

4 percent in the third quarter. That is because of the adverse tax treatment. That is not good for any of us. It is not good for the United States. It is not good for our States. In the omnibus bill that we just passed, we had all kinds of tax provisions—\$427 billion, actually, worth of tax provisions announced at 2 in the morning on Tuesday, by the way.

It has things, including a resurrection of a special tax rule that was supposed to die in 2017. We are going to send checks to people for what they did in 2018, which will have no impact whatsoever, obviously, on changing incentives since it is the past. We did that. We reversed a deal that was struck in 2015 to phase out expensive renewable energy credits. We made two changes to the tax reform of 2017, but we weren't able to include the technical fix that 66 Senators want that would cost zero.

What we were told by our Democratic colleagues is that, if you want to do that, there is a price you have to pay. The price would be tens of billions of dollars of increases in refundable tax credits. That is checks being sent to people who don't pay taxes. Ranking Member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, said just this week: "Democrats have long said the Republicans need to negotiate on broader issues if they want to fix all the mistakes in their tax giveaway." In other words, there has to be a price.

Well, if I were adopting the approach of my Democratic colleagues—and when my colleague from Hawaii comes down and makes this request—I could say, Well, you need to come up with \$50 billion worth of Republican priorities, maybe \$50 billion worth of capital gain tax cuts, or \$50 billion in reduction in some kind of mandatory spending or something. That is what I would do if I were taking the exact same approach that our Democratic colleagues took.

I am not going to do that. I am going to suggest that we both get what we are after here, and the American people get the benefit. Here is what I am going to do. I am going to modify the unanimous consent request. The way I am going to do that is to take the bill advocated by the Senator from Hawaii, drop it into a legislative vehicle, add the technical fix that I and 66 Senators support—and, by the way, 297 House Members have cosponsored the companion legislation, including 145 Democrat House Members—I am going to put them together in an otherwise empty legislative vehicle so that we can do both. When we pass it here in the Senate by unanimous consent in just a moment, if we do, then the House would virtually be assured of passage, since 297 House Members have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. President, my suggestion is we modify this unanimous consent request so that the Senator from Hawaii gets the provision that he wants and I get the provision that 66 Senators want.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 748

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request so that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 157, H.R. 748. I further ask unanimous consent that the Toomey amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Let's get clear about what is happening here. The first thing is we did something momentous as a group. We, on a bipartisan basis, decided to provide paid parental leave of 12 weeks for the Federal workforce—2.1 million Federal workers—so that individuals who are new parents don't have to make that impossible choice between receiving a paycheck and being a new dad or a new mom. Now, this is catching us up with the rest of the world. The rest of the industrialized world understands that this isn't just a humane thing to do for families. This is the right way to manage the workforce because you get higher productivity; you get better morale; and you get lower turnover. This is a smart thing to do.

There were 2.1 million people covered by this momentous change of Federal policy agreed upon over the last 48 hours on a bipartisan basis. There was a technical problem, and so the following Federal employees are not going to be covered unless we make this technical fix: employees of the DC courts, public defenders, Presidential appointees, FAA, and CSA employees, and article I judges. Everybody else is going to get 12 weeks of paid parental leave, except for these people. We can solve that today.

That is what my unanimous consent request is all about. What the Senator from Pennsylvania has decided to do is take a hostage and say, These are the only Federal employees who are not going to get this benefit because of a technical and drafting error because I didn't get something totally unrelated that has to do with a tax bill that was passed on purely partisan lines in a hurry, written primarily by lobbyists in the middle of the night.

Now, I do not mind entertaining a change to the Tax Code to deal with this question of how you expense the renovation of restaurants and retail operations, but I think Senator WYDEN is exactly right. I guess the Senator from Pennsylvania thought this was a talking point on the Republican side. Heaven forbid if there should be a negotiation. Heaven forbid something that is as important to the Republicans that is as a result of their screw-up and would cost tens of billions of dollars would not be given away for free.

The argument being made is, hey, technical for technical. This is an ac-

tual technical fix. This is a bill we just enacted in the last 48 hours. I am not even sure if the President has signed it yet, but it is about to be enacted into law, and nobody is arguing that we should not cover some small portion of the Federal workforce.

Nobody is arguing that was the legislative intent. Nobody is arguing that is public policy. What the Senator from Pennsylvania is saying, If I don't get my thing, then these people don't get the help that they deserve. These people, by happenstance of a drafting error, don't get paid parental leave. Now, this has human consequences.

I object to the Senator's modification of my unanimous consent request, and I am deeply disappointed that we can't fix this simple thing. I am happy to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania on a quick fix. I think we will get there at some point next year, but this has to be part of a broader bipartisan deal, and he knows that.

This is going to cost tens of billions of dollars, and no one gives tens of billions of dollars for nothing. Everything of that magnitude has to be negotiated on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. That is not what he is trying to do. He is trying to say because we made a technical error that was monumentally wrong and, as a result of the flawed process, why don't we trade technical fixes. This is a relatively small technical fix, and he wants to trade it for a massive technical fix that is now 2 years old.

The only thing I would say is this may be small in the context of how we operate in the U.S. Senate. It is not small if you work for the FAA and you are a new dad. It is not small if you are an article I judge and you are a new mom. It is not small for these people who deserve paid parental leave like every other Federal employee will get soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I am kind of shocked by what I just heard, that I am characterized as taking a hostage. Let's just be very clear. I am the Senator on the floor who is proposing that both Senators get their way, that the outcome works for both sides. This is a Democratic priority. Some Republicans support it; some don't. It is a Democratic priority on a mistake that was made, and I am suggesting let's fix it.

Let's take the opportunity to also fix something that 66 Senators have supported. They cosponsored it. There is even broader support—much broader in the House where it is massive. I do not know what is more reasonable than a very broadly bipartisan technical fix that scores at zero and helps every single community in America and tying that with an opportunity to do something that is a very high priority for my colleague from Hawaii.

Since my colleague from Hawaii refuses to allow us both to be able to accomplish this, I am going to have to hope that we can do it another time, and I will object to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

DECEMBER 19

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on another subject, even though I am very close to this subject in that I chaired the Armed Services Committee, and that is where all of this really began, I do want to mention one thing about what happened this morning. I think our leader over here, Mr. MCCONNELL, did a superb job. He made it very clear on the impeachment that took place last night. It is something that has not happened before. It is the first time it has happened, in that there is no impeachable offense, and it is nonetheless, I think, all driven by hatred. When you stop to think, here it is right before Christmas, and the hatred that is driving that, it is wrong.

I want to mention something that is significant, that you haven't thought of, I say to the Presiding Officer. That is, this 153rd day of the year is very significant. That is December 19. People have not stopped to realize the significant things that have happened on December 19 throughout our history and the history of the world, going all the way back to December 19, at 11:54, Henry II became King of England. We haven't really thought about the fact what does that mean to us today, but we will before long.

In 1843, December 19, again, Charles Dickens wrote "A Christmas Carol." It is the most watched, listened to, and sung event every Christmas.

In 1932, December 19, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the BBC, began transmitting overseas. That was the beginning of a whole new world of knowledge and understanding.

In 1950, December 19, NATO named General Dwight D. Eisenhower as supreme commander of the Western European defense forces.

Then in 1972, December 19, Apollo 17, the last of the Apollo moon landings returned to earth.

December 19 of 1984—I remember this well because I was in Hong Kong when this happened—that was when China signed an accord returning Hong Kong to the Chinese sovereignty. A lot of people thought it was good at the time to accept people from Hong Kong. I was there, and look what has happened now after all these years. I would have to say that hysteria has continued to this day.

Then, in 1998, December 19, the U.S. President Bill Clinton was impeached. I was there at that one, too. We have something to compare it with now, but that was December 19, 1998.

The event that is more significant by a landslide is what happened on December 19, 1959. On December 19, 1959, my wife Kay and I got married. That makes this the 60th anniversary of our

wedding. Just look at all the beauty that has followed us, 20 kids and grandkids. All of that in that 60-year period of time.

What I want to say is the beautiful life that we are still having together—and I would like to say at this point that Kay, after 60 years, is still loving, and I wish you a happy anniversary; and to everyone out there as you celebrate the birth of Jesus, Merry Christmas, and God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE DAWKINS DAVIS

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Stephanie Dawkins Davis for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

I had the honor of introducing Judge Dawkins Davis at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing more than 6 months ago. As I told the members of the committee, Judge Dawkins Davis is a highly respected member of the Michigan legal community, and she will serve our State well as a district court judge.

Judge Dawkins Davis has been an exemplary public servant who has worked hard and honorably to serve the people of Michigan. She has earned the respect of colleagues across the State and has garnered numerous awards throughout her career.

She began her career as a civil defense attorney at Dickinson Wright and later joined the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, prosecuting cases at both the trial and appellate levels. She also spent time as a deputy unit chief of the Controlled Substances Unit and as a high intensity drug trafficking area liaison.

Her successful work led to her appointment as executive assistant U.S. attorney, and after that, she became a magistrate judge for the Eastern District and was selected to serve at the Flint Federal courthouse.

Judge Dawkins Davis is a qualified jurist. The American Bar Association unanimously rated her as "well qualified." She was also the first African-American woman nominated by President Trump for a Federal judgeship.

I am proud to recognize Judge Dawkins Davis for her many accomplishments and for the diverse voice and perspective she will bring to the bench.

This seat has been vacant since October 26, 2016; that is more than 3 years. It is past time that the Senate consider Judge Dawkins Davis's nomination, and I am glad it is finally happening today.

Thank you.

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

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

VOTE ON SINGHAL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Singhal nomination?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 416 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Feinstein	Perdue
Blackburn	Fischer	Peters
Blumenthal	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hassan	Romney
Brown	Hawley	Rosen
Burr	Hoeben	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Wicker
Durbin	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Markey	Stabenow
Bennet	Merkley	Udall
Cantwell	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Schatz	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Schumer	Wyden
Hirono	Smith	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Roberts	
Isakson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just cut off a Member of our own side because they didn't get here in time. That is to underscore that by popular demand, everybody wants these times to be kept, and that is what we intend to do.

I ask unanimous consent that the votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.