

introduce the generic; and the rebate system, which works to preserve market share but also to increase prices and to keep them high so patients do not benefit from competition.

If we are going to say the patient should have the power in order to have lower prices, we can say right now that the system seems to be aligned against the patient.

What can we do? Well, my office and others have several proposals in the current pieces of legislation going through, such as the so-called real-time benefit analysis. A prescription is ordered for a patient. The patient scans a barcode, and it would say: At this point, with your deductible and your copay, this is how much this drug is going to cost you, but there is a generic available, and you can get that generic instead. That would be a real-time benefit analysis that would save the patient money.

We just talked to the folks at Blue Cross California. They are coming up with so-called gainsharing. If a patient selects a lower cost medication, the patient receives some of the savings that would otherwise have all gone back to the insurance company—another great idea. Senator BRAUN was speaking about the patient having skin in the game. In this case, there will be skin in the game because the patient shares the benefit with the payor for being cost-conscious. That is the patient having the power.

We can also add value-based arrangements, which pharmaceutical companies, to their credit, have proposed. If you are the pharmaceutical company, you get paid only if the medicine works. If the medicine doesn't work, you don't get paid. If it does work, you do. That is a value-based arrangement. We have a bill with Senator WARNER that would do that.

I would also mention attempting to cap Part D exposure. If there is a senior citizen who is in the catastrophic portion of her policy, then you can cap the amount the senior might be exposed to. Under current law, she might be paying 5 percent of \$100,000 worth of medicine. She is taking an essential drug to treat cancer, and she is paying 5 percent of that \$100,000, in addition to 5 percent of the other medications she is receiving. This is something many seniors cannot afford and this is something we as Congress can find mechanisms by which we can cap that exposure but still hold taxpayers whole.

We have to enhance existing markets. As you might guess, my theme is that we should enhance it in terms of giving the patient the power, but we also have to preserve the innovation that has led to the great drugs I spoke about earlier. If all we do is steal intellectual property from the pharmaceutical companies, we will lose these innovative drugs. But, again, we need to have the drugs affordable for the patients. This is the tension—promote innovation but ensure affordability.

We have a number of solutions, such as those I have just mentioned, in the

HELP Committee and now in the Finance Committee. Republicans have solutions. My office continues to work on those. I look forward to working with my colleagues on their implementation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 4 P.M. TODAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3 p.m., recessed until 4:01 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF JOHN P. PALLASCH

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak about the two nominations we are about to vote on.

The first one is the nomination of John Pallasch to be the Assistant Secretary of Labor overseeing the Employment & Training Administration. This is a critically important role that manages nearly two-thirds of the Department of Labor's budget and our Nation's workforce development programs, which serve over 22 million youth, workers, jobseekers, and seniors who are working to improve their employment opportunities and the lives of their families.

This position is particularly important now as we are seeing the Trump administration work to undermine some of the most crucial programs within the Employment & Training Administration. They are attempting to close Job Corps centers that help train at-risk youth, conserve our natural resources, and provide economic opportunities in rural areas and communities in need. They are also proposing a duplicative, lower quality apprenticeship program that would put workers at risk and give taxpayer dollars to for-profit colleges with very little accountability.

It is clear that the Employment & Training Administration needs a leader now who is knowledgeable, who is experienced, and who is committed to providing workers with the training, support, and benefits they need to succeed in this changing economy. Unfortunately, Mr. Pallasch is not that person. Throughout this nomination process, Mr. Pallasch has shown that he has very limited experience with or understanding of the programs that he would be overseeing.

I am going to vote against this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

At this time, I also want to once again reiterate my disappointment in the unprecedented obstruction to Democratic nominees to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the National Labor Relations Board.

Last Congress, Republicans refused to confirm two very highly qualified and respected nominees to additional terms on the EEOC and the NLRB.

Earlier this year, Republicans broke yet another longstanding tradition by confirming a majority nominee to the EEOC without a Democratic pair.

Last week, the White House announced its intention to nominate a bipartisan pair of nominees to the EEOC. After a year of obstruction, I am encouraged by this small step toward bipartisanship and normalcy, but I am here today to urge the White House to formalize these nominations as quickly as possible so that the Senate can confirm them and restore balance to the EEOC.

I strongly urge the White House to nominate a full slate of nominees—Republican and Democrat—to both the NLRB and EEOC.

For those reasons and because of Mr. Pallasch's lack of experience and knowledge about the programs and the policies he would be responsible for, I will vote against his nomination.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT L. KING

Madam President, I also come to the floor today to oppose the nomination of Robert King to be the Department of Education's Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education. This position is especially important because so many of our Nation's students are struggling today in higher education.

Over the last few years, I have heard from students who are worried about how they are ever going to afford their textbooks or their rent or even their food, who are worried if their college is preparing them for a good education and if they are going to be able to get a good-paying job and pay off their loans.

First-generation college students are struggling to navigate their financial aid and how to succeed on a college campus for the first time. I am hearing about those worried about being able to get an education without being discriminated against or harassed or assaulted on campus. Those are just a snapshot of the issues students are facing in higher education today.

These challenges are not easy to solve. That is why Chairman ALEXANDER and I are working now to address all of those issues and more in our reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

As we work to update this critically important law, we cannot ignore the current actions of this Department of Education, which is loosening and eliminating rules that benefit predatory colleges instead of protecting students. Students should have an ally at the Department of Education, someone who understands the challenges they are facing and is committed to helping students succeed.

Among other responsibilities, this Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education is responsible for developing rules, for developing a budget and legislative proposals for higher education,