

qualify. These are the types of reforms we need instead. Overhauling our entire healthcare system to put everyone on the same subpar plan would not help anyone.

The way I see it is we have two options. One option is Medicare for All, which forces everyone onto the same plan. The government tells you what clinic to go to, what doctor to see, what brand of prescription you can get access to. You lose the power to make decisions about your own healthcare, and you simply have to take what you get on somebody else's timeframe. That is Medicare for All. It would simultaneously ruin Medicare by forcing all 330 million Americans onto the same plan, which will bring down the quality of care for our seniors, who have paid over the years into the plan, and which will bankrupt our country in the process.

I think there is a better choice, a better option. Rather than the government's telling you what you have to do, let's make smart, targeted reforms that allow patients to determine the coverage and care they want at more affordable prices. I believe we can implement these reforms in a way that will bring down costs without reducing choice.

We can continue to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, which is something we all agree should be done. We can lower the costs of prescriptions and out-of-pocket costs and stop the bad actors who game the system. We can provide the States with more flexibility to allow for more coverage options so that families can pick the plans that are right for them. Yes, we can also encourage innovation so our country will remain at the forefront of medical solutions and innovation.

Those are two words you don't ordinarily see—"government-run" plan and "innovation"—in the same sentence. As a matter of fact, they are polar opposites.

Finally, we need to preserve Medicare for our seniors who have paid into this over their lifetime.

I appreciate my colleagues who are hard at work to make these kinds of reforms a reality. And I have heard from my constituents loud and clear. When it comes to healthcare, they want more choices, more affordability, not the one-size-fits-all that Medicare for All would provide.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BURR).

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. LANKFORD. I rise to remind the Senate of two anniversaries that are happening this week. This week is the 75th anniversary of the invasion of Normandy. It is commonly known as D-Day. One hundred sixty-thousand-plus individuals crossed the English Channel by aircraft, by boat. They moved in every way possible, starting in the middle of the night and with the major invasion that was the largest naval invasion in the history of the world. They would have crossed into France—what was the beginning of the end of Nazi Germany.

The loss of lives of Americans and Allied forces was catastrophic as they pushed in. The boys, 18, 19, 20 years old, got on aircraft, got on ships, launched out into the water, knowing there was a tyrant on the other side who had to be stopped. It is entirely appropriate for the Nation to pause to remember D-Day, to know the freedom we have right now was protected by a generation that stood for that freedom. As the Nation looks toward Normandy a couple days from now, I think we should once again thank the "greatest generation" that guarded our freedom.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. President, today is also a 100-year anniversary, though. One hundred years ago today, June 4, 1919, the Senate voted to pass the right for women to vote. As a son of a pretty amazing mom and as the husband of a really remarkable lady and as the dad of two daughters who are both voters now—they cannot thank the ladies enough who started in the 1800s working toward a basic human dignity and right; that is, the right for people to vote. It is astounding to us as a nation to think that it took that long, all the way up until 1919, to have a vote in the Senate to allow women to vote. That vote—with 36 Republicans and 20 Democrats that day who voted on June 4, 1919—changed the direction of how we would vote and how we would cooperate together as a nation.

Now, we have a lot of other areas to fix, but that one was a big one, and my family is grateful for what was done in the past. People who come through the Rotunda of the Capitol often see a statue there that looks like it is not finished. It is a block of stone, and there are three ladies who are carved out of it, but a part of it is not carved. I often hear people say they don't understand that statue. That statue is Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott, the three ladies who led the movement of ladies all over the country to just speak out and say ladies should have the right to vote. Those three ladies are carved into stone that is in our Rotunda, but what is interesting is, the statue is unfinished because the assumption was in the days ahead, there would be more ladies in the future who would step out and would lead a nation to make sure that we allow the rights of every single individual to be honored.

So, for the sake of my mom and my aunt, my grandmother, my wife, my daughters, and millions of ladies, we cannot thank those ladies enough for standing up for what was right at that time period. I think it is appropriate that we pause for just a moment in the Senate and remember June 4, 1919, 100 years later, and thank those ladies for standing up for the rights of ladies in their generation and the ladies in the generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

#### JOB CORPS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, everywhere I go in Montana, I hear the same thing from my State's business owners and job creators of the State; that they need more workers. They need more highly skilled welders, bricklayers, heavy machine operators, and laborers. The list goes on and on. I will tell you that I think the biggest limiting factor to moving our economy forward is a well-trained workforce. These businesses give living-wage jobs to the folks who are able to fill them, if they have the skills to fill them.

That is why I was so appalled when the Trump administration recklessly and cluelessly moved to close so many successful Job Corps programs across this country.

While we have heard there is some sort of reprieve for the Anaconda Job Corps, we have not received word that actually means it is going to stay open or any of the other Job Corps across this country—16 of which were scheduled for privatization and 9 of which were out-and-out closures—will stay open.

In Montana's case, we have two successful Civilian Conservation Corps programs: the Anaconda Job Corps and the Trapper Creek Job Corps. The Anaconda Job Corps, of course, is in Anaconda, MT. The Trapper Creek Job Corps is in Darby. These two job training centers play an active role in our State's economy.

We have a foundry in Butte, MT. It is called Montana Precision Products. Mike Robbins is a co-owner of that. This company has hired more than 50 Job Corps graduates in recent years alone—more than 50—most of whom, if not all, were from the Anaconda Job Corps. He has promoted these folks—some of them—from entry level to mid-level managers.

So when Mike and his brother Burt need high-skilled employees, the first place they look is the Job Corps. Why? Because these folks come out with a skill set that fits their needs.

Now, you may ask: Who is going into the Job Corps? These are at-risk folks. These are folks who are having a hard time with life and a hard time getting a job, and they go in the Job Corps—young people—and they give them a skill, a skill they can use in the private sector, a skill that if the Trump administration has their way, they will no longer be able to receive.