

America. The developments in the last 24 hours basically say that with respect to healthcare, it is not going to be patient-centered care, but it is going to be politics-centered care.

Now, that patient-centered care concept was one of the most common talking points I remember hearing again and again. We heard it in the Finance Committee, where I have the honor to be the ranking Democrat. We heard it again and again: We are going to have patient-centered care. It was part of the crusade to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The whole point of that patient-centered care slogan was to say that the government shouldn't come between patients and their doctors and that it wasn't going to be about politics; it was going to be about patients—making sure that politics and the government didn't come between patients and their doctors.

So here we are now, a few months later, and the Trump administration has just decided point-blank that it will decide what is best for women in Oregon and across the country. They basically said that they ought to be able to gag doctors and deny women the right to hear about healthcare options that, fortunately, are perfectly legal in America today.

The fact is, this new decree—this dictate—from the Trump administration comes with a battery of new restrictions on healthcare clinics that millions of women depend on every single day. We all know what it is about. It is an attack on Planned Parenthood. It is an attack on vital sources of care for women.

As I have said on this floor—I have gone through it again and again—the vast amount of work done by Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with abortion. It is all about vital preventive services for women, which, by the way, are especially important in rural areas.

I am sure we are going to be talking about women's healthcare tomorrow in the Senate Finance Committee, where we will be having a hearing specifically on rural healthcare. There is bipartisan interest in that topic, but I want colleagues to know, it is pretty hard to promote all of the opportunities for sound healthcare and bipartisanship when you have a decision from the Trump administration that has the potential to hit women's healthcare in rural communities like a wrecking ball.

In States like Oregon, thousands of women live in communities where there is not a clinic or a doctor's office every few miles. If the Trump administration finds a backdoor way to shutter the few options these women have today, they may not have anywhere else to turn to get the essentials of healthcare. Women could lose the right to see the doctor of their choosing.

I will just say it point-blank: If somebody wants to take away the right of women in America to see the doctors and the providers of their choice, they

are going to have to run over me. I will tell you, I think women are going to win that fight.

To have women lose access to life-saving services like cancer screenings, routine physicals, birth control, prenatal care, and so much more—that ought to be off the table for politics. It shouldn't be about Democrats and Republicans; it should be about common-sense approaches to ensure that women have all of the options for the healthcare they want and deserve.

Taking healthcare choices away from women is fundamentally wrong. Depriving women of essential healthcare information that they have every right to hear about is fundamentally wrong. The Trump administration putting itself between women and their doctors is fundamentally wrong.

The decision that came down last night, which we learned about last night, is a reckless one. It is a harmful one. We ought to make no mistake about it, it is going to make healthcare worse for women across the country.

I have now had to say it too many times to count: It is long past time for these attacks on women's healthcare to end. I hope it will not be necessary to come to this floor again.

The Trump administration will see how flawed the decision—the dictate—that came down last night is and will retract it. But until they do, I will come to this floor and make the case for ensuring that women are empowered in our country to be able to see the healthcare providers of their choice, to have the opportunity to access the vast array of services that are largely preventive from sea to shining sea.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on September 5, 2017, President Trump announced the repeal of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. As a result of that, hundreds of thousands of immigrants who came to the United States as children and are known as Dreamers have faced losing their work permits and face deportation to countries they barely remember.

DACA provided temporary legal status to Dreamers only if they registered with the government, paid a fee of almost \$500, and passed a thorough criminal background check. This DACA Program has been a success. More than

800,000 Dreamers have come forward and received DACA protection, which has allowed them to become a part of the only country they have ever called home.

Many of these Dreamers were brought here as infants and toddlers, raised in this country, pledging allegiance to that flag. They believed they were part of America, and usually at some point when they became teenagers, their parents gave them the terrible news that they were undocumented.

When President Trump decided 8 months ago to repeal DACA, he set March 5 as the deadline for the final expiration of the DACA Program. However, two Federal courts have stepped in and issued orders blocking the President's repeal of this DACA executive order. This means that Dreamers who have DACA can continue to apply to renew their status for now.

I urge every DACA recipient to file their renewal application immediately. The Trump administration is doing everything in its power to fight this court protection, and that court protection could be lifted any day. This means there is a need for Congress to do something.

Again, I urge the Republicans who control Congress to immediately pass the Dream Act—bipartisan legislation I first introduced 17 years ago that would finally give these Dreamers a path to becoming citizens of the United States.

The reality is that tens of thousands of Dreamers are already at risk of losing their work permits and being deported. The Department of Homeland Security Secretary, Kirstjen Nielsen, has promised me that her Department will not deport any DACA recipient with a pending DACA application, even if their status expires. I am going to hold her to that commitment because lives hang in the balance.

However, for DACA recipients whose status has expired, the Department will not authorize them to work unless and until their DACA is renewed. This means that tens of thousands of DACA-eligible individuals could be forced to leave their jobs while their applications are pending and before the renewals are approved.

Then consider the fate of Dreamers who are eligible for DACA but never quite reached that status. They can no longer apply for protection because of President Trump's decision to prohibit new DACA applications after September 5, 2017. For example, a child turning 15—the youngest age at which you can apply for DACA—is now blocked from applying. The non-partisan Migration Policy Institute estimates that in addition to 800,000 DACA recipients, there are an additional 1 million Dreamers who are eligible. Thanks to President Trump's harsh decision to end DACA, 1.8 million Dreamers are at risk of deportation and cannot work to support themselves or contribute to the country they love.

On September 5, Trump called on Congress to “legalize DACA.” But since then, he has rejected six bipartisan proposals to achieve that. He has even rejected a \$25 billion bipartisan offer to build his border wall. Mexico, of course, was supposed to pay for that wall.

We provided the money in a bill that also provided protection for the Dreamers. The President rejected it. Instead, he has tried to put the entire hard-line immigration agenda on the backs of the Dreamers. President Trump has said that he will support legalization for Dreamers only if Congress passes his plan, which would, among other things, cut legal immigration to the United States by more than 40 percent.

There are people within this administration and some within the Senate who really despise immigrants, and you can see it. They want to cut legal immigration to the United States. That would be the largest cut in immigration in almost 100 years.

Earlier this year, the Senate decided to vote on President Trump’s plan—the one he supports. It failed; it failed badly when 39 Senators voted for it, and 60 voted against it. President Trump is holding Dreamers hostage to an immigration plan that is so extreme that many of his own party members do not support it.

Over the years, I have come to the floor of the Senate more than 100 times to tell the stories of Dreamers. I could give these speeches endlessly. I don’t think they have the impact of coming to know the young people who are engaged and involved and at risk in this political debate.

This is Dalia Larios, the 114th Dreamer I have introduced on the floor of the Senate. She was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was 10 years old. She grew up in Mesa, AZ. She remembers celebrating the Fourth of July, going to school dances, and of course, watching the Super Bowl.

Her parents were hard workers who usually had two or three jobs. They taught her that although there were many things she could not control, she could control how long she studied and how much time she devoted to school. She did; Dalia graduated from high school in the top 1 percent of her class. She was named the most outstanding life science student in school. Not only did she excel academically, she completed over 150 hours of community service.

She is a remarkable young woman. She started an after-school dance program for at-risk children and was the first place State champion in both French and constitutional debate.

Dalia then attended Barrett, the Honors College at Arizona State University. She majored in biological sciences—specifically genetics, cell, and developmental biology. She continued her community service volunteering as an English and biology tutor at a number of health clinics. Dalia

graduated with a perfect 4.0 GPA and received a number of awards, including the School of Life Sciences award for plant-based research on cervical and breast cancer vaccines.

Today, Dalia is a fourth year medical student at Harvard Medical School. She is researching lung cancer and lung transplants at Brigham and Women’s Hospital and the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute.

In 2016 she won the Robert Ebert Prize for Healthcare Delivery Research or Service for her work on designing a student-led health coaching program to improve health outcomes in complex diabetic patients, and what did she dream to be? A cardiothoracic surgeon.

Dalia wrote me a letter. She said:

For many, DACA may be a political bargain. For me, it is my life. And [because of DACA,] for the first time ever, I have been able to live a life that is not just rooted in dreams but rather the realization of those dreams. It has been a gateway to change, inclusion and meaningful integration into the country I call home and desperately hope to serve.

At least 65 additional Dreamers were enrolled in medical school this last school year, but without DACA these Dreamers could be deported back to their countries, where they haven’t lived since they were little kids. Will America be a stronger country if we ask Dalia to leave—this Harvard Medical School graduate, who wants to be a cardiothoracic surgeon? If we tell her, “We don’t need you; go to some another country,” are we better off for that? Of course, not. We are stronger to have people like Dalia in the United States.

The Association of American Medical Colleges states that the Nation’s doctor shortage is going to continue. Both the AMA and the Association of American Medical Colleges have warned that ending DACA could make it even harder to deal with the physician shortage in the United States. They caution that President Trump’s reversal in policy “could have severe consequences for many in the health care workforce, impacting patients and our nation’s health care system.”

I personally think it would be a tragedy to deport someone like Dalia, who has so much to contribute to America.

President Trump created the DACA crisis. Instead of working toward a solution, he has sabotaged every effort we have made to support and save the Dreamers. Now it is up to the Republican majority in Congress to accept one of the six bipartisan solutions on the table to save these young people.

Congress should do its job and make the Dream Act the law of the land, or we are going to be responsible for the fate of wonderful young women like this. This amazing young woman could be saving lives in America as a surgeon, or we can deport her back to Mexico. What sense would that make?

Currently, the U.S. House of Representatives is debating when and if to return to the immigration debate. It is fortunate that 20 Republicans have had

the courage to step up so far, and I hope more will join them to say: We have to do something. We can’t just let this happen without an effort to pass a bill to solve the problem.

The same thing could be said of the Senate. That is why I am hoping that at the end of the day, we can put this kind of Dream Act and DACA bill back into active consideration on the floor of the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1615

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as in legislation session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1615; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an issue on which Congress needs to act. Congress does, in fact, have authority to pass laws governing immigration and naturalization within our system, but this particular unanimous consent request represents an attempt to pass a major piece of legislation without any opportunity for debate, any opportunity for input from the American people, or any opportunity for amendments by individual Members. If we pass it this way, we will be cutting the American people out of the debate.

Moreover, we also need to address the draws for illegal immigration. If we are going to address the needs of those who have been brought here unlawfully by no fault of their own while they were infants or minors, we need to make sure that we are not going to continue to draw people in unlawfully and that we are not going to continue to have people in various parts of the world sending their children here unlawfully, unaccompanied on many occasions and being subjected to sexual assault and all other kinds of abuse in the process. We do need to fix the underlying problem.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am just going to respond briefly.

The bill that I asked to be called today for a vote was debated at length over a period of 17 years with numerous committee meetings. This is not an open-ended bill. There is a deadline. To qualify for it, one must have been in