

in the Warren Truck Assembly Plant just outside of Detroit. The production line for Ram heavy-duty trucks is leaving Mexico and coming back to America. This will create 2,500 new jobs and inject relief right into the local economy. According to officials who announced the change, all this is only happening because tax reform is remaking the business climate in our country.

Besides the revival in manufacturing, Fiat Chrysler announced a new wave of \$2,000 bonuses for 60,000 hourly and salaried employees. They will join a growing list of more than 150 companies that have announced plans to distribute significant bonuses, permanent pay raises, more generous retirement contributions, or other benefits to their employees, all thanks to tax reform.

Prior to tax reform, companies that wanted to manufacture goods in America and hire American employees faced the highest statutory corporate tax rate in the developed world. American workers were ready to clock in, but our outdated burdensome Tax Code told potential investors to move along and find somewhere else to set up shop. Those days are over, thanks to the President and Republican majorities in the House and Senate that voted to modernize our Tax Code.

Now we are the ones with a competitive advantage. The Wall Street Journal's editorial board believes that our tax reform will benefit investment in the United States "at the expense of high-tax countries such as Germany." The Journal also reports that China "fears the tax changes could make the U.S. a more attractive place to do business." That is China. It is becoming clear that these fears are entirely justified, and it is good news for families and workers in Kentucky and all across America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House mes-

sage to accompany S. 139, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 139, a bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1870 (to the House amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1871 (to amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 1872, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1873 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1872), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 1874 (to amendment No. 1873), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, on the topic of net neutrality, since the administration's FCC voted to end net neutrality in December, Democrats have been working hard to round up enough Senators to overrule the FCC's decision, which places control of the internet in the hands of the biggest corporations.

Today we reached a milestone: 50 Senators will support Senator MARKEY's resolution of disapproval. All 49 Democrats have signed on to cosponsor, and my friend from Maine, Senator COLLINS, has also said she will support it.

With our full caucus supporting the measure, it is clear that Democrats want to keep the internet from becoming a Wild West where ISPs are free to offer premium service to the wealthiest customers while average consumers are left with far inferior options.

When we force a vote on this bill, Republicans in Congress will, for the first time, have the opportunity to right the administration's wrong and show the American people whose side they are on. Are they on the side of big internet service providers and corporations, or are they on the side of consumers, entrepreneurs, startups, and small business owners?

I applaud Senator COLLINS for supporting this effort and hope sincerely that more of her colleagues will do the same. Given how quickly this measure has earned the support of 50 Senators, I believe we have a real chance of success in restoring net neutrality and keeping the internet open and free for all Americans.

Mr. President, another pressing issue before us this week is FISA and the 702

program. The majority leader is pressing forward on a 6-year bill to reauthorize the 702 FISA Court program. This is a significant bill, but right now the majority leader is pushing for its passage without debate or amendments. That is the wrong approach.

Many of my colleagues would like to offer amendments on this legislation and, frankly, they deserve that right. Personally, I believe that while the bill makes some improvements to the 702 FISA program, it should go somewhat further. We could do a better job balancing the crucial national security imperatives of the program with legitimate concerns about privacy and protecting the rights of American citizens.

Clearly, the bill on the calendar is better than the status quo, and it is certainly better than no bill at all, but that is not the choice before us. The majority leader can open up the bill for limited debate and a few amendments, not to delay but so we can have some amendments and try to improve it.

For that reason, I will be voting no on the upcoming cloture motion. If cloture is not invoked, we can move quickly to an amendment process where Senators from both parties could offer ideas to improve the bill. That is what we ought to do, especially on a bill on the most sensitive area of the government, where security and liberty meet, and that will stand for 6 years. That is too quick for too much. We ought to have some amendments and some discussion.

DACA

Mr. President, the fate of the Dreamers has been the subject of months of intense bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. Last week, a bipartisan group of Senators went to the White House with an agreement that represents the best path forward. Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN, alongside Senators GARDNER, MENENDEZ, FLAKE, and BENNET, worked out a compromise that fits squarely inside the four corners President Trump outlined as the parameters of a deal in a televised meeting last Tuesday. In exchange for passing DACA protections, the Gang of 6 deal includes President Trump's full budget request for border security, including funding to build barriers along the southern border. It deals with family reunification within the scope of the negotiations—foreclosing the possibility of Dreamers sponsoring their parents for citizenship. The deal would also curb the diversity lobbying system—another item President Trump requested. The full details of the proposal will be announced tomorrow, but those are the broad strokes, as I understand them.

The concessions in the bill are tough pills to swallow for Democrats. It is not the bill we would have written if we were in charge, but that is not the situation we find ourselves in. To make this body work—to avoid a shutdown—we must compromise. So Democrats tried, in good faith, to meet the President and our Republican colleagues halfway—to find a deal that neither

side loved but both sides could live with, and that is what a bipartisan group of Senators achieved.

The deal they produced is right down the middle. It addresses the precise issues the President identified as part of a deal. Yet, at the pivotal White House meeting last Thursday, President Trump turned his back on this bipartisan solution and proceeded to use foul and vulgar language to demean African and Caribbean countries.

His well-reported comments were certainly unbecoming the Presidency of the United States. They were beneath the dignity of his office. They went against the very idea of America—which holds up as an unassailable truth that all men are created equal, no matter their station or country of origin, but just as distressing, President Trump's comments reveal an intransigence about coming to a deal for the Dreamers. It seems the President has only two ways of negotiating: Either he commits to a deal one day and then betrays his word the next—which is what happened last year after Leader PELOSI and I met President Trump on DACA—or he even dismisses the possibility of compromise and says a bipartisan deal is that he gets everything he wants.

Hundreds of thousands of lives hang in the balance. Funding for our men and women in uniform hangs in the balance. President Trump needs to step up. He can't just bluster. He can't just play a game of brinksmanship. He can't just be obstinate and say: My way or the highway. He needs to be willing to take yes for an answer.

A very fair bipartisan deal remains on the table. It is the only game in town, and we are making steady progress on building additional support in both Houses of Congress. If it were put on the floor of the House or Senate, I predict it would get a majority vote in either one. There is a deal to be had this week. The only person blocking it is President Trump.

So I have a challenge for President Trump. Everyone is talking about how bigoted your comments were last week. Well, actions speak louder than words. If you want to begin the long road back to prove you are not prejudiced or bigoted, support the bipartisan compromise that three Democrats and three Republicans have put before you—one that was aimed at meeting the concerns you voiced. Give the Dreamers safety here in America and bolster border security at the same time. This may be the last train leaving the station. President Trump needs to get on board.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I find myself in strong agreement with the comments of the senior Senator from New York State.

He talked about 702. Let me refer to that a bit. Section 702 is in S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization

Act of 2017. We are going to vote very soon on whether to cut off debate and block any amendments on a fundamentally flawed piece of legislation that fails to reform one of our most important surveillance tools.

Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act was intended to provide for vast and powerful surveillance of foreigners overseas who might do harm to us, and it does, but the fact that it is an effective surveillance tool used against foreigners abroad is not the concern you will hear about today.

Today, you are going to hear concern that Section 702 has also become an unexpected and powerful domestic surveillance tool—not one directed at those abroad who might do us harm, but potentially directed at every single American in this room and throughout this country, allowing the government to search for Americans' emails and other substantive communications without a warrant—the so-called back-door loophole.

If we put through here legislation saying—this legislation will allow our government to search all our emails without a warrant, Republicans and Democrats will be jumping up saying: Wait a minute. That violates the Fourth Amendment.

Well, the legislation we are voting on today—authored by the Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, DEVIN NUNES—contains what his supporters portray as a fig leaf of reform, but, in fact, the legislation makes a bad problem even worse.

I will oppose cutting off debate on this bill, and I strongly urge my fellow Senators to do the same—not to kill the bill but to afford us, on such a critical surveillance tool, the opportunity to debate the constitutional implications and offer amendments to improve the bill and to protect Americans in every single State in this country. The Majority Leader has provided no such opportunity. He doesn't want us to offer any amendments—even amendments we know could pass with a bipartisan majority.

Senator LEE and I are filing several amendments to improve this bill, including our USA Liberty Act. That is a Senate companion to a bill that was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee in a strong and very bipartisan vote. Our amendment offers a sensible compromise. It would protect national security—something we all want to do—but it also protects American civil liberties, which I would hope we also want to do.

I strongly support a warrant requirement based on Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment in the Senate Intelligence Committee that would close the back-door loophole. These amendments, and others offered by Senators PAUL and WYDEN and others, deserve a vote. And that is what I am asking for today. Senator LEE and Senator PAUL have spoken so strongly on the problems in this. They ought to be heard. They ought to have a chance to offer amendments.

Instead, the only bill we are voting on today is the House bill, which fails to comply with the fundamental constitutional imperative. I think we can do better in the Senate than to accept a flawed House bill. Do not be deceived by the sham warrant contained in the Nunes bill. Again, that is why we should have a Senate bill that speaks to those things we know as Senators and not the flawed warrant in the Nunes bill.

Its exemptions are so large as to render it meaningless. The bill would require a warrant only during the final stage of a criminal investigation and only when the government believes national security or risk to life or bodily harm are not implicated at some undefined point in time. In all other cases, and at previous points in an investigation, the government can search for an American's information in the Section 702 database just as frequently and casually as we might look up football scores on Google.

Yet, even if it is completely ineffectual, the Nunes bill has a warrant requirement. That means the sponsors of this flawed legislation acknowledge that some sort of warrant is required to protect Americans' privacy. They recognize that a search through a vast database of Americans' communications can trigger Fourth Amendment protections, at least when it is convenient to the government.

The problem is, the Constitution doesn't say: We protect Americans' rights only if it is convenient to the government. The reason they wrote the Constitution is to make sure every one of us has protections against the government.

When a Fourth Amendment interest is implicated, the government can easily obtain a warrant. They are going to come search your home. They are going to come search your files. They are going to come and search your papers. They should have to have a warrant. The Fourth Amendment either applies or it does not. If it does not, then let's have a constitutional amendment and do away with it. Nobody here would vote for that.

Even the sponsors of the Nunes bill now agree the Fourth Amendment applies. The only question is whether we have a real warrant requirement or a warrant in name only. Simply calling something a warrant doesn't make it that.

I firmly believe a real warrant requirement doesn't have to put our national security at risk. The reform proposals I support contain well-tryed exemptions for exigent circumstances to allow for emergencies. For these reasons and others, I strongly support a warrant requirement to close the back-door loophole. I think my fellow Senators, Republicans and Democrats, ought to be allowed to at least have a vote on it. If they don't, I would urge my colleagues of the Senate to vote no on invoking cloture on the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

Section 702 authorities can be temporarily extended as they were in December. In fact, the FISA Court's statutorily authorized certifications that permit 702 surveillance don't expire until the end of April. There is no emergency now. We still have the time and the ability to get this right.

Let's protect the Constitution. Let's protect Americans. The Majority Leader should do his part and allow members of both sides of the aisle who care deeply about this issue to offer amendments before any long-term authorization. I agree Section 702 is an important tool, but this issue is too important to rush through without adequate debate. I firmly believe we can both protect our national security and the civil liberties of law-abiding Americans. This bill clearly falls short, and I will be voting no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman LEAHY for his excellent remarks.

Let me simply say, to move forward without amendments surrenders the constitutional obligations Senators have to the American people. This issue is important, it is complicated, and the American people deserve to have an opportunity for some real amendments to make sure that, at the end of the day, we have policies that keep our people safe and protect our liberties.

I see my friend from Kentucky. He is joined by his colleague from Utah Senator LEE, Senator LEAHY, and me.

Our bipartisan coalition is dedicated to essentially one mission: We think the country deserves a Senate that is very tough on terrorists. We don't take a backseat to anybody in terms of fighting terrorists. What we are opposed to is an end run on our sacred Constitution.

Right now, with the changes in communication systems around the world and communication systems increasingly becoming globally interconnected, we have more and more law-abiding Americans swept up in searches under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We want to fight terrorists, but the law allows the government to target foreigners to acquire foreign intelligence information, which basically means anything related to the conduct of foreign affairs.

So let's talk about who could get swept up in these searches and who the people are whom Senator PAUL, Senator LEE, Senator LEAHY, myself, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle sought to protect as law-abiding Americans—we think they ought to have their constitutional rights. The kinds of people who could be swept up in these communications and have their emails or texts or their data searched without a warrant—it could be American businesspeople talking to foreign contacts. It could be first-, second-, or third-generation American immigrants

talking to family and friends who are still overseas; American journalists covering foreign stories; U.S. service-members talking to foreign friends they made while they were deployed; American teachers and researchers seeking information from foreigners.

How many Americans get swept up? We don't know. And we don't know—not because of a lack of effort. We have been trying for 6 years to get the government to provide even an estimate. On a number of these issues, my concern is to ensure that we have both safety and liberty, but we have actually gone backward.

In an open hearing of the Intelligence Committee, when the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats—our former colleague—was asked about whether the government could collect, in effect, wholly domestic, personal data here in the United States, we couldn't even get a straight answer with respect to whether the government, under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, could collect wholly domestic communications. We couldn't even get a straight answer to that.

What we need is the opportunity to have a real debate. We have a number of amendments that go right to the heart of what these issues are all about, particularly the government conducting repeated, warrantless searches of Americans, even if those Americans aren't the subject of any investigation, and the government then can read those private communications.

Finally, I want to put this whole issue in context. Every year, the CIA and the NSA conduct thousands of warrantless searches of 702 data on Americans, and that is just for content. They conduct tens of thousands of warrantless searches for communication records. The FBI is conducting these searches so frequently that they don't even count. But this bill might have some marginal effect on only one of those searches. So the House bill is not just fake reform; it is a setback.

The last point I would make is that we finally made some headway with respect to collection of communications that are neither to nor from a foreign target but are simply about a foreign target. I went after this issue for years, this question of abuse of what is called "abouts" collection. Finally, the government realized it was going too far, and they put limits on it. Now it looks as though they want to get back in the business, and the other body—the House—basically creates a path to going back to "abouts" collection, which even the government has admitted has been abused.

There is an opportunity, if we vote, to allow some amendments, to come up with policies that will allow Americans to look at the Senate and say: We didn't go backward. We went forward. We protected law-abiding Americans, but we made it clear that we were going to be relentless in our search for terrorists.

I know I have a little bit more time, but I see my colleague and partner Senator PAUL on the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the government listening to your phone calls, reading your emails, or reading your text messages without a warrant. It doesn't mean the government will never do this, but it means they would have to ask a judge. They would have to ask a judge if they have probable cause that you committed a crime. They would have to name you. They would have to name the information they want. It is called the Fourth Amendment. All Americans deserve the protection of the Fourth Amendment.

In fact, I believe it was John Adams who said that James Otis's argument against blanket warrants, against generalized warrants that they called writs of assistance—he said that the argument James Otis made in the 1760s was the spark that led to the American Revolution.

Lincoln is said to have written that any man can stand adversity, but if you want to challenge a man or a woman, give them power.

Over almost 1,000 years, the history of Western civilization has been the struggle to contain the power of the monarch, the struggle to contain and maintain the power of the government in every form. From Magna Carta on, it has been the people trying to take power back from either the monarchy or a despotic government. We get to the formation of our government, and Jefferson wrote that the Constitution would be the change, that the government would be bound up in the change.

Patrick Henry wrote that the Constitution is meant to restrain the government, not the people. It is about trying to restrain government from abusing the power to take our rights. You have a fundamental right to be left alone. Justice Brandeis put it this way. He said that the right most cherished among civilized men and women is the right to be left alone.

But we know also that the history of those who grab the reins of power, the history of those who take up the mantle of power is a history of abuse.

In World War I, President Wilson arrested 10,000 Americans because of their objection to the war.

FDR had an enemies' list that he actually was very vocal about and published in newspapers. There were 77 people who were his enemies, and he used the IRS to go after them.

LBJ illegally spied on Martin Luther King. We just had Martin Luther King Day yesterday. LBJ spied on him illegally in all manners and in all forms. They spied on Vietnam war veterans.

Nixon had an enemies' list.

You name it—President after President has abused this power.

President Obama had a fight with the tea party groups. It turns out that if

you registered as a tea party group, you were given extra scrutiny. And people were denied being allowed to form as a charitable group or political activist group under President Obama because they disagreed with President Obama.

We now have a current administration where there have been accusations of people in the FBI having a personal animus against this President and conspiring and discussing how they could block him. We have had members of the Department of Justice who were married to people doing opposition research on President Trump, paid for by the opposition candidate, by Hillary Clinton.

Without question, that power has been abused and will always be abused. It was Lord Acton who said that “power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” The history of our country is about trying to restrain the power of government.

Realize that we have the ability to collect all of the phone calls in Italy in 1 month. There was a story saying that we did it, that we collected every phone call from Italy. Who gets trapped in that? If you collect everyone’s phone call in Germany or everyone’s phone call in Jordan, who gets caught in that? Many, many innocent, legitimate Americans get caught up in the other end of phone calls because it is not just the phone calls of terrorists, it is everybody’s phone calls. They are all being vacuumed up, and innocent Americans are caught up in that.

Senator WYDEN has been a leader in asking tough questions on the Intelligence Committee. Are there communications that are purely between two people in America that somehow get caught up in this database? He has been given a variety of answers on this, but we suspect that Americans talking to Americans in this country are caught up in this database. Should the government be allowed to search this database to prosecute you for not paying your taxes or for a minor marijuana violation? Absolutely not. Why? Because this information is gathered without a warrant. It is gathered without any constitutional protection.

As others have said, we actually are OK with a lower standard for gathering foreign intelligence. We acknowledge that the Constitution doesn’t apply to everybody in the world. But if Americans get caught up in that, Americans deserve the protection of the Constitution.

Some on the other side have started saying: Well, it is lawfully gathered, so it could be used for any lawful purpose. That is the most ridiculous argument I have ever heard. It is gathered lawfully for foreigners, and we made the standard zero. There is no constitutional protection. We never said that we are going to gather foreigners’ information, put it in a big pool, mix it up with Americans’ information, and then type your name in—John Smith—and then find out whom you have been talking to.

Realize that they could listen to your conversation, then they could bring you in for an interview with the FBI, and if you say anything in the interview that contradicts what they eavesdropped on in your conversation, you have now committed a felony. Do you really want all of your phone calls recorded and then the government to have the ability to bring you in and ask you questions about your phone calls? And if you are not perfectly accurate in recalling your phone calls, you could go to prison.

All we are asking is that, for Americans, the Constitution should be in order. We should not get rid of the Constitution. We shouldn’t throw it out. The Constitution should protect us all.

We take an oath of office to defend the Constitution. Our soldiers take the same oath of office. Wouldn’t it be sad if our soldiers came home from fighting and defending the Constitution to learn that we gave up on it while they were gone?

The sad state of affairs here is that the majority doesn’t want any debate. They want to ram this through with no amendments. Senator WYDEN and I have worked for months on amendments and on an alternative bill which actually reauthorizes the program. Senators LEAHY and LEE have another bill that is similar that replaces the program. None of us are for ending the program. All we are saying is that if you want to look at an American’s information, you have to get a warrant.

People say it will slow us down. All of our bills have an emergency exception. If they declare an emergency, they can look at the information and get the warrant the next day. We hope that would be extraordinary and not the norm.

The thing is, we want the program to work, but we don’t want Americans caught up in it. I hope Senators will think this through. This will not kill the program.

They are going to scare you to death and say: Tomorrow, we are all going to die. The world is going to be taken over by terrorists if we don’t have this.

If we win this vote tonight, they will be negotiating within an hour and will come to a compromise that allows the Constitution to protect Americans. That was our oath of office. That is what we should do.

I urge a vote against the bill in its current fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I stand today in support of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act.

As we know, the first responsibility of the U.S. Government is to protect our citizens. To do so, we must make sure that those who protect us have the tools to keep us safe. This bill does exactly that. It provides the intelligence community and law enforcement with the right tools, but it also minds the civil liberties and the privacy protec-

tions that our Constitution requires, especially given the ever-changing technological landscape.

The importance of our country’s safety and security has been highlighted in several events from just the past 2 years. We often get lost in the constant news cycle, but let’s not forget that New York City suffered three significant terrorist attacks in the last 15 months alone.

In September 2016, a terrorist detonated a pressure-cooker bomb in New York’s Chelsea neighborhood. A second pressure-cooker bomb was found a few blocks away but didn’t detonate. Earlier that day, a bomb went off near the start of a Marine Corps charity race.

This past October, Sayfullo Saipov drove a rented truck onto the bike lane and pedestrian walkway on the West Side Highway. He mowed down numerous civilians, killing eight and injuring 12 others.

And this past December, Akayed Ullah detonated a bomb in New York City’s subway tunnel to the Port Authority Bus Terminal, injuring several people near him. He told investigators that he did it in the name of ISIS.

In June 2016, Omar Mateen shot and killed 49 and injured 53 others in Orlando, also an act in the name of ISIS.

In September 2016, a terrorist stabbed 10 people at a mall in St. Cloud, MN.

In November 2016, a terrorist injured 13 after driving into and trying to stab students and teachers at Ohio State.

And in December 2015, we had the San Bernardino shooting, where terrorists killed 14 and injured 22.

We have also seen terrorist incidents evolving around the world, especially impacting our friends in Europe.

In the United Kingdom alone, there have been at least a half dozen terrorist attacks in the past year, including a subway bombing in London, injuring 30 people; a van plowing down pedestrians on London Bridge, injuring 48 and killing 8 people; the Manchester concert bombing, in which 22 people were killed; and the attack on the British Parliament in London, killing 4, including a person from Utah.

All of these attacks and more show that the threats are real, and we must protect our country by lawful constitutional means. Congress has done so by providing lawful authority such as section 702. The section 702 program has been called “the most significant tool” in the NSA arsenal for the detection and disruption of terrorist threats. The NSA Director has said publicly that “there is no alternative way” to replicate section 702 collection. Some estimate that over 25 percent of all current U.S. intelligence is based upon section 702 collection.

There are some key examples. Hajji Iman rose from a high school teacher to become the second in command of ISIS. He was a main focus of NSA’s counterterrorism efforts. The U.S. Government offered a \$7 million reward for information leading to his capture. We spent over 2 years looking for him. He

was ultimately captured based almost exclusively on intelligence information from section 702.

Najibullah Zazi is in prison for planning an attack of the New York City subway system with explosives in 2009. He received explosive training in Pakistan from al-Qaida. He was discovered after he corresponded with an email address used by an al-Qaida courier in Pakistan, seeking advice on how to build explosives. The section 702 program uncovered the correspondence. Without that discovery, the subway bombing plot might have succeeded.

In October 2013, the FBI began investigating Shawn Parson, a foreigner from Trinidad and Tobago, after Parson began posting comments online expressing a desire to commit an attack against Western interests. Information collected through section 702 revealed Parson's efforts and was instrumental in identifying additional members of Parson's network.

Through the section 702 program, the FBI assisted foreign partners to identify the individual who committed the 2016 New Year's Eve terrorist attack at a night club in Turkey. During that attack, 38 people were killed or seriously injured, including an American citizen.

Those are just the unclassified examples.

It is important to remind my colleagues of the purpose behind section 702. It provides the government the authority to collect the electronic communications of foreigners located outside of the United States. Under section 702, it is against the law to target anyone in the United States or any American citizen, wherever that citizen is in the world.

The program is targeted. It is not a bulk collection system. Furthermore, the FISA Court must approve targeting procedures to ensure that only appropriate individuals are subject to surveillance. Minimization procedures limit the handling and use of information that is collected. All three branches of government have a hand in overseeing the program to protect the constitutional rights of the American people.

It is also important to remind my colleagues that this legislation was first signed into law in 2008. When we took up consideration in 2012 and debated the law, we authorized this legislation with no changes. The 2012 clean reauthorization had the full support of President Obama.

Some of our Senate colleagues oppose this bill. Their first, and most consistent, claim is that section 702 violates the Fourth Amendment. Our colleagues claim that it is an "end-run" around the Constitution. Others call it a "legal loophole," a "backdoor," or "warrantless surveillance."

Nothing could be further from the truth. Section 702 is fully consistent with the Constitution. Every Federal court to review section 702—even including the very liberal Ninth Circuit—has upheld the law. The Supreme

Court's recent decision to deny review of the Ninth Circuit case lets stand that court's decision. These courts consistently determined that a warrant is not required to collect or query section 702 information.

Moreover, the independent PCLOB review board has reviewed the entire legal framework of section 702 and has also found it to be constitutional.

The other main claim against this bill is that it provides "new" powers to the government. Again, this is not true.

Nevertheless, this bill does include some significant reforms. First, the bill requires the FBI to get a warrant in some criminal cases. In other words, we have added a warrant where courts have held that none are necessary. The bill also provides protection for whistleblowers and requires an inspector general's report.

In short, this bill provides our government the tools it needs to protect our national security while providing some much needed transparency measures and increased privacy and civil liberties protections.

My colleagues can tell that I am very strongly in support of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very important national security protection legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his support and for his very in-depth analysis of how this works and why it is constitutional.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator WARNER and I be permitted to conclude our remarks prior to the cloture vote.

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I yield to the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the chairman of our committee, the Senator from North Carolina, for his work on this important piece of legislation.

I obviously rise today in support of passage of S. 139, the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017. This bill would provide significant reforms that enhance the civil liberties and privacy protections of individuals, while preserving an authority critical to our national security for an additional 6 years.

As vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I have long advocated for reforms to surveillance authorities that balance the imperatives of national security and counterterrorism with the privacy rights and civil liberties of Americans.

Section 702 stands among the most important of our intelligence programs. To illustrate, I wish to highlight very briefly one recently declass-

sified success story involving a terrorist by the name of Hajji Iman.

Hajji Iman was the second in command of ISIS based in Syria. NSA spent more than 2 years looking for him. This search was ultimately successful, primarily because of FISA section 702.

NSA used collection permitted and authorized under section 702 to collect intelligence on the close associates and the network supporting Mr. Iman, including their location in Syria. Between section 702 and other intelligence that was developed, the IC was able to track down the movements of Mr. Iman and ultimately resulted in taking him off the battlefield.

This is but one of numerous examples in which information obtained pursuant to section 702 has proven critical to addressing threats to Americans both domestically and abroad.

For much of the past year and a half, I have worked closely with Chairman BURR and a bipartisan group of Senators to pass legislation to reauthorize section 702 for an extended period while incorporating substantive reforms. In October our Senate Intelligence Committee passed, in a bipartisan way, with a vote of 12 to 3, comprehensive reauthorization legislation.

Since that time, we have worked with our counterparts in the House, as well as representatives of the executive branch, to ensure that the final bill that we will be voting on tonight and tomorrow garners widespread bipartisan support and includes enhancements to civil liberties and privacy protections.

The bill before us here today is the product of extensive bipartisan, bicameral negotiations. Now, this bill is not perfect. Rarely have I worked on or voted on a bill anywhere that is perfect, but I believe this measure represents a significant compromise and preserves the operational flexibility of section 702, while instituting key reforms to further protect U.S. personal privacy.

Let me take a moment to identify a few key items in this legislation that I believe bear mentioning.

First—and I have seen my friend from Oregon, who has argued long and hard in committee for a provision like this, and he would like to see it broader, but it does include a warrant requirement—for the first time in section 702, the government would be required to obtain a court order before FBI criminal investigators are permitted to view communications collected pursuant to section 702 concerning a known U.S. person. Such a court order, based on probable cause, would apply in the context of criminal investigations opened by the FBI that do not relate to national security.

This bill also mandates that a study be conducted by the inspector general of the Department of Justice of the FBI's querying practices 1 year following the enactment of this legislation, making sure that such practices

have been approved by the FISA Court and implemented appropriately by the executive branch. This is an important provision in ensuring transparency.

It includes an assessment of the interpretations of the FBI and the DOJ of querying procedures. It includes the handling by the FBI of individuals whose citizen status is unknown at the time the query is conducted, and it includes the scope of access by the FBI's Criminal Division to section 702 information.

While this will not answer all of the questions asked by my good friend from Oregon, it will finally put the FBI on record answering questions that I deserve to know and that I believe he and other Members deserve to know.

In addition, in terms of querying procedures, S. 139 includes a section mandating a new series of procedures to be drafted and approved by the court and implemented by executive branch agencies.

The legislation also requires new public reporting of statistics about activities conducted under FISA.

As has been mentioned by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, S. 139, for the first time, extends whistleblower protections to contractors in the intelligence community. This addition is essential to ensure that those in the IC have an avenue to report abuses.

Congress must not further delay consideration of a long-term reauthorization. We have been debating this issue for the past 18 months. Indeed, Congress has known about this deadline since the prior reauthorization occurred in 2012. Numerous committees have had extensive hearings on this important issue, including in our committee, both open and closed hearings.

I believe this bill will strengthen and protect Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I again want to thank my friend, the chairman of this committee, the Senator from North Carolina, and look forward to his comments.

I yield the floor and yield back to the chairman.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I thank the vice chairman of the committee, and I say to those who are opposed to this, I have great affection for all of you. They have passion which really displays their belief that the American people need to be protected from government.

Let me just say from the start, this is the single most reviewed program that exists in the Federal Government. This is reviewed congressionally—it is reviewed by the courts, it is reviewed by the DNI, it is reviewed by the inspector general and the Department of Justice—because, on the committee, we realize this requires not just the stamp of approval from Congress but the assurance by the Intelligence Committee and by every branch of government that it lives within the parameters we set.

I am not sure everybody could have heard a more thorough description than what Senator WARNER just gave and a more overwhelming voice of support than what the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, gave, but let me take head-on a couple of issues that have come up and claims that have been made on this floor this afternoon.

One is, this is unconstitutional. Well, let me just be clear. This has been tested in the courts, and the courts have ruled this program is lawful, and it is constitutional. So any claim outside of that is not a claim from the Judiciary, which we trust, it is a claim from an individual, and I believe we should, in this case, trust the courts.

Let me say, Congress recognized the constitutionality of section 702 when it reauthorized the bill in 2012. Further, Federal courts have consistently upheld the constitutionality of 702. For example, in the United States v. Mohamud, the Ninth Circuit, December 5, 2016, the court unanimously held that no warrant is required for a search targeted at a foreign person abroad who lacks Fourth Amendment rights, even though some U.S. persons' communications are incidentally acquired in that collection.

The court found that section 702 collection was reasonable under the Fourth Amendment, the reasonableness balancing test, and the targeting and minimization of procedures sufficiently protected the defendant's privacy issues. It is contrary to things you heard on this floor in the last hour, but this is the Ninth Circuit, December 5, 2016, making a ruling based upon this incidental collection that applies to U.S. citizens.

What the vice chairman just shared with you is, we went a step further. We didn't leave it just with the court to determine constitutionality and the lack of a Fourth Amendment protection. We put into the bill that if it didn't have a national security implication—if it was a criminal act, and it was going to be prosecuted in the courts that way, before they could look at the content of that communication, it required them to go to the court and seek and get a warrant before, in fact, they could look at content.

So not only do we have the courts on our side saying there is no Fourth Amendment protection, we have gone a step further and said: In the case of U.S. citizens, if, in fact, they were incidentally collected and if, in fact, the information that was in the database is going to be used for a criminal case—Senator PAUL talked about marijuana—they would have to actually go to a court and get a warrant from a judge to look at that content, which means you are going to have an FBI agent who is going to make a determination whether the content of that message is valuable enough to go to the courts and seek a warrant. This is a protection for the American people. It is not a requirement for the Fourth

Amendment or for the constitutionality of 702.

Now, let me just say to my colleagues, if there are any on the fence post, the Director of National Intelligence is off the floor in the Vice President's Room. If you need one of the guys who has to oversee this program, who understands the importance of it, he is here. He is ready to talk to any Member. Why? Because 702 is the single most important national security tool we have in the United States.

If you ask me to sum up what is this bill for, this is to allow government to keep the American people safe. This bill does more to allow law enforcement, intelligence, the Congress of the United States, and the executive branch to assure the American people of their safety. That is at the heart of what Congress is established for. Spending and all these things come after that, but the defense of the country, defense of each individual American is what is at the root of our responsibilities, and 702, as it relates to this age of terrorism, is the single most effective tool we have to assure the American people we are doing everything we can to provide for their safety.

I might add to that, from a standpoint of the international collection and the international cadre of terrorists, we are able to share with other countries in a way nobody else can when their country is in jeopardy of a terrorist attack, and we have multiple examples where we have shared with our partners around the world—and, I might add, we don't necessarily require them to be a partner of ours to share this with them. We take countries we have no relationship with, maybe that we don't like too much—but America is unique. If we see a terrorist attack that is imminent, we will share that with any country in the world, even our hardest enemies. So let me put aside for any question that section 702 is lawful and it is constitutional.

Let me go to the rigorous oversight that I think the vice chairman described: It is overseen by the Foreign Intelligence Service Court. It is overseen by the Department of Justice and the IG. It is overseen by the Congressional Intelligence Committee. It is required to be evaluated on an annual basis by the Justice Department and by the Bureau for procedures they have to follow.

I can't stress enough that the committee—your committee—your colleagues in Congress are the ones who you should feel most confident after reviewing and providing proper oversight for this program. You see, it is those individuals who reach the clarity that is needed for this body and for the Congress to look at the American people and say: We haven't crossed the line. We have stayed within the legal box that was created.

Don't leave it to me. Let's use the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board or, as we like to refer to it, the

PCLOB. In 2014, following an extensive review, PCLOB specifically noted in that review, to date, there are no known instances in which government personnel deliberately violated the statute, targeting procedures, or minimization procedures.

Let me say that again. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board—which many here created—came out and in their report said: To date, there are no known instances in which government personnel deliberately violated the statute targeting procedures or minimization.

At the same time, in that report, PCLOB made a number of recommendations to the government intended to enhance the safeguards for privacy and civil liberties in section 702. In February 2016, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board reported that all of its recommendations had been implemented, in full or in part, by the government.

Let me say that again. In February 2016, every recommendation that the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board made about this program, the PCLOB certified that those had, in full or in part, been adopted by the Federal Government.

If you only go on what you heard over the last half an hour or an hour, you would think this is riddled with questions of constitutionality and that there are massive abuses. The fact is, there have not been any, and the courts have ruled that it is constitutional, it is legal, and it does not infringe on the Fourth Amendment at all.

Let me say to my colleagues, I expected we would be here. We had a heated debate in the committee. The Presiding Officer remembers that well because he is on the committee. We considered a lot of amendments, and at the end of the day, we came out with a bill that is very similar to what we have today. A 12-to-3 vote shows tremendous bipartisan support.

Now, if Senator WARNER had written it by himself, it would probably look different. If I had written it by myself, it would probably look different. What we are asked to vote on today is a bill that looks different than what we passed out. It is a little bit stronger from the standpoint of the protection of privacy because it does institute this warrant requirement if, in fact, you want to see the content of any collection out of 702 dealing with a criminal process.

If it is national security, we are doing exactly what I think the American people want us to do. We are using the data we have to find the people who want to commit these acts and stop them before they do. If that is not the intent of this, then this probably shouldn't exist. If anybody believes terrorists have quit, and we are no longer a target, then eliminate this.

I am closer to the line than I ever thought I would be before I got to the U.S. Senate and certainly before I became chairman of the Intelligence

Committee, but I do understand responsibilities. Responsibilities make sure those individuals whom we charge with protecting the American people have the tools they need to accomplish it. It is the reason we are debating, on this floor and at the other end of the Capitol, the funding of our military. It is to make sure our military has the tools they need to go out and do the mission they have been asked to do.

Well, from the Bureau to the intelligence community, we have asked them to do everything they can to make sure Americans stay safe, and this has been the most effective tool, with no abuses to date—and that is the determination of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, not a right-leaning institution—and the fact is, the government has lived exactly within the letters of the law that we have described.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture. Let's move on to the 30 hours on this bill, if that is what, in fact, everybody demands. We have already extended it temporarily. That is not a sign of confidence to those who work in the trenches and we ask to keep us safe.

Let's do the bold thing. Let's finish this. This is a bicameral, bipartisan, negotiated bill—both sides of the aisle and both ends of the Capitol. It is time we do our business. I urge my colleagues to vote yes for cloture.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I will be very brief.

Colleagues, what we are debating is whether the Senate will be the Senate. If you vote in favor of this, you are voting for cloture, there will be no amendments then. We would have the opportunity, if we vote against cloture, for improving this bill.

I want to emphasize that if we take a short time to improve this bill, as Senator LEE, Senator LEAHY, and Senator PAUL want to do, this program continues to operate. It is not in any way going to harm our ability to fight terrorism. This program would stand.

I urge my colleagues to vote to carry out our constitutional obligation as Senators, to have real debate and vote against cloture.

I yield.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 in the House amendment to S. 139, an act to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Rounds.

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 S. 139 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Feinstein	Nelson
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Flake	Peters
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Reed
Capito	Hassan	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Casey	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shaheen
Cornyn	Jones	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Thune
Cotton	King	Tillis
Crapo	Klobuchar	Toomey
Donnelly	Lankford	Warner
Duckworth	Manchin	Whitehouse
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Paul
Blumenthal	Heller	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Smith
Cardin	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Gardner	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 38.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer with an amendment and the amendments pending thereto fall.

The Senator from Ohio.

BUTCH LEWIS ACT

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Thanks to Senator SCHUMER and my colleagues, who will join us in the course of the evening, for coming to the floor tonight to shine a light on the more than 1 million workers and retirees all over this country who are on the verge of facing massive cuts to the pensions they have earned. This crisis affects thousands of Ohioans—perhaps more than 60,000 is our count. It affects the massive Central States Teamsters Pension Plan, the United Mine Workers Pension Plan, the Ironworkers Local 17 Pension Plan, the Ohio Southwest Carpenters Pension Plan, the Bakers and Confectioners Pension Plan, and others. It has an impact on workers, retirees, and businesses in every single State in the United States.

It is bad enough that Wall Street squandered workers' money; it is worse that the government—that this body, that the House—hasn't yet stepped up. The government is supposed to look out for these folks and is so far turning a blind eye to the promise made to these workers.

The Senate found the time to pass a massive tax giveaway for corporations that shipped jobs overseas. We know that the tax bill made it even more likely for manufacturing companies to shut down in Mansfield or Limerick or Chillicothe or Portsmouth or Springfield, OH, and move overseas. They shut down production here and move overseas, set up production there, and sell their products back into the United States. The Senate's bill does that, but it did nothing for hard-working Americans who worked their whole lives to earn their retirement. It is disgraceful, and time is running short to make these pensions whole.

I urge my colleagues in this body—colleagues with healthcare and retirement plans paid for by taxpayers—to remember that. My colleagues—all of us have our healthcare and pensions paid by taxpayers. I urge my colleagues of this body to think about these retired workers and the stress they are facing. It is an expensive time of year for people with fixed incomes. Their heating bills go up. They try to scrape together what they can for the holidays for grandkids. They have loved ones who are sick, and some of them are sick themselves.

Remember, this is about more than just these retirees and their families; hundreds of thousands of workers give up money from each and every paycheck to fund a pension they expect to be there when they retire. Think about that. Those who haven't really looked at what happens in union negotiations, where workers sit at the bargaining table, and they give up income today to put money aside for the future for their pensions—that is what they did. They gave up income 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, even 40 years ago, put it aside—often matched by employers. That money then comes

back to them in the form of a pension when they retire.

If we don't protect those pensions, how do any workers know their retirement is safe? How do you plan for your kids? How do you plan for your family's future? How do you do that when this kind of uncertainty hangs over your head? These Americans have done everything right. They have worked their whole lives to earn these pensions. They have put in long hours to support their families. They did it so they would be able to spend their retirement years enjoying time with their grandchildren, not worrying every day about how to make ends meet. The reason they thought it wasn't just blind hope was because of the legally binding contracts they negotiated in good faith.

When I first started in public service, when the legislature wasn't in session, I used to spend hours at the United Steelworkers Local 169 in Mansfield, OH, listening to workers talk about their dreams. We talked about a lot of things. I would talk about their kids, whom I had gone to high school with at Mansfield Junior High or Johnny Appleseed Junior High or Brinkerhoff Grade School. But one thing I heard over and over is how workers, as I said earlier, gave up pay today at the bargaining table for the promise of a pension to be there when they retired. It is pretty simple. They sat at the negotiating table. They earned their pensions. They gave up pay raises to do it. But now their government has allowed Wall Street to blow it, and tough luck for them. Not on our watch, Mr. President.

Before the holidays, I stood in this building with many of my colleagues and with Rita Lewis, the widow of Butch Lewis, who had worked 40 years as an Ohio teamster. Butch died of a heart attack on New Year's Eve a couple of years ago. If he were here today, Butch would tell you that he didn't work those 40 years to get just 40 percent of his pension. Sadly, Butch passed away far too soon after fighting for the retirement he and these workers earned. It is my honor to name our Senate bill the "Butch Lewis Act" after him.

This isn't a partisan issue. It affects communities we all represent. It affects Teamsters in Michigan and in Ohio. It affects workers in Montana, the Presiding Officer's State. It affects mine workers in the majority leader's State. It affects teamsters, truckdrivers, in the Democratic leader's State.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have voiced support and the desire to work together in good faith to keep this promise. Now we just need to sit down together, put politics aside, and get it done. A number of Republican Senators have been in negotiations with Democratic Senators that we have led to make sure this can get done. But fundamentally it is about whose side you are on. It is about who

we work for. Many of my colleagues made it pretty clear in December with their tax vote that they work for Wall Street and the corporations that send job overseas, but I say we work for these truckdrivers, ironworkers, carpenters, confectionary workers, and teamsters. They are not asking for a handout; they are asking for what they earned over a lifetime of work. It is time for us to do the job the taxpayers sent us here to do and save those pensions before it is too late.

I am joined on the Senate floor today by the senior Senator from Michigan and the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator STABENOW and Senator DONNELLY, who have been very active on this issue. I know Senator CASEY is going to join us, and others who have been very active, standing up for these retirees, understanding that the teamster retirees and mine workers and ironworkers and others gave up money today, gave up raises at the bargaining table, to put money aside for retirement. We owe that to them. It is time the Senate does its job.

I yield the floor to Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank my friend from Ohio. Senator BROWN has been a real champion. It is wonderful to partner with him and with the senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. DONNELLY.

All of us believe strongly—and the Democratic caucus together believes strongly—that a pension is a promise, period. A pension is a promise. Too many people right now are finding themselves in a situation where they are being told that promise is not going to be kept.

For generations, millions of working men and women have built better lives for themselves in Michigan and across the country, and better lives for their families, with jobs that provided more than a paycheck. That is part of the American dream.

These folks have worked hard, and we know that the people of Michigan can outbuild and outwork and outimagine anyone. I will take on my friends from Indiana and Ohio on that one because we know that in Michigan we have bright, hard-working folks.

In exchange for a job well done, workers knew that they could count on basic benefits, including quality healthcare and a secure retirement, a pension. Jobs like these didn't just build families. We know that those jobs have built the middle class of our country—making things, growing things, creating things, and building things. That is what has created our middle class and our way of life.

Unfortunately, though, we know that jobs that provide this kind of security and stability are becoming increasingly hard to find. Even worse, some workers have discovered that the benefits they earned over years of hard

work have proven to be less than dependable. That is why we are here, because we believe a pension is a promise, and too many people are being told that promise isn't going to be kept. That is wrong.

Imagine what it is like to be one of these workers. Perhaps you spent your career behind the wheel of a truck, hauling freight. The work is dangerous. The hours are long. You are separated from your family, but you keep on driving because the pay and the benefits are good, you are taking care of your family, and you are planning for the future. You know that after driving literally millions of safe miles, you will be able to retire with dignity. You will be able to have that cottage up north in Michigan, the snowmobile, and the boat, and to send your kids to college, thanks to the pension you worked so hard and so long for.

After decades of work, you decide it is time to park the truck one last time. You say goodbye to your coworkers and hello to a new stage in your life. You plan in your retirement to spend more time at the lake, maybe even teach your grandkids to fish. You can make these plans because you know you have the security of that pension you have worked all your life for.

Then, one day, everything changes. You learn that for a variety of reasons, the fund providing your pension is running out of money—not because of your fault. In fact, you might receive little, if any, of the benefits you were counting on. What do you do? What do you do? Do you swallow your pride, sell your home, and move in with one of your kids? Would you go back to work? Would you be able to get a job?

A lot of Michigan workers don't have to imagine what they would do because they are living it right now. This is very serious.

Again, I have always believed that a pension is a promise. Shame on our country, shame on our government if we don't make sure that promise is kept.

People who worked hard to earn their retirement benefits should not have to worry about paying the power bill or putting food on the table or keeping their homes. Unfortunately, we know that a number of multi-employer pension funds, including ones in Michigan that Michigan workers depend on, face serious challenges due to the financial crisis and other factors. I remember back in 2008 and 2009, when there was a bailout that was passed for Wall Street banks, but what about the pensions that were invested? What happened to the middle-class families depending on that? We know what happened in terms of people losing their homes, and what about the other piece, which is the pensions, that lost money?

This isn't the fault of the workers, like Kenneth of Sterling Heights, MI. He is a retired teamster. He wrote to me about his fears of being able to pay his bills and cover the basics, including food, medicine, and everyday expenses.

He worked hard all of his life. He doesn't want to end his life in poverty, nor should he have to.

He told me: "We are not the people who made the bad investments of our hard-earned money and lost billions of dollars."

Kenneth is absolutely right. This isn't the fault of the workers, and they shouldn't pay the price. They should know that the promise made to them after a lifetime of hard work will be kept.

That is why I am so pleased to be co-sponsoring the Butch Lewis Act of 2017 with my colleagues who are here this evening. The bill would create a new office within Treasury called the Pension Rehabilitation Administration. The new office would give troubled pension plans the opportunity to become solid again through loans and assistance from the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. With this bill, these plans would be able to pay workers all of the promised benefits with no cuts—no cuts. The plans would be required to demonstrate the ability to repay the loans at the end of the term.

Think about how Wall Street banks got loans. Shouldn't middle-class, working men and women—retirees who worked all of their lives and believed in our country, and believed that, in fact, our country would have their back—also have the same kind of opportunity to be able to protect their pensions?

Let me just say again that this is an incredibly important piece of legislation that affects millions of middle-class Americans who have worked their entire lives—people who are retired now or are near retirement or are still working hard and paying in and trust that, in fact, their pension will be there, and it is incredibly important that our country keep its promise to them.

Let me also say in conclusion that I will be reintroducing legislation that I introduced last session to address something else that I think is a matter of fairness: to prevent raises and reduce salaries of top pension fund executives if retiree benefits are cut. I understand how devastating pension cuts would be to retirees and their families, and the people making decisions—the people in power making decisions about funds—should actually be able to know that by feeling the same pain of cuts.

There is no question we need long-term solutions to the pension crisis facing our country. People who are retired right now and face losing that pension and going into poverty or people who are about to retire don't have time to wait. There is a tremendous sense of urgency about this.

Cutting benefits would place a terrible burden on retirees who have worked hard all of their lives to earn some dignity, some comfort, some security. It is people like Keith and Mary. They are both in their seventies and depend on Keith's pension and Social Security to meet their basic needs. They told me:

We try to save, but it is difficult. We are hoping that the pension will last more than 10 years, but who knows.

Keith and Mary have the right to know. They have the right to know that their country has their backs and that they can count on their pension being there.

I urge my colleagues to help keep that promise for Ken and Keith and Mary and hard-working people all across Michigan and America.

I see our leader on the floor. I want to thank him for making this a top priority as we are negotiating the priorities of this country, the priorities of the budget for next year. Making sure hard-working Americans have the promise kept of their pension is something that I know is at the top of his list, and I am proud to join him in this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank Senator STABENOW and my colleague from Indiana and my colleague from Ohio. Senators BROWN, STABENOW, DONNELLY, KLOBUCHAR, HEITKAMP, CASEY, and BALDWIN have been such stalwart voices for working men and women in their States—namely, teamsters and food workers—as well as Senator MANCHIN, for the miners in West Virginia, and so many others across the country.

We come to the floor tonight to urge our Republican colleagues to join us in doing something to shore up pension plans for over 1 million Americans. Millions of middle-class workers in this country—teamsters, miners, carpenters, and steel workers—have put their money into plans year after year. They knew they wouldn't be rich when they retired, but they thought they could live a life of decency and dignity. They often forewent salary increases. They said: Don't give me a raise at this percent; give me a lower raise, but put money in that pension. These people earned these pensions. They are the backbone of America.

But now, after all of their hard work and all of their savings, several multiyear pension plans are at risk of failure, through no fault of the workers. Families in my State and across the country could see their retirement savings slashed. Teamsters, miners, carpenters, and food service workers are at risk of losing security through no fault of their own. They weren't responsible for the stock market crash, and they weren't involved in offshore swaps in London or somewhere, but that diminished the value of these plans. They are certainly not responsible for Congress twiddling its thumbs and doing nothing in the face of these shortfalls. Teamsters in my State, for instance, are facing a 30-percent reduction in their retirement benefits. They feel the impact of the cuts every day.

So in conclusion, we have to get something done. Our Republican friends spent most of 2017 pressing legislation to help the wealthiest corporations and biggest corporations to get

big tax breaks, but what about the middle-class worker? What about the middle-class worker? Let 2018 be different. Let it be the year when we fix these plans, and let's do it in the upcoming budget deal.

I know that Senators BROWN, STABENOW, DONNELLY and so many others will continue to fight for hard-working pensioners until we fix the problem.

So again, I want to thank my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, for organizing an outstanding group of Senators to speak this evening on a crucial topic: pensions.

Senators BROWN, STABENOW, KLOBUCHAR, HEITKAMP, DONNELLY, CASEY and BALDWIN have always been such stalwart voices for the working men and women of their States.

We all come to the floor tonight to urge our Republican colleagues to join us in doing something to shore up pension plans for over a million Americans.

Millions of middle-class workers in this country—teamsters and miners and carpenters and steel workers—put money into pension plans year after year, forgoing large salary increases or other benefits. Do you know why? Because they said: I am going to work hard my whole life, but when I retire I want to retire with some degree of dignity. And that is what they did.

But several multiemployer pension plans are at a real risk of failure. Families in my State and across the country could see their retirement savings slashed. Teamsters and miners and carpenters and food service workers are at risk of losing that security through no fault of their own.

They weren't responsible for the market crash in 2009, which diminished the value of so many of these plans. And they certainly aren't responsible for Congress twiddling its thumbs, doing nothing to fix the looming shortfalls in the many years since.

And yet, Teamsters in my State are facing a 30-percent reduction in their retirement benefits. They feel the impact of those cuts every day.

These are funds that workers contributed to, and they earned every penny. They won't allow the families of my State to buy riches or luxuries. These pension plans won't fund the purchase of yachts or beach homes. What they will do is guarantee hard-working men and women the peace of mind that comes with a secure retirement.

We have an obligation to see that the promise made to these workers is upheld. And we ought to do it soon. If we don't, it is going to cost taxpayers more in the long run. And all throughout the meantime, hardworking American families will be denied the benefits they rightly deserve.

Republicans spent most of 2017 pressing legislation that helped the wealthiest corporations and the biggest corporations to the detriment of the middle class. Let 2018 be different. Let 2018 be a year when we finally fix these pen-

sion plans. And let's do it in the upcoming budget deal.

This will be another test of the Republican majority. Will they again ignore the pressing needs of working Americans across the country? Will President Trump again talk about helping the working men and women of this country but then turn his back on them? We will see.

What I know is that Senator BROWN, and this group of Democratic Senators, will continue to fight for the hard-working pensioners of this country until we fix this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, my colleagues and I are on the Senate floor tonight on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Americans whose pensions are at serious risk.

For generations, there has been an expectation in our country that if you worked hard and earned a pension, that pension would be there in retirement. Unfortunately, that promise is now in question.

Due to corporate bankruptcies, the financial crisis, and underfunding, among other reasons, some of the largest pension funds in this country are at risk of insolvency, potentially leaving retirees with pennies on the dollar. I know firsthand the value of a pension. My late father-in-law was a teamster. His pension allowed him to help support his family and it provided him with the dignity of a decent retirement.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans will go to sleep tonight uncertain about their financial security. I have met these retirees. I have stood with them at rallies. I have attended their meetings.

Just 10 days ago, back home in Indiana, I joined roughly 300 teamsters, both active and retired, from all corners of Indiana. They met in Indianapolis to try to learn what the future would hold. They simply want the pensions they worked so hard for and spent so many hours laboring for—and that they earned. They simply want what was promised to them and what their hard work earned for them.

Unless Congress acts soon, in Indiana alone, 22,000 teamsters and 2,700 mine workers are at risk of significant pension cuts. That is why I cosponsored the Butch Lewis Act and the American Miners Pension Act. These bipartisan bills would ensure retirees receive their pensions. Both bills create a loan program that extends the solvency of at-risk pension plans.

I also continue to work with Senators in both parties to build support and to find a solution. Conversations need to turn into that solution before the pension shortfall grows even worse. If we don't act, the solution becomes more costly every day.

The Department of Labor lists 144 multi-employer plans as being in critical or endangered status. The at-risk plans include ironworkers, roofers, ma-

chinists, fishermen, plumbers, bricklayers, and carpenters, among others.

We need to shore up our pension system before the problem grows worse. The failure of these plans would not just devastate the impacted retirees, it could be economically damaging to impacted communities and could lead to the insolvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—the PBGC—which provides pension insurance.

Last year, we similarly stood on this Senate floor together—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans—to fight for health benefits for the retired mineworkers. We solved that issue. We reached a compromise by working together, Republicans and Democrats together, and passed a permanent solution that was signed into law. Let's do it again here.

We have an opportunity to do the right thing—to ensure hundreds of thousands of Americans have the financial support they expected, that they worked nonstop for, and that they receive the pensions they earned. A solution is right here in our grasp. We have to get this done, and I urge the Senate to act immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in our fight to keep a promise made to workers and retirees across this country. I will start with where we were, where we are now, and what Washington needs to do to keep these promises.

A little over 2 years ago, Central States pension had an application before the Treasury Department, which had it been approved would have meant deep cuts to pensions that had already been earned over a lifetime of hard work.

Retirees in my home State of Wisconsin began to receive letters notifying them that their pensions could be cut by 30, 50, and, in some cases, as much as 70 percent. Treasury made the right decision and rejected these pension cuts. That was an important victory, but we have always known there is more work to be done, that we have to find a long-term solution that keeps these promises.

I am talking about a promise made to Bernie in Franklin, WI, who would have lost about one-third of his pension if the Central States application had actually gone through. I am talking about a promise made to Kenny from Menomonee Falls, WI, who spent most of his career in trucking, paying into a pension fund to safeguard his family's future. He got a letter notifying him that his pension might be cut by 55 percent. I am talking about promises made to 25,000 retirees and workers in the State of Wisconsin. They have been living with the fear and uncertainty of not knowing whether the retirement security they saved for and sacrificed for, and that their families depend upon, will be there when they need it.

If Washington does not act, these workers and retirees will face massive

cuts to their pensions earned over decades of work.

I have been proud to work side by side with Wisconsin retirees and with Senator SHERROD BROWN to introduce the Butch Lewis Act. The bill will put failing pension plans, including Central States, back on solid ground to ensure they can meet their commitments to retirees today and workers in decades to come, and it does so without cutting a single cent from the benefits retirees have earned.

In the time since Central States submitted its application to the Treasury Department, I have met with retirees in Milwaukee, Green Bay, and Endeavor, WI—last week, I was in Brookfield, WI, with many more than 200 retirees and workers—who are counting on Washington to pass this bill.

Washington needs to act. We need to pass the Butch Lewis Act, and we need to do it soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in calling for action—action to protect the hard-earned benefits of pensioners, hard-working people all across my State. I thank my colleague Senator BROWN for organizing these speeches and my neighbor to the east, Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin, for her eloquent words on behalf of the workers in her State.

I know how important benefits are to workers firsthand. My grandpa was one of many children, growing up in the Iron Range of Minnesota. He loved school, but he had to quit at age 15 to help support his family. First, he got a job as a teamster, pulling a cart, and then at a very young age, he went to work in the iron ore mines in Ely, MN.

He had wanted to be in the Navy. He had wanted to sail the world. Instead, he spent his entire life to support his eight brothers and sisters and then, later, my dad and my uncle. He spent his entire life working 1,500 feet underground, and he would go down the mine shaft every single day with his black lunch bucket, and I often thought: What did he think of when he went down that mine shaft? Did he think of that life at sea, of school, of other things? He felt he had an obligation, and that obligation was not only important to our family, which somehow ended up with me in the U.S. Senate, but it was also an obligation that was so important to our country, because when you go back as far as World War II, it was the iron ore that was made into the steel that built our country—our factories, our skyscrapers, and our ships and tanks that won that war. That is what my grandpa did, and it was dangerous back then.

My grandma would always tell me how you would hear this whistle go off, and it meant someone was either very hurt or killed in the mines, and all of the wives would go and stand outside that mine to see what miner was going to be brought up injured or worse. My

dad remembers seeing the coffins in the church in Ely lined up of miners who had been killed. This wasn't that long ago.

When someone does something like that for their family and for their country, promises that were made to them should be kept. Because my grandpa stayed in that job—over time, the safety requirements got better, the benefits got better—he was able to get healthcare, he was able to save money in a coffee can in the basement of their little house so he could send my dad and his brother to college. That all happened.

So when he got sick, he should be able to have healthcare, right? Well, he did. He had cancer, but he was able to have healthcare. When my grandma got older and lived into her late eighties, she was able to stay at assisted living. That all happened because promises made to those workers were kept.

The promise made to the workers in multiemployer pension plans is simple; that the pension they have earned through their decades of hard work will be there when they retire.

Saving for retirement is often described as the three-legged stool: Social Security, a pension, and personal savings. A stable and secure retirement relies on all three legs being strong, but some multiemployer pension plans are facing funding challenges that could weaken one of those legs. Over 10 million Americans participate in a multiemployer pension plan and rely on these benefits for a safe and secure retirement.

The Central States Pension Plan is such a plan. It was established in 1955 to help truckers save for retirement. That was while my grandpa was still in the mines. Today, the Central States Pension Plan includes workers from the carhaul, tankhaul, pipeline, warehouse, construction, clerical, food processing, dairy, and trucking industries.

In my State, there are over 21,000 workers and retirees in the plan—and this affects workers and retirees from all over the Midwest. I guess that is why it is called the Central States plan: Nearly 48,000 workers and retirees in Ohio, over 47,000 in Michigan, over 32,000 in Missouri, nearly 25,000 in Wisconsin, and over 2,000 in North Dakota.

In fact, when this issue first came up, and this was rushed over from the House—and we really didn't know the impact it would have in our States because there hadn't been a lot of thought in how this thing was done when it was part of a bigger bill—I voted against that bill because if this thing is called Central States, and I have a bunch of people calling me, I probably have a lot of people who are impacted. Unfortunately, that thing was rushed through, and people didn't have their say. In fact, 7 of the top 10 States in the Central States Pension Plan are Midwestern States.

In September of 2015, the Central States submitted a proposal to the

Treasury to reduce pension benefits for workers and retirees under the Multi-employer Pension Relief Act of 2014.

Treasury reviewed the proposal, which would have resulted in benefits cut for over 270,000 Central State retirees and workers. Some of these pension cuts were as high as 50, 60, and even 70 percent. Imagine someone who has spent their life driving a truck, saving money, and then suddenly one day they find out they are going to lose 70 percent of their pension.

I heard from people all over my State how devastating these proposed cuts would have been. People were concerned that they would not be able to afford their medication or that they might have to sell their house. Many are in their sixties, seventies, or even eighties and are not able to go back to work.

I stood up with many of my colleagues and fought against that proposal for a very simple reason: It was the right thing to do. We raised significant concerns about the plan, and the Treasury Department—in a move that I think surprised some of us, pleasantly, but not those who are on the frontlines every day, whom I am looking up at in the Gallery—rejected that proposal.

While we temporarily averted a very bad plan going into effect, this issue is not going away. The Central States Pension Plan still faces insolvency by 2025, and more than 70,000 Minnesotans are in multiemployer pension plans that are facing funding shortfalls. More than 100 of these pension plans are facing funding challenges and do not have sufficient plan assets.

Pensioners across our State and our country depend on their pensions. People like Sherman from my State, in Northern Minnesota—exactly the area I just talked about my dad being from, where my grandpa worked in the mines. Sherman has been working tirelessly on this issue and raising it at a national level, and workers and retirees whom I continue to meet are asking us and looking for us to take action.

That is why I have joined with my colleagues to cosponsor the Butch Lewis Act, and I thank Senator BROWN for his leadership on this legislation. This bill is a win-win for employers, employees, retirees, and Americans.

The bill would put the pension plan back on solid footing and ensure that the plans could meet their obligations to retirees and workers for decades to come. This would happen without cutting a single cent from the benefits our workers and retirees have earned, worked hard for, paid into the pension plan for, and built their retirement around.

The introduction of the Butch Lewis Act has been an important step forward in elevating the need for action. So as congressional leaders work to negotiate a deal to raise the budget spending caps, the pension crisis should

be a funding priority. It should be included in any comprehensive budget deal.

Somehow, in this very Chamber, people found a way to do a bunch of tax cuts. Some of them were there for the middle class, but a lot of them helped the wealthy. Somehow they found their way to that. Well, they had better find their way to include this because this is about working people.

We owe it to all Americans who played by the rules and worked hard throughout their lives secure pensions.

I stand today ready to work with our colleagues on the floor and across the aisle on a bipartisan solution. We all know that delay only makes the solution more costly. The time is here. We can't put it off any longer. We must move forward now to get this done for our workers, for our businesses, and for our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak as well about the issue of pensions, as many of my colleagues have been speaking about tonight. First of all, I want to outline a series of what I believe to be promises that the Senate and the House must keep with large segments of the American people.

Last year at this time, we were in a long debate, which had transpired over months, and the main issue there was healthcare for retired coal miners and their families. This was a promise made to coal miners across the country—thousands of them across the country and thousands in Pennsylvania alone—who were promised they would have healthcare in their retirement. That promise went unfulfilled despite the fact that we got a bill through the Senate Finance Committee, as we were instructed to do, to follow so-called regular order—have a hearing, have a vote, get it through the committee—but it was held up month after month, really from the fall of 2016 until April of 2017. That promise almost went unfulfilled, and it took far too long, but eventually we got it done.

At that time, we made another promise to those same coal miners that we would work on the pension issue for them. That was the second half of the original legislation.

When it comes to promises, we have promises to keep to those Americans who worked so hard in the most difficult job in the world.

We also have some promises that must be fulfilled. I would hope that the Republican leadership and Republican Members of the House and the Senate, along with the administration—one party in charge of two branches of government—would keep their promise to 9 million American children. The Children's Health Insurance Program is

more than 100 days overdue from being reauthorized. Everyone says they are for it, but it is not done. It was set aside to get a tax bill done, which, in my judgment, was a giveaway to the superrich and big corporations. Even if you wanted to support the tax bill, why couldn't you carve out some time by the end of the year, I asked the majority, to get the Children's Health Insurance Program reauthorized? Nine million kids; one hundred eighty thousand in Pennsylvania. Why couldn't you get it done?

Here we are now in the middle of January facing yet another deadline, and the Children's Health Insurance Program is not yet reauthorized. That is a promise. We will see by the end of the week whether the majority keeps its promise to those 9 million children.

The pension issue is the one I am going to talk about tonight, but there is also a promise that was made to approximately 800,000 young people, the individuals in the so-called DACA Program, the Dreamers. That is another promise.

The promise we are talking about tonight, at least on this side of the aisle in the Senate, is the promise of pensions. Why do so many pension plans face the obstacles, the burdens, and the crisis they face right now? The two main reasons are, first and foremost, the financial crisis, which wiped out stock holdings just as these members were retiring, and, of course, the second reason is substantial job loss in the industries that are affected by these pension plans.

While Wall Street and the gross domestic product have recovered from the horrific financial crisis that the country has now recovered from, but some people are still being hurt by it, and as the wealthier are doing better than ever—the number that was cited a couple of months ago was that since 1980, the share of national income—if you took all the income in the country, the share of national income held by the top 1 percent was 11 percent in 1980. That is a pretty high number for 1 percent. They had 11 percent of the national income. What was it in 2014? It had almost doubled to 20 percent. So when I say that the very wealthy, the top 1 percent, have done quite well—I have even used the word “bonanza”—they have done very well since 1980—I can back it up with a number, and that is the number. So even as they are doing better, and those other indicators might seem better, wages and opportunities for the middle class have stagnated, and our pensions have paid the price.

Workers across the country—including tens of thousands of coal miners, teamsters, and bakery and confectionary workers in Pennsylvania—are living with the worry that their pensions may not remain solvent. They played by the rules. They paid their dues. They put in their time for their companies. They and their children paid the price during the financial cri-

sis with their jobs and their wages. They should not have to continue to pay the price in retirement through reductions in promised pension benefits.

It is inexcusable and insulting for Americans to live with this type of worry, wondering whether they will have the quality of life in retirement they planned for and depended upon throughout their careers—careers of hard work and sacrifice, careers of giving so much to their companies and in many cases, so much to their country as well. Yet we have that uncertainty facing those individuals and their families. They are wondering whether, after decades of working in jobs that took a toll, in many cases, on their own bodies, they will need to go back to work so they can afford the heating bills or the cost of medication. That is insulting.

We must take action now to shore up our pension system, to keep the promise to the Americans who made our country what it is today—the greatest in the world, for sure. We know where Democrats stand on this issue. We are with workers. The question now is whether Republicans will work with us to get this done.

As I said before, Republicans have all the votes they need to get this done. They didn't flinch in December when it was a question of whether they would give \$13 billion in tax windfalls to the Nation's largest banks. All of that, of course, was unpaid for. We know where Republicans stand when it comes to giving away billions of dollars in borrowed money to large, profitable corporations. That was the tax bill that I mentioned before. We will soon find out whether they stand with workers when it comes to their pensions.

The Republican Congress needs to act now to make sure that we pass what is called the Butch Lewis Act to give retirees in Pennsylvania and others across the country the peace of mind that comes with knowing their retirement is secure. It is fundamental. This is a promise. It is either going to be kept, or it is going to be violated. This is the week to ensure that it is kept for those Americans who have worked so hard. They deserve these pensions. They have earned them. We need to keep our promise. The majority needs to keep its promise.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.