

Army doctor who did three tours at a field hospital in Afghanistan, somebody who knows what third-world conditions are truly like.

An article in the British newspaper the *Guardian*, out yesterday, said: "Hospitals are reporting growing chaos"—growing chaos—"with a spike in winter flu leaving frail patients facing 12-hour waits, and some units are running out of corridor space"—corridor space.

Now, that is what the situation is like in British hospitals right now, today. It turns out it happened before in Great Britain. Last winter, they had a similar problem with too many sick people and not enough options for care. Back then, the British Red Cross called the situation a "humanitarian crisis."

In today's *New York Times*—this morning's edition, page 9—talking about the British healthcare system and the problems with it, the chief executive of the National Health Service in England, Simon Stevens, in a speech to Parliament, recently said: "The N.H.S. waiting list will grow to five million people" coming down the line—grow to 5 million people. How would the American people like to be one of 5 million people waiting to get an appointment, waiting for an operation, in the waiting line? That is what Senator SANDERS and the Democrats who propose this government-run system are talking about for our country.

The scenes unfolding across hospitals in Britain—and I will describe one that is outline and written about today in the *New York Times*. It says:

Tuesday night, the emergency ward at Kingston Hospital in southwestern London looked more like an airport lounge than a hospital, with patients sprawled out in the waiting room.

"There's no real system or order; it's a jungle in here," said Nancy Harper, who had accompanied her 87-year-old grandmother, who was lying down and complaining of excruciating pain in her lower back.

"It's been more than five hours," Ms. Harper said. "We get to the front of the queue and then someone more ill comes in and we get pushed back. It's outrageous."

That is the healthcare system our Democratic colleagues are promoting for the United States—government-run, the government deciding, government rationing care.

The system in Great Britain is strained under normal conditions, even when it is not flu season. There is no margin for error. When something as routine as winter hits, the healthcare system goes completely off the rails. Is that the kind of chaos Democrats in Washington want for the United States of America? Do they want third-world conditions in hospitals; frail and elderly patients waiting 12 hours in a hallway just to get care; people getting a call telling them that the surgery they have been planning for—and maybe they have family members coming to take care of other things around the home or to take care of Grandmom—has to be put off, that they will have to wait until next month? Fifty thousand

people will be receiving that call in Britain this month.

When the government controls healthcare, it always ends up rationing care. When the bills start adding up, so do the delays. That is what happens everywhere in the world when they try a single-payer scheme. They get long lines of people waiting for care and care being denied.

Senator SANDERS put out the same plan a couple of years ago. It is interesting because one of the most liberal columnists at the *New York Times*—the newspaper that ran this story today about the British healthcare system—said that this single-payer plan would lead to rationing. Well, it does. The article went on to say that in order to keep the costs down, Washington would have to "say no to patients, telling them that they can't always have the treatment they want." That is the side of the story the Democrats will not talk about. The author of that editorial, the columnist at the *New York Times*, said that Senator SANDERS "isn't coming clean on that." The Democrats aren't coming clean on that. That is what happens in a single-payer system. Democrats who are pushing for a Washington takeover of Americans' healthcare are still not coming clean about the rationing of care that it would cause.

Republicans think patients and doctors should be the ones making those decisions, not government bureaucrats. Democrats who want to pass this new litmus test—and it is a litmus test for the liberal left—say Washington should make decisions for us. I disagree. They say that you are going to get what the government gives you. To me and to the American people, that is not what the American people want.

As a doctor who has taken care of patients for 25 years in Wyoming, patients want the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. That is the goal—not single-payer, government-run healthcare. Parents need to be able to be involved with the doctor, hospital, and their child in terms of what is best for that child, not the government coming in and making the decisions. Seniors ought to be able to decide, along with their doctor, whether it is time for a new hip or a new knee, not the government saying: We are only going to pay this many this year and that is it. And if you are not done this year, get in line for next year. And when next year comes in January, 50,000 operations push them back another month.

It is unfortunate, what we see is happening with the British healthcare system for the patients there, the doctors, the nurses, the shortages, all of the issues they have there. The issue is, do we want that for our country? We do not.

I started this by talking about NANCY PELOSI calling the tax relief reduction bill Armageddon and the worst thing in the world. She was wrong on that. Senator SANDERS is wrong about his claims

that a one-size-fits-all, government-paid, national healthcare plan that all of the American people would be under, government control, no individual choice, no patient control, not working with their doctors in their communities—I believe that would be wrong for America, and I believe that the Democrats who are supporting that and proposing that have a different view of America than certainly the people of Wyoming.

I think what is happening in England is a mistake and would be a mistake for the United States. It is not something the American people want or will, I believe, ever tolerate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING THOMAS S. MONSON

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise today to honor the selfless and dedicated life of Thomas S. Monson, the 16th president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

After nearly seven decades of church leadership and service, President Monson passed away on Tuesday evening. Millions of members of the LDS Church around the globe mourn his passing as we celebrate his life.

There is much that can be said about what President Monson taught us from the pulpit. There is much more to be learned about what he did when he wasn't speaking—the sick whom he visited, the weary he sustained, the jobless he aided, and the homeless he sheltered.

A reoccurring theme throughout his life and his ministry was "the rescue." He spoke movingly of a painting he had seen in a gallery in England that featured, as he described it, "heavy-laden black clouds and the fury of a turbulent sea portending danger and death. A life from a stranded vessel gleaming far off. In the foreground, tossed high by incoming waves of foaming water, a large lifeboat, men pulling mightily on the oars plunging into the tempest. On the shore stands a wife and two children, wet with rain and whipped by wind. They gaze anxiously seaward."

"In my mind," President Monson said, "I abbreviated the name of the painting. To me, it became 'To the Rescue.'"

Throughout his life, President Monson went to the rescue of those in need. He possessed a genuine love for those who were sad, downtrodden, and less fortunate.

He was quoted as saying:

I firmly believe that the sweetest experience in mortality is to know that our Heavenly Father has worked through us to accomplish an objective in the life of another person.

This, he took to heart. In his early years of church service, President Monson presided over a congregation with 85 widows. Although he was their appointed church leader for just a few short years, the love he felt for those widows was evident. He continued to visit each widow throughout her remaining life and was present at the funeral for each of his dear friends.

He encouraged all of us to “extend the hand that helps and the heart that knows compassion.” My colleagues here would be interested to know that President Monson often quoted Abraham Lincoln saying: “If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend.”

President Monson’s example of service and rescue was recognized by many world leaders. In an effort to promote America’s spirit of generosity, President Ronald Reagan appointed him to his Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. President Monson met with religious leaders of all faiths to talk about the welfare program of the church, which has been recognized as being highly successful in its scope and in its mission.

In closing, President Monson’s daughter, Ann Monson Dibb, observed how her father embodied the Scripture in James that reads: “Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.” There is no better description of the life and legacy of Thomas S. Monson. May we do the same by rushing to the rescue of those in need.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESCINDING THE COLE MEMORANDUM

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, up until about 8:58 this morning, we believed in Colorado that States rights would be protected. Up until about 8:58, maybe 8:55—until Twitter told us otherwise—we believed the will of Colorado voters would be respected. Why did we believe that? Because of conversations I had with then-Senator Jeff Sessions prior to his confirmation as Attorney General about what would happen with Colorado’s marijuana policy.

At the time, prior to his confirmation, then-Senator Sessions told me there were no plans to reverse the Cole memorandum. Then-Senator Sessions told me marijuana simply wasn’t going to be on President Trump’s agenda; that it was something they weren’t going to deal with; it was something President Trump simply wasn’t going to focus on.

That was back in the spring of 2016, and up until 8:58 this morning, that was the policy. One tweet later, one policy later—a complete reversal of what many of us on the Hill were told before the confirmation and what we had continued to believe the last year. Then, without any notification, conversation, or dialogue with Congress, completely reversed.

Now, perhaps the Department of Justice didn’t think this would be a big deal. I understand Attorney General Jeff Sessions’ opposition to the legalization of marijuana. I opposed the legalization of marijuana in Colorado, but this is about a decision by the State of Colorado. We were told that States rights would be protected and not just by the Attorney General, then the nominee to be Attorney General, we were told that by then-Candidate Donald Trump.

In Colorado, in July of 2016, then-Candidate Trump was asked if he would use Federal authority to shut down sales of recreational marijuana in States like Colorado. Then-Candidate Donald Trump said: “I wouldn’t do that.”

When then-Candidate Trump was asked if he thought Colorado should be allowed to do what it is doing, he said: “It’s up to the States. Absolutely.”

That was then-Candidate Trump’s position. I would like to know from the Attorney General what has changed. What has changed President Trump’s mind that the Cole memorandum would be reversed and rescinded? What has changed the President’s mind? Why is Donald Trump thinking differently today about what he promised the people of Colorado in 2016 to reverse course today? What changed? I would like to know that. I think the people of Colorado deserve to have that answer.

Without the Cole memorandum, legal businesses, operating in accordance with States rights and laws, are now operating under a cloud of uncertainty. Thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in revenue are at risk, and certainly the question of constitutional States rights is very much at the core of this discussion. I believe what happened today was a trampling of Colorado’s rights and its voters. Sure, this was a heavily debated issue, something I have already said I opposed, but the people of Colorado spoke, and they spoke loudly, and I believe that if the same question were asked today, they would even have more support for the decision they made several years ago.

I agree with President Trump that this decision should be left up to the people of Colorado and other States, and I call on Attorney General Jeff Sessions to explain to me why President Trump was wrong in 2016, what changed their minds, and that they reverse their decision to withdraw and rescind the Cole memorandum and that they reimplement and reinstate the Cole memorandum. Until that happens, I think I am obligated to the people of Colorado to take all steps necessary to

protect the State of Colorado and their rights.

That is why today I will be putting a hold on every single nomination from the Department of Justice until Attorney General Jeff Sessions lives up to the commitment he made to me in my preconfirmation meeting with him—the conversation we had that was specifically about this issue of States rights in Colorado. Until he lives up to that commitment, I will be holding all nominations to the Department of Justice.

The people of Colorado deserve answers. The people of Colorado deserve their will to be respected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for as much time as I need to complete my remarks.

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

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, despite Donald Trump’s assertion last May that “our country needs a good shutdown,” the truth is, shutting down the government is a serious and dangerous action that we must do everything possible to prevent.

Shutting down the government would impact tens of millions of our fellow Americans who would be unable to access government services. It would severely impact Federal employees who would not get the paychecks they expected. It would also have a very significant impact on our Armed Forces. In other words, we must do everything we can to prevent a government shutdown, which is exactly what will happen if a budget agreement is not reached by January 19, when the short-term continuing resolution expires.

I am very disappointed, therefore, that the Republican Party, which controls the White House, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, is pushing us closer and closer to a very dangerous government shutdown. The Republican leadership in Congress and the White House must not allow this shutdown to take place. They have to compromise. They cannot get it all.

As everyone knows, in 2011, Congress passed the Budget Control Act. The centerpiece of that bipartisan legislation was that there would be parity in defense and nondefense spending. That agreement continued in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. All of these bills provided equal amounts of funding for defense and nondefense purposes. Any future effort to increase the Budget Control Act caps must continue to