

bring in these young men, who may or may not be a member of MS-13, one of the most violent criminal gangs in Central America. Now they are unfortunately in the United States, and there is no way for the U.S. Government to keep them out even if they are gang members, under current law.

Well, I don't know how our colleagues who refuse to take up this issue and address it justify it. I just can't understand it. In my opinion, we have a real problem that our colleagues either don't want to fix or they are deliberately ignoring. We can't solve these problems by just putting our head in the sand and hoping that the problem goes away. It will not. This is just one example of a loophole, which a border security bill that I introduced months ago, called the Building America's Trust Act, would fix.

So if our colleagues are serious about coming up with a solution to our immigration problems and providing a lifeline to these young adults who are DACA recipients and, indeed, everyone who is DACA-eligible, they need to work with us. They need to recognize the reality that President Trump has laid out a pathway for that to happen, but they can't just cherry-pick and pick the parts they like and ignore the rest and expect that we are going to get an outcome.

Again, the basic failure in the Gang of 8 bill was that they got 68 votes in the Senate, including \$50 billion for border security, but they couldn't get it through the House and couldn't get it to the President for signature. I don't know how to sugar-coat it, but that is failure. That is not success. Success is to get a bill through both Houses and to get the President to sign it. President Trump has given all of us a map, a pathway for how to do that. To my knowledge, there has never been a counteroffer that addresses the four pillars that the President has proposed.

Again, I think the people with the most to lose out of this proposition, in addition to the great American people, are these young adults who would benefit from the stability and predictability and a path forward and would receive a gift, as I said, that would be the greatest gift that any human being could possibly aspire to, which is the gift of American citizenship, eventually. But it is going to be squandered. The President's generous offer will be squandered because our colleagues don't like his proposal, but they are unwilling to come up with a counteroffer so that we can actually have a negotiation. The President, I am sure, would welcome that counteroffer, and we would too.

We welcome an opportunity to actually get a result here, to make a law and not just go through a political exercise that is destined to end in failure and then become a political issue in the next election. That is not what we should be about here.

So I hope that reality will set in. President Trump has offered a pro-

posal. Our colleagues on the other side, who don't like the proposal, have not offered a counteroffer that meets the four pillars. They don't even want to pay attention to the last two—the diversity visa issue or the so-called family unification, sometimes called chain migration. They want to act like that doesn't exist, and I just don't get it.

I come from a State of 28 million people, with 38 percent, roughly, of Hispanic origin. We have a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. Texas taxpayers pay for the border security that the Federal Government fails to fund and facilitate. I want to see a solution. I am happy to vote in favor of a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, but I can't go back home and look my constituents in the face unless I tell them that this is the last time we are going to have to do this because we fixed the underlying problem—border insecurity, gaps that are exploited by criminal gang members and the transnational criminal organizations that traffic in them, and these other issues that the President has put on the table.

So I hope reality does set in because I really would like to get a bill that we could pass in the House and the Senate and get to the President for his signature and move on to these other important issues: How do we fund our military? How do we fund the community health centers? How do we provide some predictability to the rest of America that is being held hostage to this issue?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from West Virginia.

#### CIVILITY AND TRUST

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss something extremely important to each one of us in this wonderful body, which is called civility and trust. I rise to discuss them because they have been lost in Washington. I look around and we are all friends, and for some reason we lost trust in each other. We don't seem to spend enough time with each other.

I can remember Senator Robert C. Byrd, who was the longest serving Senator in the history of the U.S. Senate, and he always told me what a place this was. He said that the Senate is something special. He even wrote a book about it, about how the Senate was to operate, what the Founding Fathers' intent was for the bipartisan, bicameral body that George Washington explained so eloquently, and what our role was as the most deliberative body in the world. The whole world depends on us kind of cooling things off and making things work. But as we have seen, it hasn't done what it is supposed to do, and it is not to blame one person or the other or one party or the other. I guess we can all say that it is all of our fault for letting it denigrate to this point.

Several years ago, I took a personal pledge. I just knew something was wrong. When I first got here, I looked around and I saw that we were all expected to make phone calls raising money every day to our respective parties, and that money would be used for a couple of purposes. The purpose was basically to set an agenda or explain your priorities and your policies, but a lot of that money was directed toward defeating colleagues on the other side. So being in the Democratic caucus, the Democratic money was supposed to be raised and, if any one of my friends on the Republican side was up in this cycle, that money was supposed to be used against them. I thought that was wrong, and I know a lot of my Republican friends feel the same way—that they are supposed to be making phone calls to raise money to be used against me and everybody else who is up in this cycle. I am sure they feel the same as I do.

I have often said that I come to work in a hostile work environment, and I try to explain that in terms of how we in West Virginia would look upon this. If you go to work every day in my State of West Virginia and your colleague or some person with whom you are working is trying to undermine and undercut you to get you fired, and every day you go to work they are nice to your face but behind the scenes they are doing all they can to denigrate your work or to make your supervisors believe that you are not doing your job, back home in West Virginia, sooner or later, they are going to want a little talk. Can we talk in the parking lot? Can we have this disagreement worked out? That is just the way it would be settled, and, maybe, that is the way it should be settled here too. I don't know. I don't think so.

I have met too many wonderful people with whom I have been serving for the last 7 years who are bright, extremely capable, intelligent, and with a wealth of experience, and I would put them up against any people whom I have met anywhere in any occupation in the country. But for some reason, we are all blocked from doing the right thing or what we know is right—sitting down and not accusing each other, not working and conspiring against each other, and not getting basically to the point that it is so visceral. Perhaps, someone might be talking with me one day, but, then, that weekend they might be in my State campaigning against me. Then, we come back on Monday or Tuesday, and we are supposed to sit down and work through our problems and differences for the betterment of our country. I just think human nature doesn't let that happen, and it will not produce good results.

I have always looked forward to working with everybody. I am probably one of the most centrist, as far as being on more pieces of legislation in a bipartisan way. I have never looked at a Republican or a Democratic problem. I just looked at a problem that we had,

and I always said this: The best form of government—the best policies and the best form of politics, if you want to play hardcore politics—is good government. Everyone can take credit for doing something good, and I will assure you, if we do something wrong and we don't fix things, we all get blamed. We all get blamed. So nobody looks good when we sit and don't work on our differences, and we all get credit when we try to work together.

We are facing a lot of challenges right now. We do things that basically shun the other side because we don't want to share the glory with someone else if we think there is some good in the piece of legislation. Every piece of legislation we have voted for or against has good in it. Every piece of legislation has something good and worthwhile in it. What happens is that there are ways we can make something better, and that is where our differences are. If you can make something better, then, I need to sit down and work with you because I don't have all the answers, but we both have a desire to make the best piece of policy that we can in legislation. So we should be working together. I should be open to saying: OK, that makes sense to me; let's see if we can amend this and fix it. But it seems that we get set in our ways.

The place that Robert Byrd talked about many years ago was a place where people stayed and spent more time in Washington. They didn't come in on Monday night and leave on Thursday afternoon. They stayed and worked. On the weekends, they would even get together and have dinners together. Families would do things together during the days and the weekends, and they became friends. It is hard to say no to your friend. It is hard. All of us have been in situations that were very hurtful, when there was a friend with whom you disagreed. So you tried to find the most delicate way to see if there was a pathway forward without losing that friendship. It meant that much to us. That is what it should be here, too. But when you don't have that relationship—as a former Governor, I have my dear friend from South Dakota, and we are going to look for a way to stay together and be friends. We are not going to look for a way to disagree and diverge from that friendship that we built.

We built that over our terms working together as Governors. I have always said that Governors are the most bipartisan people I have ever met.

In our NGA—National Governors Association—when you had an education problem, when you had a Medicaid problem, when you had an infrastructure problem, when you had a veterans problem, if you looked around and you saw someone in one State who had found a pathway forward to fix that, you never hesitated to call them and say: Hey, Mike, what did you think about it? He would say: Well, I tried this, JOE. Why don't you try it? I will

send someone or you send someone out, and we will work together.

That is what I was used to doing as far as getting things done, and that is what I want to do here again. I think the place is right for it. The American people want it solved and want the States we represent to have a bipartisan pathway forward and to work together. I know the people of West Virginia want to see us get things accomplished.

I have a wonderful little State that has given their all. I often tell people in West Virginia—I tell the children: When someone asks you where you are from, I want you to puff up your chest. I want you to say: Oh, I come from a beautiful State, one of the most patriotic States in the Nation.

We have answered the call to duty more than most any State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State. We have fought more wars, shed more blood, lost more lives for the cause of freedom than any State. We have done the heavy lifting. We have mined the coal that made the steel that built the guns and ships that defend our country every day.

The Good Lord has been so kind to us and blessed us with one of the greatest venues that you will ever see in the mountains of West Virginia. My little State is called West Virginia, and we hope you will come and visit, and maybe you will even stay.

It is really who we are. And we all have that same pride; each one of us does. Whether it be Indiana, South Dakota, wherever it may be, we have a pride in our States, the people in our States, and they deserve better than what we are giving them right now.

I don't see anybody in public service, who is willing to put their name on the ballot, as my enemy. If you are willing to serve, then I am your comrade. I am going to work with you. If you are willing to take the heat that comes with these jobs, then let's make sure we get the results that the jobs should produce. These jobs should produce results so that the whole world can have a hope that America is the right place. They are the people who can solve the problems that we all have, and they still can lift us up and be the hope of the world.

With that, I am pledging to the people of West Virginia and to the American people that I will not campaign against a sitting colleague, that I will not directly fundraise against them, that I will not distribute any direct mail against them. I will not appear or endorse any advertisements directed at them. I will not use or endorse social media campaigns that attack them.

Washington will be dysfunctional until we all draw the line of truce and say that we are here for the same reason. We take the same oath. We swear on the Bible to the same Constitution—that we will uphold it. That is what we are here to do.

Since that civility has broken down because the system has changed and we

are not here and we don't know each other's families, spouses, children, we better control ourselves, hopefully through the rules we can change and the ethics laws we should live by, to treat each other in the manner that we would want to be treated.

With that, I am going to sign this pledge, and I would hope that all of my colleagues would consider signing the pledge the same way. We are the only ones who can change it. The power has changed. The pressure that comes within has changed. The way this place works has changed. The only way we can change it is to say we are not going to participate in denigrating each other and attacking each other anymore.

With that, I am going to sign the pledge. It says here:

Pledge to Return to Era of Bipartisan Cooperation and Agreement.

In order to restore civility to the United States Senate and our political discourse, we must pledge to return to an era of bipartisan cooperation and agreement.

I, Joe Manchin, pledge to the people of West Virginia and to the American people that I will not campaign against a sitting colleague, not directly fundraise against them, not distribute direct mail against them, not appear or endorse advertisements directed at them, and not use or endorse social media campaigns that attack them.

I would hope that each one of you would consider this. I think we have to take this into our own hands right now and make sure that we look at each other, that we look at each other with sincerity. You are my friend. We might disagree, but we can work through this, Mr. President. We can definitely work through this and remember what our purpose is for being here. The people want us to succeed. They depend on us to succeed, and that is the policy they need. Whether in Indiana, South Dakota, or West Virginia, they all want the same—they want America to be the hope of the world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

MR. ROUNDS. Mr. President, let me respond to my colleague and good friend from West Virginia. He and I served as Governors at the same time. We have a friendship that has now lasted more than a decade. A lot of what the Senator has indicated I feel as well in terms of the reason why we came here and the focus we should have. In fact, I think one of the most important things we can do as Members of this institution, Members of this body, is to show respect for one another and defend one another in our responsibility to try to find a way forward. Until we have that respect for one another, it will be very difficult to expect others to have that same respect for us or for this institution.

I most certainly appreciate the sentiments expressed by my colleague from West Virginia, and I appreciate his bringing them to the floor today.

## DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, it is in that spirit that I bring this message to my fellow Members of the U.S. Senate. I rise today to ask for support for the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2018.

I would like to start by thanking the majority leader for bringing the Defense appropriations bill to the floor. Now, just because the majority leader brings it to the floor doesn't mean we will necessarily get the opportunity to debate it. It requires either the unanimous consent of all the Members or at least 60 Members agreeing to have that debate. That is one of the reasons why we haven't had any appropriations measures on the floor. It takes 60 Members, Republicans and Democrats, just to begin the debate of each one of these 12 separate appropriations bills, which make up what we normally vote on during a year. This is also part of that process which has been broken for more than 44 years because it has only worked four times in 44 years. But you have to start someplace.

Providing long-term funding stability for our Armed Forces is vital to their ability to adequately train, equip, and maintain the force. In particular, under short-term, stop-gap funding measures known as continuing resolutions, which we are operating under right now, the Defense Department is restricted from starting new programs. These new programs are ones that we have already authorized through the National Defense Authorization Act on a bipartisan basis for 2018; we just haven't appropriated the money yet so that they can actually do the programs we have already agreed as a body are important to have in place. This is very concerning to me because in today's rapidly changing threat environment, these programs were designed to protect our Nation against those new threats.

If we are to adequately recover readiness levels that were lost over the last 8 years—really, in many cases, due to sequestration—as well as to modernize our Armed Forces in this increasingly dangerous and complex world, we must give them the funding, stability, and certainty that continuing resolutions fail to provide.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Readiness, I am pleased that the subcommittee has held two hearings this year on our services' readiness posture. To put that in non-DC terms, it means just exactly what their conditions are right now and their need for modernization.

Today, I would like to share just a few examples of readiness issues facing our military force. The first are issues plaguing our Navy, and both demonstrate the need to adequately fund not only our Navy but all branches of our Armed Forces.

The first issue concerns the F/A-18 Hornet aircraft. For any Members who are wondering which aircraft it is, this

is the one that people see on a regular basis on film clips and so forth showing them taking off of the carriers. This is our primary Navy attack aircraft. This is the one that we use for aerial combat. We also use this one to do the attacks in both Iraq and Syria.

The first issue is plaguing our Navy—and what they do is they demonstrate the need to adequately fund not only our Navy but, as I said, all of the different branches. So this is not only the Navy; all of the branches need this assistance.

Vice Chief of Naval Operations, ADM William Moran, stated that our legacy F/A-18A and D Hornets today take twice as many manhours as originally planned for repairs and maintenance. He has also stated that “on a typical day in the Navy, about 25 to 30 percent of our jets and our airplanes are in some kind of depot maintenance.” Overall, just over half are unavailable for operations today. So it is not just the F/A-18 Hornet, it is all of their aircraft that are in need of upgrading.

To sum up the Admiral's comments, the Navy is putting in twice the maintenance manhours to maintain a fleet that is less than 50 percent available.

In a crisis situation, the Vice Chief said, “We can and we do put airplanes and ready air crews forward,” but “there's no depth on the bench behind them if we had to surge forces.” In other words, all of the aircraft that are available right now, we have on the frontlines. These are the ones that are serving overseas. We don't have backups in case they start to go down.

The Marine Corps is also experiencing serious readiness issues with its F/A-18 fleet, and there is a human cost. On December 8, 2016, the Marine Corps announced that yet another pilot had been killed as a result of a training accident in the F/A-18 Hornet. This was the third Marine Corps F/A-18 Hornet class A mishap—which is defined as an accident resulting in a death or the complete loss of aircraft—over a month-and-a-half time period. In the previous 22 months, the Marine Corps had experienced seven class A mishaps flying legacy F/A-18 Hornets. Sadly, some or all of these mishaps might have been avoided with the additional training and maintenance that would have been forthcoming with the additional funding that had been recommended in the National Defense Authorization Act, which this body, on a bipartisan basis, has already voted on.

Returning to the Navy, its maintenance-related readiness concerns extend to its attack submarine fleet. Admiral Moran recently mentioned that attack submarines are sometimes sent to private shipyards for maintenance because government shipyards are already at capacity with higher priority work, especially and specifically on aircraft carriers and ballistic missiles submarines, but the private shipyards do not have the capacity to take on extra repair work. This lack of shipyard capacity is severely impacting our attack submarine fleet.

For example, the USS *Albany*, which is an attack submarine, spent 48 months in the repair yard due to repeated delays as the workforce focused its attention on aircraft carriers and on ballistic missile submarines. That means an entire crew spent years waiting for a deployment that never came.

Worse still, the USS *Boise* attack submarine wasn't even put in the shipyard last summer because the shipyard workload was so far over workforce capacity. As a result, that boat is currently sitting in Norfolk, VA, and is not certified to dive while it awaits maintenance. This is a taxpayer asset sitting at dock tied up, not being repaired, not even being worked on. Right now, it is so far out of shape, it is not even allowed to dive. In fact, the *Boise* will not be able to rejoin the fleet until 2020 or later. That means this vital Navy asset will be unavailable for at least another 48 months.

In fact, a maintenance backlog has docked 15 nuclear-powered attack submarines for a total of 177 months—or almost 15 years—in which those attack submarines have not been available in the protection of our country.

While I am discussing some serious Navy readiness challenges, all of our services face readiness challenges.

Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson recently said:

The fiscal year 2018 continuing resolution is actually delaying our efforts to increase readiness of the force, and risk accumulates over time. We are stretching the force to the limit, and we need to start turning the corner on readiness.

With a shortage of nearly 2,000 pilots, out of about 20,000 total, Secretary Wilson went on to say, current Active-Duty pilots were burning out because the Air Force was too small for what the Nation is asking.

“Our biggest need right now is for a higher and stable budget to provide security and solvency for the nation,” she went on to say.

According to Defense Secretary James Mattis, operating under a continuing resolution for 2018 runs the risk of delaying vital projects and increasing their costs, including 37 Navy projects, 16 Air Force projects, and 38 Army projects. The projects that could be impacted include progress on new trainer aircraft, weapons systems, and important training programs.

The most important things Congress can do to solve these problems are to provide funding stability and avoid arbitrary budget caps that constrain defense spending below that which is required to protect our Nation. This bill that is before us now does both. More specifically, only by removing these caps can we avoid the Department of Defense having to make difficult choices that are so devastating for our Armed Forces. In particular, we must avoid their having to make the false choice of paying for readiness while assuming the risk for modernization or vice versa.

The American people expect us to adequately defend America next year