

Enzi	Lee	Schatz
Ernst	Markey	Schumer
Feinstein	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Fischer	McSally	Scott (SC)
Gardner	Menendez	Shaheen
Grassley	Merkley	Shelby
Hassan	Moran	Sinema
Hawley	Murkowski	Smith
Heinrich	Murphy	Stabenow
Hirono	Murray	Sullivan
Hoeven	Paul	Tester
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Thune
Inhofe	Peters	Tillis
Isakson	Portman	Toomey
Johnson	Reed	Udall
Jones	Risch	Van Hollen
Kaine	Romney	Warner
Kennedy	Rosen	Whitehouse
King	Rounds	Wicker
Lankford	Rubio	Wyden
Leahy	Sasse	Young

NAYS—1

Gillibrand

NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Harris	Roberts
Coons	Klobuchar	Sanders
Graham	Manchin	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mary S. McElroy, of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to the nomination.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephanie A. Gallagher, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of Stephanie Gallagher of Maryland to be a U.S. District Judge for the District of Maryland. This is a noncontroversial nomination which the Senate should be able to confirm in short order.

Judge Stephanie Gallagher brings tremendous experience to the courtroom as a sitting U.S. magistrate judge in Baltimore, as well as being a former prosecutor, private law firm attorney, and judicial law clerk. Her strong roots in the Maryland legal community, tremendous understanding and respect for the rule of law, and willingness to volunteer her time in service outside the courtroom make her an exceptional nominee. I was pleased to recommend Judge Gallagher's nomination to President Trump, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN.

I must note for my colleagues that I originally recommended Judge Gallag-

her's nomination to President Obama along with Senator Mikulski, back in 2015, given the impending retirement of Judge William Quarles in 2016. Judge Gallagher's nomination has actually been favorably recommended by the Judiciary Committee on three separate occasions, in 2016, 2018, and now in 2019. Most recently, on June 20, 2019, the Judiciary Committee favorably recommended Judge Gallagher to the full Senate for confirmation by a vote of 21–1.

I want to thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for working with me to ensure we seek out the best attorneys in our State for Federal judicial vacancies, which are lifetime appointments and one of the most important obligations we have as U.S. Senators. We have recommended judicial nominations to the President that have made Marylanders proud of our Federal courts.

Stephanie Gallagher, of Baltimore, MD, has been a U.S. magistrate judge in Baltimore since April 2011. As a magistrate judge, Judge Gallagher works closely on a daily basis with district court judges, the very position she has been nominated for today. In her current position as a magistrate judge, Judge Gallagher convenes settlement conferences, resolves discovery disputes, and prepares reports and recommendations on dispositive motions. With the consent of the parties, Judge Gallagher can take jurisdiction over civil cases. In consent cases, she becomes the presiding judge, making all rulings in the case and overseeing the trial. In this capacity, she has presided over civil bench and jury trials. She has served as the criminal duty judge on a rotating basis with her colleagues, where she presides over preliminary proceedings in felony cases and handles misdemeanor cases, including those occurring at Federal military installations in Maryland.

Previously, Judge Gallagher was a partner and cofounder at Levin & Gallagher LLC, now Levin & Curlett, for 3 years, served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Baltimore for 6 years, and was a litigation associate at Akin Gump in Washington, DC, for 2 years. She practiced in a wide variety of legal issues, including complex civil litigation, employment disputes, constitutional issues, criminal defense, and criminal prosecution.

Judge Gallagher began her legal career as a law clerk for then-Chief Judge J. Frederick Motz of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland from 1997 to 1999. She received her J.D. in 1997 from Harvard Law School, graduating cum laude, and received her B.S. in government from Georgetown University in 1994, graduating magna cum laude.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has declared this Maryland seat as a judicial emergency, based on the length of the vacancy and the caseload of the court.

Judge Gallagher was given the rating of unanimously well qualified by the

American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, which is their highest possible rating.

Judge Gallagher brings tremendous experience and credentials to the courtroom as a sitting U.S. Magistrate Judge in Baltimore, as well as being a former prosecutor, private law firm attorney, and judicial law clerk. Her strong roots in the Maryland legal community and fantastic understanding and respect for the rule of law make her an exceptional nominee. I was pleased to recommend Judge Gallagher's nomination to both President Obama and President Trump. I am confident that she will serve the people of Maryland extremely well once she is finally confirmed for this lifetime appointment as a U.S. District Judge for the District of Maryland.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this nomination and confirm Judge Gallagher.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the confirmation of Judge Stephanie Gallagher to serve as a Federal judge for the U.S. District Court of Maryland. Judge Gallagher has an impressive legal background and has provided years of service to the State of Maryland.

She is currently a U.S. magistrate in Maryland having served in this capacity since 2011. Moreover, she has occupied the position of Assistant U.S. Attorney office for the State of Maryland. Finally, she clerked for the Honorable J. Frederick Motz, a Judge in Maryland's Federal district court.

Judge Gallagher has been lauded repeatedly as a rising star, as one of Maryland's Super Lawyers, and has received a number of awards and commendations from a number of Federal agencies.

Moreover, she has strong academic credentials having graduated from Harvard Law School, J.D. cum laude. I cannot think of anyone more qualified to occupy this critical position at this important time and am grateful for her nomination and the Senate's overwhelming support for her confirmation to serve as a Judge in Maryland's Federal District Court.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today we mark the 18th anniversary of the September 11th attacks. We remember the nearly-3,000 people who lost their lives. We pray for all of the 9/11 victims and their families. We honor our 9/11 heroes. They were the brightest lights that day in the dark sky—our brave firefighters, police, service men and women. So many Americans gave their lives to save lives that day, and we pay tribute to them today.

Congress has passed new laws to care for 9/11 first responders. We recently

made the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund permanent. This ensures that all those who responded to the terror attacks and their families have peace of mind and first-rate healthcare.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, I want to turn to the topic of the overall healthcare debate that we are having in this country. For the past several weeks, I have been home in Wyoming, as you have been home in North Dakota, and I listened to the people I am so privileged to represent, many of whom I have been privileged to treat as their doctor. Of course we discussed their healthcare. As a doctor, I want to make care better and more affordable.

Folks in Wyoming actually know me first as a doctor, so many of them call me Dr. BARRASSO or JOHN as opposed to Senator BARRASSO. People back home think of their doctors as members of the family, as friends, neighbors who live down the street, who go to the same church, whose kids go to the same schools. The local hospital in Casper is right in the center of town. People don't want that to change. They want the same people giving them care, but they want it at lower costs.

This holds true for the rest of the country. People are rightly concerned. Americans worry that they won't be able to pay for healthcare. Republicans are listening to these concerns, and we are focused on lowering the out-of-pocket costs for people's healthcare. That is why we ended the unfair Obamacare tax penalty. We ended that. We recently banned the costly drug price gag clauses so people could know what things actually cost and what the best deal was for them.

Now we are focused on ending something called surprise medical billing. It happens. You get huge medical bills that you don't expect and you can't easily pay. We are also moving more measures to lower drug prices that people actually have to pay.

Here is the problem: Democrats are rejecting all of our efforts. They are proposing costly healthcare—to me, schemes. The Washington Post reports that five of the seven Democratic Senators who are Members of this body and who are running for President have backed a one-size-fits-all approach. It is a government-run plan they call Medicare for All. The Washington Post reports that a majority of House Democrats also back it. They have actually cosponsored it. They want it to become the law.

The Democrats' proposal would take away on-the-job health insurance from 180 million working Americans. Let me repeat that. What the Democrats are proposing with their so-called Medicare for All—a one-size-fits-all proposal for healthcare in this country—would take away the healthcare that people get on the job that they earned on the job. There are 180 million people who get their insurance that way in America. The cost of their proposal is \$32 trillion—that is “trillion” with a “t.” It is

an astronomical amount of money. Of course, they have to pay for that, as Senator SANDERS has said, by raising taxes on the middle class.

These Democrats clearly aren't focused on helping to lower the costs of care. They are too busy, in my opinion, with plans to destroy health insurance, to destroy union workers' hard-fought insurance benefits, to destroy the current Medicare Program for 60 million seniors, and to destroy the health coverage that people have earned at work. For what? It is all so that government can have complete control over America's healthcare system. We can't afford for that to happen. The Democrats have admitted that their ObamaCare healthcare law has failed. The polling shows that the majority of Americans do not want a one-size-fits-all healthcare plan for them.

Now, remember, when it came to the vote on ObamaCare, congressional Democrats in the House and the Senate promised that the Obama healthcare law would control costs. They actually named it—I think completely misnamed it—the Affordable Care Act. It was the Unaffordable Care Act. What we have seen is that out-of-pocket costs soared and that insurance premiums soared all after the Obama healthcare law was signed. For many Americans, health insurance premiums have doubled since the signing of the Obama healthcare law. Monthly premiums are often more than mortgage payments. This can't stand. This simply can't continue. We cannot trust the Democrats to roll the dice again with the healthcare of the American people.

The Republicans are focused on real reforms—reforms that actually lower costs and reforms that protect patients with preexisting conditions. In July, the Senate's Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions approved a measure to end surprise medical billing. It also includes language to bring down the cost of drugs. As a doctor, I know patients shouldn't stress over forms. When you are sick, you should focus on getting well. Care from an out-of-network provider can result in a big bill—called a surprise medical bill—and it can easily blow an entire family's budget. Patients should really not be pawns in this high-stakes financial chess game, so we are working with President Trump to end this unfair practice of surprise medical billing. It is the right thing to do for patients and for their families.

The Republicans are also making progress on lowering drug costs. We passed a bill I cosponsored to end the drug price gag rule. As a result, patients can always find the lowest priced drug. We are continuing to work with the President on this and other issues.

Still, to make more progress, we need Democratic support and cooperation. The choice is clear—to work together to lower costs without lowering standards or to follow the Democratic Senators who are running for President

and follow the House Democrats who are pushing for a one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare for America with the loss of choice and the loss of control—all of the concerns that come with a one-size-fits-all, government approach.

It doesn't seem like they are for lowering costs. It seems they are for raising your taxes and taking away your control and your choice. They are not for improving care. They are for increasing and growing the role of government. Remember, the Democrats want to take away health insurance from 180 million Americans—working Americans—people who go to work every day and have earned their health insurance at work.

At the same time, the Democrats who are running for President are promising free healthcare. I was astonished when I heard this from the Democrats. They are promising free healthcare for illegal immigrants. They want to take insurance away from hard-working Americans and give insurance—free—to illegal immigrants.

What kind of proposal is that? Who is being represented with this proposal by these Democratic Senators and other Democrats who are running for President? Who do you think is going to pay for all of this? Why should we pay more to wait longer for worse care?

It is not something Americans want or will tolerate. Instead, let's give patients the care they need from the doctors they choose and at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11TH

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I start my remarks tonight by thanking my colleague from Wyoming for his remarks concerning the anniversary of the horror that was September 11, 2001. I join him and all of my colleagues here in recognizing that in the midst of that horror, the American people came together, and we demonstrated the strength, kindness, bravery, and resilience that we have throughout our history.

I, too, remember the victims, their loved ones, as well as all of the brave first responders. I thank all of the men and women of our military who continue to fight against terrorism and who keep us safe, and I remember the lives lost on the battlefield.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I also want to take a minute tonight to talk about the importance of there being the continued funding to address our Nation's opioid crisis. As the Senate Appropriations Committee prepares its markup of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies' fiscal year 2020 budget, I rise to discuss the urgent need for additional funding to combat the fentanyl, heroin, and opioid crisis.

The substance misuse crisis continues to ravage communities in my home State of New Hampshire and all

across our country. People in New Hampshire are doing vital work to address this crisis and get those who are struggling the support they need to get and stay healthy.

Just last month, I visited Moms in Recovery in Lebanon, which is an addiction services program through Dartmouth-Hitchcock that is providing comprehensive care to get pregnant and parenting women the services they need to address substance misuse. In Lebanon, NH, Moms in Recovery offers everything from medication-assisted treatment to group therapy, counseling, outpatient therapy, parenting classes, and more. Providers said that what started as a program for 5 women is now serving 60. It has transformed from a program that just served pregnant women to one that is now serving women after they give birth. It works to help them stabilize their lives and to reengage in our workforce and in our communities.

People in my State are implementing innovative approaches to help their friends and neighbors, and Congress needs to give them the support they need to help save lives.

I have been proud to work with Senator SHAHEEN and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strengthen support for treatment, recovery, prevention, and law enforcement efforts. This includes having worked to secure more than \$6 billion in the 2018 budget agreement for governmentwide efforts to combat this crisis and to ensure that as the appropriations process progressed, hardest hit States, including the Granite State, were prioritized.

Last year, we also passed the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, which the President signed into law. It included, among many critical priorities, the following: establishing comprehensive opioid recovery centers, expanding access to medication-assisted treatment, and supporting law enforcement in its efforts to curb the shipment of fentanyl through the Postal Service.

Yet nobody in this body should think that our work is anywhere near complete. As the Appropriations Committee considers funding bills for the next fiscal year, I urge my colleagues on the committee to ensure that State opioid response grants, which have been a vital tool in increasing access to treatment, recovery, and prevention, are fully funded. While these grants should be increased, they must, at the very least, be fully funded at the fiscal year 2019 levels.

It is also imperative to continue prioritizing hardest hit States and to give communities additional flexibility to use this funding to address other substances that are being used in conjunction with or instead of opioids. While the vast majority of overdose deaths in New Hampshire still involve opioids, specifically fentanyl, we are seeing substances like crystal methamphetamine emerge as a growing issue. Additional flexibility in funding

can help communities respond to this challenge in realtime.

This crisis didn't begin overnight, and it will not be solved overnight. What we need at the Federal level is a long-term solution and additional certainty so States and communities know they will have stable and consistent Federal funding as they implement strategies and treatment programs that will help save lives.

One important next step would be to pass Senator SHAHEEN's Turn the Tide Act, which is legislation I have cosponsored that would invest \$63 billion in flexible funding over 10 years, support treatment and prevention efforts, and address workforce challenges in the treatment field. This is the kind of long-term, comprehensive approach we should be taking, and I will continue to join with Senator SHAHEEN to push for this bill.

The fentanyl, heroin, and opioid crisis remains the most pressing public health and public safety challenge facing New Hampshire and many other communities across our country, and the biggest mistake anyone could make is in thinking our efforts to address this crisis are close to being done.

I am going to continue to push to ensure that those on the frontlines of this crisis have the support they need. I urge my colleagues to join me so we can make our families, communities, and country healthier and safer so we can help save lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I so enjoy listening to my colleagues as they talk about the issues that are important to them and to the States they represent. It is, indeed, one of those privileges that we in this body enjoy, and many times we take it for granted. Yet today is a day of remembrance. It is a day that we look back and say we ought not take it for granted because there are many in this world who would threaten our freedoms and our liberties.

Earlier this week, I was talking with some of the members of our team, and we were trading stories about where we were on the morning of September 11 and how it affected the way we viewed their place in the world, and their memories, and what their recollections were. Those of us who vividly remember that day still recall an unsettling cascade of emotions. There was shock, confusion, and, finally, dread as we realized we were not, as initially thought, seeing a senseless accident, but that, indeed, we were under attack. As the morning wore on, dread really gave way to fear and panic and, finally, to absolute terror that our loved ones who were in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania and who were in the air, maybe flying home, were among those who were experiencing firsthand what was happening. It was the perfect storm of conflicting media reports and

jammed cell service that made it almost impossible to reach out to people and to ask that question, "Are you OK?" and to hear their voices.

Through the smoke and the blood came a moment of awful clarity. Life would never be the same because we would never again experience life without feeling as if we were a target. The events of September 11 introduced a new generation of Americans to the reality that our country is not and will never be immune to the threat of terror.

Those who were teetering on the edge of adulthood may not have immediately made the connection between global politics and the disaster that was playing out on TV in real time. Yet, by the time terrorists struck that second tower, I think a lot of people really had begun to understand what was happening. Later, they learned that a half a world away, a group of men who referred to themselves as al-Qaida had made it their life's mission to murder Americans. They were doing it to prove a point. Yes, it did leave a mark on this Nation and on our citizens. Younger Americans' memories of that day really are fuzzier, but almost without exception, my staff members remember what they now describe as a sense of national unity rising up in the days following the attacks.

They remember that every house on the street flew an American flag and that every adult they knew stood in a line to give blood. They saw small town first responders load up those firetrucks and emergency vehicles and head to New York.

At the time, they really didn't understand geopolitics, but they did understand fear and suffering because they saw that fear in the eyes of their teachers and in the eyes of the adults who surrounded them; but they also saw the shift that the attacks and the aftermath caused in our country. For a time, partisanship and bitterness was washed away. What you saw was unity, and waving flags.

Now, almost 20 years later, memories are growing fuzzy. Sometimes they are nonexistent. Calls for unity have been replaced by heated debate. Too often, the loudest voices look back at 9/11 as an event in the collective memory, and they don't look at it as an occurrence that changed lives and lifestyles forever.

They consider in passing the remnants of the attacks in debates over foreign policy and defense spending, but ignore why we remain so focused on national security. This is why every year, without exception, we remind ourselves that the kind of hatred it takes to bring an entire country to its knees gives no quarter.

We acknowledge the actions of 19 terrorists whose twisted beliefs led to the violent murder of nearly 3,000 innocent people because even though the panic of that awful morning has faded, our enemies' desire to make an example of us has not. But America, with all her

imperfections, still thrives in utter defiance of hatred, divisiveness, and destruction.

Today, we remember those who died, and we keep their memory as a beacon against the void that allowed violence and terror.

We remember the heroes who defied fear and reason and ran toward the flames, putting love of country and countrymen above all else.

And we remember and remind ourselves that by simply standing back up, America made herself the world's best example of what it looks like when love, hope, and valor triumph over the forces of darkness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action for the nominations confirmed during today's session of the Senate.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:15 p.m. on Thursday, September 12, the Senate vote on the Bowman and Nordquist nominations and that, if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; further, that following disposition of the Nordquist nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Feddo nomination; finally, that at 1:45 p.m. the Senate vote on the Feddo nomination and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms

sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-49 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Poland for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$6.5 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

GREG M. KAUSNER,
(For Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-49

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$4.1 billion.

Other \$2.4 billion.

Total \$6.5 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty-two (32) F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) Aircraft.

Thirty-three (33) Pratt & Whitney F-135 Engines (32 installed, 1 spare).

Non-MDE: Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer, and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4I/CNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer; Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F-35 unique infrared flares; reprogramming center; F-35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (PL-D-SAI).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: September 10, 2019.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Poland—F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft

Poland has requested to buy thirty-two (32) F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) Aircraft and thirty-three (33) Pratt & Whitney F-135 Engines. Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer, and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4I/CNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer; Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F-35 unique infrared flares; reprogramming center; F-35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistics, and personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$6.5 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally, which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. This sale is consistent with U.S. initiatives to provide key allies in the region with modern systems that will enhance interoperability with U.S. forces and increase security.

This proposed sale of F-35s will provide Poland with a credible defense capability to deter aggression in the region and ensure interoperability with U.S. forces. The proposed sale will augment Poland's operational aircraft inventory and enhance its air-to-air and air-to-ground self-defense capability. The Polish Air Force's legacy MiG-29 and Su-22 fleet will be replaced with F-35s. Poland will have no difficulty absorbing these aircraft into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this aircraft, systems and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company in Fort Worth, Texas; and Pratt & Whitney Military Engines in East Hartford, Connecticut. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale. However, the purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreements will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor(s).

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips to Poland involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews/support, program management and training over the life of the program. U.S. contractor representatives will be required in Poland to conduct Contractor Engineering Technical Services (CETS) and Autonomic Logistics and Global Support (ALGS) for after aircraft delivery.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.