisan agreement on all of the outstanding issues. I know there are men and women on both sides of the aisle who are just as upset as I am with the direction we are headed in. I plead with them to see reason and prevail upon their leaders—and most of all the President—to give us an opportunity to work together, to let us do the job the American people sent us here to do.

When President Trump decides he is finally ready to lead his party to a deal, Democrats will be ready, willing, and eager to climb it. And for the first time, we can reach it quickly.

Tomorrow, the President and the four leaders should immediately sit down and finish this deal so the entire government can get back to work on Monday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to particularly commend the five Democrats who voted not to shut the government down. The new Senator from Alabama, during his campaign, said it was important for the S-CHIP program before it ran out of money, and he listened to the seven Democratic Governors who said: This is an emergency; we need help.

There were five courageous Democrats on the other side who said, I am actually up to this ridiculous argument that it made sense somehow to shut down the government over an illegal immigration issue that the vast majority of this body would like to do something about anyway.

I want to particularly commend the five Democrats who had the courage to stand up to this ridiculous strategy that put their whole party in an incredible predicament. The White House just indicated, the President is not going to talk about the issue at all while the government is shut down. He made it quite clear. He said: ‘When Democrats start paying our armed forces and first responders, we will reopen negotiations on immigration reform.’

So this particular strategy has eliminated the possibility of getting a signature on the thing they shut the government down over. Can anybody explain to me this strategy? I am perplexed. I wasn’t first in my class, but I wasn’t last either. How does this get them what they are looking for?

We will continue to talk because when all the games stop, the issues are still there—every single one of them are still there. The American people expect us to act like adults, to get together and solve the problems.

I want to ask for an amendment to change the date to February 8. We will, unfortunately, not be able to get that vote tonight, but I will be subsequently asking for consent, but at some point here, we will be voting on February 8. That is the date the senior Senator from South Carolina and I have been talking about, and the Democratic leader and I have been talking about—which begins to move a little bit closer to where our friends on the other side say they wanted to be—but a reasonable period of time that takes into account the State of the Union, our party conferences, and the amount of time it takes to actually write a bill once you have an agreement. You can’t just reach an agreement, snap your fingers, and everything falls into place and you are ready to go. It is a reasonable period of time to first agree, and then write, get ready to negotiate a settlement that we have been working on for months. Europe is a very reasonable time. I hear there is sentiment for that on both sides of the aisle. I hope so.
At some point, we will vote on that option. I can’t get that vote tonight, but I am going to ask consent to have that vote tonight.

**VOTE ON MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1903**

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to table the motion to refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

**VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1917**

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to table the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to table the motion to refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to table the motion to refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with an amendment numbered 1917.

The motion is as follows:

On Page 1, line 6 of the House Amendment Strike “February 16” and insert “February 8”.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motions having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur with a further amendment in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.


**MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1918**

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

**MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1920**

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I move to refer the House amendment to H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is as follows:

At the end add the following.

‘This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.’

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk, providing for continuing appropriations for pay and death benefits for members of the Armed Services, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we passed similar legislation during the government shutdown back in 2013. My hope is that we can restore funding for the entire government but before this becomes necessary. I am going to object for tonight, but we will discuss it again tomorrow. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. Nelson, Mr. President, many of us have participated over the last few hours in several conversations trying to bring the parties together, and, indeed, a lot of movement has occurred. There seems to be one substantial issue remaining in which things could come together. So I am going to ask that we delay the shutdown for at least 1 day. Most of us on this floor do not want a shutdown. Since there were discussions here in earnest in a bipartisan way, we ought to give those discussions a chance to bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk that would provide for a continuing resolution to fund the government through Saturday, January 20, 2018, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McConnell, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1301**

Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. President, this shouldn’t take very long.

I was most disappointed tonight when the President of the United States put out a statement that tried to divide us based on party when it came to support of our military. There is no such division. Everyone in this Chamber knows it. So, as we have in other instances where we have had a shutdown—remember, in 2013, we did this right off the bat. I want to make sure that tonight we send a very clear signal that we don’t want one moment to pass with there being any uncertainty that any soldier anywhere in this world will be paid for the valiant work they do on behalf of our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk, providing for continuing appropriations for pay and death benefits for members of the Armed Services, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. McConnell, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we passed similar legislation during the government shutdown back in 2013. My hope is that we can restore funding for the entire government but before this becomes necessary. I am going to object for tonight, but we will discuss it again tomorrow. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. Nelson, Mr. President, many of us have participated over the last few hours in several conversations trying to bring the parties together, and, indeed, a lot of movement has occurred. There seems to be one substantial issue remaining in which things could come together. So I am going to ask that we delay the shutdown for at least 1 day. Most of us on this floor do not want a shutdown. Since there were discussions here in earnest in a bipartisan way, we ought to give those discussions a chance to bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk that would provide for a continuing resolution to fund the government through Saturday, January 20, 2018, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McConnell, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1301**

Mr. Tester, Mr. President, I had the feeling at one point in time tonight that we were very, very close to an agreement. I think, as we look around this body, we see folks on both sides of the aisle who want to come to an agreement and will work hard for an agreement.
It is a fact that we need a better budget. We need a budget that works for America. We need a budget that goes to the end of the fiscal year, which isn’t that long from now, by the way—only the end of September. It is a fact that we need CHIP funding and money for our schools and libraries, certainly for our military, and money for the northern and southern borders and for opioids and the list goes on.

The majority leader has said that they have been working on a budget settlement for weeks. I think most of us, if not all of us, are willing to stay here and work until this work gets done. I am certainly willing to.

This is supposed to be the most deliberative body in the world. I know that some will say there is just not enough time, but there is. I have watched this body work very quickly when necessary. I think a government shutdown would require that.

We have pushed this budget off now for 112 days. That is why I am proposing a 3-day continuing resolution so we can work together to come to a conclusion to do what the American people want; that is, have a budget that works and that can stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:28 a.m., adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 2018, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward Charles Prado of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be colonel

Steven J. Acevedo
Johan K. Ahn
Antony M. Alexander
Jonathan L. Arneault
Richard J. Barrett
John P. Baron
Laura M. Baghe
Bradley J. Boettig
Karen E. Bowman
Margaret R. Brown
Glenn D. Burns
Christopher P. Campbell
Elizabeth A. Casstevens
Nathan D. Chepra
Bri M. Chumbley
Johnathan M. Compton
Amy A. Costello
Robert M. Cromer
Richard D. Dagosta
Steven W. Davis
Paul T. Deloreto
An T. Duong
Geoffrey L. Ewing
Brinn Flake
Hindi L. Gaddey
NDayja A. Gogate
Alan D. Guelke
Marshall T. Hayes
Kevin D. Hettenger
Aquilla L. Hightsmith Tyler
Joshua A. Hodges
David T. Hines
Julia C. Jackson
Maria R. J. Latifi
Peter A. Lehan
Jeffrey J. Lewis

To be lieutenant colonel

Robert J. Love
Patricia A. McGaffin
Shelby D. Martin
Christopher M. Matthew
Mariere Francene McKee
Ryan G. K. Mihata
Madessa D. Mitchell
Shawn D. Nichols
Jon J. Opry
Levi J. Otero
John C. Rockwell
William R. Roberts IV
Luke B. Simonet
Barton C. Staat
Adam M. Stahr
Kara M. Vanderkamp
Wende E. Wolfsmann
Leslie A. Wood
Toby W. Woodward
Heather C. Yun

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under title 10, U.S.C., section 626:

To be major

Nataliya A. Arles
Omar S. Ahmed
Andrew J. Amack
Michael E. Argylis
Sumit S. Bagga
Nicholas A. Baker
Matthew G. Baldwin
Austin B. Balitensperger
Katharine A. Banah
Austin N. Barbee
Sarab J. Barneuette
Joseph B. Baxter
Jason A. Beachler
Bradley W. Beeler
Angel Z. Belgard
Kainen A. Belling
Richard J. Bennett
John L. Biddick
Brian C. Bentele
Jason R. Berry
Shawn G. Berdjawi
Frisbinder S. Hiller
Jeremy T. Bigham
Sara S. Birdsong
Caroline A. Bolduc
Peter N. Bonenbau
Clintion J. Borchardt
Gregori G. Boulo
Jared G. Brinkhoff
Matthew J. Brown
Samantha R. Brown
Carl Bryce
Karen G. Burcher
Jason A. Burchett
Paul E. Butler
Shauna M. Butler
Robert T. Byrom
Stephen D. Cagle, Jr.
Jonathan J. Campbell
Philip A. Cannady
Michael J. Cacioppo
Katharine M. Cailin
Geoffrey S. Callen
Patricia K. Catrow
Matthew J. Cellini
Michael J. Chipps
Chad T. Christensen
Elle S. Cleaver
Philip G. Cleric
Kelli K. Clinticroncoco
Joshua A. Coker
Jason A. Csokay
Jennifer A. Cross
Michelle A. Cunnigham
David N. Daig
Michael J. Daguffon
Bradley R. Dayton
Mauroic De Castro Pretelt
Kaitlin P. Debrock
Stephanie A. Deign
Christopher B. Delangar
Sara M. Despain
Sarab M. Dittrich
Chad B. Douglas
David J. Downey
Kimberly M. Duvall
Jennifer A. Dunn
Robert J. Edmund
Gregorio S. Edwardson, Jr.
Joseph L. Ehrbig
William S. Ellis
Jennifer R. Enman Bourguin
Daniel C. Eschberg
Stephen F. Elgach
Angela L. Escobedo
Escaro J. Escano
Janet J. Eyre
Nicole S. Fanning
Matthew J. Feely
Paul W. Fernander
Jason E. Fisher
Emily J. Fleckner
Christopher D. Fontmayor
Jonathan T. Forfula
Brant D. Forrest
Andrew L. Franklin
Ashley J. Fukuncha
Michael C. Gallante
Steven W. Gallo
Kara W. Garcia
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

**To be major**

- Kimberley E. Postale
- William M. Pryor
- Sarah A. Pullen
- Mitchell J. Radigan
- Robert J. Raynor
- Rustin A. Rawlings
- Erin K. Redd
- Evan J. Richards
- Janine C. Richardson
- Dana C. Rogers
- Patrick D. Saa
- Eamin Sadeghi
- Elliott J. Sally
- Sandra M. Salem
- Christopher D. Sanders
- Cong C. Santoso
- Christopher J. Sardonn
- Eric C. Scott
- Kenneth F. Sleater
- Aljo W. Sharp
- Amanda B. Shaub
- Michael A. Shaub
- Cameron M. Showery
- James T. Shen
- Xiaoming Shi
- Meryl A. Simon Logan
- Erica M. Simon
- Samantya G. Simpson
- Katherine M. Slogic
- Joshua M. Sosa
- John D. Stacey
- Douglas M. Steen
- Brian N. Stephens
- Brian D. Stephens
- Kelly M. Stidom
- Jivan V. Storey
- Jordan T. Stouffer
- Jeremy C. Strommayer
- Joseph C. Stuart
- Chenghou Su
- Kenneth L. Tanyi
- Alan D. Tate
- Joshua M. Tate
- Aaron J. Thomas
- Jonathan O. Thomas
- Spencer D. Thomas
- Richard T. Thorofred
- Emily M. Tipton
- Vincent G. Tober
- Jodie K. Timbralik
- William T. Timbralik
- Scott A. Tonish
- Jonathan D. Topham
- David R. Trigg
- Steven D. Trigg
- Anna E. Trzeciak
- Ian S. Tuzzun
- Colby C. Uptegraft
- Matthew J. Vargas
- Elizabeth W. Vassiliou, Jr.
- Douglas B. Walton
- Steven B. Walton
- Brenda W. Welch
- Evan M. West
- Christopher R. Wil
d- David J. Wilton
- Brian C. Wolf
- Heather L. Wolfe
- Richard M. Wood
- Adam W. Work
- Bart D. Wottoning
- Randall V. Yalk
- Adam N. Young
- John J. Yu
- Michelle L. Zielinski

**To be lieutenant colonel**

- Verónica Zarnabibra

**The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:**

- Kevin D. Alford
- Nathan S. Anderson
- Peter A. Baldwin
- Scott D. Barlow
- Jeffrey G. Belisle
- Craig S. Berg, Jr.
- Halton W. Bright
- Andrew G. Boston
- Michael Brewer
- Kimberly B. Broughton
- Allison R. Buel
- Omar L. Caraway
- David H. Carlisle
- Shuhang Chen
- Stephen B. Chipman
- Daniel X. Choi
- Joonce H. Choi
- Rebecca A. Chrislit
- Richard A. Clark
- James D. Covelli
- Jean M. Cowling
- Jason W. Cromar
- Bætarsað S. Danby
- Sonja I. Dardz,elni
- Brett W. Davids
- Ryan E. Davis
- Mark D. Davidson
- Robert M. Dewitt
- Emanuele Diazelo
- Elizabeth A. Dryer
- Stephen B. Edstrom
- Anthony C. Eschielman
- Erin E. Ezell
- Brandy F. Fennell
- Philip Flatual
- Robert W. Fontenette
- Aven W. Forrester
- Justin P. Fox
- Elizabeth M. Gaia
- Katheryn B. Garner
- Kathryn T. Gatto
- Starlena A. Gianollini
- Matthew D. Graham
- Ross F. Graham
- Aaron D. Grant
- Heather M. Hancock
- Joni C. Hodsdon
- Justin B. Holcomb
- Charles T. Howard
- Andrea W. Johnson
- Linda B. Jones
- Stephen A. Kucia
- David B. Leary
- Toby P. Lees
- Friedelh L. Lipata
- Carrie A. L.T. Lage
- Kevin C. Lo""
The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Air Force under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be colonel

Andrew A. Arndt
John C. Barnes
Daniel H. Beaudry
Chad K. Britton
Andrew J. Brouwell
Matthew T. Bryan
Thomas P. Burnham
John T. Castlen
Christopher M. Chatelain
Yan Clermont
Chase C. Cleveland
Kevin S. Cople
Jason C. Coffey
Jack R. Cohen
Christina K. Colclough
Dana E. Cook
Derek M. Covne
Michael T. Davis
Phillip J. Dickerson
Joshua G. Dimoff
Charles B. Edson
Christopher D. Eldred
Austin L. Enick
Jenna C. Ferrell
Timothy J. J. FitzGibbon
Edward J. Gladding
Michael A. Gold
Brent B. Hancock
Maura C. E. Hoppman
Bonson B. Hoskins
Colby P. Horowitz
Casey G. Jones
Kevin M. Jusinski
Barbara K. Kerrane
Jamison S. Kim
Nicole M. Kim
Susan Kim
Alan K. Kirk
Winter S. Lear
Joyce C. Liu
Nicholas A. Lucchetto
Robert D. Lutters
Sean P. Magnabosco
Jonathan S. Marshall
Aaron K. McCartney
Timothy M. McCullough
Jason M. McKeown
Robert H. Merk
Alexander Morningstar
Dustin P. Myers
Sarah E. Nealen
Jennifer D. Norris
Timothy B. Olliges
Jared V. Olson
David J. Paedo
Elliot J. Fernula
Shawn J. Forrest
Amanda A. Presson
Hannah E. Pressley
Jason A. Quinn
Steven N. Quinzel
Robert J. Rauchohorst, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 624 and 3064:

To be major

Andrew A. Arndt
John C. Barnes
Daniel H. Beaudry
Chad K. Britton
Andrew J. Brouwell
Matthew T. Bryan
Thomas P. Burnham
John T. Castlen
Christopher M. Chatelain
Yan Clermont
Chase C. Cleveland
Kevin S. Cople
Jason C. Coffey
Jack R. Cohen
Christina K. Colclough
Dana E. Cook
Derek M. Covne
Michael T. Davis
Phillip J. Dickerson
Joshua G. Dimoff
Charles B. Edson
Christopher D. Eldred
Austin L. Enick
Jenna C. Ferrell
Timothy J. J. FitzGibbon
Edward J. Gladding
Michael A. Gold
Brent B. Hancock
Maura C. E. Hoppman
Bonson B. Hoskins
Colby P. Horowitz
Casey G. Jones
Kevin M. Jusinski
Barbara K. Kerrane
Jamison S. Kim
Nicole M. Kim
Susan Kim
Alan K. Kirk
Winter S. Lear
Joyce C. Liu
Nicholas A. Lucchetto
Robert D. Lutters
Sean P. Magnabosco
Jonathan S. Marshall
Aaron K. McCartney
Timothy M. McCullough
Jason M. McKeown
Robert H. Merk
Alexander Morningstar
Dustin P. Myers
Sarah E. Nealen
Jennifer D. Norris
Timothy B. Olliges
Jared V. Olson
David J. Paedo
Elliot J. Fernula
Shawn J. Forrest
Amanda A. Presson
Hannah E. Pressley
Jason A. Quinn
Steven N. Quinzel
Robert J. Rauchohorst, Jr.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 624 and 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

Tyler M. Abercrombie
The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be colonel

Randolph S. Carpenter
The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 624 and 3064:

To be major

Angel Soto
The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

Matthew C. Dawson
Lee C. Novy

In the Navy

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be captain

Eric C. Correll
HONOURING DR. GERALD BROWN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Gerald Brown on his retirement after forty-four years of distinguished service to his country and community as a Professor of Operations Research at the Naval Postgraduate School, located in my district on the central coast of California.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, Dr. Brown has demonstrated deep commitment to our nation and its values. After receiving his M.B.A. in Quantitative Methods from California State University, Fullerton in 1969, he went on to complete a Ph.D. in Mathematical Methods at the University of California, Los Angeles in 1974. While working on his doctorate, he concurrently completed Naval Officer Candidate School, graduating with the rank of Ensign in 1973.

After his educational and training, Dr. Brown began to work as an Assistant Professor of Operations Research at the Naval Postgraduate School. He has committed his entire teaching career to training the next generation of our nation’s naval officers at the Naval Postgraduate School, earning countless awards and accolades that reflect his dedication. Over the past forty-four years, Dr. Brown has taught the principles of operations research and computer science to thousands of officers from the U.S. military and allied nations. Former students include astronauts, Admirals, and even former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen.

The accolades earned by Dr. Brown include the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Medal, which is the highest honor that the Secretary of the Navy can bestow upon a civilian who demonstrates extraordinary service in their post. Dr. Brown also has three patents under his name owned by the federal government, and was the first professor from the Naval Postgraduate School to be accepted into the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Gerald Brown’s devotion to his work and impressive accomplishments will be remembered by all who have worked with him at the Naval Postgraduate School, and the work of his students will serve as an enduring legacy. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Dr. Brown on his contributions to our community and congratulating him on a well-earned retirement.

MACCABI USA MEN’S SOCCER TEAM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Maccabi USA men’s soccer team for competing in the USA 2018 King Cup tournament in Las Vegas, Nevada to honor our great American hero Martin Luther King, Jr.

Twenty men from Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania achieved an undefeated record of 4 wins, no losses and 2 draws, scoring 15 goals and allowing 6 against to earn the silver medal in the 2018 King Cup. The team consisted of the following individuals: Scott Agran, David Alhadef, Gary (Gaza) Bernstein (C/O), Bob Boone, Scott Cohen, Jeff Cohn, Ed Harris, Stuart Hochberger (Cptn.), Dan (Indy) Indech, Don Kent, Ken Kramer, Ramin Lalezari, Jess Mogul, David Parks, Keith Silberman, David Stone, Lawrence Swemer, Mark (Wiz) Wisnevezit, and was managed by Steve (Golty) Goldenring and Dan Kurtz.

Maccabi USA is a 501c(3) not-for-profit organization with an extensive history of enriching Jewish lives through athletic, cultural and educational programs. Maccabi USA supports Jewish athletic endeavors enhanced by cultural and educational opportunities in the United States, Israel and throughout the world. These 20 men exemplify this great ideal. I extend my deepest congratulations to the Maccabi USA men’s soccer team for their dedication, hard work and competitive spirit.

THANKING FRANCIS “FRANK” RUSSO

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.
of NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Frank Russo for his service to his country.

Frank Russo was born and raised on Staten Island. It was there where he graduated from Monsignor Farrell High School in 1991. He then matriculated at St. John’s University where he graduated in 1995, receiving his Bachelor’s degree in Criminal Justice. After college, Frank was accepted to the U.S. Customs Service under their Outstanding Scholar Program. After serving in U.S. Customs and Border Protection as a Deputy Field Coordinator and Assistant Director, he was eventually promoted to the position of Port Director for John F. Kennedy International Airport.

As Port Director, Frank has worked closely with the NYPD to combat the nation’s opioid epidemic. In his first year, his team successfully intercepted over 80 shipments of fentanyl. Moreover, under his watch, Customs and Border Protection agents seized large batches of narcotics 14,000 times. Additionally, they seized $9 million in currency linked to terrorism, drug trafficking, and other illegal activities. With 1,700 trained and devoted officers, Frank is truly on the front line in keeping our nation safe.

Frank Russo is a dedicated public servant who has served our country for many years with distinction. His tireless work provides critical resources to our community in Central Illinois. MASON DISTRICT HOSPITAL

HON. DARIN LAHood
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. LAHood. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Mason District Hospital of Havana, Illinois, as it celebrates its 60th anniversary. Their tireless work provides critical resources to our community in Central Illinois.

Mason District Hospital was founded in 1957 with a mission to provide the highest quality healthcare to its surrounding communities. Since then, the Hospital has grown alongside our community to provide high-quality care in the face of an ever-changing healthcare landscape. As a rural critical access hospital, Mason District Hospital is immensely important to the hard-working people of Mason County and the surrounding area. Its demonstrable success in fulfilling the needs of its patients for so many years is admirable and worthy of recognition.

Mason District Hospital has served thousands of Americans in their most desperate and vulnerable times. Their great reputation is known throughout Illinois and it is an honor to represent them in Congress. Congratulations to Mason District Hospital for sixty successful years, and here’s to many more. Thank them for all that they do.

IN RECOGNITION OF VISITING STUDENTS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the civic minded young men from The Hun School of Princeton who visited the Capitol. I would like to honor Headmaster Jonathan G. Brougham and Head of Middle School Kenneth J. Weinstein for their service and sacrifice to benefit the lives of youth. In a world where there is so much uncertainty, it is important to educate students to be mindful individuals who are aware of the trials of the less fortunate, and who seek to benefit the lives of all fellow citizens. I am confident that under the direction of these distinguished educators, these students will be molded into strong leaders who are ready to take on the world and whatever opportunities lie ahead.

As a member of Congress, I view there is no better way to guarantee a strong future for America than to instill in our young people the values of service, sacrifice, and compassion.
Honoring Integrated Wood Components, Inc.

Mr. Faso. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Integrated Wood Components, Inc. (IWCI) of Deposit, New York for being named “Local Business of the Year” by the Deposit Chamber of Commerce. Founded by the Kamp Family in 1972, IWCI has become an industry leader in composite wood furniture manufacturing through their commitment to producing quality products in an efficient and environmentally conscious way. This recognition is a true testament to IWCI’s continued legacy of innovation, community involvement, and environmental stewardship.

Boasting one of the most modern, energy efficient, and fully integrated wood components manufacturing plants in the country, IWCI is known for its cutting-edge operation, swift adaptation to consumer needs, and technological advancements. The “Local Business of the Year” award, however, is a special designation reserved for those businesses who go above and beyond demonstrating exemplary business practices. In the 19th District, community involvement and conserving our cherished outdoor spaces are priorities we hold dear, and IWCI is no exception to that. From aiding local community organizations to embracing environmentally-sensitive practices, IWCI is a bulwark of community and environmental sustainability.

For over forty years, IWCI has left a positive imprint on our Upstate community and economy. On behalf of New York’s 19th District, I want to congratulate the Kamp Family on their many years of hard work and community service, and celebrate IWCI on its much-deserved award. I am grateful for the Kamp family’s commitment to New York State, and I wish them and IWCI continued success.

Honor. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant. A life-long Jacksonian, Margaret C. Barrett-Simon graduated from St. Joseph High School and the University of Southern Mississippi.

She was first elected to the Jackson City Council in 1985. During her years of experience on the Council, she has served as President, Vice President, and Chair of the Planning Committee, Budget Committee, Rules Committee, Legislative Committee, Homeless Task Force and the Transportation Committee.

She is very active in the local community through her service to various civic organizations. She currently serves on the board of the Salvation Army, Farish Street YMCA, School of Liberal Arts for Jackson State University and the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame.

She serves as the Advisory Council Member and Chair of the National League of Cities, National President, Women in Municipal Government and State President of Women in Municipal Government. She is involved in the Urban Poverty Task Force; the National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families; and the Mississippi Municipal Association.

She and her husband, Dr. Al Simon, have five daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Councilwoman Margaret C. Barrett-Simon for her dedication to serving others for 32 years.

Personal Explanation

Hon. Mark DeSaulnier of California

Hon. Rodney Davis of Illinois

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Silgan Closures, a leader in the manufacturing industry in Illinois’ 13th District.

The Silgan Closures plant in Champaign, Illinois was awarded the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award. The company also made significant changes to its operation in an efficient and environmentally conscious way. This recognition is a true testament to Silgan’s continued legacy of innovation, community involvement, and environmental stewardship.

We recognize and honor Integrated Wood Components, Inc. (IWCI) of Deposit, New York for being named “Local Business of the Year” by the Deposit Chamber of Commerce. Founded by the Kamp Family in 1972, IWCI has become an industry leader in composite wood furniture manufacturing through their commitment to producing quality products in an efficient and environmentally conscious way.

As the UAW points out, at a time of growing wealth inequality and a shrinking middle class, the last thing Congress should do is deprive workers of their legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively where there is indisputable evidence that unions help increase worker wages.

I would have voted against this bill, which seeks to deprive workers of their right to advocate for themselves and ask for the wages they deserve.

Recognizing Silgan Closures

HONORING MARGARET C. BARRETT-SIMON

HON. JOHN J. FASO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. Faso. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Integrated Wood Components, Inc. (IWCI) of Deposit, New York for being named “Local Business of the Year” by the Deposit Chamber of Commerce. Founded by the Kamp Family in 1972, IWCI has become an industry leader in composite wood furniture manufacturing through their commitment to producing quality products in an efficient and environmentally conscious way. This recognition is a true testament to IWCI’s continued legacy of innovation, community involvement, and environmental stewardship.

Boasting one of the most modern, energy efficient, and fully integrated wood components manufacturing plants in the country, IWCI is known for its cutting-edge operation, swift adaptation to consumer needs, and technological advancements. The “Local Business of the Year” award, however, is a special designation reserved for those businesses who go above and beyond demonstrating exemplary business practices. In the 19th District, community involvement and conserving our cherished outdoor spaces are priorities we hold dear, and IWCI is no exception to that. From aiding local community organizations to embracing environmentally-sensitive practices, IWCI is a bulwark of community and environmental sustainability.

For over forty years, IWCI has left a positive imprint on our Upstate community and economy. On behalf of New York’s 19th District, I want to congratulate the Kamp Family on their many years of hard work and community service, and celebrate IWCI on its much-deserved award. I am grateful for the Kamp family’s commitment to New York State, and I wish them and IWCI continued success.

HONORING ROYDEN DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Silgan Closures, a leader in the manufacturing industry in Illinois’ 13th District.

The Silgan Closures plant in Champaign, Illinois was awarded the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award. The company also made significant changes to its operation in an effort to reduce energy consumption, making it a true example of the sustainability in manufacturing and a deserving recipient of this award.

By converting from injection molding machines to compression molding machines, Silgan was able to reduce the company’s greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 2,900 metric tons. Silgan also began using rail to import their plastic resin, further reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Even small changes like switching to LED lightbulbs and using more environmentally friendly cleaning agents have had a significant impact when it comes to cutting down on energy use at Silgan’s facility in Champaign.

As a member of the Climate Solutions Caucus, I will continue to support policies like Section 179(d) of the IRS code, which incentivizes businesses to become more energy efficient, and the Mechanical Insulation Installation Incentive Act, which would expand 179(d) to include the installation of mechanical insulation.

Businesses like Silgan Closures are an example of how incentivizing sustainability can produce results. I’m proud to highlight the good work that Silgan Closures is doing to lead the way in sustainable manufacturing in my district. They are certainly deserving of the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Silgan Closures, a leader in the manufacturing industry in Illinois’ 13th District.

The Silgan Closures plant in Champaign, Illinois was awarded the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award. The company also made significant changes to its operation in an effort to reduce energy consumption, making it a true example of the sustainability in manufacturing and a deserving recipient of this award.

By converting from injection molding machines to compression molding machines, Silgan was able to reduce the company’s greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 2,900 metric tons. Silgan also began using rail to import their plastic resin, further reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Even small changes like switching to LED lightbulbs and using more environmentally friendly cleaning agents have had a significant impact when it comes to cutting down on energy use at Silgan’s facility in Champaign.

As a member of the Climate Solutions Caucus, I will continue to support policies like Section 179(d) of the IRS code, which incentivizes businesses to become more energy efficient, and the Mechanical Insulation Installation Incentive Act, which would expand 179(d) to include the installation of mechanical insulation.

Businesses like Silgan Closures are an example of how incentivizing sustainability can produce results. I’m proud to highlight the good work that Silgan Closures is doing to lead the way in sustainable manufacturing in my district. They are certainly deserving of the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award.
The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuse, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

The District operated under the FMAP formula, as it did prior to the Revitalization Act, although this result, the District received only $23 million in stead of the $49 million it was due. I was able to secure a technical correction in the Balanced Budget Act of 1999, partially increasing the annual allotment to $32 million from fiscal year 2000 forward. I appreciate that, in 2005, Congress responded to our effort to get an additional annual increase of $20 million in the budget reconciliation bill, bringing D.C.’s Medicaid reimbursements to $57 million, as intended by the Revitalization Act, although this amount did not reimburse the District for the years the federal error denied the city part of its rightful federal contribution.

In conclusion, this bill would treat the District just like the federal government treats other large cities when it comes to Medicaid reimbursements, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

HONORING THE 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE ROBERT YATES

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Robert Yates upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

When the District faced financial difficulty as the only city to pay for state functions, Congress, with the District’s consent, passed the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Revitalization Act), which transferred from the District to the federal government the costs and/or operations of several state functions, including prisons, courts and offender supervision. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which included the Revitalization Act, statutorily set D.C.’s FMAP at 70 percent. The District’s financial crisis was largely the result of the District’s uniqueness as the only city responsible for paying for state functions, while the federal government also imposed unique revenue limitations on the District. All of the revenue limitations remain. Congress recognized that state costs are inappropriate for a city to shoulder, though the District has continued to carry many of these burdens like a state.

Medicaid is a joint federal-state program. The FMAP statutory minimum is 50 percent and the maximum is 85 percent. Local funds may constitute up to 60 percent of a state’s share. The FMAP formula is based on a state’s per capita income relative to the national average, and the higher a state’s per capita income, the lower the FMAP. If the District operated under the FMAP formula, as it did prior to the Revitalization Act, the federal government would pay only 50 percent of D.C.’s Medicaid expenditures.

The District, a city with no state to contribute to it, must alone absorb the state portion of Medicaid. Thus, the District pays for 60 percent of Medicaid, more than any U.S. city. Considering the difference in the size of its tax base, the District should certainly contribute no more than New York City’s contribution to Medicaid. Therefore, my bill would raise the federal contribution to the District’s Medicaid program to 80 percent, equal to that of New York City.

On December 21, 2017, Representative Morgan Griffith introduced a bill (H.R. 4709) that would blow a massive hole in the District’s budget by reducing the FMAP for D.C. from the current 70 percent to 54 percent. Under the bill, beginning in fiscal year 2020, the federal government would pay the higher of the FMAP formula or a FMAP fixed percentage that decreases until it reaches 54 percent in 2027 and thereafter. Mr. Griffith’s bill demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the uniqueness of D.C.’s structure and economy and the intent of the Revitalization Act. I will fight to defeat this backwards bill.

In 1997, a formula error in the Medicaid Dis-proportionate Share Hospital allotment reduced the District’s Medicaid share, and, as a result, the District received only $23 million instead of the $49 million it was due. I was able to secure a technical correction in the Balanced Budget Act of 1999, partially increasing the annual allotment to $32 million from fiscal year 2000 forward. I appreciate that, in 2005, Congress responded to our effort to get an additional annual increase of $20 million in the budget reconciliation bill, bringing D.C.’s Medicaid reimbursements to $57 million, as intended by the Revitalization Act, although this amount did not reimburse the District for the years the federal error denied the city part of its rightful federal contribution.

In conclusion, this bill would treat the District just like the federal government treats other large cities when it comes to Medicaid reimbursements, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE ROBERT YATES

HON. RICHARD HUDSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Robert Yates upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

Robert began his association with Holman Moody Racing, Robert was mentored by fellow NASCAR Hall of Famer Junior Johnson. In 1983, as the engine builder for Bobby Allison and Cale Yarborough, he was able to lead Bobby to a series championship with DiGardi Racing. His accomplishments allowed him to launch his own team in the late 1980s, Robert Yates Racing. Success followed him during every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR history.

By the time he retired, Robert Yates had amassed 57 total wins, 1,155 starts and 48 poles won. His accomplishments also include winning the NASCAR premier series championships and the Daytona 500 three times. To say Robert Yates is a racing legend would be a gross understatement. A fierce competitor and true gentleman, he is the embodiment of a racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year’s class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Robert Yates is extremely deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Robert Yates on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

HONORING JAMES CODY BURKHURM
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true patriot and friend. James Cody Burkharm of Hope, Arkansas, has faithfully served in my office as a legislative correspondent and most recently as a legislative assistant. He previously served on my congressional campaign, for a combination of four years on my staff.

Whether it was traveling the farms of the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas to meet with cattle ranchers or taking a meeting with postal workers, Cody put in the long hours to meet the needs of his fellow Arkansans.

When I learned Cody would take a new position that would return him to our beloved Natural State, I felt sadness for the people of the Fourth District to lose Cody’s hard work and persistence. At the same time, I felt happiness and joy for him as he begins the next chapter of his life. I give Cody thanks for his dedication during these four years and wish him the best.

HONORING THE 2018 ACADEMY NOMINEES OF THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, more high school seniors from the 11th Congressional District trade in varsity jackets for Navy pea coats, Air Force flight suits, and Army brass buckles than most other districts in the country. In fact, this is nothing new—our area has repeatedly sent an above average portion of its sons and daughters to the nation’s military academies for decades. This fact should not come as a surprise. The educational excellence of area schools is well known and has long been a magnet for families looking for the best environment in which to raise their children. Our graduates are skilled not only in mathematics, science, and social studies, but also have solid back-grounds in sports, debate, and other extra-curricular activities. This diverse upbringing makes military academy recruiters sit up and take note—indeed, many recruiters know our towns and schools by name.

Since the 1830s, Members of Congress have enjoyed meeting, talking with, and nominating superb young people to our military academies. But how did this process evolve? In 1843, when West Point was the sole academy, Congress ratified the nominating process and became directly involved in the composition of our military’s leadership. This was not
an act of an imperial Congress bent on controlling every aspect of government. Rather, the procedure still used today was, and is, a further check and balance in our democracy. It was originally designed to weaken and divide political coloration in the officer corps, provide geographical balance to our armed services, and to make the officer corps more resilient to unfettered nepotism and handpicked European armies.

In 1854, Representative Gerrit Smith of New York added a new component to the academy nomination process, the academy review board. This was the first time a Member of Congress appointed prominent citizens from his district to screen applicants and assist with the serious duty of nominating candidates for academy admission. Today, I am honored to continue this wise tradition in my service to the 11th Congressional District.

My Academy Review Board is composed of local citizens who have shown exemplary service to New Jersey, to their communities, and to the continued excellence of education in our area; many are veterans. Although from diverse backgrounds and professions, they all share a common vision, that the best qualified and motivated graduates attend our academies. They assess a student's qualifications and analyze character, desire to serve, test scores, and other activities. At this time, they also inform my office of their desire to be nominated.

I would like to take a moment to recognize and thank them publicly for participating in this important role. Being on the board requires hard work and an objective mind. Members have the responsibility of interviewing upwards of 50 outstanding young men and women every year in the academy review process.

The nomination process follows a general timetable. High school seniors mail personal information directly to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy once they become interested in attending. Information includes academic achievement, college entry test scores, and other activities. At this time, they also inform my office of their desire to be nominated.

The academies then assess the applicants, rank them based on the data supplied, and return the files to my office with their notifications. In late November, my Academy Review Board interviewed all of the applicants over the course of two days. They assess a student's qualifications and analyze character, desire to serve, and other talents that may not appear on paper.

This year the board interviewed over 40 applicants. The Board's recommendations were reviewed files and notified applicants then forwarded to the academies, where recommendations were considered. The Board's recommendations were considered, and other talents that may not appear on paper.

As these highly motivated and talented young men and women go through the academy nominating process, never let us forget the significant role the academies, who are acquirers reviewed files and notified applicants and my office of their final decision on admission.
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Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Jerry Myers for his service to Davie County and wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK DESAULNIER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to vote on Friday, January 11, 2018 as my mother passed away.

We can provide law enforcement officials with the resources and capabilities necessary to defend the nation while simultaneously upholding the hard-fought and hard-won individual rights enshrined in the Constitution. As we now know, the National Security Agency has collected vast swaths of telephone and internet data, using Section 702 as justification, some of which was on Americans for whom there was no suspicion of wrongdoing. Liberty and security do not need to be mutually exclusive. However, S. 139 did not do enough to protect Americans from the watchful eye of government surveillance.

I strongly supported the amendment put forth by Congressman JUSTIN AMASH and Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN that would put more limitations on access to information collected on Americans and stronger safeguards against law enforcement using that information without a warrant. I would have supported this amendment and was disappointed that it did not pass.

Without the addition of the Amash-Lofgren amendment, I would have voted against this bill. There is still space to address these issues so that individual privacy rights will be upheld while our country is protected, but this bill did not protect Americans' privacy adequately.

TRIBUTE TO XAVIER STAUBS

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, rise today to pay tribute to Xavier Staub, a freshman at Corunna High School, for his heroic actions in saving a rival swimmer from drowning during a swim meet. Xavier showed bravery and courage in helping to save the life of another.

Xavier is a freshman at Corunna High School. This past January 4, his quick and decisive action saved the life of a competing student. After completing the last leg of the 200-yard medley relay against rival Owosso High School he noticed panicked spectators pointing to Kamrin Samson, a junior at Owosso High School, who was sinking to the bottom of the pool. Xavier jumped back into the pool, swam down, and brought Kamrin back to the surface to receive the medical attention he needed. Once Kamrin was out of the water, medical personnel and coaching staff from both high schools performed the necessary treatment to resuscitate him.

For such a young individual, Xavier did not waver in a crucial moment. He was fearless and courageous at a time of life or death for a fellow swimmer. To Xavier, all that mattered was doing the right thing. Actions such as these should serve as a guideline for how we should live our own lives: selflessness in service to others. Xavier’s heroic actions on January 4 will be remembered by those in attendance for years to come, and they are a defining moment in his young life.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Xavier Staub for his heroic and selfless actions.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF MARY AUDREY GALLAGHER

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and service of Mary Audrey Gallagher. An educator, advocate, and proud mother, Audrey passed away peacefully on January 4, 2018, after enjoying time with her loved ones during the holidays. Audrey's life truly embodied the spirit of a hard-working, loving Irish American, as she nurtured strong bonds in her communities while fighting for the rights of the disenfranchised.

Audrey was born in Queens, New York, on September 6, 1922. Audrey's honesty and integrity were formally recognized when she graduated from The Mary Louis Academy in Queens, New York, with the Character, Loyalty, and Spirit of Study Award, one of the academy's highest honors.

Upon graduating high school, Audrey attended and graduated from St. John's University, where she was captain of the school's Cheerleading Squad. After leaving a lasting mark on her campus community as a promising prospective instructor, she became a public school teacher. Some years later, Audrey married Warren Dromm. Her son, my dear friend and now-New York City Council Member Daniel Dromm, was born soon after. She was also mother to Lori, Marybeth, John, and Joseph. Her exemplary record of service continued, and after opening a nursery school, Audrey went on to become the director of multiple day care centers in New York City. She was instrumental in unionizing workers and she helped secure much-needed pay raises for paraprofessionals. Her courage and dedication changed lives. Audrey's support of her son, an openly-gay man, greatly advanced the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community through his advocacy and by founding the Queens chapter of Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG), of which Audrey was an active participant.

Audrey, along with Daniel and PFLAG-founder Jeanne Manford, worked to use their voices to fight the good fight against bigotry and intolerance in Queens and throughout New York City. But her support did not stop there—Audrey became a venerable presence in the Queens LGBT community, attending parades, advising the parents of LGBT youth, and wholeheartedly supporting her son in his own endeavors to improve Queens. Having served as PFLAG's Queens chapter Chairperson, Audrey believed in the special role that parents of LGBT children play. It is evident that her love for her son helped make
Mr. Speaker, I arise today to honor the life and legacy of a great Floridian, Irwin Stovroff, who passed away peacefully this week at the age of 95.

Born in Buffalo, N.Y., Irwin served in World War II as the 2nd Lieutenant in the 506th Squadron, 44th Bomb Group. He was captured by the Germans as a Jewish prisoner of war at Stalag Luft 1 and later received the Purple Heart for his courageous service.

Mr. Stovroff's dedication to veterans was the focus of his life. He founded Vets Helping Heroes, a nonprofit group to help veterans in need of service dogs, and it is through his efforts that the NDAA of 2010 included language from the Wounded Warrior K-9 Corps Act. Mr. Stovroff also volunteered as a National Service Office for ex-POWs at the Palm Beach VA hospital. His selfless service to others embodied the commitment to national service that distinguishes the Greatest Generation.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to have known Irwin and his dog Cash were frequent and welcome visitors to my office, when Irwin and I would discuss ways our community could better serve our veterans.

Mr. Stovroff was an American hero. I extend my heartfelt condolences to Doris, the rest of Irwin’s family, his many dear friends, and all those who were touched by his kindness, compassion and dedication to our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Stovroff’s life and the lives of all veterans. Our nation is better because of Mr. Stovroff’s service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Ken Squier upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

"Welcome to the Great American Race", Ken would say as viewers tuned in to watch the race. As one of NASCAR’s original broadcasters, Ken was able to make the audience feel not only that they were at the race but that it was the most exciting race they had ever watched. Success followed him during every step of his journey, which culminated in one of the most impressive broadcasting careers in NASCAR history.

Throughout his career, Ken saw the importance of broadcasting and his understanding of the future of the sport led him to become a co-founder of the Motor Racing Network. "Common men doing uncommon things", Ken would describe drivers as his voice filled the arenas with excitement all across the country. Ken would say as viewers tuned in to watch the race. As one of NASCAR’s original broadcasters, Ken was able to make the audience feel not only that they were at the race but that it was the most exciting race they had ever watched. Success followed him during every step of his journey, which culminated in one of the most impressive broadcasting careers in NASCAR history.

This year’s class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. Ken was one of five chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Ken Squier is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandchildren of seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 18 March for Life.

Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the thousands of faithful and devoted students descending on Washington, D.C. to attend the March for Life Rally. The March for Life began in Washington, D.C., as a small demonstration and rapidly grew to be the largest pro-life event in the world.

I am proud to represent Peoria Notre Dame High School and Bloomington Central Catholic High School, both participating in today’s march. I applaud the institutions across the country that send their students to this event heightening their devotion to the cause.

These students show true dedication to their beliefs by taking the time out of their busy lives to travel across the country to show their support for the pro-life movement. I feel it is critical in this day in age for young, faithful people to get involved and fight for the sanctity of human life. The dedication and energy these students have shown are vital to the continued advocacy of pro-life issues.

This event, and the students and organizers who make it possible, deserve to be recognized today as pillars of society and strong examples of civic leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandchildren of seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., for his dedication to the community, friends and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandchildren of seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandchildren of seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandchildren of seven grandchildren.
the Veterans Views radio program, broadcasting out of Hammond, Indiana. For nearly a decade, the program’s hosts, past and present, have been tireless advocates for veterans residing in Indiana’s First Congressional District, across the nation, and abroad. As Veterans Views approaches its 10th anniversary, I commend those involved for not only bringing veterans’ issues to the forefront, but for giving those who served a voice.

From its humble beginnings on a cable access channel, before shifting to its current radio format, several local veterans who once made personal sacrifices to defend our country assembled to serve their veteran brothers and sisters in another way. Selflessly, these individuals provided an avenue by which veterans could share their collective experiences, and in doing so, forged a path of public service that has improved the lives of many veterans. Local veterans Ernie Dillon, Bill Emerson, Patrick O’Donnell, Dennis Shults, and Donald Shults combined their experiences and knowledge to create a platform where veterans in the community might seek support or assistance or discuss pertinent issues.

Currently, Veterans Views, hosted by Ernie Dillon, Patrick O’Donnell, Bill Emerson, and David Hinshaw, airs weekly on WJOB 1230 AM and also shares its message via the Veterans Views’ Parole Board, Major Crimes Task Force Oversee Committee, Operational Area Disaster and Citizen Corps Council, and the Marin County Sheriff’s Office. Through these roles, Mr. Schulze was able to improve the public’s relationship with local government agencies and fight for issues such as pesticide reduction in western Marin County.

Ed Schulze’s impact on the City of Novato can be measured not only through the issues he has worked on, or meetings he has attended, but also through the people whose lives he has touched over the years. As a dedicated family man and consummate public advocate, he has inspired generations of community leaders since moving to Novato nearly a half-century ago.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Ed Schulze for his many years of selfless volunteerism and leadership across the City of Novato and the County of Marin.

CONGRATULATING MR. A. ROBERT TINDALL

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. A. Robert Tindall on his 91st birthday that was celebrated on January 5, 2018.

A. Robert Tindall, or known by his friends as Bob, was born in Trenton on January 5, 1927. Bob is one of a few remaining American veterans who has served our country during World War II.

Bob served as a Radioman in the United States Navy, where he was stationed on a minesweeper. During the war, Bob served his country by helping to detect underwater mines that could have done great harm to our fleets. Because of his invaluable service, Bob’s work helped countless ships from being destroyed and in time saved thousands of lives.

After leaving the Navy, Bob attended Rider College in New Jersey and then Drexel University in Philadelphia where he studied mechanical engineering. While attending college, Bob’s father owned a real estate business and asked Bob to assist. His work with his dad in real estate eventually led him to start his own career in real estate and insurance. Today, Bob resides in Ewing. He has three children, four grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Bob on his birthday, and to thank him for his service to this country. Let us never forget the sacrifice he and others like him made to protect the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF MARY HELEN MCCAY, PH.D.

HON. BILL POSEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Dr. Mary Helen McCay who has just been named a Fellow of the National Academy of Inventors—a highly prestigious professional distinction. Dr. McCay currently serves as University Research Professor and Director of Florida Institute of Technology’s National Center for Hydrogen Research.

Dr. McCay grew up in Fort Pierce just south of Florida’s Space Coast, which is one of space exploration from an early age. Many Helen remembers watching Astronaut John Glenn’s famous launch during high school assembly. Like many young people growing up on the Space Coast at that time—including myself—her enthusiasm for space exploration grew as she regularly visited Patrick Air Force Base and Kennedy Space Center to watch our rocket launches. With a strong interest in studying science and engineering, she went on to earn her Ph.D. in Metallurgical Engineering from the University of Florida in 1973.

Dr. McCay was a Principal Investigator at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center for almost 20 years where she studied the influence of microgravity of single crystal formation and conducted failure analyses of space vehicle materials. She was Principal Investigator on a Microgravity Laboratory I flight experiment, as well as three other flight experiments and received the NASA Scientific Achievement Medal for her work. Her involvement with NASA led to her becoming a Payload Specialist Astronaut for Space Shuttle Challenger Flight SpaceLab-3 mission.

Prior to joining the Florida Institute of Technology, Dr. McCay was Professor of Engineering Science and Mechanics, Chair of the Center for Laser Applications, and Adjunct Professor of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science at the University of Tennessee Space Institute and received numerous awards for her groundbreaking research. She has published more than 130 technical articles; serves as reviewer on 8 peer-reviewed journals; and holds 24 patents, 22 for laser-induced-surface improvement and its applications. Together with her husband, Dr. Dwayne McCay, the President of the Florida Institute of Technology, she holds 15 joint U.S. patents in the area of metallurgical engineering.

When asked about her inspiration in science, Dr. McCay points to Madame Curie for her persistence and as her brilliance. She credits her mother and father as key influences in her life, as well as the Dominican sisters who taught her in grade school, her high
Nazarbayev's dedication to working with the United States, Kazakhstan renounced its arsenal, be- longing to a non-nuclear state, and continues to be a leader in nuclear security.

Further, the economic ties between our two countries continue to expand, particularly in areas such as energy and investment. This is evident through our work to implement WTO obligations and improve the investment climate. In 2016, bilateral trade with Kazakhstan grew to $1.9 billion (a 117 percent increase from 2015), supporting more than 7,000 U.S. jobs. Just last year, the USA Pavilion at the G20 Summit in Turkey was the first country to recognize the importance of science and technology. Along with her colleagues she does outreach to local high schools to encourage students to consider pursuing a career in one of the STEM fields. She also coordinates a K–12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology.

Over the years, a major pillar of our strategic partnership has been built on a shared interest in nuclear non-proliferation and security. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan inherited the fourth largest nuclear stockpile in the world—roughly 1,410 nuclear warheads. Under President Nazarbayev's leadership, and in conjunction with the United States, Kazakhstan renounced its arsenal, becoming a non-nuclear state, and continues to be a leader in nuclear security.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Mary Helen McCay, as well as Dr. Dwayne McCay and the dedicated faculty of the Florida Institute of Technology, for their contributions to science and engineering, and for their commitment to inspiring young minds and future scientists of our nation.

U.S.-KAZAKHSTAN RELATIONS

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCaul
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the United States, and to recognize the strong and growing relationship between our two countries.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Kazakhstan became an independent nation, and the United States was the first country to recognize it. Since then, over the last 26 years, Kazakhstan and the United States have built a strategic partnership based on mutual trust, commitment, and genuine friendship in order to advance our bilateral political, military, and economic goals.

Over the years, a major pillar of our strategic partnership has been built on a shared interest in nuclear non-proliferation and security. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan inherited the fourth largest nuclear stockpile in the world—roughly 1,410 nuclear warheads. Under President Nazarbayev's leadership, and in conjunction with the United States, Kazakhstan renounced its arsenal, becoming a non-nuclear state, and continues to be a leader in nuclear security.

Further, the economic ties between our two countries continue to expand, particularly in areas such as energy and investment. This is evident through our work to implement WTO obligations and improve the investment climate. In 2016, bilateral trade with Kazakhstan grew to $1.9 billion (a 117 percent increase from 2015), supporting more than 7,000 U.S. jobs. Just last year, the USA Pavilion at the G20 Summit in Turkey was the first country to recognize the importance of science and technology. Along with her colleagues she does outreach to local high schools to encourage students to consider pursuing a career in one of the STEM fields. She also coordinates a K–12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology. She also coordinates a K–12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology.
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Further, the economic ties between our two countries continue to expand, particularly in areas such as energy and investment. This is evident through our work to implement WTO obligations and improve the investment climate. In 2016, bilateral trade with Kazakhstan grew to $1.9 billion (a 117 percent increase from 2015), supporting more than 7,000 U.S. jobs. Just last year, the USA Pavilion at the G20 Summit in Turkey was the first country to recognize the importance of science and technology. Along with her colleagues she does outreach to local high schools to encourage students to consider pursuing a career in one of the STEM fields. She also coordinates a K–12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology. She also coordinates a K–12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology.
HONORING HENRY CAMPBELL
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a talented and driven man Mr. Henry Campbell. Mr. Campbell has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve his community.
Henry Campbell a lifelong resident of Yazoo City, MS was born on November 26, 1957 to Margaret Campbell and Henry Coleman, the youngest of eight children.
Henry Campbell graduated from Yazoo City High School in 1975 as a student and successful athlete. His athletic talents in basketball landed him an opportunity to be drafted by the New York Yankees, but he chose to attend college instead. Campbell earned a baseball scholarship to Jackson State University where he played from 1976 through 1978, while he studied in Physical Education.

In college, Campbell enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve for six years as a Supply Specialist at the National Guard Armory in Yazoo City, MS. Campbell started working for Yazoo City when he took a job as a maintenance person for Yazoo Housing Authority. He was later accepted a job as Manager for the Wardell Leach Recreational Complex which he managed from 1999 through 2009. In 2009 he became the Director of Parks and Recreation.
After 20 years with Yazoo City he has decided to retire and spend his time hunting, fishing and traveling.
Campbell is married to Joyce Williams and to that union they have five children.
Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Henry Campbell for his desire to make a difference in the lives of children and the community.

RECOGNIZING THE ROTARY CLUB OF BOCA RATON'S OPAL AWARDS
HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018
Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the important work done by the Rotary Club of Boca Raton and to congratulate the recipients of their Outstanding People and Leaders (OPAL) awards. This year’s honorees are Billi and Bernie Marcus, Jerry and Joan Glassman, Frank and Laura Frione, Summer Faerman, and Reverend Bill Mitchell.
Each of these honorees have made a lasting impact on our South Florida community. Their philanthropy, service, and selfless sacrifices have touched countless lives.
I extend my most sincere congratulations to all of tonight’s honorees. Looking ahead in this new year, I am confident that the Rotary Club of Boca Raton will continue to be a cherished institution that better our community. I greatly appreciate the Club’s work and am pleased to honor their OPAL award honorees.

IN RECOGNITION OF AMANDA EDMONDS FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO THE YPSILIANTI COMMUNITY
HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018
Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Amanda Edmonds for her service to our southeastern Michigan community and Growing Hope, an Ypsilanti based non-profit, over the past 15 years. She has enriched countless lives as a local leader and Executive Director of Growing Hope.
Raised in Missouri, Ms. Edmonds has been a passionate community leader and social justice advocate since she was a young student. After receiving her B.S. and M.S. from the University of Michigan’s School of Natural Resources and Environment, Ms. Edmonds became involved as a volunteer in Ypsilanti in 1999. She started volunteering at Perry Learning Garden, now Growing Hope, in Ypsilanti and is looked to as a leader in sustainable gardening, economic development and local food access. Through her passion for food sustainability, she worked to expand the Perry Learning Garden into Growing Hope, a non-profit that serves southeastern Michigan communities with start-up and gardening assistance, teaching classes, and hosting local farmer’s markets.
Ms. Edmonds is a beloved leader in our community and has served as the Mayor of Ypsilanti since 2014. As Growing Hope’s Executive Director, Ms. Edmonds has greatly expanded the facility’s urban farm and instituted teaching programs for students and adults all throughout Michigan. The program serves as an example for other sustainable urban farms, and Ms. Edmonds travels to share how Growing Hope’s success can be mirrored in other communities throughout the country. Her work as Growing Hope’s Executive Director has seen her appointed to the Michigan Food Policy Council, where she chaired the Healthy Food Access Task Force for the state, as well as Vice Chair of the Washitawag Food Policy Council and Ypsilanti Parks & Recreation Committee. Ms. Edmonds has been an invaluable leader at Growing Hope, and we look forward to her continued positive impact on our Michigan community.
Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Amanda Edmonds as she retires from her position at Growing Hope. Her work has bettered Ypsilanti’s food sustainability and access for years to come.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE ROBERT “RED” BYRON
HON. RICHARD HUDSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018
Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the racing legend Robert Byron upon his enshrinement into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame. If it weren’t for men like Robert Byron, there is no doubt the racing industry as we know it
would not exist today. Robert played a pivotal role in both the development and expansion of NASCAR since its inception. After winning NASCAR's first season championship, Robert won NASCAR's first Strictly Stock title the following year, driving for car owner and Hall of Fame inductee Raymond Parks. Success followed every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR history.

After being injured during WWII in service to his country, Robert used a modified clout that attached to his leg. Robert continued to race and his injuries magnified his impressive skills. Even though he passed away in 1960, his legacy lives on and will now be preserved forever in the NASCAR Hall of Fame. A fierce competitor and true gentleman, he is the embodiment of racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Robert Byron is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Robert Byron on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Oxbow Public Market of Napa, California, which is celebrating the 10th anniversary of its opening.

Real estate developer and specialty-food consultant Steve Carlin opened the Oxbow Public Market in 2007. Home to more than twelve specialty merchants, including a distillery, ice cream shop and bookstore, Oxbow remains one of the most popular places in Napa to find great food and wine.

Thanks to their exceptional quality and variety of products, the Oxbow Public Market has earned praise from numerous news outlets and food magazines. In September of 2017, Tasting Table, an online magazine devoted to America's best food and drink, recognized the Oxbow Market as home to "the world's best English Muffins." The magazine praised Oxbow for its numerous homemade, local offerings, and cited testimony from Oprah Winfrey, who regularly flies Oxbow's English muffins to her home and described them as "crunchy on the outside, fluffy on the inside, and scrumptious all over."

The Oxbow Public Market proudly sells a source of world-class products, but provides a showcase for the innovative people and practices that make Napa's agricultural community so special.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Oxbow Public Market for creating a place in our community where people can gather to enjoy the best local produce and wind of the Napa Valley. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

HONORING JEFFERY KILPATRIC

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Jeffery Kilpatrick.

Jeffery Demond Kilpatrick was born on August 13, 1973, in East St. Louis, Illinois, to the parents of Jimmy and Mary Alice Kilpatrick.

Jeffery is a dedicated member of the Body of Christ Ministry in Memphis, Tennessee under the leadership of Pastor Barbara Palm er.

Jeffery graduated high school in May 1991 from East St. Louis Senior High School. He later continued his graduate studies at Mississippi Valley State University where he earned his Bachelor and Master Degrees.

He developed an interest in politics at an early age and decided to run for the position of Mayor of East St. Louis when he was successfully re-elected in 2009 and 2013. Along with ensuring the safety and promoting the development of new businesses and community enrichment, Jeffery is a Correctional Supervisor at the Mississippi State Penitentiary and Mound Bayou Police Department where he has also made a career of protecting the citizens of Sunflower County for 23 ½ years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Jeffery Kilpatrick for his dedication to serving others and giving back to his community.

IRANIAN PROTESTS

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the developments in Iran. For years my colleagues and I have been advocating for changes in Iranian policy, including the adoption and implementation of human rights with respect to dissidents, religious minorities, protesters and opponents. The recent protests, and the loss of life in response to the protests, give us the opportunity to reflect that now is the time to reaffirm free-dom of expression. Now is the time to reaffirm restraint and protect the lives of protestors.

I am encouraged that the High Level Political Dialogue between the European Union and Iran in Brussels last year included a discussion on protecting and enhancing human rights. Nor should it go unnoticed that even the Iranian Supreme Leader noted that the leading opposition group, the Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK), has popular support within Iran. It follows that the MEK should be treated as a legitimate opposition party with grass roots appeal. The MEK has pointed out the excesses of the current government and its efforts at accountability ring true with many Iranians.

It is my hope that Iran can embrace a legitimate and fair leadership approach to its own people, and allow dis-sidents and protestors the freedom to air their grievances.
Mr. Kee left his indelible mark not only in the local arena but also in the international domain. In 1979, Norman and Esther Kee created the Washington D.C.-based U.S.-Asia Institute, chartered to improve relations between the United States and Asian nations. He led many official delegations of the Institute to Asian countries. Further, he served as its chair for many years, and then as chair emeritus. In 1980, he was a member of the Madrid conference that convened to help implement the first Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In 1980, he organized a dinner for President Jimmy Carter at the Silver Palace restaurant in Chinatown. It was the first and only time a sitting president attended a function in the neighborhood. Mr. Kee’s reputation and experience in U.S.-Sino relations were esteemed and appreciated by leaders in both Washington, D.C., and China.

Despite his national and international endeavors, he never lost sight of his formative local roots and he remained active in community services. He helped found the Chinese-American Planning Council, became a board member of the highly regarded Hamilton Madison House and helped found and served on the Board of Trustees of Confucius Plaza. Mr. Kee also served on the board of the YMCA of Greater New York. There, his efforts and financial support helped to establish the foundation of the YMCA in Chinatown, and he ensured that Chinatown was given its first swimming pool in its local Y. The YMCA ultimately conferred its highest honor on Mr. Kee, inducting him into the prestigious Order of the Red Triangle. In 2010, Mr. Kee and his son Glenn Lau-Kee were recipients of the Honorable George Bundy Smith Pioneer Award conferred by the New York State Bar Association’s Federal Litigation Section. In further recognition of Mr. Kee’s pioneering services as an early Chinatown lawyer that extended to a lifetime of commitment, the Asian American Bar Association of New York endowed the Norman Lau Kee Trailblazer Award in his honor. Norman Lau Kee closed out his professional life at the age of 89 after 60 years of practicing law and becoming a local icon who also had a national and global reputation. Norman Lau Kee touched so many lives in a positive and beneficial way as a paragon of the American Dream and is more than deserving of the highest praise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 2018

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote on January 17, 2018 to approve the Jour...
that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion, and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to fill with hatred and mistrust of the injustice of such an act, against all white people. I would only say that I can also feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man.

But we have to make an effort in the United States. We have to make an effort to understand, to get beyond, or go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poet was Aeschylus. And he once wrote:

Even in our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart, until, in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God.

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.

So I ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King, yes, it’s true but more importantly to say a prayer for the little brown church in the southern Georgia town, which said of us love a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We’ve had difficult times in the past, but we and we will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of violence; it is not the end of lawlessness; and it’s not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land.

And let’s dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world. Let us dedicate ourselves to proving the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land.

And let’s dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that. I’ll say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Thank you very much.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 2018, I was improperly recorded as a Yes vote on Roll Call No. 11. This was in error and that I wish to be recorded as a No on RC No. 11.

STATE BILL 139

HON. DEVIN NUNES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) provides a framework for the Government to target non-U.S. persons located overseas to obtain foreign intelligence information, with the compelled assistance of electronic communication service providers. S. 139 reauthorizes and improves upon this authority—the intelligence value of which cannot be overstated. For example, Section 702 was critical in the tracking of Haji Iman, a senior Islamic terrorist who was removed from the battlefield.

Members have had numerous opportunities over the past several years to attend Section 702 education sessions, either on Capitol Hill or at Fort Meade, Maryland. These sessions have demonstrated the extensive level of oversight related to this authority, and underscored that no acts of intentional abuse have occurred since its creation. Despite these facts, and the fact that various courts have affirmed the constitutionality of Section 702, some Members sought to add further protections to enhance U.S. person privacy. As a result, S. 139, which reauthorizes title VII of FISA for six years, includes additional privacy, oversight and transparency provisions.

Throughout the debate, a good deal of inaccurate information about Section 702—including about the program’s oversight, as well as the current or potential use of incidentally collected U.S. persons information by the Government—was put forward publicly.

Section 702 is not a bulk-collection authority. It is instead narrowly applied to a relatively small number of communications. The Director of National Intelligence’s 2016 annual transparency report, the Intelligence Community publicly reported that there are roughly 106,000 Section 702 targets—a vanishingly small number of targets worldwide. In the District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Judge Andrews found no intentional abuse occurred or that Congress needs to further limit the Section 702 authority.

Some in Congress called for a permanent end to “about” communication collection. Such a prohibition would limit NSA’s ability to reconstruct the collection in the future, even with FISC approval, and use it to identify threats. For that reason, Congress permanently prohibited NSA’s “about” communication collection, S. 139 includes a compromise that allows for the possibility of a future technical solution. If NSA wants to restart “about” communication collection, NSA would need to first convince the FISC that the technical changes to “about” communication collection satisfy the FISC’s concerns from 2016. After receiving FISC approval to restart “about” communication collection, NSA would brief the relevant congressional committees of jurisdiction, and then wait 30 days to provide Congress time to act. If Congress takes no action in 30 days, NSA may move forward with “about” communication collection. This legislation strikes the right balance between national security and privacy.

2. FBI ACCESS TO SECTION 702 INFORMATION FOR CRIMINAL PURPOSES

Similar to all other surveillance authorities, it is possible that a Section 702 target may communicate with a U.S. person or person located inside the United States. Collection of a U.S. person communicating with a foreign target is known as “incidental collection.” Such “incidental collection” is carefully managed. The Intelligence Community’s procedures for handling the incidental collection of U.S. person information are reviewed by the FISC, and have been found to be sufficient by the PCLOB. Furthermore, U.S. district courts have reviewed the issue of incidental collection of U.S. person information under Section 702, and determined that such collection is consistent with the Fourth Amendment.
Committee), some have claimed that the Intelligence Community is abusing the Section 702 authority by targeting Americans, an action that is specifically prohibited by statute. There is, however, no evidence of a single intentional abuse that has resulted in the improper targeting of Americans. There have been others who have asserted that the Intelligence Community has inaccurately reported certain statistics each year related to the use of Section 702. These claims are demonstrably false, and unsupported by any evidence. Unfortunately, the dissemination of such inaccurate information is a disservice to the American public and the men and women of the Intelligence Community who serve in silence to keep us all safe from threats, both foreign and domestic.

During the course of reauthorization discussions over the past several months, the Committee has brokered key compromises necessary to reauthorize this critical national security authority. Therefore, after significant deliberation, the House and Senate leadership agreed to institute a probable cause-based order requirement for the FBI to access the content of a Section 702 communication that is responsive to a U.S. person query conducted by the FBI during a criminal investigation not related to the national security of the United States. This order requirement does not mandate that the FBI obtain an order before reviewing metadata, accessing the results of any query reasonably designed to return foreign intelligence information, or querying to return evidence of a crime that is related to the national security of the United States. The order requirement is narrowly tailored to address instances where FBI is conducting a predicated investigation into criminal activity not related to national security and seeks to access the content of a Section 702 communication.

Consistent with well-established case law, the order requirement should not be construed to mean—and it is not the Committee’s intent—that law enforcement access to lawfully-acquired information constitutes a separate “search” under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by various federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain an order from the FISC to review lawfully-acquired Section 702 information, even if such access was pursuant to a query using a U.S. person identifier. Accordingly, the agreement to institute this limited order requirement is intended as a legislative accommodation to provide additional statutory protections for U.S. person information that is incidentally collected under Section 702.

This order requirement, along with the restrictions on the use of Section 702 information in criminal prosecutions, should provide further assurances to the American public that the purpose of this critical national security tool is to discover and mitigate foreign threats to the United States, and the handling and use of Section 702 information against U.S. persons is carefully controlled and managed.
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S315–S357

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2325–2328. Pages S347–48

House Messages:

Further Continuing Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: Pages S316–44, S351–55

Rejected:

  McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1905, to change the enactment date. (By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 15), Senate tabled the motion.) Pages S354

  McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1903 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. (Senate tabled the motion.) Page S316

Pending:

  McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. Page S316

  McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1917 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill), of a perfecting nature. Pages S354

  McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1918, to change the enactment date. Page S354

  A motion was entered to close further debate on the McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1917 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill) (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Monday, January 22, 2018. Page S354

  During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

    By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 14), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. Pages S351–52

    Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

    McConnell Amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1905), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1905 (listed above) was tabled.

    McConnell Amendment No. 1907 (to Amendment No. 1906), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1905) (listed above) fell. Page S316

    McConnell Amendment No. 1904 (to Amendment No. 1903), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1903 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill) (listed above) was tabled. Page S316

    A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the House message to accompany the bill at approximately 12 noon, on Saturday, January 20, 2018. Page S355

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic.
Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Messages from the House: Page S346

Measures Referred: Page S346

Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S346

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S346–47

Additional Cosponsors: Page S348

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S348–49

Additional Statements: Pages S345–46

Amendments Submitted: Pages S349–51

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—15) Pages S352, S365

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. on Friday, January 19, 2018 and adjourned at 1:28 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2018, until 12 noon on the same day. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S355.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:


Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet: Senators Wicker (Chair), Blunt, Cruz, Fischer, Moran, Sullivan, Heller, Inhofe, Lee, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Young, Schatz, Cantwell, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Marky, Udall, Peters, Baldwin, Duckworth, Hassan, Cortez Masto, and Tester.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security: Senators Moran (Chair), Blunt, Cruz, Fischer, Heller, Inhofe, Lee, Capito, Young, Blumenthal, Klobuchar, Marky, Udall, Duckworth, Hassan, and Cortez Masto.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard: Senators Sullivan (Chair), Wicker, Fischer, Inhofe, Lee, Johnson, Gardner, Young, Baldwin, Cantwell, Blumenthal, Schatz, Marky, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness: Senators Cruz (Chair), Moran, Sullivan, Lee, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Marky, Schatz, Udall, Peters, Baldwin, and Hassan.

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security: Senators Fischer (Chair), Wicker, Blunt, Heller, Inhofe, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Young, Peters, Cantwell, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Udall, Baldwin, Duckworth, and Hassan.

Senators Thune and Nelson are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 37 public bills, H.R. 4844–4870; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 126–127; H. Con. Res. 99; and H. Res. 705–707, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H581–82

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Mara Nathan, Temple Beth-El, San Antonio, Texas.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Al Green (TX) announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution.

Question of Privilege: Representative Al Green (TX) rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a privileged resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the McCarthy motion to table H. Res. 705, impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors, by a yea-and-nay vote of 355 yeas to 66 nays with three answering “present”, Roll No. 35.
Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 4712, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 36. Pages H560–69, H571

H. Res. 694, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4712) was agreed to yesterday, January 18th.

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Hoyer motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 1 aye to 418 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 37. Pages H571–72

Recess: The House recessed at 1:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:01 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2018.

Committee Meetings

SAFETY OF THE U.S. FOOD SUPPLY: CONTINUING CONCERNS OVER THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION’S FOOD-RECALL PROCESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Safety of the U.S. Food Supply: Continuing Concerns Over the Food and Drug Administration’s Food-Recall Process”. Testimony was heard from Gloria Jarmon, Deputy Inspector General of Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and Douglas Stearn, Director, Office of Enforcement and Import Operations, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Food and Drug Administration.

LEGISLATION ADDRESSING LNG EXPORTS AND PURPA MODERNIZATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Legislation Addressing LNG Exports and PURPA Modernization”. Testimony was heard from Steven Winberg, Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; James Danly, General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Travis Kavulla, Vice Chairman, Montana Public Service Commission; and public witnesses.

DEFICIENCIES IN THE PERMITTING PROCESS FOR OFFSHORE SEISMIC RESEARCH

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Deficiencies in the Permitting Process for Offshore Seismic Research”. Testimony was heard from Walter Cruickshank, Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; Tom Davis, Senator, District 46, South Carolina; Jon Ludwigson, Acting Director, Government Accountability Office, Denver, Colorado; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 22 through January 26, 2018

Senate Chamber

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: January 23, to receive a closed briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

January 23, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold closed hearings to examine cyber warfighting policy, 3:30 p.m., SVC–217.

January 24, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on global nuclear developments, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

January 24, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine officer personnel management and the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980, 3 p.m., SR–222.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine global challenges and United States national security strategy, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: January 23, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors, and to be a Member of the Board of
Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Marvin Goodfriend, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Thomas E. Workman, of New York, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, 10 a.m., SD–538.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States reform, focusing on Administration perspectives on the essential elements, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: January 24, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office, 10:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: January 23, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security, to hold hearings to examine surface transportation security, focusing on addressing current and emerging threats, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Wireless Emergency Alert system, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: January 23, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the performance of the electric power system in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic during recent winter weather events, including the bomb cyclone, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 23, to hold hearings to examine facing 21st century public health threats, focusing on our Nation’s preparedness and response capabilities, 10 a.m., SD–430.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on access and innovation, 10 a.m., SD–430.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, 2:30 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: January 25, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine combating the opioid crisis, focusing on exploiting vulnerabilities in international mail, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: January 24, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, and Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: January 23, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

January 25, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: January 24, to hold hearings to examine turning 65, focusing on navigating critical decisions to age well, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House Committees

No hearings are scheduled.
**Next Meeting of the SENATE**

12 noon, Saturday, January 20

**Senate Chamber**

**Program for Saturday:** Senate will continue consideration of the McConnell motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, Further Continuing Appropriations Act, with a further amendment.

---

**Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Saturday, January 20

**House Chamber**

**Program for Saturday:** To be announced.

---

### Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

**HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budd, Ted</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>E73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, Andre'</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>E79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney, Joe</td>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>E77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley, Joseph</td>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>E78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Rodney</td>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>E78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSaulnier, Mark</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>E70, E73, E76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutch, Theodore</td>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>E70, E73, E77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingell, Debbie</td>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>E77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovan, Daniel M.</td>
<td>Jr. N.Y.</td>
<td>E69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faso, John J.</td>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>E70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, Brian</td>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>E69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelinghuysen, Rodney</td>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>E71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosar, Paul</td>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>E78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, Richard</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>E71, E72, E74, E76, E77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman, Jared</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>E75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaHood, Darrell</td>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>E69, E74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaul, Michael T.</td>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>E70, E76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCollum, Betty</td>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>E79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moolenaar, John R.</td>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>E73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton, Eleanor</td>
<td>The District of Columbia</td>
<td>E71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunes, Devin</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>E80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panetta, Jimmy</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>E69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlmutter, Ed</td>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>E69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey, Bill</td>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>E75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensenbrenner, P.</td>
<td>James, Jr.</td>
<td>Wisc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Bennie G.</td>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>E70, E74, E76, E77, E78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Mike</td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>E78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visclosky, Peter J.</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>E71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walorski, Jackie</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>E72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson Coleman, Bonnie</td>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>E75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welch, Peter V.</td>
<td>Vt.</td>
<td>E79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerman, Bruce</td>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>E71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeldin, Lee M.</td>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>E80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>