

here. You needed to have a budget done on time. Maybe you might lapse a day—what would have been for us last October—but you couldn't get beyond that. You couldn't do that in the State legislature for the State budget, couldn't do it on the city council, couldn't do it on the school board. Families can't do it in their own lives. We shouldn't do it on behalf of the 320-some-odd million people who call America home.

Now, the CR—this continuing resolution to keep the government open one more time, for the fourth time; not the first time, not the second time, not the third time but the fourth time because we are all basically about tax cuts for the wealthy but not taking care of everybody in terms of government funding—kicks the can down the road again without making the necessary investments into our communities. It continues the chaos and the dysfunction that has defined the last year of Republican control. It doesn't fund community health centers, something I am so proud of in my home State of New Jersey—federally qualified health centers. They take everybody who comes through the door—all taken. You have insurance? Great. You don't have insurance? We will take care of you. You have Medicaid or Medicare? Fine. Bottom line, a system that delivers quality healthcare. This doesn't do it. It leaves them in the lurch out there.

The CR doesn't set budget numbers to fund national security or domestic investment priorities. We talk about our national defense—and, yes, I am one of those who is willing to plus-up national defense—but guess what, the nondefense side of the budget is about homeland security, the FBI, the Secret Service, the Treasury Department, the National Institutes of Health that protects us in terms of illnesses, the CDC—all of these elements are in the domestic discretionary side of the budget so they are important, too, but we don't fund budget numbers that allow the national security or domestic investment priorities to take place.

I heard Leader MCCONNELL say last night that the CR is about helping all Americans. Well, I will tell you, it doesn't do squat for the 3.5 million Americans who call Puerto Rico their home and who are suffering in an appalling human catastrophe in the wake of devastating storms. It doesn't adequately assist communities in Texas and Florida and Western States that are ravaged by fires that are still waiting for Congress to act on disaster relief. Even the Secretary of Defense's spokesperson said we have been working under a continuing resolution for 3 years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow. This is wasteful. This is the Secretary of Defense's spokesperson: This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully funded fiscal year 2018 budget or face ramifications for our military.

I would add that these young people—many of them who wear the uni-

form of the United States and are willing to risk their lives and die for the country that seems to want to reject them—they deserve an opportunity to have a resolution at last.

Let me just say, I know the President has said that maybe the country needs—would benefit from a good shutdown. I don't ever think there is a good shutdown. I know, in the past, when President Obama was in the White House, then Mr. Trump said: Oh, it is the President who is the leader. It is the President who has to bring everybody into the room. It is the President who has to get people to come to a conclusion.

Well, you showed up late in the game—very late in the game—the final hours.

Finally, I think all of us who have been around either this institution or the Congress know that you need 60 votes in the U.S. Senate. I have compromised many times on foreign policy. I compromised with my colleagues to try to achieve a solution for the DACA legislation. There were hard choices to be made and things I don't like, but I compromised. Let me tell you something. Sixty votes, you don't even have your 60 votes. Two of our Republican colleagues have said—I understand why because they don't want to keep kicking the can down the road: No, we are not going to vote for this. One of our colleagues is infirm, not here. So they are not anywhere even near their numbers.

So that means, when you need 60 and you are far from it, that you have to engage in a negotiation and a compromise. It is not just stick it and accept it because when that happens, then we are on the dangerous path that when this short-term resolution doesn't solve itself—if we agree to a month—then ultimately we will have another CR, and maybe we will like even less what is in that CR. Maybe there will be language that we will find particularly problematic. Maybe there will even be numbers we don't care for.

The point is, if you know you need 60, you don't wait until the final hours to try to come to a negotiation.

I would rather live a day on my feet than a life on my knees, in defense of the 9 million people who call New Jersey home, to make sure they get what they need, not what I am shafted to try to have to accept.

So I personally am for a very short-term resolution that makes leadership and the White House and all of us, as far as I am concerned, stay here working to achieve what the American people deserve, which is a full funding of their government—no more short-term lurching from crisis to crisis. This is an opportunity to take care of those Americans who have been hurt in hurricanes and storms and fires and the people of Puerto Rico; an opportunity to give Dreamers their dream; an opportunity to fund our public health centers; an opportunity to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program

not for 6 years but for a decade. We have seen study after study that says we could save millions if we funded it over a decade. Why should we not save millions?

This is an opportunity to deal with the pensions that people who worked a lifetime and, through no fault of their own, now find themselves possibly shortchanged. Let's help them retire with the dignity they deserve.

This is an opportunity to make sure the National Institutes of Health—which is doing ground-breaking research on the Alzheimer's that took my mother's life, on the Parkinson's that affects our neighbors, on the diseases that affect our people, but you can't do long-term trials if you don't know what your funding is going to be. The list goes on and on.

The people of America deserve far better than what they are getting, and I reject the proposition that you can just stick it to us and suggest that we have to accept it. You create the crisis and then you want us to accept it.

Well, it is time to get the job done on behalf of the American people. That is why some of us will not support a longer term funding resolution, because all it will do is get us right back to where we are today. The American people deserve much more than that.

They deserve that, and there is no reason we can't deliver that.

With that, I yield the floor.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

---

#### NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint, PN1355.

I will object because the Department of the Treasury has failed to respond to a letter I sent on September 29, 2017, to a bureau within the Department seeking documents relevant to an ongoing investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Despite several phone calls between committee staff and Treasury personnel to prioritize particular requests within that letter, the Treasury Department has to date failed to provide any documents.

My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Ryder in any way. However, the Department must recognize that it has an ongoing obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

---

#### MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the Iowans who have traveled to the Capitol today to be with us for the March for Life.

I commend them and the many other Americans who have traveled here

from every corner of the country to embrace the sanctity of life. Their participation in this march symbolizes their compassion and concern for the most innocent and vulnerable among us.

I also want to call on my colleagues to join us in supporting the immediate passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This common-sense measure, which I have cosponsored, recognizes that the government has an interest in protecting the unborn from the excruciating pain they are capable of experiencing during a late-term abortion.

Some people call this measure “Micah’s Law,” in honor of an Iowa boy, Micah Pickering, who was born at 20 weeks postfertilization. I have met Micah and his parents. Micah didn’t just survive. He is a beautiful little boy who is thriving.

Research suggests that, after the fifth month of pregnancy, the nervous system of the unborn child has developed to the point where that child is capable of detecting and responding to painful stimuli. This also is around the time when the unborn baby is soothed by the mother’s voice. We are hearing that babies may learn within the womb, absorbing language sooner than we previously thought, so it should surprise no one that these same unborn babies can experience intense pain during a late-term abortion when their limbs are being torn apart in their mother’s wombs.

Currently, the United States is one of only about seven countries in the world that permit elective abortions past 5 months. Among the very few that embrace late-term abortions are Vietnam, Singapore, and North Korea. Passing this bill, which imposes restrictions only on elective abortions and only after the fifth month of pregnancy, would bring the United States in line with the vast majority of countries around the globe. Lawmakers in these other countries have grasped the concept that late-term abortions are essentially barbaric and often unnecessary.

Many of my colleagues actively supported the Americans with Disability Act. How could you support a measure like that and not also seek to protect the unborn babies whose parents might choose to end their lives late in pregnancy merely due to a disability like Down syndrome? I believe that the lives of unborn babies with this condition have the same value as those of other unborn babies.

If you do not support restrictions on abortions after the fifth month of pregnancy, when infants at the same stage of development are being born prematurely and, like Micah Pickering, surviving long term, then what, exactly, is your limit—if any—on abortion?

I remind my colleagues that the American people overwhelmingly support restrictions on late-term abortions. Numerous States, including

Iowa, already have passed similar legislation to protect the unborn baby who is capable of experiencing pain.

In 2016, I convened a congressional hearing at which two doctors testified in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. We learned that about a quarter of the babies born prematurely, around 5 months, will survive long term if given proper medical assistance.

One of the doctors who testified, Colleen Malloy, is an associate professor in the pediatrics department at Northwestern University’s School of Medicine. According to Dr. Malloy, by 20 weeks of development, the unborn baby’s pain receptors are present and linked. As further explained by Dr. Malloy, at 20 weeks’ fetal age, premature babies are “kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. We can easily witness their humanity, as well as their experiences with pain.”

Dr. Anthony Levatino, a practicing gynecologist with decades of experience, testified similarly at a House hearing several years ago. Dr. Levatino estimates that he performed over 1,000 abortions in private practice, until his adopted daughter died in a car crash. His child’s death was a life-changing event that led him to stop performing abortions. Performing an abortion on a 24-week-old unborn child is undoubtedly painful for that baby, Dr. Levatino testified. Scientific studies confirm that the unborn can experience pain after the fifth month.

The Judiciary Committee in 2016 also heard testimony from Dr. Kathi Aultman, a former abortion provider. She told us, an “abortionist knows exactly what he or she is doing because they must count the body parts after each procedure” to make sure they have cut the whole baby out of the mother.

Dr. Aultman also questioned why an unborn baby who can live outside the womb should be given no consideration, no protection, and no rights just because the child is unwanted, and she is right. Why shouldn’t we have compassion for babies whose nervous systems are developed enough for them to experience pain? Why shouldn’t we protect them from dismemberment with steel tools?

This is a measure that the majority of Americans—including a majority of women—broadly support. Once again, I urge my colleagues to embrace the sanctity of innocent human life and vote for this landmark legislation.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING CAPTAIN JOHN YOUNG

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we are on the eve of a new era of space exploration. We are constructing the world’s largest rocket and a deep space capsule

to send humans to Mars. Two new commercial crew capsules are under construction to ferry astronauts to and from the International Space Station starting later this year. Huge industrial complexes to manufacture and process new rockets and satellites are being built in record speed to further advance America’s leadership in space.

The successes of space exploration today are built upon the brave efforts of NASA’s past pioneers. I am saddened to note that, on January 5 of this year, we lost one of those national heroes, astronaut and retired U.S. Navy CAPT John Young.

Captain Young has been called the astronaut’s astronaut. Indeed, if you ask around the astronaut corps who they most looked up to, my guess is John Young’s name would come up quite a bit.

Captain Young was among the second group of astronauts chosen for the early space program. He flew to space six times, the only astronaut to fly in the Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle programs. In addition to walking and driving a rover on the surface of the moon, Captain Young commanded the very first space shuttle mission.

Taking off like a rocket and landing like an airplane, the space shuttle could not be tested in space without a crew. It was perhaps the riskiest flight, spaceflight ever endeavored; yet whether it was landing on the Moon or rocketing off the pad in the space shuttle, Captain Young was the essence of cool, his heart never topping 90 beats per minute.

By the time John Young retired, he had spent over four decades at NASA. First at the Navy and later at NASA, Young dedicated his entire career to public service.

Throughout his career, Captain Young was a tireless advocate for safety at the agency. He was a brilliant and intuitive engineer. He was known for writing scathing memos regarding safety problems at the agency, asking penetrating technical questions at reviews, and doing it all with a simple “tell it like it is” country-boy mentality that he never lost from his central Florida upbringing.

It may seem a contradiction that the man who commanded perhaps the riskiest space mission in history was also one of the agency’s most outspoken advocates for safety, but it is not.

Captain Young strongly believed we must explore the unknown and push further out into the cosmos, but he also believed the men and women who bravely venture into space on all our behalves deserve the very best we can do to bring them home safely.

We are seeing the fruits of nearly a decade of transformation and renewal, while at the same time reverently marking the passing of the first generation of space explorers. Just in the last few years, in addition to John Young, we have lost John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, Gene Cernan, Dick Gordon,