

found several photographs of her daughter—not photographs she wanted to see, but on the other hand, there was her daughter alive. She said: My first reaction was relief that she was alive. Then, of course, I called backpage, and I said: I found my daughter. She is on your site. She is 14 years old. Please take her ad down.

Backpage said: Did you pay for the ad?

She said: No, I didn't pay for the ad. That is my daughter. She is 14 years old.

They said: No, we can't take down the ad. You didn't pay for it.

Can you imagine?

She was eventually reunited with her daughter. And there is a film called "I am Jane Doe" in which she and other women, mothers and young women, are featured. You can see more about her story and what a brave woman she is because she is now standing up to it. She filed a lawsuit, but the lawsuit was not successful because the judge said there is this immunity.

By the way, the courts that have ruled that these websites are protected by this Federal law have said that Congress ought to do something about that. Most recently, last August, a Sacramento judge dropped charges against backpage, stating: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

To me that is an invitation for Congress to act, saying: We get it; they are exploiting human beings online, but this Federal law gives them immunity.

This immunity was put in place 21 years ago in an effort to try to ensure that we could have a free internet, and that is very important, but it was never intended to provide immunity to illegal activity like this—certainly not to keep people in the business of sex trafficking.

That injustice is why we introduced our legislation. It is called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA. I introduced it with Senators BLUMENTHAL, MCCAIN, McCASKILL, CORNYN, HEITKAMP, and others. Senators THUNE and NELSON took this bill through the Commerce Committee late last year.

We had a spirited debate in that committee, and it ended up coming out of the committee with a unanimous vote. Why? Because after hearing from the victims, after hearing from the experts on both sides, the Senators said: Whoa. This doesn't make any sense. As Senators, it is our responsibility to change this law.

It provides justice for victims of online sex trafficking because they will have the opportunity to sue. It holds these websites accountable that knowingly facilitate crimes. It also helps in terms of prosecutions because the State prosecutors now—the AGs, the local prosecutors at the State level—

will be able to have access now to the courts to be able to take on these websites and, again, hold them accountable. The prosecutions, again, have been thwarted because of this immunity.

These are very narrow changes. They don't affect the freedom of the internet at all. In fact, I would argue it helps to ensure a free internet. To take care of these bad actors and by holding these folks accountable, it is going to provide the justice the victims deserve.

It is a fair and commonsense approach, and that is why it has the support not just of the Members I have mentioned but actually, now, 66 or 67 Members of the U.S. Senate. That is out of 100 Members. That is a rare thing to have that kind of support. It has the majority of the Republicans on board. It has the majority of the Democrats on board.

It is a fair and commonsense approach that is going to make a real difference in the lives of the people we represent. It will be effective at curbing this increase in trafficking that we see online. Every day we don't act, there are more women and more children who are being trafficked unnecessarily.

It also has the support of an extraordinary coalition of law enforcement organizations, anti-trafficking advocates, survivors, faith-based groups, civil rights communities, major businesses, and even some members of the tech community that initially pushed back against this legislation. Looking at it, I think many of them realized this is not a defensible position to say we shouldn't amend this Federal law that is providing immunity to these bad actors.

Members of the U.S. Senate who have cosponsored the bill, including colleagues of mine who are in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, are saying: I want to be part of the solution. They are showing some courage, and I appreciate that. People who have really shown courage are these survivors—these children and these women who have been trafficked—and they need our help.

We need 60 votes to pass most things around here. In this case, we will have some objections, apparently, and so having 66 or 67 supporters of this legislation is a key number. It enables us to ensure that we can get this onto the floor and passed on the floor. So why are we waiting? We shouldn't wait. We should move this month, during Human Trafficking Awareness Month, Human Trafficking Prevention Month. We should move because it is the right thing to do for these victims and those who might be victims between now and when we act. It is the right thing to do because it will create a safer and a better and a more just society. Elected officials like us are elected to do just that.

There were hundreds of sex trafficking survivors on Capitol Hill last week, and I met with them. The stories

will break your heart. Some were the parents, some were trafficking victims themselves. They have shown great courage by sharing their stories, bringing their tragedy public, and now we owe them the opportunity to get this legislation passed, to ensure that we can protect some of the most vulnerable among us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Indiana.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to Hoosiers: protecting our unborn children. Right now, Hoosiers from across the State of Indiana are traveling to Washington, DC, to take part in tomorrow's March for Life. This annual event brings together the unsung heroes of the life movement—those who have dedicated their lives to saving innocent children.

Now, despite what is often portrayed in the media, life-affirming principles are supported by a majority of Americans. A poll by POLITICO and the Harvard T.H. Chan School for Public Health showed that 58 percent of Americans—almost three in five Americans—oppose allowing Medicaid funding to be used for abortion.

According to the Quinnipiac University polling, 60 percent of Americans, including 46 percent of Democrats, support Federal legislation limiting abortion after 20 weeks.

I am proud to cosponsor the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This act would protect unborn children at 20 weeks postfertilization—the point at which scientific evidence proves abortion inflicts pain.

It is estimated that this commonsense legislation will save roughly 12,000 to 18,000 babies annually, and it will not apply, incidentally, to cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at risk.

Before being elected to the U.S. Senate, I sat on the board of directors of Hannah House. This is in Bloomington, IN, where I live. It offers women loving support during pregnancy.

I further spent 2 years as a smalltown attorney in little Paoli, IN, and I offered free legal services for parents who wanted to adopt. So you can see why I am very passionate about helping children find loving homes and helping caring adults become parents. I have seen firsthand, through my own experiences, the importance of advocating for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

The United States is one of only seven countries in the world that allows abortions after 20 weeks. This list includes human rights violators like China and North Korea. This isn't company we want to keep.

During this time, when there is principled disagreement on so many

issues—Republicans disagreeing with Democrats, conservatives disagreeing with progressives, surely, we can come together and take action that a significant majority of Americans want. So I am hopeful this critical legislation will receive a vote on the Senate floor very soon.

Thank you.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the Senate and the House right now are struggling to pass yet another short-term continuing resolution to avoid a Federal shutdown at midnight on Friday. For nine consecutive years now, since I have gotten to the Senate, we have begun the fiscal year without regular appropriations bills being enacted into law. If we pass another continuing resolution this week, it will be the fourth continuing resolution for fiscal year 2018. There were three CRs, or continuing resolutions, for fiscal year 2017. This “government by CR” is chaotic and it is disruptive. It is inflicting real damage on our Armed Forces, as well as on critical domestic programs that benefit people across this country.

I live in a very small town in New Hampshire called Madbury, and if our board of selectmen in Madbury committed this kind of budgetary malpractice, we would get rid of them.

The fact is that the frantic scramble to pass a new CR by midnight on Friday is yet another manufactured crisis here in Washington. It is a crisis that is completely unnecessary. The Appropriations Committees in both Houses of Congress have completed their work in a thoughtful, timely manner. In this Congress, the House passed all 12 of its appropriations bills out of committee. In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee passed 8 of our 12 bills, and we did that with overwhelming bipartisan support. The only reason we didn't report the other four bills out of committee is because the leadership directed us to stop.

So let's be very clear. This is not about appropriators not being able to get our work done and not being able to agree on what we want to do. This is about the leadership in Congress—the Republican majority—which has refused to allow us to go forward with a regular order budget process. The House, the Senate, and the White House are all controlled by Republicans, and if they wanted to complete the appropriations process in a timely manner, we could have done so, and we could have done it with bipartisan support.

Now, I am especially concerned about the damage that government by CR is inflicting on our Armed Forces and national security. Those of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee were disturbed by testimony from the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM John Richardson, in September of 2016. He said: “Our ability to achieve true effectiveness and efficiency has been undermined by budget instability, workforce limitations, and eight—now likely nine”—and it was nine—“straight years of budget uncertainty and continuing resolutions.”

I remember when Admiral Richardson came and spoke to the Navy caucus, and we were asking him what his concerns were. He said: Well, you know, my biggest concern is budget certainty, and what we tell everybody in the Navy now to figure on is to figure that they can't do anything in the first quarter of a fiscal year because they are going to be operating under a continuing resolution.

He pointed out: “This compromises our mission, and drives inefficiency and waste into all that we do.”

In a similar vein, the Army Chief of Staff, GEN Mark Milley, has repeatedly warned us of the damaging impacts that budget uncertainty has on the Army's combat readiness. Training cycles are disrupted, and sometimes they are discontinued. All non-mission-critical maintenance is postponed for the length of a CR.

Now, I share the views of many in this Congress that we need to increase support for our military. We live in an uncertain world, where we are facing security threats from ISIS to Russia and North Korea, and we could go down a long list. We must be prepared to respond, but we can't increase military spending at the expense of funding our domestic needs.

When it comes to funding domestic needs, no challenge is more urgent and frightening than the nationwide opioid epidemic. In my State of New Hampshire, nearly everyone has a heart-breaking story of a family member, a friend, or a colleague whose life has been destroyed by opioids. We can just look at these headlines and see what the challenge is. This is on August 16, 2017, from our State newspaper, the Concord Monitor, in the capital: “N.H. drug overdose deaths—mostly from fentanyl—continue at a high rate.”

The CDC recently said that New Hampshire has the highest overdose death rate from fentanyl, the third highest in the country. Nationwide, in 2016, more than 63,000 Americans died from overdoses—more than 63,000 people. If we were losing that many Americans to a disease outbreak, to a war in the Middle East or elsewhere, there would be an outcry in Congress and we would pass legislation to address the crisis in a matter of days. Well, this current funding crisis is an opportunity for us to address the opioid epidemic.

In recent weeks, along with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator

HASSAN, I have urged the Senate to make an immediate emergency \$25 billion Federal investment in treatment and prevention—a down payment on a sustained, reliable funding stream to support efforts by States and communities. At long last, we could provide a response that is commensurate with the magnitude of this public health crisis.

There is bipartisan support in this body and throughout Congress to address the opioid epidemic. President Trump promised when he was campaigning, and since he became President, that he was going to work to end this epidemic. Yet we are still waiting to see the resources that States and communities need.

Now, last week many of us watched with great anticipation when President Trump invited bipartisan representatives from both the House and Senate, and the television cameras, to talk about how we were going to address the funding situation that we are in, and how we were going to address DACA—those young people who were brought to this country through no fault of their own and are now in a situation where they don't have citizenship and they don't have a way forward.

Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN spent four months negotiating an excellent, bipartisan agreement to strengthen border security and to give Dreamers the path to citizenship that they deserve. The President, in that meeting that we all watched said: Bring me a solution, and I will sign it.

Well, they reached an agreement that would likely pass in the Senate with at least 60 votes. Last week, President Trump applauded the deal. He invited Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN to the White House to finalize it. And when they got there, they were shocked to find that the President had completely reversed himself.

This morning, Senator GRAHAM was stating the obvious when he said: “We do not have a reliable partner in the White House.”

Well, we do have reliable partners in this body. Give us that bill. Let us vote on it. Let's send it to the President, and let the President veto it if he doesn't like it.

Yesterday, Majority Leader MCCONNELL said: “As soon as the President figures out what he is for, then I will be convinced that we are not just spinning our wheels but actually dealing with a bill that can become law.”

Well, again, we have a bipartisan deal on DACA. Let's vote on it.

There are very real consequences to the constant chaos, turmoil, and policy reversals that have become the new normal under this President. We must commit ourselves on a bipartisan basis to restoring order to the appropriations process. It is time to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to pass full-year appropriations bills that address the needs of the American people.

As we work to resolve this current fiscal impasse, any agreement should include a number of basic provisions.