

Cassidy	Hoeven	Portman
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Reed
Coons	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Isakson	Roberts
Cortez Masto	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Jones	Sasse
Crapo	Kaine	Schumer
Cruz	Kennedy	Scott
Daines	King	Shaheen
Donnelly	Klobuchar	Shelby
Durbin	Lankford	Smith
Enzi	Leahy	Stabenow
Ernst	Lee	Sullivan
Feinstein	Manchin	Tester
Fischer	Markey	Thune
Gardner	McCaskill	Tillis
Gillibrand	McConnell	Toomey
Graham	Menendez	Udall
Grassley	Moran	Van Hollen
Harris	Murkowski	Warner
Hassan	Murphy	Warren
Hatch	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	Wicker
Heitkamp	Paul	Wyden
Heller	Perdue	Young
Hirono	Peters	

## NAYS—5

Corker	Rounds	Schatz
Merkley	Sanders	

## NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Flake	McCain
-----------	-------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

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 Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent; the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Ex.]

## YEAS—72

Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murphy
Bennet	Hassan	Nelson
Blunt	Hatch	Paul
Boozman	Heitkamp	Perdue
Burr	Heller	Peters
Capito	Hoeven	Portman
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Reed
Carper	Inhofe	Risch
Casey	Isakson	Roberts
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Jones	Rubio
Coons	Kaine	Sasse
Corker	Kennedy	Scott
Cornyn	King	Shelby
Cotton	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Tester
Cruz	Leahy	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Ernst	McConnell	Warner
Fischer	Menendez	Wicker
Gardner	Moran	Young

## NAYS—25

Baldwin	Harris	Shaheen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Smith
Booker	Hirono	Stabenow
Brown	Markey	Udall
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Cortez Masto	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Sanders	Wyden
Feinstein	Schatz	
Gillibrand	Schumer	

## NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Flake	McCain
-----------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 25.

The motion is agreed to.

## CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant 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 Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

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 Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Ex.]

## YEAS—73

Alexander	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hassan	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Perdue
Blunt	Heitkamp	Peters
Boozman	Heller	Portman
Burr	Hoeven	Reed
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cardin	Inhofe	Roberts
Carper	Isakson	Rounds
Casey	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Jones	Sasse
Collins	Kaine	Scott
Coons	Kennedy	Shaheen
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Gardner	Murkowski	
Graham	Murphy	

## NAYS—23

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Schumer
Blumenthal	Harris	Smith
Booker	Heinrich	Stabenow
Brown	Hirono	Udall
Cantwell	Markey	Warren
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Schatz	

## NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	McCain
Flake	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 73, the nays are 23.

The motion is agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report both nominations.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years; and Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

## TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL JOSEPH MARTIN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to recognize MG Joseph M. Martin and his outstanding military career, which is made evident by a significant milestone promotion to lieutenant general. Major General Martin is the commanding general of the 1st Infantry Division at Fort Riley, KS, and assumed this command in October of 2016 when he took command of the Big Red One—the Army's longest serving, permanent division since 1917.

Within days of assuming command of the Big Red One in 2016, he deployed with his division headquarters, 500 of his soldiers, to Iraq. He assumed leadership of the Combined Joint Forces Land Component Command-Iraq in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Major General Martin's combat leadership was remarkable in Iraq. During the 9-month deployment, he led the fight, alongside the Government of Iraq, against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria in Mosul. His efforts, and the efforts of the brave soldiers in the U.S. Army and all of our troops, led to the defeat of ISIS in Mosul and the destruction of their territorial hold. ISIS had been in control of Mosul since 2014 but were beaten back by Major General Martin and his forces. They liberated 1.8 million Iraqis, and it was a remarkable victory.

In the manner of a true combat leader, Major General Martin was one of the last soldiers to return from the mission in July of 2017. When General Martin returned stateside, he quickly demonstrated his leadership back on base at Fort Riley, and he led the 100th anniversary of the division.

He has been an outstanding partner to me and fellow Kansans on a number of initiatives to support the Big Red One. He has been involved in the communities of Manhattan and Junction City and those other communities that surround Fort Riley. It is no surprise to me that he has been selected for promotion to lieutenant general. He is a proven leader, capable of completing the most complex challenges under the most stressful situations. The Army has made the right move with his promotion and, furthermore, by placing him in a position of greater responsibility.

I am confident Kansans will join me in congratulating soon-to-be-confirmed Lieutenant General Martin on his promotion. We honor and thank him for his service.

We recognize the sacrifices he and his family have made over the last 32 years. I recognize his wife Leann and their children, Kylie and Joey, for their service over the years. Strong Army families make strong Army soldiers.

I have no doubt—none—that Major General Martin will continue to be one of the Army's best leaders, and I look forward to seeing what lies ahead for him in his career.

Congratulations, General Martin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nominations of Ms. Jelena McWilliams to be Chair and a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

As one of the three primary Federal financial regulators, the FDIC plays a critical role in the U.S. financial system, particularly for community banks. As head of the FDIC, Ms. McWilliams will be responsible for ad-

ministering the Deposit Insurance Fund and ensuring the safety and soundness of the financial system while also promoting economic growth. She will also contribute to deliberations on financial stability as a member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

In having focused extensively on financial institutions throughout her career in both the private and public sectors, Ms. McWilliams is supremely qualified for this position.

She has a unique view of the U.S. regulatory system and its regulated entities, most recently serving as the chief legal officer, executive vice president, and corporate secretary for Fifth Third Bank, which is a regional bank based in Ohio. Prior to that, she served as a valuable member of the Banking Committee's staff for both Senator SHELBY and me. Ms. McWilliams also worked as an attorney at the Federal Reserve during the financial crisis and on the Small Business Committee under former Senator Snowe.

Many of my colleagues and I can personally attest to her qualifications, her good judgment, and her expertise, which will be an asset to the FDIC and to the country.

At her nomination hearing in January, Ms. McWilliams demonstrated a deep knowledge of the issues overseen by the FDIC as well as a commitment to carrying out its mission. She discussed how her personal experience has shaped her conviction in the FDIC's unique responsibility as a deposit insurer, noting that one of the side effects of the civil war that broke apart the former Yugoslavia was a collapse of its financial system. Her parents, who still lived there, had their savings disappear overnight when a local bank closed its doors. Yugoslavia had no deposit insurance, and her then 68-year-old father returned to work as a day laborer.

As she stated at her hearing, "I can assure you that the core mission of the FDIC resonates profoundly with me and, if confirmed, I will not take its mission or my duties lightly."

Ms. McWilliams has conveyed a strong desire to encourage economic growth and facilitate new bank creation by continuing to address the disproportionate regulatory burden that is faced by community banks. Additionally, she acknowledged the need to expand Americans' access to credit and the banking system.

If confirmed as a member and Chair of the FDIC, I look forward to having the opportunity to work with Ms. McWilliams on these important issues. I strongly support her nominations today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, starting in January of 2017, extending to today, the President, often with the help of this Republican Congress, has

engaged in a very deliberate, very purposeful campaign of sabotage to the American healthcare system. We are now starting to see the very serious consequences of this campaign of sabotage. It started on Inauguration Day when President Trump signed an Executive order that ordered all of his agencies to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. It found its way to the Senate floor when Republicans spent most of 2017 trying to pass legislation that would take insurance away from 23 million people, according to the CBO.

The President undertook a number of steps to try to weaken the exchanges where millions of people get their healthcare. He cut the open enrollment period in half. He stopped funding advertising. He pulled funding for the navigators, who are the people who go out and try to help people sort through their healthcare options. There is no reason to do that, to try to stop people from being able to sign up for healthcare, unless your intention is sabotage. There is no public policy reason to give people less time to sign up or to give them less information about their options.

Most recently, the Republicans finally succeeded in repealing the individual mandate which the Congressional Budget Office said will, by itself, increase premiums by 10 percent and wipe out insurance for 13 million people. The administration is now trying to expand the sale of what we call junk plans, which are insurance plans that don't have to cover a minimum set of benefits, that don't have to protect people with preexisting conditions or existing sicknesses from higher premium rates.

I think I came down to the floor 2 weeks ago to talk about the first two rate filings of the rate filing season. These were in Maryland and Virginia. The rate filings were, quite frankly, catastrophic. While these were the worst of the bunch, all of the rate filings were much higher than the rate of medical inflation.

The worst requested increase was when one insurance plan in Maryland asked for a 91-percent increase in premiums. One insurance plan in Virginia asked for a 64-percent increase in premiums. In Maryland, the head of the insurance plan who asked for the 91-percent increase said the reasons for it were the continuing actions on the administration's part to systematically undermine the market and to make it almost impossible to carry out its mission. No one can afford a 91-percent increase in premiums, and no one can afford a 64-percent increase in premiums. Frankly, very few people can afford a 15- or a 20-percent increase in premiums.

This week, we received the rate filings from the State of Oregon. In Oregon, the Providence Health Plan, with about 90,000 customers, which is one of the bigger plans in the State, is asking for a 14-percent premium increase. Now, that is not 91 or 64, but there are

a lot of families who simply aren't going to be able to afford a double-digit premium increase in Oregon. It is important to note that Oregon put into place a new State-based reinsurance program, and if not for that reinsurance program, this would have been a 20-percent increase.

I am just going to keep track of all of these increases so we have a sense of what is happening to consumers as a result of this campaign of sabotage. We will add this rate increase in Oregon of 14 percent, and I will make sure I get it right.

The CBO has told us, the repeal of the individual mandate is going to jump premiums by 10 percent. So, in Oregon, you can be relatively sure that had the Republicans not repealed this big part of the Affordable Care Act, you would have been looking at a single-digit increase, something that would have mirrored medical inflation. Yet, because of the actions that had been taken here and because of many of the actions that have been undertaken by this Congress, we are looking at a double-digit increase.

Keith Forrester, who is the head of one of Oregon's biggest insurance companies, said our rate increase reflects the expected costs of providing coverage to our members, including the impact of eliminating the individual mandate.

Senate Democrats are going to be down on the floor pretty relentlessly over the course of the next few months to make people understand that as you are getting your health insurance bills, as you are seeing these big increases, a big reason will be due to the actions that your elected leaders have taken—this Republican Congress and this administration.

Yet the rate increases might be getting even bigger than they already are today. That is because of this expected proliferation of these new junk plans. Again, these are called short-term plans by the administration because they used to be, truly, short-term options. They were 3 months in duration. You would pick up one of these plans in between coverage, and because they were short-term plans, they were not required to cover mental health and maternity, and they could charge you more if you were sick.

This administration has decided these plans can now be sold for a full year, meaning they will essentially stand side by side with regulated plans that have minimum benefits and protect people with preexisting conditions. The administration said, only a couple hundred thousand people nationwide might sign up for these plans.

The CMS's Chief Actuary says—this is President Trump's CMS, the administration's own Chief Actuary—that is wrong; that, in fact, it will be a million and a half people potentially signing up for these junk plans. It could get as big as 1.9 million by 2022.

Who will sign up for these junk plans? It will be healthy people because

healthy people aren't going to need all of the coverage. It will be people who don't have preexisting conditions, who don't have addictions or diagnosed mental illnesses. It will leave behind in the exchange plans the people who need the coverage. Those people will not go on the junk plans because they will need insurance plans that cover their illnesses or their diagnoses. What we know is that if you have a sicker population in the exchange-based plans, in the regulated individual market, those premiums will go up.

A recent study found, the combination of the individual mandate and the proliferation of these new junk plans will result, on average, in 16-percent increases in premiums all across the country. In Connecticut, that could mean the premiums will go up by \$1,155.

Now, that is not something the health insurance companies did. That is not because of rising medical costs. That is because of decisions that were made by this Republican Congress and this Republican administration—two decisions. There was one decision to repeal a big part of the Affordable Care Act that protected sick people, that kept their rates lower. Another decision by the administration was to give relatively healthy people access to stripped-down plans.

Admittedly, those two changes may offer some benefit to people today who are healthy. I am not going to deny that those two changes may provide a lower insurance rate for a subset of people who are healthy, but we are not supposed to just represent the healthy people. Today you are healthy, and tomorrow you are not. We are supposed to represent all Americans. In fact, we probably should be going the extra mile to make sure people who, through no fault of their own, have serious diagnoses aren't paying an arm and a leg more for coverage, but we are not doing that because of the steps this Republican Congress and this Republican President have taken.

On average, insurance rates are going to go up for everybody in Connecticut by \$1,100, according to one study, and they are going to potentially skyrocket for people who can't get onto these stripped-down junk plans.

I think it is really important we talk about this. As I walked across the State of Connecticut last summer—something I have come to do in the last few years; I take about 5 or 6 days and walk from one side of the State to the other, which is something the Presiding Officer and others probably can't do in States that are a little bit longer across than 110 miles—healthcare was the dominant theme. In their having heard the news that I would be in a certain town during the day, people waited for me who were miles ahead on the road. They waited ahead of me for hours and hours to talk to me about their illnesses and about their fears that this Congress and this President were going to take away their coverage.

We were successful in defeating the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and that is great news, because the Affordable Care Act is more popular than ever before, but this Congress and this President are trying to ruin some of the most important protections in our healthcare system because they are mad that they lost the repeal vote by one vote.

So it is important for us to tell Americans what the consequences of that sabotage campaign are. It certainly means that people are going to get less protection, but it also means that, over the course of the next few months, as rates are filed across the country, you are going to see some devastatingly high premium increases due to the Republican campaign of healthcare sabotage—this week, 14 percent in Oregon; last week or the week before, 91 percent in Maryland, 64 percent in Virginia. This is what happens when you strike blows at the American healthcare system, and it is important for Americans to understand what that means.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I hope that one day soon it will not be necessary to come to the floor of this Senate and shine a spotlight on how the Trump administration is making it harder and harder for women in America to get the healthcare they need and deserve. It seems like not a week goes by without the Trump administration full-on attacking women's healthcare. It is the agenda of what I call healthcare discrimination, and it is out in full force.

The latest news came out officially less than 24 hours ago. The Trump administration has put itself right in the middle of women and their doctors, denying access to critical information that millions of women rely on from physicians and nurses—the very providers they trust and depend on. What this means is that across this country you can say good-bye to the guarantee that women are getting the whole story about their health and the options they have for their care. For millions of women, the healthcare they need is going to have to get a Trump stamp of approval, and that Trump stamp of approval is going to be the requirement to get the care they need.

I just want to say to my colleagues here in the Senate that I think this alone makes a mockery of all the talk I remember hearing from Republican colleagues in this body who said there is going to be patient-centered care in

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. TLLIS). 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

the United States already for over a year. So it would not be a magnet for those who would like to come and take advantage of it in the future. It wouldn't apply to them, but it does apply to 1.8 million who would be eligible for citizenship.

I am sorry that there was an objection, but I will continue to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to resolve this. We owe it to Dalia and to many others like her who are waiting for Congress to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from North Carolina.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, sadly, I have to do a speech that I promised I would do every week until we find justice for someone who has been in a Turkish prison now for a number of days. This is Pastor Brunson. He is a Presbyterian minister from Black Mountain. He has been in Turkey for 20 years, doing missionary work for a small church that I will describe briefly later.

On October 4, 2016, he was swept up in President Erdogan's regime's reaction to an unlawful coup—a coup that I disagree with. I believe in a peaceful transition of power, and I do believe that people who are responsible for it should be subject to Turkish laws. But the roundup of people by President Erdogan—he cast a very wide net—went so far beyond any reasonable expectation of people who could have been involved in the coup attempt. On October 4, 2016, a Presbyterian minister from Black Mountain, NC—the same church that Billy Graham was a part of—found himself arrested on charges for being a potential terrorist and plotting a coup.

He is in a Turkish prison. He has been in that prison now for 593 days—593 days, almost 17 months—without charges. He is held in a prison cell that is designed for 8 people but has 21 people in it. He is not really allowed to speak with his family. In fact, the only family he has seen over the last 593 days has been his wife, because they have been afraid to let his children come into the country for fear that they would not be allowed to leave, nor will his wife Norine leave the country for fear that she will not be able to come back. She is his only connection to his family. It has been 593 days.

I want to go back and tell you what really underlines why they think this Presbyterian minister is a part of the coup attempt or a terrorist organization. It is because they believe that religions in the United States are somehow joined together in this intelligence-gathering network so that, instead of doing missionary work, they can go into these countries and infiltrate their systems and then force coups or support or provide aid to people who would commit a terrorist act against the Turkish homeland—something that I would object to and some-

thing of which I would say that anybody who does that should be subject to Turkish law.

They believe this of Pastor Brunson, a pastor of a church in Izmir, who for many years, when he was doing missionary work, didn't even have a church. They finally were able to get the resources together. They have 50 members. This is a 50-member congregation in a church in Izmir, which is one of the more populous cities in the Turkey.

This is a very small church. On a packed day, on a Sunday, you may be able to fit 120 people in it. They open the doors so that people walking down the street can hear what they are talking about. They open the windows. They invite anybody in it.

Part of the case is that they believe that people who have entered that church are Kurdish, and because they are Kurdish, they must be associated with the PKK, and if they are associated with the PKK, then, clearly, they were involved with terrorist attempts against Turkey.

This church was also used in evidence. You see the picture. There is a small room upstairs in this very small church. There have been over one dozen secret witnesses. In a Turkish court, he doesn't have a trial by jury. He has three judges, and there is a prosecutor who is elevated, effectively, to be another judge, whom he is testifying before. One of the secret witnesses said that he clearly is guilty of nefarious activity because one night he saw a window open in this church for about 4 hours. That was the evidence submitted.

There is a problem with that. No. 1, generally speaking, in our country, having a light on doesn't necessarily go directly to being prosecuted for terrorism or conspiracy to commit terrorism. There is another problem with this allegation. This room doesn't have a window. There is no possible way somebody could have seen the light. Even if you would argue that seeing a light could somehow be linked to terrorist activity, you can't even see it.

To make matters worse, after more than a dozen secret witnesses came on, many of them in Turkish prisons themselves for the prosecution, the defense asked if they had 10 witnesses who would testify on his behalf. The judges said they would not be allowed to testify because they are suspects. They haven't been charged with anything, necessarily. They may not even be incarcerated, but they are suspects. Therefore, he has no opportunity whatsoever to defend himself.

I am about to go back and do a final vote on the National Defense Authorization Act. We have to get President Erdogan's attention. In a bill that we are going to have on this floor in the next couple of weeks, I believe we are going to send a very clear message to the President and to the people of Turkey to treat our people fairly, to treat with respect a nation that is prepared

to send American men and women to Turkey to fight and die for their freedom. If they don't, then we are going to have to continue to up the temperature until justice is done for Pastor Brunson and others in Turkish prisons.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time on the McWilliams nominations be considered expired at 12 noon on Thursday, May 24; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Evans nomination, the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the nomination; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 603. I ask consent that there be 10 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

##### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### VA MISSION BILL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senate today passed the VA MISSION Act, a long overdue piece of legislation of that would finally provide an overhaul of the healthcare system at the Department of Veterans Affairs that is desperately needed. The bill would