

making administrative decisions affecting thousands of people the world over, his lifelong commitment was to serving individuals in need. Although an expert manager, he was first and foremost a disciple of Jesus Christ, a man of remarkable kindness, unwavering love, and preternatural empathy.

President Monson was a servant first and a leader second. Endless are the stories in which he would drop everything, sometimes even leaving church meetings early over which he was presiding, to visit a grieving widow, bless a sickly child, or minister to a family in need. Both on macro and micro levels, President Monson was intimately involved in building up the Kingdom of God, and he was perhaps the greatest living example of Christ's admonition to find the one lost sheep who has gone astray and take him back to the fold.

Of President Monson's boundless charity, Elder Joseph B. Wirthlin once said:

Tom has given everything to [those in need], including the shirt off his back. I mean it! I've seen him give away his suits and his shirts and his shoes.

President Monson was among the greatest men I have ever known. Service was his motto and humility his hallmark. Countless were the lives he touched as a prophet, father, and friend. He emulated Jesus Christ in every particular, helping all of us draw closer to God by drawing all of us closer to each other.

I am so grateful for the life of my dear friend and for the example he left for everyone to follow. He was a friend of mine. He showed me great friendship and at times stood up for me. I will never forget one time he leaned over to me and said: "I vote for you." That meant so much to me. All I can say is that having his vote was very important to me. The man was one of the greatest men I have ever met on this Earth—a man of humility, a man of effort, a man of distinction, a man of love and compassion, a man who really knew how to work with other people, a man who loved his fellow men and women, a man who worked in a consecrated manner all the days of his life for Jesus Christ and his ministry. I am going to personally miss him. I believe that his imprint on not just the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—commonly nicknamed the Mormon Church—but around the world is going to be very difficult to ever forget.

God bless the remaining family. I hope everything will go well with them. I intend to attend the funeral if I can and hopefully lend whatever I can to honoring one of the greatest men I have ever met in my life, and I have met a lot of really great men and women.

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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William L. Campbell, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of William L. Campbell, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Baldwin	Cotton	Hoeven
Barrasso	Crapo	Inhofe
Bennet	Daines	Johnson
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Jones
Blunt	Durbin	Kaine
Booker	Enzi	Kennedy
Boozman	Ernst	King
Brown	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Burr	Fischer	Lankford
Cantwell	Flake	Leahy
Capito	Gardner	Lee
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Graham	Markey
Casey	Grassley	McCaskill
Cassidy	Harris	McConnell
Cochran	Hassan	Menendez
Collins	Hatch	Merkley
Coons	Heinrich	Moran
Cornyn	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cortez Masto	Heller	Murphy

Murray
Nelson
Paul
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Rounds
Rubio
Sanders

Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Shaheen
Shelby
Smith
Stabenow
Sullivan
Thune

Tillis
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—10

Alexander
Corker
Cruz
Donnelly

Isakson
McCain
Perdue
Roberts

Tester
Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Texas.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this last weekend I had the honor of going to Camp David with Members of both the House and the Senate to meet with the President and Vice President and members of his Cabinet to talk about the prospects for 2018. After a very successful 2017, we are now looking forward to what sort of legislation we can do on a bipartisan basis that will help us build on those successes of 2017. Many of these are domestic priorities, but, of course, others are national security in nature.

Our internal strength, of course, affects our diplomacy and military effectiveness abroad, and where we were located, at Camp David, actually demonstrates that. It was, after all, the site for secret talks to negotiate the Camp David Accords, historic peace agreements signed by Israel and Egypt in 1978. What happened on American soil ultimately changed the global landscape, and it wasn't the only time. Over the years, Camp David has come to represent peace. It is a place where leaders put aside their differences to look to avoid conflict.

Nonetheless, today we have to admit, given the global environment, that peace is imperiled. We have recently seen that in Iran, where the largest wave of protests in more than a decade have revealed widespread discontent not only with Iran's economy but also as a result of the actions taken by its military, which has supported Hezbollah and other terrorist organizations around the world. As a matter of fact, Iran is the No. 1 state-sponsor of international terrorism, which is one reason why many of us blanched at the idea of releasing money to Iran as part of the joint agreement on Iran's nuclear program—money that they could then plow back into their support for organizations like Hezbollah and their aggressive support for terrorist organizations generally.

Last week the Trump administration imposed sanctions on five entities tied to Iran's ballistic missile program. Apparently, Tehran continues to care more about funding its terrorist proxies across the Middle East than supporting its own citizens, and frustrated

Iranians rightfully have said: Enough already; we are not going to take it anymore.

As Secretary Mnuchin said last week, here in the United States we shouldn't "hesitate to call out the [Iranian] regime's economic mismanagement, and diversion of significant resources to fund threatening missile systems at the expense of its citizenry." The Secretary is exactly right.

Meanwhile, the situation in North Korea remains precarious. That country—and I say this unequivocally—must denuclearize. That is why I recently introduced a resolution with many of my colleagues here in the Senate.

The purpose of the resolution is to expressly declare that Congress is unified in its condemnation of the increasingly hostile and intransigent behavior of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Since Kim Jong Un took power 6 years ago, he has ordered at least four nuclear tests, including the September detonation of what his regime—and outside experts generally agree—said was a hydrogen bomb.

Despite great efforts made by the United States, including a recent Executive order by the President, North Korea's history as a bad-faith negotiator continues unabated on the world stage. It obstinately violates diplomatic norms and human rights at will and was recently redesignated, itself, as a state sponsor of terrorism.

The resolution I referred to a moment ago asserts that the United States, as well as the United Nations Security Council and our regional allies, should continue to implement the absolute strictest of sanction regimes in an effort to get the regime's attention and hopefully bring them to the table as part of this path forward toward denuclearization. We must continue to exhaust every reasonable diplomatic option necessary to achieve the complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs.

Our resolution also recognizes that the President has the constitutional responsibility to protect the United States and our allies, but it emphasizes that congressional authorization is necessary prior to committing U.S. forces to a sustained military operation on the Korean Peninsula. In other words, under the Constitution, the President has his responsibilities and duties, and Congress has its responsibilities and duties, and this resolution recognizes both. We look forward to working together closely with the President in a unified front this year to confront North Korea, as well as rogue actors elsewhere.

President Trump, we know, does not take our national security threats lightly. He has a world-class national security team, with General Mattis, Secretary Tillerson, and Director Pompeo, just to name three. In an im-

portant speech last month, the President outlined the four pillars of his administration's national security strategy.

He said the first pillar is to protect our homeland. We can't secure our Nation if we can't secure our own borders, and we can't secure our borders unless we confront, both at home and abroad, the threat of terrorism and ideologies bent on doing us great harm.

Second, the President said that we need to promote American prosperity because the only way we are going to be strong militarily and at the homeland is if we have the resources and economy to pay for it. Economic growth at home is critical for our influence around the globe as well. We, of course, took a big step in this direction by passing tax reform last month, but a lot more needs to be done to continue to grow our economy and to return America to its historic prosperity—like updating and not scrapping the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade agreements, for example, and rebuilding our national infrastructure, which was also on the agenda at Camp David this weekend.

The President's third pillar of the national security strategy is to preserve peace through strength. We usually attribute that concept to Ronald Reagan, but of course he is not the first or the last to recognize the joinder of peace and strength. President Trump said in his speech that "weakness is the surest path to conflict, and unrivaled power is the most certain means of defense."

I think he is exactly right—which means we have to end the defense sequester that started with the Budget Control Act of 2011. I supported our efforts to rein in discretionary spending, but the fact is, only about 30 percent of the money that the Federal Government spends is actually appropriated, and a little more than half of that is defense spending. I simply cannot in good conscience agree to continue those budget caps for defense spending without considering the increase in risks to our men and women in uniform and our country's national security generally. We have to continue to modernize our military, which we started last year by reauthorizing the Defense Authorization Act.

Fourth, the President's strategy asserts that we have to advance American influence in the world through strong alliances and by championing our core values without apology. As the President said:

A nation that does not protect prosperity at home cannot protect its interests abroad. A nation that is not prepared to win a war is a nation not capable of preventing a war. A nation that is not proud of its history cannot be confident in its future. And a nation that is not certain of its values cannot summon the will to defend them.

I couldn't have said it any better myself.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

CHIP AND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today marks a sad and, frankly, shocking day for too many of America's children and hard-working families because it has now been 100 days since funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers expired.

History has shown us that there is a whole lot that can get done in 100 days. It took Thomas Jefferson only 17 days to write the Declaration of Independence; the brave allied forces who landed on D-day advanced through France and liberated Paris in only 80 days; and Congress managed to pass 15 major pieces of legislation during President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's first 100 days in office. Yet, here we are, 100 days past the deadline of September 30, and Congress still hasn't managed to pass long-term legislation to reauthorize what we call CHIP—the Children's Health Insurance Program—and to fund our community health centers.

We have a strong bipartisan bill funding CHIP, which was passed out of committee. I give our chairman and ranking member kudos for working together. I was proud to work with them. It came out of committee with only one "no" vote and has waited and waited and waited on the floor of the Senate. Senator BLUNT and I have a bipartisan bill to continue funding community health centers, and 70 Members of the Senate have signed a letter supporting long-term funding for community health centers, which expired September 30—100 days ago.

Right now, we are in a situation where 9 million children and their parents don't know what is going to happen long term. As soon as this month, 100,000 children and their families in Michigan have begun to get letters saying that their children will lose coverage, and they are trying to figure out what is going on.

Imagine being a parent who is working hard. A lot of folks I know are working two jobs, trying to hold it together. You don't have health insurance; you earn too much for your children to be able to get Medicaid health insurance, so the Children's Health Insurance Program is your lifeline. It is your lifeline. It gives you peace of mind to know that if your daughter falls and breaks her arm or your son gets a cough that won't go away, you can take them to the doctor.

What if those children have something worse than a broken arm or a cough? What if they are diagnosed with type 1 diabetes or asthma or cancer? Just imagine being that parent and getting a letter which says that your child may no longer have health insurance. It is not necessary. This is not necessary.

We could do this tomorrow. If we thought it was important enough to bring it to the floor, we could get a vote—and I believe it would be overwhelmingly bipartisan—tomorrow if