

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise very briefly to thank my friend, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

One more time, I urge all of our colleagues to vote for S. 139, which will be coming up for a vote in a few moments.

This is a critical tool that our intelligence community uses on a regular basis to keep America safe. It is a tool that—as someone who has more, perhaps, observance of this program than most—I do not believe has been abused or will be abused. This legislation includes meaningful reforms on furthering civil liberties protections and making sure that a year from now, the questions that many Members have asked over the years, particularly of the Bureau, will be answered.

I think this foreminded legislation needs to pass and needs to pass with an overwhelming majority.

Again, I thank the chairman for his good work. We had a 12-to-3 vote out of our committee on this legislation. We had a 60-to-38 vote that moved us forward on the cloture motion. My hope is that many other colleagues who care deeply about national security will join us in the final passage of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman of the committee, Senator WARNER.

I think what we have seen is a process that has tried to take into account concerns that not just Members but the American people have had with programs that operate in a degree of secrecy, and I think most Americans understand why.

The assurance I have tried to make and the vice chairman has tried to make to our colleagues and to the American people is that we are vigilant in the rigorous oversight of not just this program but of the entire complex of intelligence in the United States. It is our job as committee members, and we do it without the clarity that most members would like to have on issues. I respect the fact that some still disagree with us, though the number is small. I also feel extremely proud today that we are getting ready to, in the next few minutes, reauthorize the single most important intelligence tool that exists for us to keep the American people safe.

I think we will look back on this as a needed tool. Today, the threat landscape looks worse than it probably ever has. The reason Americans can safely go to bed at night is that there are a

lot of dedicated folks to whom we provide tools in order to keep them safe. It starts with a vote in this body, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote, when given the opportunity shortly, to reauthorize the 702 program.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT
NO. 1870

Madam President, I move to table the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to accompany S. 139.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—34

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

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 139

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 98, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam 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 until 7 p.m., with the time equally divided, and that all quorum calls during that time also be equally divided.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

PROTECTING LIFE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to get a chance to address an ongoing conversation that is happening in Washington, DC, right now and will be over in the next 36 hours. As unusual as this may sound, with all of the drama that is happening here, just outside this building there are tens of thousands of people—most of them students—who are gathered in Washington, DC, preparing for something called the March for Life. This has happened for decades now. Students and adults come from all over the country to Washington, DC, to quietly speak

for those who cannot speak for themselves—children still in the womb—and to be able to speak out for the protection of life.

It is an interesting conversation that has a tremendous amount of science, a tremendous amount of faith, and a tremendous amount of heat around it, as some individuals don't want to discuss the issue of abortion or would simply say: That is a woman's choice; we need to set that aside and ignore it.

There is a whole group of students who arrive here saying: Wait a minute. That child in the womb has 10 fingers and 10 toes, unique DNA that is different from the mom and different from the dad. The child feels pain in the womb and has a beating heart. That doesn't sound like tissue to me; that sounds like a child.

They are raising great issues that, quite frankly, science reinforces as well.

Last week, I had the opportunity to be able to stop by one of the great research facilities in Oklahoma. They are doing tremendous research on cancer, on MS, on Alzheimer's, and a lot more. I stopped by one of the labs and talked to one of the scientists there. They are actually doing research on zebra fish.

Now, as odd as this may sound, they are actually taking zebra fish eggs and developing those eggs. As they are first beginning to hash out of the eggs, they are injecting them with a gene that they know to be cancerous in humans, allowing that to be able to develop in the zebra fish and seeing the abnormalities there. Then, they try to treat it with different drugs to be able to see if once they get the abnormalities, they can reverse it. They are literally taking the zebra fish, creating problems, and seeing if they can fix them.

They are going into great detail. The microscopes, the work, the millions of dollars that have gone into this research are all for one simple thing—the ability to be able to cure diseases that affect human life.

As a culture, we have determined that life is valuable. Human life, especially, is valuable and precious. The challenge that we have is determining when that life begins. I and millions of others believe that life begins at conception, when that child has a different DNA than the mom or the dad. That tissue is not just the mom's tissue at that point; it is growing independently. There is no difference in that child in the womb and the child that is in the backyard playing, laughing, and going down the slide, other than time. There is no difference.

Last year, Cleveland Cavaliers' guard J.R. Smith and his wife had little Dakota. When I say "little Dakota," I mean little Dakota. She was born at less than 1 pound at 19 weeks of development. She left the hospital 5 months later at 7 pounds, 4 ounces—7 pounds, 5 ounces, actually.

When she left the hospital, it was a remarkable event. It was celebrated all over social media—this guard with the

NBA Cleveland Cavaliers and this beautiful child leaving.

Dakota is now 1 year old, and it has been interesting the stir that happened around her birth as a lot of people stopped and thought about a child that small and that young. It was interesting. The CNN articles that came out at the same time as little Dakota's birth noted that a child at 23 weeks of development has a 50 to 60 percent chance of survival now. Science has changed a lot over the last several decades. A lot has happened. It is remarkable to hear the stories of surgeries that are happening in utero.

In 1995, Roberto Rodriguez actually went through surgery still in the womb. He had major problems in his left lung, and at 20 weeks, they went in and did surgery in utero, fixing his left lung. It allowed him to finish out his term, and 13 weeks later he was delivered healthy. Little Roberto Rodriguez is now 22 years old.

This technology is not new anymore. In many ways, the science has far surpassed what were our conversations here in America dealing with policy around children.

Back in 1970, when the Supreme Court passed *Roe v. Wade*, they had this whole conversation about viability and that government has a right to be able to step in and protect children at the moment that they are viable. Well, in the 1970s, that was very different than what it is now. Now we see children at 21, 20, 22 weeks of development being born and being natural, healthy, great children. We need to be able to catch up in law.

We may disagree on a lot of things on life. As I have already stated, I believe life begins at conception. In this body, I know there are a lot of conversations, saying: How do we actually get to a sense of commonality and common ground on these issues.

Well, let me just lay down three different areas where I would say that maybe we could find some common ground on these three areas. Though we may disagree on when life begins, can we at least agree that Americans have the freedom of conscience? Can we at least agree on the late-term abortions, when a child is clearly viable? And can we at least agree that when a child is born alive, they should be protected? Let me just hit those three very quickly.

The first one is just basic freedom of conscience, allowing an individual to be able to live out their conscience. I spoke to several nurses just a few months ago. When those nurses were hired at the hospitals they worked in, they told the individuals in HR and the physicians they worked with that they believed life begins at conception and they had a moral and conscience belief that they wanted to protect children. They were told at that moment: You will not have to participate in abortions. We understand your conscience belief, and we will protect your conscience belief. For years, they did not.

Then, suddenly, they ran short in nurses at one moment, and they pulled each of them in at different times and in different hospitals and in different States. They told the stories that they had been pulled into a procedure, being told on the way in: We need you in this procedure—arriving only to find out it was an abortion they were being forced to assist with. They were appalled to be part of the death of a child rather than protecting the life of a child. Each of them was told: You will lose your job if you don't participate in the taking of this child's life. That is an unfair place to put them in.

Individuals should be able to have the freedom of conscience and should be able to live out their moral and spiritual beliefs. I would never go to an abortion doctor and force him to peacefully protest against his own abortion clinic. That would be absurd. But for some reason, pro-abortion hospitals see no issue in at times compelling a staff member to participate in something they find objectionable, even when they made their stance clear.

We should never force a person to administer a lethal injection in a prison if they have a moral objection to the death penalty. That seems only reasonable. We are rightfully furious when a man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't respond to his advances. No one would say that if she doesn't like his advances, she could just go find another job. But for some in our culture, they want to look away when that same man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't violate her conscience and help perform an abortion. They are willing to tell her: Just quit and go find another job. What is the difference?

We wouldn't compel a vegan to eat meat at the company barbecue, would we? Why would we compel a person to assist in the taking of a life when they are personally offended by the practice?

The right of conscience should be protected for every person. Religious intolerance is a personal choice, not a legal requirement in America.

Late-term abortions are another area where I think we should be able to find common ground, and we should be able to protect these children. We should agree that elective late-term abortions should be ended in America. This is an elective abortion after 5 months of pregnancy. When the child's nervous system is fully developed, they can feel pain at that point.

We in America, because of the pro-abortion lobby and the activists who are around them, have lost track of this simple fact: We are one of seven nations in the world that allow elective abortions after 22 weeks of gestation. In fact, of these seven nations that allow abortions after 22 weeks of gestation, three of them—Canada, Singapore, and the Netherlands—allow elective abortions only until 24 weeks, just 2 weeks later. But there are only four countries in the world that allow elective abortions at any moment. Are you

ready for this club? There are four nations that are like us: the United States, Vietnam, North Korea, and China. That is it. Those four nations allow elective abortions at any stage. That is a horrible club for the United States of America to be in. Those countries are some of the worst human rights violators in the world, and that is the elite club in which we find ourselves.

The pro-abortion lobby is so powerful and so wealthy, and they are so engaged, they are not willing to relent that even one child's life could be protected, even when they are clearly viable, leaving the United States in this horrible collection with Vietnam, North Korea, and China on abortion policy. At 5 months old, a child in the womb can kick, stretch, yawn, smile, suck its thumb, and feel pain. It is a viable child.

Late-term abortions represent only 1.3 percent of all abortions in America. I would contend we should stop this practice altogether. There are 191 nations that don't allow this—191 nations. There is no reason we should not as well.

This is interesting. The Washington Post heard several people quote that statistic about seven nations are the only nations that actually allow any abortions at this late stage. Those three that I mentioned—the Netherlands, Canada, and Singapore—allow them up to 24 weeks but not after that. So they ran their famous Fact Checker on this issue. The Washington Post ran through all of it and looked at it and said: This sounds like this is not correct. They ran through the whole study, looked at it, fact-checked the whole thing, and at the end of it came back and said: No, it actually is correct. What seemed a dubious statement in the beginning they fact-checked and gave what the Washington Post calls their elite Gepetto qualification—that means no Pinocchios; true statement.

We should be able to resolve this. I have made no secret that I believe that life begins at conception, but I would say to this group that not everyone agrees with me on this, but we should at least be able to protect life when it is viable.

Let me add one more detail to this that is painful to even discuss. Of those late-term abortions that occur—those 1.3 percent of abortions that occur during this late time period—the child is too large and too well developed to actually have a traditional abortion procedure, so the abortions are done by the abortion doctor reaching in with a tool into the womb and literally pulling the child's arms and legs off, allowing the child to bleed to death in the womb and then pulling its parts out a piece at a time. Why do we allow that in America? As I said, 191 other nations do not. All of Europe does not. When is the last time you heard me say our social policy needs to catch up with Europe? We are better than this.

One last statement, because I have some colleagues who want to join me

in this conversation. We should be able to agree on a simple principle: that if an abortion is conducted and it is botched and instead of destroying the child in the womb, the abortion doctor actually induces the delivery—in those rare cases, the current practice is, when the child is delivered, everyone in the operating room backs away and allows the child to die of exposure on the table, because they can't actually take the life anymore; it has been fully delivered.

Kermit Gosnell sits in prison right now because, as an abortionist in Philadelphia, he was in the practice of delivering children and then killing them after they were delivered. It is already a crime to physically take the life of that individual, so the current practice is, if they mess up the abortion and deliver instead of destroy, they just allow the child to die on its own, crying on the table. Can we as Congress and as Americans at least agree that it is barbaric to watch a crying child on the table slowly die; that at least at that moment of delivery, we would agree a child is a child when we can see all 10 of their fingers, see all 10 of their toes, and hear their voice crying on the table? This is an issue that shouldn't be controversial. This is an issue for which we should find great compassion.

I would challenge this body, when we deal with conscience and when we deal with late-term abortions and when we deal with children who are born alive, that we find resolution in those areas.

I am aware this is a difficult topic. I understand that for many people, this conversation is painful to even consider and that for the millions of American women who have experienced abortion in their personal lives, this is painful to even consider. But I am also aware that until we talk about these hard issues and resolve them, they will continue to advance.

We are better than this as a nation. Let's prove it in the way we treat our most vulnerable.

With that, I ask unanimous consent for colloquy time with some of my colleagues, and I would like to be able to recognize Senator BLUNT from Missouri.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here with the Senator from Oklahoma—and we are about to be joined by the Senator from Iowa—to talk about the topic Senator LANKFORD just said is difficult to talk about. When you actually stand up and explain what is going on, it is hard to imagine that we still let these things happen.

I would suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that we could talk about the fact that the minds of people have changed on this issue. Almost all change their minds once we explain the two things the Congress is focused on this year. Polling on this shows that I believe 63 percent of all Americans now

believe that these late-term abortions should not be allowed to occur.

As Senator LANKFORD pointed out so well, the countries that allow this to happen are not the countries whose social policies we would want to be aligned with, including China and North Korea, which have a stated purpose of eliminating children for no other reason than just population control, and they wind up eliminating more female children than male children in that process because apparently their belief is that the male child has more economic value going forward. Why would we want to be aligned with countries that look at these issues that way or just simply think the pain should be allowed?

The House has passed the pain-capable bill. Where are we now in the House on the born-alive bill? Is it to be voted on this week, or has it been voted on already?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the House passed both the pain-capable and the infant protection born-alive bills in prior months. The Senate has yet to take that up, and it is our hope in the Senate to be able to bring that up for real dialogue in conversations in the days ahead.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I think the pain-capable bill was passed by the House in October.

We have thousands of Americans coming this week, focusing on tomorrow, to talk about this issue. These two bills are two of their priorities, but of course their priority is to honor life. The March for Life is designed to do exactly that.

Clearly, the March for Life—now in its 45th year—is not a celebration. It is not an anniversary or a celebration; rather, it is a time to remember that there is a lot that we still need to do to ensure that our society is a society that values every human life no matter how small, no matter how vulnerable, no matter how little capacity that life has to protect itself. And the way that society, I think, has decided to deal with this is looking at things like partial-birth abortion, the description of which was every bit as bad as the dismembering abortions, but Congress stepped forward on that topic. Some people who performed that particular act didn't stop doing it, but they are in trouble when you find out they have done it.

So thousands of people from all over the country—in fact, tens of thousands of people; it is a number that I believe is always underreported. Based on looking at the March for Life crowd and any other crowds we see here, I guarantee that the final number—if you take any of those crowds and look at them, I believe there is a willingness to ignore the thousands of people who come in buses from all over the country, in the worst possible weather more years than not, to stand up and say: We don't want this to happen.

I think young people are increasingly more and more defensive of the idea of

life and more and more offended about the places where we have chosen not to draw the line. How can you possibly justify a baby who is born alive and the process that Senator LANKFORD just described where you can't take that life but you can step back and not do anything to save that life, or the uniquely troubled countries we are involved in that allow developed children—boys and girls, 10 fingers, 10 toes, the ability to feel pain—to inflict that pain on those children at that time.

The American people don't support this. Almost nobody who understands what is going on supports it. But if you are asked in polling, I think, as I said earlier, 63 percent—more than 6 out of 10 Americans—say: How can we be continuing to let that happen?

So supporting those who come here, responding to those who understand this—and certainly the two Senators on the floor here—the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Oklahoma are among the best advocates for life, among the best advocates for getting information out about life, about adoption, about what happens and what our laws allow and the laws of other countries don't allow.

Certainly I will be welcoming the March for Life this year in Missouri and other States. The Vice President last year became the first Vice President in the history of the country to speak to March for Life and made it clear where his views were and where the administration stands.

The missing component here to do the right thing is in Congress itself. We have an opportunity to step up and do that. We need to have this debate on the floor because people, once they enter into this debate, realize it is not a debate that they want to be in, because the wrong side of this is the side where slightly more than a handful of countries allow it to happen, what we allow to happen.

I am pleased to be here on the floor with Senator LANKFORD and Senator ERNST.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues from Oklahoma and Missouri, and we will be joined shortly by the Senator from Montana as well.

I am rising today to discuss the importance of protecting and celebrating life.

As I travel across the State of Iowa, I have had the opportunity to hear directly from families whose lives have been changed by the innovative, life-affirming services offered by their local pregnancy resource center. There are so many more stories of vulnerable lives saved all across the country, not just in Iowa but all across the country.

I would like to begin by recognizing the critical, on-the-ground actions of these pregnancy resource centers, maternity homes, and adoption agencies across the country that are changing and saving lives. I want to thank them for all they do.

Since coming to Washington, I have tried to hold Congress accountable to do its part to protect the most vulnerable in our society. The Senator from Missouri has mentioned that we can measure a society, and ours is a great society, but we can do more to protect those who are vulnerable. For example, last January, I introduced legislation to defund Planned Parenthood while protecting women's healthcare centers. As I have stated time and again, taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill for roughly half a billion dollars annually for an organization like Planned Parenthood that exhibits such disrespect for human life. Despite what they may claim otherwise, Planned Parenthood is not the Nation's preeminent provider of women's healthcare. For example, Planned Parenthood facilities don't even perform in-house mammograms. They don't do that. Community health centers, on the other hand, continue to greatly outnumber Planned Parenthoods. They provide greater preventive primary healthcare services, regardless of a person's ability to pay.

Additionally, last April, President Trump signed my legislation into law that ensures States are not forced to provide entities like Planned Parenthood—the Nation's single largest provider of abortions—with Federal title X dollars.

I am grateful to have worked with Congresswoman DIANE BLACK, a dear friend in the House; my Senate colleagues, who are with me here today; and President Trump to make sure States are not forced to award providers like Planned Parenthood with taxpayer dollars through title X family planning grants.

Another effort my colleagues and I continue to work on is passing Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Children Protection Act in the Senate. Whenever I discuss this bill, I cannot help but share the remarkable story of a very special family from Newton, IA.

In July 2012, Micah Pickering was born prematurely at just 20 weeks postfertilization—the very age at which this bill would prohibit abortions. When he was born, Micah was only—if you can imagine it—about the size of a bag of M&Ms, about the size of the palm of my hand. Yet Micah was still a perfectly formed baby with 10 fingers and 10 toes.

When I first met Micah, he was just a few years old, and he came to visit me in my office. We had a photo of Micah when he was just born. Again, folks, he was the size of the palm of my hand, a little bag of M&Ms. I had that photo in my office. Little Micah ran up to that photo, and he pointed at it and said: Baby.

And we said: Yes, Micah, that is a baby. That is a baby.

Just a few months ago, I had the opportunity to visit again with Micah and his parents in my DC office. I can attest that now at 5 years old, Micah remains a happy, healthy, energetic

little boy. Stories like Micah's show all of us that at 5 months, an unborn child is a child—just as Micah would say—a baby.

There is also significant scientific evidence that at 5 months of development, these babies can feel pain. Yet there is no Federal law protecting these vulnerable babies from abortion. As a result, every year in our country, the lives of thousands of babies just like Micah end painfully through abortion. Currently, the United States is 1 of only 7 countries to allow abortions at 5 months of gestation. We are in the company of China and North Korea. Folks, this is unacceptable.

There is much work to be done in the ongoing fight to protect life. We understand that. As folks from across the country travel to Washington to "March for Life" this week, I am urging my colleagues to join me in calling for a vote on this critical legislation that recognizes these unborn babies as the children they are and provides them the same protection from pain and suffering that all of our children deserve—again, as Micah Pickering would say, "a baby."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator SASSE to join us for this colloquy as well.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I say thank you very much to the Senator from Oklahoma and thanks to the Senator from Montana for spelling me. I have been sitting in the Presiding chair during this colloquy, so I have not been on the ground floor able to participate, but I would like to associate myself with this colloquy and with the leadership of the Senators from Oklahoma, Missouri, Iowa, and Montana.

I, too, know Micah, and it is an amazing thing. I wish all 100 Senators had a chance to know Micah and his family. I also want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, as he began this, that we are one of only four countries in the world that allow elective abortion at any time for any reason. Our peers in this are North Korea, China, and Vietnam, and it is a genuine shame. The American people need to understand that, and this body needs to grapple with that reality.

As the Senator from Missouri said, it is special to be a part of the rally and march over the next 36 hours because the college kids who are coming here understand this far better than the general public. There is a movement in this country to want to respect and celebrate life, and good things are happening generationally with this cause.

I want to associate myself with this colloquy and thank the Senator from Montana for spelling me from the chair. Thank you.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this is a difficult issue for so many people because it is intensely personal for so many people. We understand full well the grief some families have when this

topic comes up because there are millions of men and women who they know their child has been aborted. We get that. We want to have incredible compassion for them as they struggle through some of the most difficult decisions of their life. We understand that when they go to the mall and they watch a small child laugh in the food court of the mall, they wonder in the back of their head, "Would that have sounded like my child when they laughed?"

We get the grief they live with for the rest of their life as they process through what some physician told them was tissue, but in their heart they know was a child. This is a nation that can set some basic principles to help those individuals, to promote adoption, to be able to encourage those families and help walk alongside them. We are good at grace and compassion as a nation. We can continue to be better at it. One of the ways we have to be able to express that is for the most vulnerable, for those children who have yet to be born.

I would like to invite the Senator from Montana to also join in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I thank Senator LANKFORD for leading this very important conversation. I thank Senator BLUNT, Senator ERNST, and Senator SASSE for joining us today as well in this discussion.

Mr. President, 28 years ago, I became a first-time dad. By the grace of God, we got to see three more children born after our first child David was born. I can tell you, my wife Cindy and I were excited and a little bit terrified when we welcomed David into the world.

As a parent, one of the toughest things is to see your child in pain. I remember when David cried, I would have given an arm and a leg to stop that pain. I remember when he was just a little baby taking David to the pediatrician to get that shot and so forth, and the pain David felt and the screams and the crying I think were much harder on the parents than on the baby.

I think we all recognize the pain a child feels after they are born. As I have gone on and researched this issue of pain and babies and so forth, science tells us that a baby feels pain before they are born. Senator SASSE mentioned earlier that we are one of four nations that allows elective abortion at any time during a pregnancy. The question is, if we were 1 hour before delivery—the baby is 1 hour from being delivered—as a nation, can we at least agree that we should have a law that says abortions should not be allowed because it is pretty clear that the baby is going to feel pain? The question is, at what point do we know they feel pain during the pregnancy?

It is shocking to think our Nation loses 13,000 children a year to late-term abortions. We can have the debate

about all abortions, but today we are focused on late-term abortions. Thirteen thousand children a year die from late-term abortions. At 20 weeks, these babies can suck their thumb, they can yawn, they can stretch, they can make faces, and science shows these babies are also capable of feeling pain.

Our ears may be deaf to their cries, but we don't have to live in ignorance, not when research and even common sense tells us these unborn children feel pain. In fact, there is a reason unborn babies are oftentimes given anesthesia during fetal surgery. That is why we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is unconscionable that we are allowing unborn children as old as 20 weeks—that is 5 months—to be killed when they can feel pain. In fact, do a Google search. If you have a smartphone, are sitting in front of a computer, type in "20 weeks." You don't even have to type in "baby." Just type in "20 weeks." Then, take a look at the pictures, the images that come up after you complete that search. This is one of them. In fact, I had my smartphone last night. I said to my staff: I typed in "20 weeks" in the Google search, and this is the image that comes up.

How can we say that is not a baby? While much of the media turned a blind eye to the atrocious acts of Kermit Gosnell, and they didn't watch the horrific videos taken undercover at Planned Parenthood clinics, many of us did. We did watch, and we cannot sit in silence. Most of us would not wish that treatment on even our most hated of enemies, let alone a child of any age.

The United States is just one of seven countries that allows elective abortions after 20 weeks. It is not a good list to be on. It is the same list we share that has China and North Korea on it. As an American citizen, I believe in our founding principle that all men and women are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As a person of faith, I am called—we are called—to help the most vulnerable in our society. As a U.S. Senator, it is my honor to support this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there has just been a dialogue—a colloquy—here on the floor. I thank Senator DAINES from Montana, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, Senator ERNST from Iowa, and Senator SASSE from Nebraska for joining in a dialogue of this basic issue of life.

In 1973 this week, *Roe v. Wade* was passed by the Supreme Court in a split decision. We are still having this dialogue, and there is still an ongoing argument about looking into the womb. We know a lot more now—about times now—than they knew in 1973, and we know a lot more about the development of a child now than they knew in 1973. We are still having this ongoing debate that, I think, is a righteous de-

bate, quite frankly. I think it is entirely appropriate for us to be able to talk about these kinds of difficult issues and try to find some resolution. The American people have these dialogues, and we should have them here and be able to bring the debate to the forefront.

This is not about people whom we hate. It is always interesting to be able to get the dialogue and pushback from people who say: You just hate people because of whatever reason. It is not true. It is, actually, that we love children. That is really the issue. There is a vulnerable child in the middle of this conversation, and sometimes they don't seem to come up in the conversation about protecting rights or about giving people privacy. All of those things are wonderful euphemisms, but in the middle of that, there is a very small child who is being discussed. We are trying to elevate their voice—to literally speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. We think that is an appropriate role for government—to speak out for the most vulnerable and see if we can find justice for those individuals.

This week is not only the week that we have the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*; it is also the week that we celebrate Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. I would say that he is a terrific role model in this conversation. His basic teaching is that hate doesn't win over a friend, that only love can do that. Only love can transform an enemy into a friend. That is what we are trying to do.

To the people who oppose this idea, we get it. We can have that dialogue. They are not our enemies, though. Quite frankly, we want to respond to their comments in love and say, "Let's sit down and have a reasonable dialogue. Let's express our affection for children," and be able to talk about how valuable they really are in our society. Let's talk about adoption. Let's talk about ways to be able to continue to take care of them. In the middle of it, let's talk about a child as a child, not just as tissue that is random, because tissue that is just random doesn't suck its thumb and smile back at you. It doesn't stretch and yawn. It is a child who does that. We want to be able to have that conversation.

I would urge this body to stop ignoring what millions of the American people see as the issue. Let's talk about the child, and let's see where we are going to go. I think a good first step for us to be able to talk about this is with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, what we call the pain-capable bill, which deals with late-term abortions—very late, 5 months and later—and the issue of conscience.

Are we really going to compel people to perform procedures they find morally reprehensible in the destruction of a child rather than in the protection of a child? We should be able to find common ground on those.

Let's then keep the conversation going because it is a reasonable thing

for us to be able to discuss. If we cannot talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in this place, where can we talk about it?

Again, I thank my colleagues for participating and for their tenacity and their compassion and their affection for all Americans whether they agree or disagree on this issue. I appreciate very much their engagement.

I appreciate very much the volunteers who are scattered around the country right now who are serving women in some of the most difficult moments of their lives at crisis pregnancy centers, at women's resource centers, and other locations. They are volunteering; they are providing clothes; they are providing help; they are providing sonograms and pregnancy tests; and they are walking those families through those tough days. Thanks to those volunteers as well today, wherever they may be, and bless them for the ongoing work that they do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, access to healthcare is on the line today for 24,000 Montana children. The House of Representatives is working to pass legislation that will reauthorize a program called the Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as CHIP, for 6 years and will keep the government open. If passed, it will then come to us for a vote.

Why don't we take the opportunity before us to come together on issues we agree on instead of always fighting on what divides us? I think we can all agree on keeping Montana kids healthy.

Let me tell you a story about a family from Helena, MT, the A-Gee family.

Jaxon was a normal baby—a happy, healthy baby—until October of 2016, when he was just 8 months old. That is when he was first flown from Helena to Missoula's Community Medical Center's Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. He was deathly ill with a respiratory infection.

At that time, it was not clear why Jaxon had gotten so sick, but his parents soon learned that he had Leigh syndrome, a disease in which the body is not able to process energy properly, which leads to muscle weakness, swallowing problems, and severe illnesses with just a simple or a common cold. His parents quickly learned to manage his new feeding tube, to suction his mouth and his throat, and to put him on oxygen monitors at night.

Unfortunately, Jaxon has had five more serious infections. Each time, he has become ill. It has happened so quickly that he has had to be flown to Missoula even though he has a team of pediatricians, nurses, dietitians, speech therapists, and physical therapists who

are trying to help keep him from getting ill.

As Jaxon's mom would say, when Jaxon gets ill, the only way to keep him from having to be flown to Missoula is to get him seen by his pediatrician as soon as possible so that if he does get sick, it is relatively minor.

I can tell you that this family in Montana is grateful for Healthy Montana Kids, which is Montana's CHIP program. They are thankful for its providing Jaxon's insurance and the copay for his care and his medical supplies. His mom says that the insurance is what makes it possible to manage Jaxon's condition and possible to afford well-baby checks instead of their just going to the doctor's on an emergency basis.

To add more background to the story, Jaxon's dad was disabled in a workplace accident, so he is home, caring for Jaxon and the family's other two children. Jaxon's mom works, and her employer has been phenomenal to her—those are her words—as they have faced Jaxon's hospitalizations, but the family of five couldn't afford Jaxon's care without Healthy Montana Kids. A helicopter bill for the ride from Helena to Missoula alone can be as much as \$34,000, and Jaxon has taken that flight six times.

This family doesn't know what it will do if the funding for CHIP runs out, but the family is committed to caring for its son no matter what. That is why I support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP.

Let me provide another reason.

This is Danielle. She is 9 years old, and she lives in Deer Lodge, MT. When she was just 18 months old, she suddenly lost the ability to walk.

Cindy and I are the parents of four children. I cannot imagine a more frightening moment as a parent if one has an 18-month-old child, and he suddenly loses his ability to walk.

Danielle was diagnosed with a form of juvenile arthritis. You don't think about arthritis affecting an 18-month-old child. This is a disease that causes pain, swelling, a stiffness of joints, as well as vision problems.

Thankfully, Danielle was started on a medication—a twice-a-month injection that controls the swelling and inflammation. Because of that, she can walk and even run again. Yet these injections are expensive. To pay outright for just 1 month, it costs over \$6,000. Last summer, for 3 months, Danielle was unable to get the injections. She stopped walking, and she no longer could go to school. Her mom had to carry her through the house.

When Danielle was approved for Montana's CHIP program, she was able to go to the doctor's and get on another medication—an infusion this time. She is now back at school and running around—to quote Mom—"like a kid who doesn't have any problems." Danielle loves to study math and science, and when she grows up, of all things, her dream is to be a doctor for

kids. Without CHIP, Danielle's family would be unable to afford the medication she needs. Without CHIP, Danielle wouldn't be walking.

Danielle and Jaxon and the thousands of other Montana kids and their families need us to work for them. So I am saddened that partisan politics would get in the way of access to healthcare for these children. We have the opportunity today to reauthorize CHIP for 6 years and avert a government shutdown at the same time.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing here, to do the right thing for the 24,000 Montana kids who use this important program. I urge them to support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP and to keep the government open.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Vermont.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are at a pivotal moment. If the Congress does not get its act together by tomorrow, there will be a government shutdown. A government shutdown will be extraordinarily destructive to the people of our country, millions of whom depend upon government services. It will be destructive to millions of Federal employees who keep their families going with a paycheck from the government. It will be destructive to the U.S. Armed Forces, men and women who put their lives on the line to defend us. So it seems to me that we have to do everything we can to prevent a government shutdown.

As everyone knows, we have a Republican Party that controls the U.S. Senate, a Republican Party that controls the U.S. House of Representatives, and a Republican who is in the White House, President Trump. We are now 3½ months into the fiscal year, and the Republican Party has yet to give us an annual budget.

The U.S. Government is a \$3 trillion operation. There is no business in this country of any size that can run week to week, month to month. We need an annual budget, and now the Republicans are coming back, asking for a fourth continuing resolution. You cannot run a government like that. It is unfair to the American people, unfair to the Armed Forces, unfair to all of us.

Three and a half months have gone in the fiscal year; yet the Children's Health Insurance Program has not been reauthorized. This is a program that has existed for decades with bipartisan support. How can we not reauthorize the CHIP Program?

Three and a half months of the fiscal year have come and gone, and we have not reauthorized the Community Health Center Program, which provides primary healthcare, dental care, mental health counseling, low-cost prescription drugs to 27 million Americans