



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2019

No. 172

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Eternal master, You sit on the throne of the Universe. We offer You today a sacrifice of Thanksgiving, for we borrow our heartbeats from You.

Inspire our lawmakers to love discipline and to cherish Your word, seeking always to glorify You. May they trust Your power and wisdom to supply what is needed to keep our Nation strong.

Have Your way, sovereign God. You are the potter; we are the clay. Mold and make us after Your will, while we are waiting yielded and still.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for 1 minute.

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

### WOMEN'S SMALL BUSINESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I read, I want to apologize to the Small Business Women of America because October is National Women's Small Business Month, and my apologies because this speech should have been given on October 1 rather than at the end of the month.

October is National Women's Small Business Month, and I want to recognize the many women-owned businesses. They really help make our economy stronger. In Iowa, we work hard to inspire women to start businesses and support them in their entrepreneurial journeys.

According to American Express, Iowa ranks eighth out of 50 States for growth in the number of women-owned businesses, as well as in their own growth in employment and revenues.

The network growth for women entrepreneurs and access to resources have helped make the difference in these women's lives and our communities. I hope that this growth will continue and that we will continue to have a massive increase in the number of women's small businesses in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 further minute as in morning business.

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

### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I know you aren't going to believe this—what happened in addition to President Trump being sworn in—but on January 20, 2017, President Trump was sworn into office and became our Nation's 45th President. Most Presidents enjoy what political scientists refer to as a "honeymoon" period. During that honeymoon period, these new Presidents are given a chance to push their agenda, and partisan politics usually takes a back seat—but not for this President.

On his Inauguration Day, January 20, 2017, a Washington Post headline read—so it had to be coming out even before he was sworn in—"The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun." That campaign has been in full swing ever since. Let's make no mistake: This process about concerns over alleged high crimes and misdemeanors, as the Constitution speaks about the

reasons for impeachment, doesn't really mean much compared to an effort to impeach this President that started before he ever was sworn in. No, instead, this is about the Democratic Party, still bitter years later, trying to undo the 2016 election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that article in the Washington Post, dated January 20, 2017.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 2017]

THE CAMPAIGN TO IMPEACH PRESIDENT TRUMP HAS BEGUN

(By Matea Gold)

The effort to impeach President Donald John Trump is already underway.

At the moment the new commander in chief was sworn in, a campaign to build public support for his impeachment went live at [ImpeachDonaldTrumpNow.org](http://ImpeachDonaldTrumpNow.org), spearheaded by two liberal advocacy groups aiming to lay the groundwork for his eventual ejection from the White House.

The organizers behind the campaign, Free Speech for People and RootsAction, are hinging their case on Trump's insistence on maintaining ownership of his luxury hotel and golf course business while in office. Ethics experts have warned that his financial holdings could potentially lead to constitutional violations and undermine public faith in his decision-making.

Their effort is early, strategists admit. But they insist it is not premature—even if it triggers an angry backlash from those who will argue that they are not giving the new president a chance.

"If we were to wait for all the ill effects that could come from this, too much damage to our democracy would occur," said Ron Fein, legal director at Free Speech for People. "It will undermine faith in basic institutions. If nothing else, it's important for Americans to trust that the president is doing what he thinks is the right thing . . . not that it would help jump-start a stalled casino project in another country."

The impeachment drive comes as Democrats and liberal activists are mounting broad opposition to stymie Trump's agenda. Among the groups organizing challenges to the Trump administration is the American

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6261

Civil Liberties Union, which plans to wield public-records requests and lawsuits as part of an aggressive action plan aimed at protecting immigrants and pushing for government transparency, among other issues.

"We think that President Trump will be in violation of the Constitution and federal statutes on day one, and we plan a vigorous offense to ensure the worst of the constitutional violations do not occur," said Anthony D. Romero, the ACLU's executive director.

"We may have a new president, but we have the same old system of checks and balances," he added.

Strategists behind the campaign for impeachment said they are confident that other groups will soon join their cause. They argue that Trump will immediately be in violation of the U.S. Constitution's Foreign Emoluments Clause, which prohibits a president from accepting a gift or benefit from a foreign leader or government.

Fein cited several examples, including rent paid by the Industrial & Commercial Bank of China for its space in Trump Tower in New York and potential ongoing spending by foreign diplomats at the Trump International Hotel in Washington and other Trump properties. In addition, he said, royalties collected by the Trump organization from the president's business partner in the Philippines, who was recently named special envoy to the United States, could violate the clause.

Trump said this month that he would donate "profits" from foreign business clients to the U.S. Treasury. However, neither Trump nor representatives of the Trump Organization have provided details on how such payments would be tracked, collected and disbursed.

The foreign emoluments clause has never been tested in the courts, and some scholars argue that violating it would not qualify as "treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors," the grounds for impeachment of a federal official.

But Fein noted that former Virginia governor Edmund Jennings Randolph, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and later the first U.S. attorney general, argued during Virginia's debate over ratifying the constitution that a president who was found to have taken a foreign emolument "may be impeached."

His group has mapped out a long-shot political strategy to build support for a vote in the House on articles of impeachment.

The first step is fairly simple: getting a resolution introduced that calls for the House Judiciary Committee to investigate whether there are grounds to impeach Trump—a move that Fein said a number of members of Congress are interested in taking. "Getting it introduced is not going to be a problem," he said.

Still, the idea that a majority of the GOP-controlled House members would ultimately vote to launch an investigation of the new president seems highly improbable. Fein said he is confident the political climate will change and lawmakers will eventually support the effort.

"I think that at a certain point, the combination of new revelations coming out and, importantly, calls and pressure from constituents in their own districts will be a deciding factor," he said. "And at some point, they will decide it is in their own interests to support this."

While half a dozen federal judges in American history have been impeached by the House and successfully convicted in the Senate, no U.S. president has ever been removed from office through such a process. The closest was Andrew Johnson, who narrowly avoided conviction in the Senate in 1868 after

the House charged him with removing the secretary of war in violation of the Tenure of Office Act.

In 1974, the House Judiciary Committee approved articles of impeachment against then-President Richard Nixon, but he resigned before they could be voted on by the full House. President Bill Clinton was impeached by the House on charges of perjury and obstruction of justice, but the articles of impeachment were defeated in the Senate in 1999.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will vote on funding for the national defense. It will offer a test for our Democratic colleagues: Will their party's impeachment obsession crowd out even the most basic governing responsibilities?

Unfortunately, it seems we may already have our answer. The Democratic leader said at a press conference yesterday that his party intends to filibuster funding for our Armed Forces. Democrats have plenty of time and energy for their 3-year-old journey to impeach the President, but they can't get to yes on funding our servicemembers. That is about as clear a statement of priorities as you could get around here.

Just a few days ago, U.S. Special Forces executed a daring mission and took out the founder of ISIS. It was the clearest possible reminder that the national security of the United States and the missions of our servicemembers do not pause for partisan politics. But less than a week later, for political purposes, Senate Democrats say that they will refuse to secure funding for those very same missions.

Washington Democrats have talked up a storm in recent days, criticizing the administration's approach to Syria and the Middle East. Lots of talk—but, apparently, they are not concerned enough about the Middle East and fighting ISIS to actually vote for the funding that keeps the missions going.

Consider this. If Democrats filibuster this defense funding, as they threatened to, they will literally be filibustering the exact kind of military assistance for Ukraine over which they are trying to impeach the President.

Let me say that again. This legislation is what appropriates the money for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, which is precisely the program that Democrats are trying to impeach President Trump for supposedly slow-walking. Yet, tomorrow, right here in the Senate, they say that they are going to filibuster funding for the exact same program.

Only in Washington—only in Washington will you see a show like that.

They want to impeach the President for delaying assistance to Ukraine

while they block funding for the program themselves. I would say it is unbelievable, except that is exactly what is happening.

Look, I think it is pretty clear that our Democratic colleagues do not have a great affinity for President Trump. But the country cannot afford for Democrats in Congress to take a 1-year vacation from any productive legislation just because they would rather obsess over impeachment.

ISIS and other radical terrorists are not going to hit the pause button because Democrats will not fund the U.S. military. Strategic competitors like Russia and China are not going to hit pause because Democrats would rather hurt the White House than fund our military commanders.

Look, Congress needs to do its work. We need to fund our Armed Forces. Tomorrow's vote will tell us which Senators are actually ready to do it.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, speaking of impeachment, yesterday, House Democrats released their much-hyped resolution, which was advertised as bringing fairness and due process into Speaker PELOSI's and Chairman SCHIFF's closed-door, partisan inquiry. Unfortunately, the draft resolution that has been released does nothing of the sort. It falls way short—way short.

As I have said repeatedly, an impeachment inquiry is about the most solemn and serious process the House of Representatives can embark upon. It seeks to effectively nullify Democratic elections and cancel out the American people's choice of a Commander in Chief.

For that reason, any such inquiry must be conducted by the highest standards of fairness and due process. But thus far, this time around, instead of setting a high bar, House Democrats seem determined to set a new low.

Speaker PELOSI has initiated a bizarre process, starting with the fact that she began it with a press conference instead of a proper vote of the House. The process seems to be treating Chairman SCHIFF as though he were a de facto special prosecutor, notwithstanding the fact that he is a partisan Member of Congress whose strange behavior has already included fabricating a lengthy quotation and attributing it to President Trump during an official hearing, which he was chairing.

House Democrats' inquiry thus far has been conducted behind closed doors. They have denied their Republican counterparts privileges that Democrats received during the Clinton impeachment when they were in the minority. Unlike during the inquiries around both President Clinton and President Nixon, they have denied President Trump basic due process rights and are cutting his counsel out of the process in an unprecedented way.

House Democrats' new resolution does not change any of that. It does not

confer on President Trump the most basic rights of due process or, seemingly, alter Chairman SCHIFF's unfair process in the House Intelligence Committee in any way whatsoever.

Chairman SCHIFF can continue doing this behind closed doors without the President's participation, so long as he holds at least one public hearing at some point. He is not even required to make all the evidence he obtains public. He alone gets to decide what evidence goes in his report. And the resolution doesn't even give the President any rights in the public hearing that it requires Chairman SCHIFF to hold.

The resolution merely seems to contemplate that maybe—maybe—some day in the future, at some other phase of this, due process might—might—finally kick in, but only if the House Judiciary Committee feels like holding hearings and calling its own witnesses—in other words, no due process now, maybe some later, but only if we feel like it.

“No due process now, maybe some later, but only if we feel like it” is not even close to fair. “No due process now, maybe some later, but only if we feel like it” is not a standard that should ever be applied to any American, and it should not be applied here to the President of the United States.

I understand that many House Democrats made up their minds on impeachment years ago, but our basic norms of justice do not evaporate just because Washington Democrats have already made up their minds.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, our Democratic colleagues do apparently have time to push for show votes on messaging resolutions with no chance of becoming law. This week's installment is a Democratic effort to limit the flexibility that Governors of both parties have utilized to lighten the burdens of ObamaCare. States have jumped at the opportunity to use waivers to reduce the costs associated with ObamaCare's mandate. In the States that have taken advantage, premiums decreased significantly.

In 2018, the Trump administration expanded this policy with an even more flexible interpretation of this part of ObamaCare. The goal was to give States even more of what they had been asking for, even more latitude to preserve consumer choice and lower premiums. But notwithstanding all the evidence that says this is the right direction for the American people, our Democratic colleagues want to roll back the Trump administration guidance and limit States' flexibility.

Since this position is virtually impossible to explain on its merits, our Democratic colleagues have instead turned to a familiar talking point: the false claim that Republicans are trying to undercut protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. Sound familiar? But, of course, that is not true.

As Senate Republicans have said over and over and over again, we support protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. And the administration has made it very clear that this waiver program poses no threat—no threat—to those protections. The Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has stated that “a section 1332 waiver cannot”—cannot—“undermine coverage with people with pre-existing conditions.”

What is more, as the White House has already made clear, Democrats' resolution has zero chance of becoming law. This is just another political messaging exercise with no path to making an impact.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution, keep fighting to lower premiums for the American people, and protect those with preexisting conditions.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 4334

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4334) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2020 through 2024, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AND THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES RELATING TO “STATE RELIEF AND EMPOWERMENT WAIVERS”—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 52, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 52) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8

of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to “State Relief and Empowerment Waivers”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, even as we consider the package of appropriations on the floor this week, we must also think about how both parties can reach an agreement on all 12 bills we need to pass before Thanksgiving. It is way past time for Democratic and Republican appropriators to sit down and hammer out bipartisan agreement on allocations to the various agencies, known as 302(b)s. That is how we got this done in the past. Democrats and Republicans in Congress have successfully negotiated two budget deals. The key to those agreements was that the President allowed Congress to do its work and stayed off to the side. I believe that, again, if left to our own devices, Congress could work out an agreement to fund the government.

As everyone remembers, the President's meddling and erratic behavior caused the last government shutdown—the longest in our Nation's history. The best way to avoid another shutdown would be for the President to keep out of the appropriations process and for Republicans to stop the games and get serious about negotiating in a bipartisan way forward.

I believe there was a meeting yesterday, and there may be some progress. I think some progress was made. Let's continue moving in that direction, the four corners of the Appropriations Committee—House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans—and put together an agreement we can all support.

#### TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, on the whistleblower, as the House of Representatives continues its impeachment inquiry as to whether the President jeopardized national security by pressuring Ukraine to interfere with our 2020 elections, the White House, their allies in Congress, and the media have resorted to despicable tactics to falsely discredit individuals who have provided the House testimony.

Yesterday, LTC Alexander Vindman, an Active-Duty Army officer serving on a detail in the White House, testified before Congress. Since Lieutenant Colonel Vindman's testimony was announced and especially in the past 24

hours, he has been vilified by individuals in the media and elsewhere. Although he has served our country for more than 20 years, although he is a recipient of the Purple Heart after being wounded while serving in Iraq, he has been called derogatory terms, and some have even gone so far as to call him a spy and question his loyalty to the United States.

These attacks are outrageous. They are unacceptable, and they are not unlike the attacks the President and his allies have levied against the whistleblower whose account first alerted Congress to the President's misconduct with Ukraine. The President has publicly suggested the whistleblower is treasonous and a spy.

Separately, recent public reports suggest that a Republican member of the House Intelligence Committee is actively trying to expose and leak the whistleblower's identity. This is so, so wrong. Disclosing or causing to be disclosed the identity of a whistleblower is such a breach of faith of our whistleblower laws, which are designed to see that the truth gets out. Anyone seeking the release of the whistleblower's identity is frustrating the truth and is potentially in violation of Federal law. Not only that, the disclosure of the whistleblower's identity may result in reprisals and threats to their personal safety and the safety of their families.

Today, I am sending a letter to the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Army asking them to provide us with what actions the Army is taking to ensure that Lieutenant Colonel Vindman is afforded appropriate protections. Lieutenant Colonel Vindman and whistleblowers like him are standing up for the Constitution they swore an oath to defend. Their lives and families must not be put in jeopardy by an outrageous attack or disclosure.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, now on healthcare, today the Senate will hold a vote on a resolution to repeal a Trump administration rule promoting junk health insurance plans, which offer a way around protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. The administration has worked to make it easier for States to use taxpayer dollars to subsidize these junk insurance plans, many of which don't cover essential benefits, like maternity care, preventive screening, and mental healthcare. These junk plans leave families vulnerable and are nothing but a boon to health insurance companies.

For nearly 3 years, Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration have sabotaged Americans' healthcare. Funding to sign up Americans for health insurance has been eliminated. Programs to help low-income Americans afford insurance has been canceled. President Trump's budgets have threatened deep cuts to Medicare and Medicaid. Now, the Trump administration is suing to repeal the entirety of the healthcare law.

Yesterday—just yesterday—new data showed that 400,000 fewer kids have

health insurance now, most of whom are under 6—innocents. When they have bad health, they need help. That breaks your heart. The effect of all this sabotage is very, very real.

Now, think about this issue, about protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. Think of a mom or dad who has a son or daughter and they discover that he or she has cancer. They go to the doctor, and the doctor says: Look, I have this very expensive medication or this expensive treatment that will help cure your child, but the insurance policy doesn't cover it.

The family doesn't have enough money to pay for it, and they watch their child suffer. That should not happen in America. We want to prevent it from happening.

That is why we hope our colleagues will join us in this CRA to overturn what the administration has done that would allow that terrible example to go forward.

Let me continue on healthcare for a minute. Despite making explicit promises to defend protections for Americans with preexisting conditions in campaign ads—I even heard some speak about it as recently as yesterday—Republicans have voted to undermine these protections in Congress on several occasions. There is no getting around the fact that junk insurance plans offer a way around these important protections and drive costs up for everyone else.

Do Republicans want to use taxpayer dollars to fund these junk plans and add to insurance company profits?

I hope not, but we will see today. Today, my Republican colleagues face a test. They can vote to defend healthcare protections for Americans who need it most or they can stand with President Trump and vote to allow these junk health insurance plans with so many devastating effects on so many families flood the market.

#### SYRIA

Mr. President, finally, on Syria, we were informed yesterday that after multiple requests, the Senate will finally receive an all-Member briefing by the administration on the situation in northern Syria this afternoon. I am glad the briefing is taking place, but it is regrettable that it has even taken this long.

Secretary Pompeo also will not participate, which is profoundly disappointing, given that we must hear from the Secretary of State at times and on issues such as this.

Nevertheless, those members of the administration who will be there today must answer several important questions. What is our strategy moving forward on northern Syria? How are we going to protect troops and our national interest? And, most importantly, exactly what is our plan to ensure the enduring defeat of ISIS and to make sure that those who are still imprisoned don't escape and those who have already escaped don't hurt us?

These urgent questions go to the heart of America's national security, and we need them answered today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The majority whip is recognized.

#### DEATH OF ABU BAKR AL-BAGHDADI

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, ISIS took a big hit over the weekend when U.S. forces raided ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi's compound in Syria. Al-Baghdadi died in the raid after he detonated a suicide vest in a final act of cowardice, killing three children with him. The second in command was confirmed killed in a second military strike hours later, leaving the organization temporarily leaderless.

Over the past few years, ISIS has spilled a river of blood across the Middle East. Its brutality has set it apart even among other terrorist organizations. Torture, rape, enslavement, crucifixions, beheadings, and the deliberate targeting of whole populations based on their religious beliefs—the list of crimes is long and often nearly unspeakable.

The world is a safer place today because of al-Baghdadi's death. This impact will only be temporary unless we dedicate ourselves to ensuring that ISIS is permanently defeated.

The successful raid on al-Baghdadi's compound is a reminder of the fact that our military may be called on at a moment's notice to head halfway around the world to fight evil. The men and women of the U.S. military stand on guard 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, ready to put themselves between us and danger.

This past weekend, I had the honor of helping to welcome home 112 South Dakota Army National Guard soldiers of the 147th Forward Support Company and Bravo Battery of the 147th Field Artillery Battalion. These citizen soldiers were in Europe for nearly a year working with our NATO allies and increasing unit readiness.

As Members of Congress, we have no more fundamental responsibility than ensuring that our men and women in uniform are prepared to meet any threat. We do that by providing timely and adequate funding for the current and future needs of our Armed Forces. That means funding the military through regular order appropriation bills—not through temporary funding measures that leave the military in doubt about funding levels and unable to start essential new projects.

Unfortunately, our efforts to fund the military in a timely fashion have been stymied by Democrats who blocked the Senate from passing the Defense appropriations bill in September before the end of the fiscal

year. We are now a month into the new fiscal year, and Democrats are still indicating that they intend to block this year's Defense appropriations bill.

Let me briefly review what Democrats are blocking. They are blocking funding to support a pay increase for our military men and women. They are blocking funding for weapons and equipment that our troops need right now. They are blocking investment in the equipment and technology that our military will need to defeat the threats of the future. They are blocking funding for missile defense, for research and development, for ships, planes, and combat vehicles to update our aging fleets, and they are blocking funding for our allies, including \$250 million in military assistance for Ukraine.

Let me just repeat that last point. Democrats, who are currently trying to impeach the President for allegedly delaying Ukraine funding, are currently blocking \$250 million in assistance for Ukraine. Now, I am pretty sure that is the definition, if you look it up, of both irony and hypocrisy.

Toward the end of the summer, it looked like Democrats might actually be willing to work with Republicans to pass this year's appropriations bills. Both Democrats and Republicans agreed to a bipartisan deal laying out funding levels for both defense and nondefense spending, but, apparently, that was as far as Senate Democrats were prepared to go. Now that it has come time to honor the spirit of that agreement and get this year's Defense appropriations bill done, Senate Democrats are balking.

Democrats would like us to believe they are serious about legislating; that their yearslong obsession with impeaching the President isn't distracting them from doing their job. Well, they are going to have a chance to prove that in the very near future.

If Democrats are actually serious about legislating, if they are serious about meeting their responsibilities, then they will work with Republicans to move forward on the Defense appropriations bill and to get this legislation to the President as soon as possible. I hope that is what they will choose to do.

As Chairman SHELBY noted on the floor last week, Congress's failure to do its job and fund our military is making the military's job more difficult, and that, as Chairman SHELBY noted, is unacceptable. It should be unacceptable to all of us. It is time to get our men and women in uniform the funding they need and the pay increase they deserve. It is time to get this year's Defense appropriations bill done. It is time for the Democrats to stop stalling and foot-dragging and blocking, and for them to work with us to make sure our men and women in uniform have what they need to protect Americans and keep us safe.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, at 12:15 p.m., the Senate will vote on a Democratic proposal to overturn a Trump administration guidance from the Department of Health and Human Services that would lower insurance rates all across America. Seems like a strange thing to do, but to justify that, the Democrats have come up with a scary fairytale that has no basis in truth, that suggests that somehow this effort to lower insurance rates would jeopardize the protection for pre-existing conditions that all Americans have according to the law. Of course, that can't happen because the law doesn't permit it. So I want to talk about that a little bit today.

What the Senate Democrats want to overturn is a Trump administration guidance regarding what is called a section 1332 waiver. Now, a 1332 waiver was part of the Affordable Care Act of 2010 that Democrats passed. No Republican voted for it. So you had the Affordable Care Act, which says, among other things, that every American who has a preexisting health condition is protected. That means that if I have a preexisting health condition, and I want to buy insurance, I have a right to buy it. I can't be charged any more for it because of my preexisting health condition, and I am covered if I get sick. That is what we mean by protection for preexisting conditions. That is in the Federal law. No American can be denied that protection.

In the very same law, the Affordable Care Act, Democrats wrote another provision to give States more flexibility in how they spend ObamaCare money with the hope that they might be able to lower rates for Americans who have health insurance. That would be a good thing because in Tennessee, and across the country, really, since ObamaCare passed, rates have gone up 163 percent. Those rate increases especially hurt people who make a little bit more than \$50,000—say a songwriter in Nashville or a farmer like Marty, whom I ran into in the Chick-fil-A outside Nashville, who said: I can't afford health insurance. I have to pay \$15,000 or \$20,000 because I don't get any ObamaCare subsidy.

States are trying to take advantage of this provision of the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—that says States may have some flexibility in how they spend ObamaCare money. The law also says states cannot jeopardize pre-existing conditions protections for anybody.

Now, the best evidence that what we are talking about is a scary fairytale is that 12 States already have used a 1332 waiver. Remember, this is the provision in the Federal law that was designed to give States more flexibility

in how they spend Federal dollars. Twelve States have already used that provision in law to lower rates. There are 12 waivers from States that have been approved by the Trump administration, and premiums have gone down in all 12 States as a result of this action. This is what the Democrats want to stop. They want to stop States from using this provision which the Democrats invented in 2010 to lower insurance rates. That is why it is a scary fairytale that only on Halloween anybody could imagine could come up with.

Now, 7 of the 12 waivers that were approved by the Trump administration were under an Obama definition of Section 1332, and 5 have been approved since the new guidance that is the subject of the vote today. For any State to get a 1332 waiver, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has to approve it. Seema Verma is the Administrator of that agency. She has made it very clear, No. 1, that none of the 12 waivers that have been approved jeopardize preexisting health condition protections for anybody. In other words, the waivers did lower rates for some people, but they didn't hurt anyone's ability to buy insurance who had a preexisting condition. Just because it helped some people didn't mean it hurt other people.

Seema Verma went on to say very clearly:

To be very clear, the 2018 guidance—

The one we are talking about today—

does nothing to erode ObamaCare's preexisting condition provisions, which cannot be waived under Section 1332.

In other words, the law the Democrats wrote in 2010 does not allow States to waive the preexisting condition. Seema Verma goes on to say:

"Section 1332 does not permit States to waive Public Health Services Act requirements such as guaranteed availability and renewability of health insurance, the prohibition on using health status to vary premiums, and the prohibition on preexisting conditions exclusions. Furthermore, a section 1332 waiver cannot be approved that might otherwise undermine these requirements. This administration stands committed to protecting people with preexisting conditions."

The bottom line is, 12 States have already used section 1332 waivers to reduce premiums. More States want to come up with other ideas to do the same. In none of the 12 States were preexisting condition protections jeopardized for one single person. Seema Verma says it cannot be, under the law, and if any of the other States have some sort of new proposal—she wouldn't approve it.

There is no doubt there is a good reason why so many Governors may want 1332 waivers. In fact, many of the States that have already been granted waivers have Democratic Senators as well as Democratic Governors. Many States are trying to reduce health insurance rates because ObamaCare has driven those rates so high. In the four

bipartisan Health Committee hearings I chaired in September of 2017, virtually, every witness told our committee that the process of applying for a 1332 waiver was too cumbersome, too inflexible, and expensive for States to use.

In the fall of 2017, provisions to improve that waiver application process were included in bipartisan legislation that was proposed by 12 Republican Senators and 12 Democratic Senators. At one point, the distinguished Senator from New York, the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, said it was such good policy that every Democrat ought to vote for it.

In 2018, Senate Democrats blocked that bipartisan legislation, which would have, by the way, lowered insurance premiums by 40 percent over 3 years, and it became clear Democrats were refusing to change even a word of ObamaCare.

I encouraged Secretary Azar and the administration to take a look at the section 1332 waiver and, within the current law, do whatever they could to give States more flexibility. Fourteen Governors wrote the Secretary seeking help to make 1332 waivers work so they could start lowering premiums in their State.

In October of 2018, the Trump administration issued new guidance with much needed flexibility so States can use 1332 waivers. Democrats who vote at 12:15 to overturn this guidance are taking a tool away from their States, a tool that many States want, to lower health insurance rates and, in every single case, without jeopardizing protection for preexisting conditions.

That was the whole purpose of the 1332 waiver. That is why Democrats put it in the Affordable Care Act. That is why 13 States have approved those waivers and 12 have been approved just for one type of solution called reinsurance. That is when States take some money and put it in a reinsurance pool. A State can take the sickest people in that State and put them there. When the sickest people are out of the other pool, it lowers rates for the people who are left. States can do reinsurance with Obamacare money. States lower health insurance rates for these people in the pool. You make sure the people who are sickest have insurance, and you don't take away anyone's right to buy insurance who has a preexisting condition.

In each of the States, health insurance premiums have gone down as much as 43 percent in some cases. North Dakota has seen the average ObamaCare premium decrease 20 percent; Colorado, 16 percent; Delaware, 13 percent; Montana, 8 percent; Rhode Island, 6 percent. You want to overturn a guidance that attempts to give States more of that same kind of flexibility to lower insurance premiums without affecting the ability of any American to buy insurance with preexisting condition protections? There is no reason States shouldn't be able to have that flexibility.

Let me give you an example of what this guidance that we are talking about today would mean. In 2017, Iowa submitted a waiver application that would have restructured the premium subsidies. That is the money Iowa gets from Washington under ObamaCare. According to Iowa Governor Kim Reynolds, Iowa's waiver would have given 18,000 to 22,000 Iowans access to more affordable insurance. These were Iowans who made too much to qualify for Federal subsidies and were left behind by ObamaCare's skyrocketing profits. This might be a farmer in Iowa making \$55,000 a year and, with no subsidy, paying \$15,000 or \$20,000 for an insurance policy. The rates would be lower under Iowa's proposal.

Under the old guidance, Iowa's innovative waiver couldn't be approved. Now, with the new guidance—the one you seek to overturn today—Iowa can work with Administrator Verma to get the kind of creative waiver so 18,000–22,000 more Iowans can afford health insurance. To be clear—to emphasize—just as with the other 12 examples that have been approved, no new waiver can be approved that would take away the right of any Iowan who has a preexisting health condition to buy insurance at the same price as if that person didn't have a preexisting health condition and to keep insurance coverage when that Iowan gets sick.

It is simply a scary Halloween fairytale drummed up by the other side—for reasons I can't imagine since so many of their States are benefiting from 1332 waivers—to take away from States the ability to reduce health insurance costs. As I said earlier, any waiver that is approved—as 12 already have been—to help some people get lower cost health insurance cannot hurt another person in that State by taking away their right to buy insurance at the same price that covers their preexisting condition. States with 1332 waivers include these States with Democratic Senators who will be voting today: Hawaii, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Wisconsin. Do they really want to take away from their State the ability to lower health insurance premiums in a way that doesn't jeopardize preexisting conditions? That is pretty strange. Then there is Colorado, Montana, Delaware, Rhode Island, Alaska, North Dakota—the same.

I think this just gets back to the point that Democrats have elevated ObamaCare to the 67th book of the Bible, and they can't change a word of it, even though they wrote the 1332 waiver in the Affordable Care Act to give States the flexibility to reduce healthcare premiums, which 12 States now have done. Democrats also wrote, in the Affordable Care Act, that you cannot take away from any American the right to buy insurance at the same price if you have a preexisting health condition. That has been reaffirmed by the Trump administration. It is in the law. To suggest otherwise, as I said

earlier, is a scary fairytale dreamed up for Halloween.

I hope that all Senators—especially from those States who have seen the 1332 waiver work so well—will vote not to overturn the guidance that gives more Americans a chance to pay lower healthcare premiums.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Wisconsin.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1556

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague Senator MARK WARNER and the entire Senate Democratic caucus to force a vote on his resolution to protect Americans with preexisting health conditions and stop the Trump administration from using American taxpayer dollars to promote junk insurance plans that don't even have to cover people who have preexisting health conditions.

The difference between the two sides of the aisle here is really clear. The Senate Republicans have worked with President Trump to pass repeal plans that would take people's healthcare away and allow insurance companies to charge more for people with preexisting health conditions.

When their effort failed legislatively, instead of working in a bipartisan way to lower healthcare costs for working families, President Trump and his administration spent 2 years working to sabotage our healthcare system. The Trump administration's sabotage has made it harder for people to sign up for quality, affordable coverage, and there are more Americans who are uninsured today than when President Trump took office.

The Trump administration is even in court to support a lawsuit to overturn the Affordable Care Act completely, which will take away guaranteed health protections and raise costs for Americans with preexisting health conditions. If they succeed, insurance companies will again be able to deny coverage or charge higher premiums for nearly 130 million Americans who have preexisting health conditions.

Meanwhile, this administration has expanded what we call junk insurance plans. These are plans that can deny coverage to people with preexisting health conditions and don't have to cover essential services like prescription drugs, emergency room visits, and maternity care.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to think about this for a moment. President Trump supports overturning the law that provides protections for people with preexisting health conditions while he expands these junk plans that don't provide those protections. This is what the Senate Republicans support. This is their plan.

Last year, we forced a vote on my legislation to block President Trump's expansion of junk insurance plans that don't have to cover people with preexisting health conditions. The final vote tally was 50 to 50, with the entire Senate Democratic Caucus and one



Senate Republican voting in support of my legislation. Those who say they support healthcare coverage for people with preexisting health conditions should support the No Junk Plans Act. Today, I want to take another vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1556 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, the Senator from Wisconsin is exactly correct. Every Senate Democrat has voted to take away a low-cost insurance option from what the Urban Institute says is 1.7 million Americans. These people can't afford other kinds of insurance. That is what they want to take away, and she is attempting to do that once again. I have plenty of constituents who have a right to get their insurance but who can't afford it. This is the only kind of insurance they can buy.

This kind of insurance was good enough for the George W. Bush administration. It was good enough for the Clinton administration. It was good enough for the Obama administration right up until the last few days, and it should be good enough under the Trump administration.

According to the Urban Institute, all the Trump short term plan rule does is give 1.7 million Americans an opportunity to buy short-term insurance while they move from one job to another or while they look for a different situation. According to the Urban Institute, those 1.7 million Americans would otherwise go uninsured, and that is what the Democrats are for.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, obviously, I am disappointed with the objection.

I would point out that these junk plans are often called short-term plans, but the change that was made by this administration was to go from a 3-month sort of transition plan that, as my colleague indicates, could be used when one changes employment or other short-term use, and now they are available and renewable for up to 3 years. These plans do not preserve the protections under the Affordable Care Act to cover people with preexisting health conditions and essential health benefits.

You don't have to take my word for it. We can read directly from the fine print on the actual plans that are being debated.

One of these junk plans from Companion Life, which is currently avail-

able in my home State of Wisconsin, reads: "This plan has a pre-existing limitation provision that may prevent coverage from applying to medical conditions that existed prior to this plan effective date."

Another junk plan from Golden Rule says that the plan doesn't comply with the guaranteed essential benefits provided by the Affordable Care Act.

To quote directly from the plan, the description reads: "Even if you have had prior Golden Rule coverage and your preexisting conditions were covered under that plan, they will not be covered under this plan."

It is abundantly clear that these plans don't cover protections for people with preexisting conditions.

The people of Wisconsin did not send me to Washington to take away people's healthcare. I want to protect the guaranteed healthcare coverage that millions of Americans depend on. I want to help more families get the quality, affordable healthcare they need.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1905

Despite the sabotage that I have described from this administration against the Affordable Care Act, in Wisconsin this year, things are getting better with the new Governor. Thanks to strong leadership from Governor Evers and the investments his administration is making, Wisconsinites will have more choices and more affordable rates for quality health insurance plans this year. Wisconsinites in every corner of the State will be able to find healthcare plans this year that include essential benefits like prescription drug coverage, maternity care, emergency room visits, and mental healthcare at more affordable prices.

Governor Evers is providing funding for more health insurance navigators and is conducting awareness campaigns in the State so that families in Wisconsin will have the information they need to sign up for quality and comprehensive healthcare plans. That is why enrollment navigators are so important. We need to keep up the funding for navigator programs so that more people can find affordable healthcare plans that meet their needs. Navigators help millions of Americans, including those in rural communities, sign up for quality healthcare coverage.

The Governor of Wisconsin understands the importance of navigators, but Washington has failed to step up. Unfortunately, since President Trump took office, his administration has slashed Federal funding for the navigator program by 84 percent. Trusted navigator programs, like those in Wisconsin, have had their funding cut by nearly 75 percent since 2017, meaning fewer people in Wisconsin have received the support they need to obtain affordable coverage.

That is why I introduced the ENROLL Act this year with my good friend from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY. This bill restores funding for

the navigator program and helps to ensure that Americans have better access to the affordable healthcare coverage that they need and want. The ENROLL Act passed the House of Representatives earlier this year. We should also pass it in the Senate so that Americans can more easily enroll in quality healthcare coverage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1905 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, in 2017, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services found that navigators were not cost-effective in enrolling people in health insurance.

During the 2017 open enrollment period, navigators received over \$62.5 million in Federal grants while enrolling 81,426 individuals. That is less than 1 percent of those enrolled in the Federal exchanges, which comes out to a cost of \$767 per enrollee. In other words, the taxpayer is paying \$767 per enrollee for each person enrolled. The CMS also found that nearly 80 percent of the navigators failed to reach their enrollment goals.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed to see my Republican colleague again object to the legislation that will help more Americans access quality, private health insurance, Medicaid, or the Children's Health Insurance Program. This is especially harmful to families in rural communities who already lack access to in-person assistance for shopping and enrolling in quality, affordable health insurance coverage.

So let me lay plain for everyone what we are seeing here from the Republicans and this administration.

Today, the Republicans objected to passing my ENROLL Act, which would provide funding for healthcare enrollment assistance to help people find high-quality, affordable plans that would actually meet their healthcare needs.

Today, the Republicans objected to passing my legislation to stop the expansion of junk insurance plans that don't even have to cover people with preexisting health conditions.

The Republicans are working to make it harder for one to sign up for high-quality, affordable healthcare.

This administration is encouraging Americans to buy junk insurance plans that don't provide the health coverage

that they need and that can deny coverage to people who have preexisting health conditions.

Finally, the Republicans and the Trump administration are supporting a lawsuit that would overturn the entire Affordable Care Act and take healthcare away from literally millions of American families.

The choice for the American people could not be clearer. I am working with my Democratic colleagues to help make things better for the American people. Sadly, the Senate Republicans are helping the Trump administration make things worse. I will not give up this fight.

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

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

S.J. RES. 52

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, we are going to vote on a CRA later this afternoon, and this has been the issue dominating D.C. and did in my campaign: the cost of healthcare.

I am going to vote against the CRA, and I am not going to go into the particularities of it. I just want to tell you how it works on Main Street USA and kind of my perspective of how we really solve healthcare in a way that is going to be affordable and last for a long time.

I just finished visiting all 92 counties in Indiana talking to Hoosiers, young and old, small businesses to farms. Everyone is concerned about where is healthcare cost going in the future.

We don't seem to, here, have a real good plan for it. As a Main Street entrepreneur that took it on myself a few years ago to create a sustainable, affordable plan, most people think it absolutely can't happen using free market principles. I will go into a few details of how that works in my own business.

ObamaCare was addressing an issue that has been boiling up for a long time. I took on the insurance companies to fix it in my own company back in 2008—covered preexisting conditions, no caps on coverage.

But ObamaCare was a solution that was never going to work. It was Big Healthcare in cahoots with Big Government. Never have I seen that result in something less expensive and more effective.

I believe in free markets driving the solutions, and the healthcare industry is who I blame for being in this pickle. That sounds unusual coming from a free market guy that doesn't believe in government.

But not all markets are free. One of the most disappointing things is when my own Republican colleagues mistake the healthcare industry for being one

that is free and transparent. It has evolved over the years to where it has become as bloated and dysfunctional as the Federal Government that runs trillion-dollar deficits.

ObamaCare decisions are made by healthcare industry executives and Federal Government bureaucrats, instead of by patients, employees, and mostly employers who are the only ones that really have skin in the game when it comes to our healthcare system.

I believe the underlying principles of ObamaCare were right on. No one should go broke because they get sick or have a bad accident.

I believe that you cover preexisting conditions with no caps on coverage. Kids staying on the plan until they are 26? Fine. But it didn't work from the beginning, and it won't be an affordable—it was the Affordable Care Act. It turned into the un-Affordable Care Act, and it is not a solution in the long run.

The solution will be to get the industry out of the doldrums and to realize that when 80 Senators weigh in with an idea of how to fix your business, the cat is out of the bag. You have a problem. Sadly, in a place like this, which you can see can get sidetracked in so many different ways and then never really craft solutions that last in the long run, that is kind of what we are up against now.

The bills that have come through from three different committees—primarily Finance and the one I am on, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—do some good things. Senator GRASSLEY and I did an op-ed this week about negotiating drug prices in a way that is going to bring them down. These bills have real things that will work. I am disappointed that they are not aggressive enough, but we need to start somewhere.

The drug companies have been notoriously involved in—after they do such a good job coming up with a solution, a remedy, then hand it over to a broken distribution system that ends up—and I will tell a little story.

When I was uninsured, after I had to get off my great company's insurance that was based upon wellness, not remediation, and my employees and patients were encouraged on dollar one to shop around and find solutions—that worked. Here, the industry does everything it can to not make it work. This should have been a simple thing to do.

Luckily, I don't have many prescriptions. I knew it was a generic that should cost 15 to 20 bucks. I had six or seven places to choose from in my hometown. I went to the first one that would have been the most convenient and fumbled around for 2, 3, 4 minutes. They kept asking me what my insurance plan number was. I said: I have none. I am uninsured. I want your best deal.

It came back \$34.50.

I made another call to a place that I know has been on the leading edge. It took them 10 seconds, \$10, and they

said: By the way, we can have it ready in 10 minutes.

That is the way things worked in the real world.

Any of us that run businesses where you have transparency, competition—take LASIK surgery for instance. It is the only part of healthcare that actually works. Do you know why? Insurance companies aren't involved. Providers deal with patients, consumers. Ten, 12 years ago, \$2,000 to \$2,500 an eye, done with a scalpel. Now the technology is better, and you can get it done for \$250 to \$500 an eye. That is the way things should work.

The solution is not more of what we tried that has failed. It certainly isn't Medicaid for All. How can that work when, if you are honest about how much it is going to cost, it would nearly double the size of our Federal Government. Plus, why would you turn something like that over when we can't even get it right in the Veterans' Administration, where about 10 million patients are covered, not 330 million? That would be jumping from the frying pan into the fire. It would be a disaster. We can't afford it. Of course, no one around here ever asks the question about how you pay for anything.

We are going to completely exhaust the Medicare trust fund in 6 to 7 years. Employers and employees have been paying into that since the 1960s. That will probably be the first reality check this place has—maybe along with the fact that foreign countries and everyone else are not going to keep lending us money to finance trillion-dollar deficits—which, by the way, will hit \$1.5 trillion in 6 to 7 years, when the interest on the debt is going to be more than we are paying for defense.

In conclusion, our healthcare system needs radical change, but it needs to be changed in a way that takes the power from the industry and government and gives it back to the patient/consumer, like it works in the real world.

I will use this example: I know that in my hometown, if you are buying a big-screen TV—which, by the way, costs about one-fourth to one-third of what it did 10 years ago, kind of like LASIK surgery—I know people in my hometown would probably drive 50, 60 miles to save 50 bucks on a thousand-dollar purchase. We don't do that. The healthcare consumer has atrophied. They talk about they love employer-provided insurance. Well, that is because the consumer pays for very little of it.

I will give a few details of what can happen when you are innovative, when you incorporate the concepts of skin-in-the-game, doing more than asking others to pay for it. In our own plan, people enter their deductible less than they did 11 years ago because the incentives were put in place. But I found a way to do it uniquely, where most CEOs didn't want to take the risk.

I believe in insurance for everyone. I believe in access. You heard me earlier. In this day and age, preexisting conditions—that ship has sailed. I backed



that up with actions in my own business. But I don't believe that you can take more of what is proven never to work and try to get it to be where it is twice the size of our current government.

Republicans can lead on healthcare but only if we stop acting as apologists for a healthcare industry that is dysfunctional and broken to the core, and then you set yourself up, for politicians here—and a public that generally falls for it—that that is going to be the solution.

On our first foray into surrendering that right to the government through ObamaCare, it yielded what it was predicted to—higher costs and fewer options.

The only prescription for our ailing healthcare system is consumer-driven, transparent competition. I look forward to unveiling more of those ideas, and that is why I will vote against the CRA this afternoon.

I put the challenge and the onus on the back of the healthcare industry to get with it before you have a business partner that you are not going to like—the Federal Government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, while I am so sad to be here, I am always glad to have the opportunity to recognize Senator Kay Hagan.

There are certain people who carry with them a warmth and kindness that lift up others, even in places that are not always warm or kind and even when the going gets tough. Kay was exactly that kind of person and one of the best examples I can think of. She wasn't only that—not at all. As another mom in the Senate, I saw how deeply she was dedicated to her family—her husband, Chip, and her children, Jeannette, Tilden, and Carrie. Kay was smart, witty, and fierce, and she was an unwavering champion for North Carolina families and communities.

Nine years ago almost to this week, Kay came to the floor to advocate for health reform, and she did it as she always did—by putting North Carolinians first.

Kay came here and she shared the story of Tim and Marilyn, a family from Mooresville, NC. They had racked up tens of thousands of dollars in debt because Marilyn's preexisting condition meant her only option was a high-cost, high-deductible plan. Kay called powerfully for protections for preexisting conditions.

Nearly a decade has now passed since the Affordable Care Act became law, so not everyone remembers how, in that fight, every single Senate vote mattered, and there were certainly

some Senators who listened to the pun-dits and the naysayers at the time who wanted the bill to fail. Kay tuned out all of that and listened to people from her home State, like Tim and Marilyn, instead, and because she did, more than 4 million North Carolinians with preexisting conditions have protections in law today. They have the peace of mind Kay wanted so badly for Tim and Marilyn and every one of her constituents.

Democrats are going to be talking a lot about healthcare this week, and in particular, we are taking a very important vote on upholding those protections that Kay fought so hard for. So especially throughout this week, I will be thinking about Kay. I will be thinking about the difference her love for her State has made in the lives of people across North Carolina and our country. I will be grateful, as so many others are, for her amazing friendship, her wisdom, and her willingness to stand up for what is right.

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

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

#### S.J. RES. 52

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it has been just over 2 years since the Senate voted down legislation that would have repealed the Affordable Care Act. If we had voted down the Affordable Care Act, that would have also erased the protections for Americans with preexisting medical conditions.

In the time since then, two things have happened. One, my colleagues from across the aisle have read the writing on the wall. They recognized that the American people support the protections for preexisting conditions on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis; and, two, the Trump administration released the rule that we are discussing today—a rule that would allow taxpayer dollars to subsidize these short-term junk plans that actively undermine the insurance market and jeopardize the one very popular part of the ACA, protecting folks with preexisting conditions.

I know that my colleague, Senator BALDWIN, was here earlier, and Senator BROWN, Senator WYDEN, and Senator MURRAY. They have outlined in some detail the challenges around these junk plans, or some refer to them as short-term plans. The truth is, these plans don't have to cover things such as emergency room visits, maternity care, or other essential benefits, and they once again allow insurance companies to discriminate against Americans based on their medical history.

With all due respect to my Republican colleagues, you can't have it both

ways. If you support protections for preexisting conditions, you can't sit by and let this administration dismantle them. You have to stand up and defend these protections because, as you know, folks in Virginia are depending on them and constituents in your States are as well.

Very shortly, each Member of this body will have a chance to go on the record with this resolution of disapproval.

I fear some Members of this body have forgotten what it was like before the ACA, when an unexpected surgery or a diagnosis of a chronic illness could mean a one-way ticket out of the middle class.

Unfortunately, this is not a hypothetical. Earlier today, a group of us had a press conference where a young woman from my State came forward, and not only did her child have an enormous medical condition, but her husband was then diagnosed with lymphoma, and she was diagnosed with brain cancer.

Without the protections of the ACA, she testified she would not be able to afford healthcare coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I will speed this up.

Let me also point out that, recently, one of my constituents, a man named Jesse, received a \$230,000 medical bill for his back surgery. Unbeknownst to him, he purchased one of these so-called short-term junk plans only to discover that he now fell into the category of having a preexisting condition, and this plan didn't cover his challenge.

Jesse is 1 of the more than 3 million Virginians with a preexisting medical condition. Nationwide, more than 130 million Americans have preexisting medical conditions like diabetes, asthma, or cancer.

Before the Affordable Care Act, an insurance company had every right to deny these individuals coverage, charge them unaffordable premiums, or terminate their plans. We cannot go back to those days.

Unfortunately, this administration has used every tool at its disposal to destabilize the market in the hopes that it will come crashing down so they can finally repeal the ACA.

The rule we are talking about here today is a perfect example, among many others, of what this administration has done. They have defunded cost-sharing payments that reduce premiums in the marketplace. They have shortened the enrollment period and cut the budget for outreach navigators—all folks who have helped Americans find a plan that works best for them.

Look at the recent case. The Texas v. United States lawsuit that could be decided this very week would, overall,

strike down the health insurance system as we know it, with no replacement plan in place.

The truth is, if these protections for people with preexisting conditions are going to survive, we have to have a stable insurance market.

We can and should have legitimate debates about 1332 waivers. Certain States have used those in a very productive way, but that is not what we are talking about today.

The Trump administration's rule is not a good-faith effort to bring down costs or drive innovation. It is a direct effort to undermine the stability of the insurance market and is an attack on the viability of protections for Americans with preexisting conditions.

Again, I know we are going to vote on this CRA action very shortly. I urge my Republican colleagues to support it so folks with preexisting conditions can go about their daily lives knowing they will be protected.

Thank you. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues giving me those extra couple of minutes.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I know it is Halloween, and it is time for trick or treat, but I urge my colleagues not to be tricked by this scary fairy-tale dreamed up by the Democrats that would suggest that the section 1332 waiver that give States more flexibility, which they wrote, somehow jeopardizes protections for people with preexisting health conditions, which they also wrote. Both are in the 2010 ObamaCare law.

Preexisting health conditions are protected. The law says so. The law does not allow any 1332 waiver, which is the subject of what we are voting on in a few minutes, to change that.

Twelve States have had their 1332 waivers approved by the Trump administration, and in no case did it affect preexisting conditions.

Seema Verma, who has to approve all of these waiver applications from the Department of Health and Human Services, says the law doesn't permit any change in preexisting condition protections, and if somehow a waiver asked for it, she would not approve it.

What my Democratic friends are voting for today is to take away a tool from States that has been used to reduce rates by 43 percent in Maryland, 20 percent in Minnesota, and 15 percent in New Jersey. It has been used in Hawaii, Wisconsin, Colorado, Minnesota, Delaware, Rhode Island, Alaska, and North Dakota.

Why would you take away a flexibility option that you wrote to give your own voters lower health insurance rates?

I know it is Halloween, but don't be tricked. Don't believe this scary fairy-

tale. Protection for preexisting conditions when you buy health insurance is the law. Nothing in the 1332 waiver guidance changes that.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we will vote to reject yet another attempt by the Trump administration to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, ACA. The President has tried to do everything within his power to dismantle the law. He has tried to repeal it through Congress twice and failed both times. When that did not work, his administration joined Republican State attorneys general in a lawsuit that would strike down the ACA with no plan to replace it, one of the reasons Congress rejected his initial repeal efforts. Now, this President has decided to unravel the ACA through other means.

We have seen efforts to destabilize the health insurance market by not making cost-sharing payments, reducing funding to help enroll individuals in plans, or by allowing insurers to sell less comprehensive plans through short-term coverage or association health plans. This administration has also welcomed waivers from States that want to restrict Medicaid coverage by conditioning benefits on whether or not someone has a job.

Throughout its ongoing efforts to sabotage the ACA, the Trump administration issued its rule to allow States to discriminate against Americans with preexisting conditions. This rule gives States new options for pursuing a section 1332 "state innovation waiver" under the ACA. Section 1332 of the law gives states additional flexibility to implement State-specific improvements that expand coverage, reduce costs, and provide more comprehensive benefits. I am proud that Vermont was the first State to apply for a waiver when the application process first started in 2016.

Now this administration wants to significantly change the enforcement of the four important guardrails enacted by Congress that waiver proposals must meet in order to be approved. These guardrails ensure that the waivers must offer comprehensive plans at an affordable rate that protect patients with preexisting conditions and do not increase the Federal deficit. Under this rule, States can increase costs for vulnerable populations and reduce their quality of coverage. That is unacceptable, especially for this President who promised on the campaign trail that "everybody is going to be taken care of." The intent of the 1332 provision was to let States innovate, so long as they continue to cover the same number of people and maintain the consumer protections set forth in the law. Vermont's waiver is consistent with the ACA and seeks to *expand* coverage to improve healthcare outcomes for all Vermonters.

By allowing States to permit the sale of health insurance plans that do not cover essential health benefits such as maternity care, emergency room visits,

or mental healthcare, those that need comprehensive health insurance coverage will be forced into a high cost plan, or stuck with an insurance plan that can deny benefits for whatever reason. These consumer protections were at the heart of the ACA and are why Vermont and a number of other States have enacted State laws to maintain these critical protections for those with preexisting conditions.

Throughout their numerous attempts to sabotage the ACA, this administration has made dubious claims that they support protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. Certainly, their well-established record clearly and unequivocally refutes this claim. Today, Senate Republicans can show the American people that they do genuinely want to protect Americans with cancer, diabetes, arthritis, substance use disorders, behavioral health disorders, or any of the other preexisting conditions that States would not have to cover under this rule.

This vote is about the more than 130 million Americans with a preexisting condition who need strong protections. It is about who we are as a nation and how we care for our people. Congress must ensure that all Americans have access to comprehensive, high-quality health insurance plans that meet their needs at an affordable rate. The passage of Senator WARNER's the Protect Pre-Existing Conditions Congressional Review Act resolution would be a step in the right direction. We must not send our country back to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against people with preexisting conditions. We must not go backward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 337 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoehn	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennet	Harris	Warren
Booker	Sanders	

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 52) was rejected.

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 amendment No. 948 to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Richard C. Shelby, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Lisa Murkowski, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, James E. Risch, Mitch McConnell.

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 amendment No. 948, offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY, to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 338 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Graham	Reed
Baldwin	Grassley	Risch
Barrasso	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Braun	Hoehn	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Jones	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	Kennedy	Sinema
Collins	King	Smith
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	
Gillibrand	Portman	

NAYS—5

Blackburn	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Paul	

NOT VOTING—7

Bennet	Harris	Warren
Booker	Klobuchar	
Cassidy	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 5.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 948, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Shelby) amendment No. 950, to make a technical correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, so far, the 116th Congress has been full of a number of dubious measures, as I might characterize them, by our friends across the aisle as it relates to our healthcare system.

For starters, our Democratic colleagues in the Senate and the House and on the Presidential campaign trail are hailing Medicare for All as the gold standard for healthcare in America.

I was here during the debates over the Affordable Care Act, and I remember President Obama's saying, if you like your policy, you can keep it and that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Neither one of those proved to be correct and true. Yet, here, our Democratic colleagues have simply given up all pretense and have embraced a Medicare for All Program that would outlaw some 180 million Americans' private health insurance policies. In other words, the policy you get through your employer as part of the fringe benefits of your employment would no longer be available under Medicare for All. This is, of course, socialized medicine, which ensures long waits for standard care.

Yes, it is true that I have heard some say: "Well, it is Medicare for All. Who would want it?" and others say: "No. I am for the public option." Both of these are slippery slopes into a single-payer, socialized medicine healthcare system that will deny consumers the choices they might prefer to make for themselves rather than to leave the government to make those choices for them. Not only would this trigger a lot of disruption, it would also lead to sharp increases in taxes to fund this, roughly, \$30 trillion pipedream.

Last month, Speaker PELOSI managed to take this debate on healthcare to the next level. It seems like controlling people's healthcare alone isn't enough. Now they want to run the drug industry too. Forget about choice. Forget about competition. Forget about innovation. One of the things that has characterized the American healthcare system is the lifesaving innovation of drugs. The Democrats want to now have the Federal Government determine what the formulary is, what drugs are available to you. They want to set the prices and ensure the bureaucrats rather than families are at the center of our healthcare system. They are churning out partisan healthcare bills, one after another, and taking their party further and further to the left with every move.

I would like to think, ultimately, cooler heads will prevail in the Senate, where we have been working on bipartisan bills to bring down healthcare costs. For example, the Senate's Judiciary, Finance, and HELP Committees have each passed bipartisan packages of bills to end surprise billing so as to

create more transparency when it comes to pharmaceuticals and increased competition, but that doesn't mean this side of the Capitol is immune from some of the politics when it comes to our healthcare system.

Rather than following the Speaker's lead in introducing partisan bills, the Democratic leader in the Senate has taken a different tack, that of blocking bipartisan consensus bills. For example, there is a bill I introduced earlier this year with our colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, to bring down skyrocketing drug prices. Senator BLUMENTHAL is a Democrat, and I am a Republican, but contrary to what you may see in the media, that doesn't mean we can't talk to each other or work together in the best interests of our constituents.

Because Senator BLUMENTHAL and I both sit on the Committee on the Judiciary, we have been looking at the price hikes that have been caused by people who game the patent system, specifically something called patent thicketing. Some drugmakers build a web of patents that is so intricate it is virtually impossible for competition to go to market even when the patent on the underlying drug has expired or will expire soon. They use these so-called patent thickets to hold competitors at bay and keep prices high for as long as possible.

This is something Senator BLUMENTHAL and I are trying to stop through our bill, the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act. This legislation would disarm those patent thickets and streamline litigation by limiting the number of patents companies can use so competition can go to market sooner.

This legislation passed the Senate's Judiciary Committee in June without having a single member on either side of the aisle vote against it. It was unanimous, which is something that doesn't happen all that often in the Committee on the Judiciary. In the past, something with this level of support would have quickly sailed through the full Senate but not today, not on the minority leader's watch. According to a report in POLITICO, the minority leader is blocking this bipartisan bill.

With the House Democrats' obsession of impeaching the President and, apparently, their interest in accomplishing nothing else, the odds of bipartisan legislation getting done around here are getting slimmer and slimmer each day. Rather than seizing the opportunity to pass a bill that will provide relief to the folks we represent who struggle with the high costs of prescriptions, it is politics 24/7. I am disappointed in our colleagues' single-minded obsession with undoing the 2016 election and removing the President from office. One of the casualties of that, though, is the prevention of our being able to pass even bipartisan bills to help the American people, the people we represent.

I ask here, publicly today, for the minority leader to reconsider his decision

of blocking this bipartisan piece of legislation.

I am afraid the vote our Democratic colleagues have just forced us to take this afternoon shows just how far they are willing to go to prove a point, even when the point is not well made, which leaves me with little optimism that the minority leader will have a change of heart.

As we have heard, the Affordable Care Act has what is known as State innovation waivers. That is part of what we voted on just a moment ago. It is important to reiterate that these innovation waivers, which were a part of the Affordable Care Act, enable States to waive some of the law's burdensome requirements in pursuit of finding alternative means of coverage. States can apply for these waivers to change how insurance subsidies are used, for example, and select a combination that better fits their States' and their citizens' needs. What works in a State as big as mine, with 28 million citizens, isn't, maybe, going to work in the same way as in a smaller State—North Dakota or Delaware.

Washington bureaucrats shouldn't be able to decide what best suits the needs of my constituents in Texas. That is why these waivers, which are part of the Affordable Care Act, are so important and why, last year, the administration gave the States more flexibility to tailor their insurance plans to suit their constituents' needs. This does not mean, as we have heard, that the States have an entirely free hand. It just gives them more flexibility to use Federal dollars where they are needed most. Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues are opposed to these expanded innovation options.

They claim they forced this vote to repeal the rule because it puts patients' coverage for preexisting conditions at risk, but that is not true. Section No. 1332 does not allow States to waive ObamaCare's preexisting conditions' coverage. In fact, these waivers give States the ability to provide enhanced support for those with preexisting conditions and high healthcare costs. So far, 13 States have been approved for these waivers.

It is worth noting on this chart the 1332 waivers that have been issued this year. Colorado has seen a reduction in premiums by 16 percent; Delaware by 13 percent; Montana by 8 percent; North Dakota by a whopping 20 percent; and Rhode Island by 6 percent.

So with preexisting conditions covered, and with premiums actually going down, what is there to object to?

Well, our Democratic colleagues are simply waging a war against a problem that does not exist, but I guess if you say it often enough and loudly enough, some people, somewhere, may just believe that coverage of preexisting conditions is somehow a partisan issue. It is not. They are grasping at straws as their party unfortunately has gone further and further to the left on healthcare.

Well, 10 of the 13 States that received waivers are represented by at least one Democrat in the Senate. Why would you vote for a repeal of a rule consistent with existing law that would lower premiums for your constituents which would require coverage for preexisting conditions unless it is your good sense overcome by perhaps politics?

Our Democratic friends make it seem like coverage of preexisting conditions is a partisan issue when it is not. We all agree that patients with preexisting conditions should receive health coverage, period.

Earlier this year, I cosponsored a bill introduced by our friend, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. TILLIS, called the PROTECT Act, which would reaffirm our commitment that no American will ever be denied health coverage due to a preexisting condition. We believe that coverage for preexisting conditions shouldn't hang in the balance of a court decision. It would finally codify what every Member of this body says they agree with: That all Americans deserve access to health coverage, specifically to cover preexisting conditions.

All this rule by the Trump administration does is provide the States with the flexibility to cater to their citizens' healthcare needs, and there simply was no reason to overturn it, and we did not.

So I would encourage our colleagues to stop daydreaming about pie in the sky ideas like Medicare for All—simply unaffordable, absolutely unworkable—or a government-run pharmaceutical industry where the government sets the prices and says what drugs you or your family can get access to.

Quit trying to fight the President at every turn and every step he wants to make. Try to find places where we can work together, and let's do that by moving bipartisan legislation that will lower out-of-pocket costs for drugs and improve people's quality of life and standard of living.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the Senator from Texas, my colleague—and we have worked together and will continue to. For the record, there is something that I think needs to be mentioned.

It was a year ago, maybe even longer, that the attorney general from his State of Texas initiated a lawsuit with more than a dozen Republican attorneys general to eliminate the Affordable Care Act—all of it, the protection when it came to preexisting conditions, lifetime limits, allowing members of the family to keep their children on their policy until they reach the age of 26.

These States attorneys general, starting with his State of Texas, said: Get rid of all of it. Eliminate it. And then President Trump said: We will join in the lawsuit. Let's eliminate it completely.

So when I hear these pleas on the floor that we are all for the principles

in the Affordable Care Act, not a single Republican Senator voted for it, and now there is an effort by the attorneys general and the Trump administration to do away with it.

Is it because they have a better idea? No. I am sure you remember that moment not long ago when our departed colleague, John McCain, came to the well of the Senate and was the deciding vote to save the Affordable Care Act. The point he made is still valid. The Republicans have no alternative. I want to make sure the Affordable Care Act is better. There are some parts of it that need to be improved, but to eliminate it as this lawsuit would from the Trump administration? That is a step backwards.

There are two other points that I would like to make. When it comes to our current healthcare system, it has many positive things: wonderful doctors and hospitals, amazing technology and medicine.

But there are also some built-in flaws in the system. Let me give an example, one simple story. I met a woman the other day. Her sister is an OB/GYN. She got married, pregnant, about to have twins, couldn't be happier, but the babies came early. And so this doctor went to the hospital to deliver her babies, her twins, and they needed to be put in the neonatal intensive care unit of the hospital, which of course she did.

Good news. Three or four weeks later, they were ready to come home. They came home, and of course, everyone was happy to receive them. But they weren't happy to receive the bill for hundreds of thousands of dollars. What was it for? It turns out that, at the hospital, the doctor was in network for the woman who was delivering the baby. The hospital was in the network for delivering the baby. But the NICU was a separate entity that even this doctor didn't know it wasn't in network.

Her babies went to this lifesaving intensive care unit in the hospital, and she received a bill for hundreds of thousands of dollars—a surprise bill. Is that right? Of course, it is not. And here is a professional, a medical professional, who frankly could not ask all the right questions, obviously, and became a victim of the system.

Let me tell you one other story, when we talk about the current state of the cost of medicine. I go to Rockford, IL, and I meet a young woman, and she introduces me to her mother. Her mother is a waitress, a hard-working lady, never took a day off in her life. But she did have some health insurance, and her health insurance covered her daughter until her daughter reached the age of 26, and then her daughter was on her own.

The problem was her daughter is diabetic, and her mother understood that now the cost of insulin, which had been covered by the family health insurance, was an individual personal burden for her daughter to pay, and the

cost of insulin had gone up dramatically during the girl's young life.

In the last dozen years or so, the cost of insulin has gone from \$39 for a vial—one of the most commonly used types of insulin called Humalog made by Eli Lilly—from \$39 a vial to \$329. The mother was in a panic. Her daughter was working part-time and just getting started, still suffering from diabetes. Her mother was afraid she would not be able to afford the insulin, so her mother, a waitress, was taking her money and putting it aside to buy vials of insulin, so if her daughter started to run short, she would be able to provide her with the insulin.

What is the cost of that same product in Canada? \$39—\$329 in the United States; \$39 in Canada. What is the difference? It is the same drug made by the same company in the United States. The difference is the government of Canada stepped up and said: We are not going to let you do this. We are not going to let you run the cost of insulin to the high heavens at the expense of people who live in Canada. And Eli Lilly said: We will play by your rules, if that is what the Canadian Government says.

So when I hear Senators, like my friend from Texas, get up and talk about this terrible invasion of government into our rights, that lady, that mother in Rockford would certainly like to have her government—our government—step up and give her a chance to have affordable insulin so she could have peace of mind for her daughter. It is not too much to ask.

#### THE RELIEF ACT

Mr. President, the reason I came to the floor is because I wanted to respond to my friend—because it is a critical topic—but the reason I came to the floor is to discuss an issue which is not uniquely American, but is truly American.

For 528 years now in this place called America, we have immigrants coming to the shores of our Nation. Starting and following Christopher Columbus—if you buy that side of the story, and I do—we have had millions come to our shores and they have become part of America. With the exception of Native Americans and indigenous people, they have come from every corner of this earth to be part of what we call the United States.

You would think, with that history, that we would have a pretty clear idea of what our policy should be when it comes to immigration. Sadly, you are wrong. We have the most broken immigration system imaginable. I have studied it for years and continue to. It is almost impossible to understand all of the twists and turns in our immigration system.

Seven years ago, there were eight of us—four Democrats and four Republicans in the Senate—with the leadership of Senator McCain, Senator SCHUMER, and many others, who came together and rewrote the entire immigration code, the entire immigration body

of law. It took us months of meeting every single night, hammering out compromises, agreeing to provisions. Then we went to the Judiciary Committee, and hundreds of amendments were offered. Senator Sessions of Alabama, I think he offered dozens by himself. He wasn't too happy with the bill.

But we went through that lengthy process, came to the floor of the Senate, and faced even more amendments. At the end of the day, though, it passed. I believe it was 68 votes on the floor of the Senate. We passed comprehensive immigration reform, sent it to the House of Representatives, and unfortunately, the Republican leadership would not even consider it. They didn't even bring it up for a debate or for an amendment.

So we are stuck today with a broken system, and we are also stuck with a system that is rife with politics. I would say, and I think no one would contradict us, no President before Donald Trump has really made such an issue of immigration—no one.

It has been an issue in the past, but this President, from the beginning of his campaign until the current time, has hammered away at immigration constantly, calling those that came from Mexico murders and rapists and so many other things that he has done—I can go through the long litany of things that have happened. It is pretty clear that, when it comes to the policy of immigration, that this administration has fallen down and falls short when it comes to immigration.

Today, I want to address one aspect of this. I am the ranking Democrat on the Immigration Subcommittee. Coincidentally, the chairman of that Subcommittee in Judiciary is the gentleman from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, who just left the floor.

So far this year, 10 months into this year, our Subcommittee on Immigration, despite all the problems, all of the challenges, has had one hearing—one hearing. It is a good thing that we are not paid for the work that we do because, frankly, we have done little or nothing.

The Senate Judiciary Committee in the same period of time has only voted on one immigration bill. The Republican majority limited debate to only 1 hour and didn't allow a single amendment to be offered. It is hardly an ambitious effort to make a body of law better.

It is time for the Immigration Subcommittee to go back to work. Today, I sent a letter—joined by every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee—asking the Republican Chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, to hold a hearing on one serious problem in our immigration system: the green-card backlog.

In our broken immigration system, there are not nearly enough immigrant visas—legal visas known as green cards—available each year. As a result, many of the immigrants to this country are stuck in crippling backlogs for years, sometimes decades.

Close to 5 million future Americans are in line waiting for green cards. Many are living and working in the United States on temporary visas, while many are waiting abroad, separated from their families who are living in the United States.

Under current law, only 226,000 family green cards and 140,000 employment green cards are available each year. Children and spouses of lawful permanent residents count against these caps, which further limits the availability of green cards.

The backlogs are really hard on families who are caught in immigration limbo. For example, children in many of these families “age out” because they are no longer under the age of 21 by the time the green cards are available.

That is why I have asked the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, to hold a hearing on this issue to consider several pending bills dealing with this green card backlog. I have asked him repeatedly. I have asked Senator GRAHAM, and I have asked Senator LEE, who is engaged in this debate. This will help the Senate to understand the impact of each of these proposals before us, to try to reach an agreement.

That is how the Senate, incidentally, is supposed to work, where the committees gather, bring in witnesses, have an open debate, agree on a bill, move it forward to the floor, open it to debate on the floor. In 2013, as I mentioned, I was part of a bipartisan group that showed it can work. We need to show it again. Then, our bill went through extensive hearings and debate.

Unfortunately, the senior Senator from Utah, my friend, Mr. LEE, has tried to avoid regular order on this question. He does not want it to go to committee. I hope he will reconsider. He has come to the floor several times to attempt to pass his legislation, S. 386, without any debate or chance to offer any amendments. Because he has chosen this approach, I have come to the floor today to speak about his legislation and mine.

My concern with Senator LEE’s bill is simple. The solution to the green-card backlog is obvious: Increase the number of green cards. But S. 386, Senator LEE’s bill, includes no additional green cards. In fact, it has carve-outs for special interests—which are not in the original version of the bill that passed by the House—and that will cut the number of green cards that are available to reduce the backlog. Without any additional green cards, S. 386 will not eliminate the backlogs for the immigrants, particularly those from India—and there is a large number, over half a million, the nationality with the most people in the employment backlog. It will dramatically increase backlogs for the rest of the world if we go by Senator LEE’s bill.

Ira Kurzban is one of the Nation’s experts on immigration law. He took a look at Senator LEE’s bill, and he said the backlogs will be longer and larger

because of it. In fact, over 165,000 Indian immigrants currently in line for these visas will still be waiting 10 years from now.

Mr. Kurzban has also made it clear that the Lee bill puts some Indian immigrants to the front of the line—because they have been waiting the longest—at the expense of every other country.

From 2023 until well into 2030, there will be zero EB-22 visas for the rest of the world. None for China, South Korea, Philippines, Britain, Canada, Mexico, every country in the EU and all of Africa. Zero. It would choke off green cards for every profession that isn’t IT—healthcare, medical research, basic science, all kinds of engineering; chemists, physicists.

That is why dozens of national organizations representing many immigrant communities oppose the bill introduced by Senator LEE. Groups representing Arabs, Africans, Asians, Canadians, Chinese, Greeks, the Irish, Italians, Koreans, South Asians, and many, many more have come out in opposition to the Lee bill. More than 20 of these groups sent a letter in opposition.

In light of this attempt to pass the Lee bill and the problems it has run into, I am offering an alternative to this legislation. My alternative is basic and straightforward. It would eliminate the green card backlog and treat all immigrants fairly.

The RELIEF Act, which I introduced with Senator PAT LEAHY and Senator MAZIE HIRONO, will treat all immigrants fairly by eliminating immigration visa backlogs. The RELIEF bill is based on the same comprehensive immigration bill I described earlier. It would lift green card country caps, but, unlike S. 386, the RELIEF Act would increase the number of green cards to clear the backlogs for all immigrants waiting in line for green cards within 5 years. Compare that to S. 386, the Lee bill, where more than 165,000 Indian immigrants currently in line will still be waiting 10 years from now.

The RELIEF Act will also keep American families together by treating children and spouses of legal permanent residents as immediate relatives, just as the children and spouses of citizens are, so they won’t count against the green card cap. My bill would protect aging-out children who qualify for legal permanent resident status based on a parent’s immigration status.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2603

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged of S. 2603, the RELIEF Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the time with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the legislation to which the Senator from Illi-

nois has referred, Senator LEE’s bill—Senator LEE is not able to be here to object, so on his behalf, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sorry for this objection. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for coming to the floor on behalf of the Senator from Utah. I have been in communication with the Senator from Utah. I hope he will join me in asking for a hearing. This is an issue which literally affects hundreds of thousands of people living in this country, many of whom have been here for years and decades. Practicing physicians in my hometown of Springfield are affected by this debate. They want to know what their future will be and the future of their children.

I am trying to find a reasonable way to work out a compromise on this, and I stand ready to do so. I hope Senator LEE will join me in asking Senators GRAHAM and CORNYN to have a hearing before the Judiciary Committee. I want to extend this invitation to Senator LEE to join the Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats who signed a letter with me today requesting this hearing.

I am happy to sit down and discuss this issue with the senior Senator from Utah or any other Senator. If we work together in good faith, I believe we can reach a bipartisan agreement on legislation that can pass both Chambers and be signed into law.

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.

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

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

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, just over a year ago, President Trump signed into law the most comprehensive and sweeping opioid response package in the Nation’s history, a piece of legislation that passed this body with overwhelming bipartisan support—a rarity in gridlocked Washington. The reason we came together was simple: Opioid abuse is tearing apart families, straining our law enforcement and emergency services, and engulfing our communities. Young mothers with precious babies and young people in the prime of their lives are focused on fentanyl rather than finding their path toward success.

This crippling epidemic has touched the lives of Iowans from all walks of life and from all areas of our State. We have seen the harrowing statistics and the ongoing struggles that many of our loved ones face. In Iowa, we also struggle with an ongoing meth epidemic that further threatens our communities. In just one of many statistics, the number of children put into foster



care in the United States due to parental drug use nearly doubled from 2000 to 2017.

I have heard so many heartbreaking stories from families who have a loved one battling addiction.

A mom from Polk County shared with me her son's 7-year battle with addiction and how the vicious disease affects all levels of society, including our friends, our neighbors, and in her case, her family. She concluded by pleading with Congress to act to end, in her words, "this horrific situation and serious threat to our nation's future." Families like this are desperate for their loved ones to reach recovery and good health before their story ends in tragedy. As is sometimes quoted, "Addiction is a family disease. One person may use, but the whole family suffers."

It is these heartbreaking stories that propelled me and my colleagues to take action. This bipartisan package named the "SUPPORT Act" expanded treatment and recovery options for opioid addiction, created new tools for prevention and enforcement, supported safe disposal of opioids, strengthened first responders' training, and provided for the safe disposal of unused drugs. It has produced real results for Iowans and for folks all across the country.

Just last week, I had the chance to join the First Lady of the United States, Melania Trump, Secretary of Health and Human Services Alex Azar, and a number of other administration officials to discuss the progress made on opioid abuse, including efforts to reduce the number of women using opioids during pregnancy.

This President and this Republican-led Senate are tackling the opioid crisis in a meaningful and thoughtful way, and I couldn't be prouder to be associated with this work. In Iowa alone, for instance, we have seen the number of deaths from opioids decrease by 19 percent. In September, the administration announced \$932 million in awards for State opioid response grant funding, including over \$11 million for Iowa.

This past Saturday, Iowans from across the State participated in another National Take Back Day to raise awareness and encourage the safe disposal of unused prescription drugs. Earlier this year, in April, when we had another Take Back Day, in my home State of Iowa, 88 law enforcement officers worked at 135 collection sites throughout the State and collected 11,680 pounds of unused prescription drugs. More than 135,255 pounds of unused drugs have been collected in Iowa since the beginning of the drug take back program.

I am humbled to say that my bipartisan Access to Increased Drug Disposal Act, which was part of the package we passed last year, led directly to resources being awarded in Iowa for events like these.

We should be encouraged by the impact the SUPPORT Act, combined with the Trump administration's efforts,

have made in the lives of Iowans in just 1 year.

As we continue in our fight, I feel hopeful and determined—hopeful that we can help Americans rise above the chains of addiction and determined all the more to keep making progress on behalf of families across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from Iowa for her comments and also for her organizing this event this afternoon. This is an opportunity for us to talk not only about some of the things we have done in the U.S. Congress that are positive in terms of addressing the largest drug crisis we have ever faced in our country but also about what we need to do going forward and how we need to keep our eye on the ball to be sure that we don't see more addiction coming, that we don't see some of these new dangers—like crystal meth and other drugs—coming up.

Again, I thank my colleague from Iowa. Iowa has been hard-hit; so has Ohio. In fact, in 2017, our opioid overdose rate was about three times the national average. We have, unfortunately, been in the top five in terms of overdose deaths for most of the last 10 years. We have had nearly a dozen Ohioans dying from these dangerous drugs every single day. This has now surpassed car accidents as the No. 1 cause of death in my home State of Ohio.

What has happened is, since 2017, with a lot of work from a lot of people on the ground, with some help from Washington—about \$4 billion in new funding that this body has approved and taken the lead on—we have begun to make progress.

Last year, in 2018, Ohio had a 22-percent reduction in overdose deaths. This leads the country in reductions, and we are proud of that because of the lives that have been saved. But we also realize that we came from such a high mark, high watermark, that it is important for us to keep the pressure on to continue to make progress.

What has happened in Ohio is what is happening around the country, which is the SUPPORT Act, which was signed into law by the President just about 1 year ago, and other legislation, like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—the CARA legislation—and also the State Opioid Response grants, have started to work.

I see the Senator from Missouri is on the floor today. What they have done in the Appropriations Committee to fund these projects is making a huge difference back home. I have spent a lot of my time working with the community organizations, talking to addicts and recovering addicts. I have talked to a couple thousand in the last couple of years alone. I will tell you, it is working. What is working are more innovative programs back home to close some of these gaps.

Recently, I had the opportunity to go out with the RREACT team in Columbus, OH. They are being funded with a grant of about \$800,000 from the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the CARA legislation. Again, this has been funded by the Appropriations Committee, actually, at above its authorized level.

It is working. They are closing an obvious gap, which was that people were overdosing, getting Narcan. Our brave first responders were saving their lives, and then those people were going back to the community they were from—back to the same family or the same group of friends—and, unfortunately, with the addiction not having been addressed, they were overdosing again and, sometimes, again and again and again.

Often, these first responders—the firefighters back home—will tell you: We were saving the same person time and again. Some of that is still happening, but what the RREACT team does when there is an overdose and when Narcan is supplied—this miracle drug to reverse the effects of the overdose—then there is followup. Of course, we should have done it years ago, but we are now doing it. I am proud to say, in my home town of Cincinnati, OH, Colerain Township, much of this was started, but now it is spreading around the country.

The Columbus RREACT team is one of the best. They go out with firefighters, EMS personnel, with law enforcement, plainclothes, with social workers, with treatment providers, to the family, to the home—and I have gone out with them; I have gone to the homes and met with these addicts—and they say: Look, we are here to help. We are not here to arrest you, but we are here to say that you need to get into treatment.

Unbelievably—and a lot of people are skeptical of this. Here is an addict; why would they come forward? But in about 80 percent of the cases, in terms of the RREACT team, these individuals say: Do you know what? OK, I will try it.

That is the first step. That is the critical first step—to get into treatment and then longer term recovery and begin to turn that person's life around, as well as that person's family and that person's community because it has devastated all of the above.

This is what is happening with the Federal legislation funding innovative projects back home to close these gaps and to make a difference. I am very appreciative of what our team has done here—Republicans and Democrats alike.

In the more recent legislation that was just passed, the SUPPORT Act, we also included something that focuses exclusively on fentanyl. This is really important. It is called the STOP Act. In my subcommittee, we did an 18-month investigation of this. We spent a lot of time on it. We worked hard to make it bipartisan but also to be sure

it was something that would actually work. We found out that fentanyl, which is the worst of the drugs and the most dangerous, is killing more people than any other drug. Even today, with our success on opioids, this synthetic opioid is coming almost exclusively from China, and at the time we passed the legislation a couple of years ago, it was almost exclusively coming through our U.S. mail system—our U.S. mail system. This deadly drug was coming into post office boxes and to people's homes.

What we said to the post office was: You have to put some screening in place, much like FedEx does or DHS does or DHL or other private sector entities. Guess what. They are starting to do that, and it is making a big difference. They are now requiring advance electronic data from these packages, showing where they are from, where they are going, what is in them. This allows law enforcement to target those packages and to stop some of this fentanyl coming in.

Unfortunately, the post office is not doing all it should do. Under the legislation, they are supposed to have 100 percent of packages from China, as an example, being flagged, being screened, and they are not.

Right now, we think they are identifying from China about 88 percent of the packages. It is not 100 percent yet. Let's get to 100 percent.

We have also found that the Postal Service, based on a 2019 audit this year by the inspector general, identified and pulled about 88 percent of the packages from China that were flagged. That leaves, of course, many packages that are not being flagged. So over 10 percent of these packages, the post office can't even find.

Let's do better. We can do better. It is critical that we continue to hold the post office accountable because this is poison coming into our communities. That is in this legislation.

One kilogram of this fentanyl is powerful enough to kill about one-half million people. That is how powerful this is. It is a true life-and-death issue.

We have introduced new legislation in Congress called the FIGHT Fentanyl Act in the last week. Why? Because, otherwise, fentanyl, which is currently listed as a substance on schedule I—a schedule I drug and therefore illegal—is going to come off that list in February of next year. We can't let that happen, of course. Let's not do a short-term extension. Let's put fentanyl on as a scheduled drug permanently.

I see more of my colleagues have come to talk about this issue.

My point, I guess, is very simple. We have done some great things in this body to help our governments back home at our State and local levels and the nonprofits and people in the trenches who are doing the hard work. Let's keep it up. Let's be a better partner. Let's continue to provide support through the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, through the Opioid

Response grants, through the STOP Act, and through other things to be able to give folks back home the tools they need to push back against this scourge, against this addiction that is devastating our families, our communities. Now we see, with the opioid progress having been made, other drugs coming in—particularly, crystal meth—directly from Mexico. So it is not just about this; it is about being flexible enough to be able to approach that as well. We have new legislation on meth that we should also be working on to provide that flexibility.

In the meantime, again, the Appropriations Committee is doing its work, sending the funding that is making a difference to save lives in our communities.

I yield back my time.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator PORTMAN for his comments about what we have tried to do to provide the money, but let me tell you, having been involved in that part of it, really, before we began to pass legislation, nobody was more vigorously active than Senator PORTMAN to try to continue to point out the size of this problem and that something had to be done. He was out there talking about how big a problem this was for the country before other people were.

Thanks to Senator ERNST for bringing this group together today to talk about this critical issue as we figure out better ways to deal with this terrible scourge of addiction and activity that preys on people who have become addicted.

More than 47,000 lives were lost due to opioids in the United States in 2017—47,000 people. More people died of opioid overdoses than died in car accidents. The No. 1 cause of accidental deaths changed dramatically in the last handful of years. For everybody who died, there were hundreds of others who were risking their lives by misusing prescription drugs or illegal drugs or, even worse, illegal drugs that they had no idea what was in them.

The fentanyl challenge is so big and so dangerous. It seems to me it would be a pretty poor business model to try to have a drug so powerful, a product so powerful, that there is a good chance the person you are selling it to will never be a customer again because they are going to die from taking this drug, often knowing it is an incredibly dangerous moment to try to get on a drug-induced high that defies anything that has happened to them before. Of course, once you cross that line, there is no other line to cross because you are no longer a customer. Your life is gone. Your dependency on these drugs, no matter how it began, whether it was a high school cheerleading accident or a car accident or a running accident or a dental appointment—all kinds of ways—and in past decades, people believed prescribing these opioids had no danger of addiction and, boy, did we find out that was wrong.

Now, 3.4 percent of our entire gross domestic product—almost \$700 billion—was impacted and lost by the ongoing opioid crisis in 2018. Every State has a problem. Our State, Missouri, has a problem. We have seen a steady increase in synthetic opioid use over the last several years. This seemed to be moving from east to west, and I was hoping that by the time it got to us we would have more information, more thinking about it. I think that actually may have happened, but it is still bad. We had a 40-percent increase in fentanyl-related overdoses from 2016 to 2017.

Health and Human Services Secretary Azar and I were in Kansas City together at the Truman Medical Center to talk about this epidemic—Truman Medical, the No. 1 provider of uncompensated care in our State. We went to the neonatal area and saw babies who had neonatal abstinence syndrome, which is affecting a number newborns now, and looked at how they were dealing with newborns who were born addicted.

Truman doctors and leaders there, as well as leaders in other area health centers in Kansas City, talked to us about how they were dealing with this. We have learned, even in the context of one urban area, that there is not necessarily a one-size-fits-all way to deal with this, which is why we have tried to focus our money at the Federal level on giving States the maximum flexibility they could have, within their State and in their State, to come up with what worked in the communities they were trying to work with.

We have provided the money. We haven't found every solution yet, but we are on the way, I think, to doing that. We have included flexibility for the States to use in funding for treatment, funding for prevention, funding for recovery from opioids, and other stimulants.

In Missouri, Federal funding in the last year has treated 4,000 people who wouldn't have been treated otherwise. Narcan is more and more available at workplaces and other places.

There is simply more work to do. We need to continue our focus on targeting resources toward opioid addiction but also toward behavioral health issues. I have said a number of times as we have dealt with this that if you don't have a behavioral health problem before you are addicted, you absolutely will have one after you are addicted.

One of the things we have found to be a big advantage in our State is that we had the good fortune to be part of this eight-State pilot program in which, in a number of locations in our State, regarding excellence in mental health, we are treating behavioral health, mental health, as we would treat any other health problem. That means you would treat it as long as it needs to be treated. There is no 14-day limit or 28-day limit. You can be treated just as you would for a kidney problem or another cancer problem or any other

problem, as long as you need it. We are finding great success in combining not only the medicated assisted therapy with getting off opioids but also the ability to have that mental health component as long as it needs to be there.

We are hoping to continue to work on the facts we have put together to determine what happens when you treat behavioral health issues like all other health issues, to determine other healthcare costs that people have. We are hoping to extend that pilot another 2 years, not to make it a permanent Federal responsibility but to be sure that States and communities in the future will have the level of evidence they need to look at, that there will be enough evidence compiled to show what really happens because everybody understands that treating mental health like all other health is the right thing to do.

I think these pilot projects are compiling the evidence to show you that not only is it the right thing to do, but actually it is the financially responsible thing to do as well.

Attacking this problem from all levels is critical. We are way beyond where we were 5 years ago. We are not where we need to be yet. States are trying things, sharing things that work and sharing things that don't work and why they didn't work in the communities that tried them. So we are going to continue to move forward with this.

I know Senator CAPITO is going to speak after me. She is also one of the early advocates for doing something about what she saw were significant problems that had developed in her State. I was grateful to have her advice and her driving this discussion in the way she did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I think it is very impactful for us to be discussing today a problem that has hit all of our States.

Senator BLUNT, in his great work not just on the Appropriations Committee but in his State of Missouri, has been very active. I think we all have. It is a problem that knows no political boundaries.

Certainly, my State of West Virginia has one of the deepest, strongest, and toughest problem. We have the highest rate of opioid-related deaths per capita. It is not something we wear proudly, but it is something that has really forced us to try many innovative things and to try to be the leader in the solutions.

That is a lot of what I am going to talk about today because a lot of what we have seen in the SUPPORT Act, from all of our individual States, has been incorporated into a national response to what is an epidemic around our country that is frightening, scary, and, in my view, could almost lead us to losing a generation. This powerful reaction we have had to the three

pieces of legislation is absolutely critical.

We passed the SUPPORT Act. It was signed into law a little bit over a year ago. That was really as an add-on to the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act that we passed several years before that, but as my part of this discussion today, I want to share the successes that have worked in our State and how I think they have been able to be incorporated around the country.

After CARA, we realized that while we did great with money for rehab facilities and helping our first responders with Narcan and other more immediate problems, there were other things we didn't focus on that we really needed to focus on in order to have a comprehensive solution, and that is the children—the children who are impacted in a home of addiction or exposure to addiction and also the jobs that are being lost because of it. So we went back to the drawing board, and we came up with the SUPPORT Act, which is landmark legislation where we are seeing real results.

For instance, in my State of West Virginia, the State opioid response grants are the grants that really go to every State in a formula fashion, where you are supporting treatment centers, drug courts, and other responses to the addiction issue, but under the old rule, the money was divided up according to your population size. So I started talking with Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire—a small State impacted more critically, like our State of West Virginia—and saying: Wait a minute. Our smaller States are really not getting enough in the State opioid response grants to make an impact and to be part of the solution. So we pushed hard to change this funding so States that are more acutely affected, that have smaller populations, like Montana, West Virginia, and New Hampshire, are able to get more funding so we can attack the problem where it is the deepest and the most acute.

It helps with our WVU Comprehensive Opioid Addiction Treatment, the COAT, Program, the model they have put together at WVU for medication-assisted treatment made. It helps with our peer recovery coaches, and it has also had a lot of impact on our children and our families.

What we have also found, like every State here, I am sure—in the State of Arkansas, you probably have more kids in foster care than you have had in the past because of this issue. According to our West Virginia Bureau of Children and Families, approximately 82 percent of the children who are in foster care are there because of parents with substance abuse-related issues. That is 82 percent of our children, and we have thousands more in foster care. It is directly attributable to this issue. It doesn't even mention all the grandparents and great-grandparents, in some cases, who are raising children.

How do we tackle the ripple effects of this issue? Well, you can create some-

thing that was also created in West Virginia called the Martinsburg Initiative. It is spearheaded by the Martinsburg Police Department—a small city very close to DC, the West Virginia part that is close to DC—the Berkeley County Schools, and Shepherd University. It is a partnership with the Boys & Girls Club of the Eastern Panhandle.

This is based on a CDC study that shows that when children have adverse childhood experiences—called ACEs—if you can categorize children who have adverse childhood experiences, if you can identify those children and pay special attention to them through things like the Martinsburg Initiative, you can maybe head off issues that could come into their future.

So police officers come to the schools. They mentor the children. I met them at the Boys & Girls Club of the Eastern Panhandle and talked about the positive influence a police officer, combined with the schools, combined with a college student, can have on a young person's life—and, in some cases, the most trusted person in their life—if they are subject to a home that is filled with drug and opioid addiction. We saw the success of this.

I joined with Senator DURBIN—again, across the aisle—to ensure that the SUPPORT Act created some of this. We are now taking it the next step forward to address these issues in the RISE from Trauma Act, which would help us to build the trauma-informed workforce—we don't have enough people working in this area—and increase those resources in our communities.

Senator BLUNT talked about how important it is to work with babies who are born with exposure to drugs. This is also a part of the solution that has come from West Virginia, where the baby is taken out of the hospital setting to try to address the issues of that first trauma in the first days of their life, to try to wean them off of not just the exposure to drugs but also to incorporate the family into this so they can see what kind of pediatric recovery is needed and what the long-term effects might be.

Senator PORTMAN has been an incredible leader, trying to get rid of the fentanyl that comes in that is killing people. Over half of the people who die, die of a fentanyl overdose. He is trying to work with China and to work with the post office to get the tools to prevent illegal fentanyl from entering this country. We have had some success, but it is still frustrating. There is too much getting in.

I chair the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations. This is a big issue for our Border Patrol and our ICE agents to be able to make sure we are giving our post office the tools.

Another thing we did was we passed the INTERDICT Act, which the President signed, which will help the CBP and also the post office be able to detect fentanyl. It comes in these little packages because it is so very lethal.

A lot of what we have done is Federal funding, but a lot of what we have done

is listen to what our local communities are doing and listen to how they are solving problem in States that are highly affected.

One of our communities of Huntington has really been a leader in this. One of the most effective strategies that Huntington has had—and Huntington had the highest overdose rate in our State—was to create these quick response teams. This is when a person comes into the emergency room with an overdose and is discharged, they are then contacted within 72 hours by a quick response team from the community. A plainclothes police officer, with a health officer or a social worker, and, in some cases, a faith-based respondent comes in and says: Are you ready for recovery? When you are ready for recovery, this is where you go. We are your community. We want to help you. We understand where you are. We understand your issues. We are your neighbors, and we want to help you.

This has really already had a very good effect in the city of Huntington, in Cabell County, because the overdose rate in that area has gone down 26 percent since they instituted the quick response team concept. So it is going across the country, and part of that is because it is in the SUPPORT Act.

I have hope for what we have done in West Virginia, but there are way too many people and families who are affected by this. There are too many lost lives, too much lost time, and too much lost love, quite frankly. There are parents of children who can't sleep at night. The only night they sleep is when they know their child is incarcerated because they don't know if they are going to wake up the next morning. There is story after story of just tragedies.

We are all working together. I think we have a long way to go. I think we have hit on some good solutions. We need to keep the ones that are working, and the ones that don't work, send them on down the road because we know there is no one solution to this very difficult problem.

I am going to continue to fight with my colleagues here today for every single person and all those folks whose lives are touched by this crisis.

Do you know what? We are all touched by it. If I ask for a show of hands in a townhall meeting and say: Who knows somebody who has been touched by this crisis, it is almost unanimous. Everybody raises their hands.

We are going to emerge stronger. I am optimistic, but this is a long fight. I am really pleased to join with so many of my colleagues in this fight.

I think my colleague from Arkansas, who has worked hard on this as well, is the next one up.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I say a special thanks to Senator CAPITO and all she has done, not only

in this area but in so many things that affect rural America, certainly, being the cochair of the Rural Broadband Caucus. The list goes on and on. We do appreciate her leadership.

Our Nation's opioid epidemic is, unfortunately, a subject we have spoken about all too often here and in so many other places. It does feel, however, that the tone and tenor of our remarks reflect a much more hopeful outlook than many of our previous discussions have had. That is because we are making progress in the fight.

Around this time last year, we came together to overwhelmingly pass a comprehensive legislative package that was signed into law by President Trump, Democrats and Republicans working together.

There has been a noticeable difference as a result of this comprehensive reform. Law enforcement is now better equipped to stop illegal opioids from reaching our communities, and efforts are being stepped up at the border to cut off the influx of fentanyl from China. More first responders have been trained to administer naloxone, which has prevented opioid overdoses from claiming more lives in our communities.

Most importantly, we have saved lives by increasing access to mental health and addiction treatment services for those struggling to overcome opioid dependence.

The treatment and recovery aspect of our strategy is the key. Federal resources are being deployed nationwide to break the cycle of addiction.

These grants are invaluable for the facilities that give those struggling with addiction and their families new hope in the fight against opioid abuse. From what I have seen firsthand at treatment facilities in Arkansas, these efforts are indeed making a difference. They are helping tremendously.

The impact of this national epidemic has been felt acutely in the Natural State. According to the CDC, Arkansas had the second-highest prescribing rate over recent years, enough for each Arkansan to have one opioid prescription in his or her name.

It has taken a conscious effort by the State's medical community to drive those numbers down by 12 percent over a 4-year period. Limiting the amount of dangerous pain pills in circulation is a very positive and much needed step, but what about all the expired, unused, and unnecessary medications already in circulation?

That is where Arkansas Take Back comes in. Arkansas Prescription Drug Take Back Day events happen twice a year at locations across the State. These events are an opportunity for Arkansans to safely dispose of unused or expired medications with no questions asked. They also serve as an opportunity to further educate the public on the opioid epidemic and the importance of proper disposal of medications.

The 18th Arkansas Take Back this past weekend was another in a long

line of successful events. According to Arkansas drug director Kirk Lane, over 27,000 pounds of pills were collected at the nearly 200 event day locations and the 200-plus permanent drop boxes across the State.

These events are a heavy lift on the part of many Arkansans. We greatly appreciate the efforts of law enforcement agencies across the State, as well as their partners—Rotary clubs, prevention resource centers, Arkansas Department of Health, and so many others that carry out Take Back Day events.

The hard work to organize these opportunities to properly dispose of prescription medications is certainly worthwhile. Research has found that the majority of opioid abusers get their drugs from friends and family, often lifting pills from a familiar medicine cabinet. When you tally the results from the previous events in the State, Arkansas ranks third nationally in pounds collected per capita through Take Back. That means there are fewer homes in Arkansas where unsecured medications can get in the wrong hands.

I thank my colleagues for sharing similar success stories from events in their States. It is important that we highlight these programs. Anything we can do to get these dangerous drugs out of circulation certainly can help save lives. It is also a valuable reminder that we will all have a role to play in the fight to end the opioid crisis. Prescription Drug Take Back Day is an easy way each one of us can certainly do our part.

I yield the floor to my good friend Senator HOEVEN, whose leadership is also very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his work and also my other colleagues, those who have already spoken and the good Senator from Montana, who is going to speak right after. This really has been a bipartisan effort to make a difference, and I appreciate all my colleagues who are here today and who have done so much to advance this work, as well as the Senator from Kansas, who I believe will be speaking here in just a minute.

I join my colleagues today to discuss our Nation's effort to battle the opioid abuse epidemic that has taken far too many lives and has affected communities both large and small. Our first responders, law enforcement officers, healthcare professionals, and medical facilities are fighting this crisis on the frontlines. That is why we worked to advance a comprehensive approach that assists these key players and empowers States and localities to combat this public health emergency.

Last year, Congress passed and the President signed into law bipartisan legislation—the SUPPORT Act—to help families and communities impacted by addiction. This law supports

prevention, treatment, recovery, and law enforcement efforts.

Additionally, the SUPPORT Act contains language that I was able to co-sponsor to prevent the sale and shipment of illicit and dangerous drugs. This aligns with the goals of my Illegal Synthetic Drug Safety Act, which closes a loophole that has enabled bad actors to circumvent the law to distribute synthetic variations of drugs, like the powerful drug fentanyl, by labeling the products as “not for human consumption.” While these variations are technically different, they hold the same dangerous risks as the original drug.

The law also includes the Synthetic Tracking and Overdose Prevention Act, or STOP Act—another measure I co-sponsored that requires shipments from foreign countries sent through the U.S. Postal Service to provide electronic data. This enables CBP to better target illegal substances like fentanyl and prevent them from being shipped into our country from places like China and other countries.

These measures are important steps in keeping deadly drugs like fentanyl out of our communities; nevertheless, there is more to do, and we continue working to combat the opioid abuse epidemic from all sides. Just this week, I co-led a letter with Senator SHAHEEN encouraging the FAA to work with airlines to get opioid overdose reversal drugs like Naloxone included in the airlines’ emergency medical kits.

As chairman of the Senate Ag-FDA Appropriations Subcommittee, I worked to secure \$20 million in our fiscal 2020 funding legislation to support telemedicine grants that will help rural communities to combat opioid abuse as well.

Additionally, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have supported the good work of Senator BLUNT, the chair of the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee, to provide strong support for opioid abuse prevention, treatment, and recovery initiatives through the Department of Health and Human Services. The Labor-HHS-Education bill provides \$3.9 billion for such efforts, including \$800 million for the National Institutes of Health to develop pain management alternatives to opioids, as well as to study opioid addiction, and \$200 million to support the great work done by our community health centers, to enable them to expand prevention and treatment services and provide access to opioid overdose-reversal drugs.

Also, these bills include language I helped author that places a focus on addressing the challenges facing rural communities struggling with this ongoing crisis. The bill gives States greater flexibility in how they can use opioid abuse funds, including allowing some resources to be used to address stimulants like meth, which remains a substance of high concern in many of our rural States, including my own.

We need to move forward with the Labor-HHS appropriations bill and the other full-year funding bills, including the Defense appropriations bill, which I believe we will be voting on this week, because they are vital to our national security and provide certainty for our military and our servicemembers.

Passing these full-year appropriations bills will ensure that we fund important priorities, from national security to vital support for our ag producers, to combatting the opioid abuse epidemic we are talking about here today.

We worked hard to pass the SUPPORT Act to provide our healthcare providers, first responders, and law enforcement with the tools to prevent drug abuse, treat those suffering from addiction, and assist those in recovery.

While progress is being made, we need to continue working together to advance full-year funding bills to keep moving the ball forward in the fight against opioid abuse. We can combat the epidemic, stem its tide, and save lives.

I again want to commend my colleagues and will defer to my colleagues from Montana and Kansas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, just over a year ago, President Trump signed into law a major bipartisan bill, the SUPPORT Act, to help combat the opioid and drug epidemic that is devastating this country. I call that a very good first step in this long fight, and now we must continue working to do even more.

Drug overdoses are now the leading cause of death for those under age 50 in the United States. Our country is in the middle of a major opioid and meth crisis, and the sad reality is, this epidemic isn’t slowing down anytime soon. It has been said that meth is the next wave of the opioid crisis.

Sadly, in my home State of Montana, that wave is already reality. Meth is destroying Montana families and communities. As I travel across Montana, I hear far too many heartbreaking stories of addiction and tragedy. From Great Falls to Wibaux, to the Flathead and across Indian Country, the stories are all too real.

We need to do more to put an end to the tragic stories we are seeing in the news—no more stories of babies being born addicted to meth; no more stories of meth breaking up families; no more stories of babies being left in the forest—literally left in the forest—because their parents were high on meth. These stories are real, and their impacts are real.

Montana’s meth crisis is claiming lives, breaking up families, and leaving our foster care systems overcrowded and sometimes overloaded. It is leading to a significant rise in violent crime. In fact, from 2011 to 2017, there was a 415-percent increase in meth cases in Montana, with meth-related deaths rising 375 percent during those same years.

In Montana, the meth crisis is disproportionately impacting Native American Tribes. Enough is enough. That is why I fought to include my legislation, the Mitigating METH Act, which strengthens Indian Tribes’ ability to combat drug use, in the SUPPORT Act that was signed into law just last year.

That historic and comprehensive legislation was a great first step, but there is a lot more work that needs to be done, and tangible things can be done.

In Montana—we are a northern border State, but we have a southern border crisis. I say that for a very clear reason. There is no denying the fact that the meth that is invading Montana and that is devastating Montana is Mexican cartel meth. It is not home-grown meth anymore; it is Mexican cartel meth that is smuggled across the southern border.

Mexican meth is cheaper and more potent. In fact, several years ago, the meth we saw in Montana was home-grown meth. It had potency levels around 25 percent. Today, the Mexican cartel meth has a potency level of over 90 percent. That results in a much more dangerous form of meth. It is much more widespread, and the price has dropped.

I have met with Montanans across our State—whether it is law enforcement, doctors, nurses, treatment facility professionals—to come together, to work together, and to help combat the meth crisis we see in Montana. I am committed to fighting for more resources that give law enforcement and Border Patrol the tools they need to fight this epidemic. I will also continue to advocate for stronger support for treatment and care for our most vulnerable. Those who are addicted to meth need help, and they need compassion.

One thing we absolutely must do to help combat the drug epidemic is to secure our southern border because without secure borders, these illegal drugs and meth will continue to come across that southern border and have easy access into our country and into States like Montana. I won’t stand by and let this be the norm.

Earlier this summer, I was honored to welcome Vice President PENCE and Karen Pence to Billings. They got to see this crisis firsthand. They got to hear directly from law enforcement and Montana families impacted by the crisis. I saw Vice President PENCE and Mrs. Pence sitting around a table inside a facility that is helping moms who are addicted to meth and who are working with moms and their children to get better. They were telling their stories about how they have gotten better through treatment at the Rimrock Foundation facility there in Billings and starting out a much brighter chapter in their lives because of the help provided from Rimrock.

I stand with President Trump. I stand with his administration as we

work together to secure our borders and protect our communities from illegal drugs and to end this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues and especially Senator DAINES for pointing out what is happening in rural and smalltown America. As a matter of fact, most of my colleagues—Senator HOEVEN, Senator CAPITO, Senator DAINES, Senator BOOZMAN, Senator BLACKBURN—all represent large States, and we represent cities, of course, but also rural and smalltown America. I thank them for their concerted efforts. We have all been working together.

I thank Senator HOEVEN more particularly for his work on funding, as he is the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and I echo his support for getting these appropriations bills done.

I just want to talk and add to their comments about this national issue of immediate concern, substance abuse and opioid addiction. I think it is timely because just 1 year ago, the President of the United States signed the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act into law. This was the legislation that was the culmination of months of bipartisan work. I emphasize the word “bipartisan.” We talk about it a lot but seldom see it. This is one effort that we got done. This moved across several committees and both Chambers of Congress. So I think it is something we can take great pride in, showing folks back home that we can actually do something together.

I am proud to be part of this effort on behalf of both the Finance and HELP Committees in the Senate. The legislation included a bill I introduced to encourage the use of electronic prior authorization in Medicare Part D, which would help overcome one of the primary challenges to patients receiving their medications, including treatments for substance abuse disorders and non-opiate alternatives to treating pain.

The SUPPORT Act also included our language that would help shed light on the best practices and the barriers to using telehealth for treating substance abuse disorders in children who are covered under Medicaid. It will also focus on how we can utilize telehealth to help children in rural and underserved areas, including how treatment can be offered in school-based settings. All of us who have spoken on this issue have the same problem.

In last year's farm bill, the Senate Agriculture Committee, of which I am proud to be chairman, also included provisions to help those suffering from substance abuse disorders, primarily in our rural areas. We prioritized funding in the community facilities and distance learning telemedicine programs for projects focused on treating addiction, including opiates.

I am proud of these efforts, but there is so much work left to do to combat addiction. This is a real epidemic as has been stressed by my colleagues.

Real progress starts at the local level. In my home State of Kansas, we continue to need assistance in preventing meth use, as was so eloquently discussed by my colleague from Montana, Senator DAINES.

We still have use and abuse taking a heavy toll on many communities throughout the State. Patients suffering from addiction in rural parts of the country face many challenges in accessing the clinical services they really need. We have heard from many Kansans who have to travel long distances, sometimes across State lines, in order to access substance abuse treatments.

I recently spoke with many Kansas district attorneys for a second year in a row. Last year they came in, and I thought they were going to talk about the criminal justice act that we had just passed. No, they wanted to talk about meth. I said: Well, wait a minute, I thought we made some real progress in eliminating the meth labs in Kansas.

That is the case, but for a second year in a row, they pointed out again the meth coming in from Mexico, which was demonstrated by Senator DAINES. There was a tremendous concern over this kind of meth, which is so much more powerful. Their No. 1 concern was individuals in many parts of the State who were suffering from addiction and constantly cycling through the court system and clogging up the courts. These individuals often do not have access to substance abuse treatments that can help control their addiction and keep them out of the criminal justice system.

That is why I introduced this year the Meth Addiction Act. All of us have individual acts, and we also hope that we can meld them together. This is a bill to extend the reach of these treatments to more people who so desperately need them. Our bill would allow our community mental health and addiction treatment facilities to connect patients via telehealth to physicians who are authorized to prescribe the controlled substances that treat addiction. This would help to empower local and rural providers to use every tool necessary to combat this epidemic.

In addition, last year, I had the privilege of attending a drug take-back event in Kansas, hosted by Walgreens and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas. This is the kind of local initiative that is especially important, as we have consistently heard about the importance of preventing diversion as one way of combating this epidemic.

At the same time, we must be careful and make sure that efforts to address the problem do not deny patients the controlled substances if they have a legitimate and clinical need for these treatments. That is why safe disposal

of these medications is such an important tool in solving this very complex issue. This initiative offers people year-round options to help to prevent diversion of addictive medications to their friends and loved ones, without limiting access to treatment.

Finally, I would like to recognize that 2 weeks from now, the city of Topeka, KS, the capital of Kansas, is hosting the Kansas Opioid Conference. The people who are truly on the frontlines of the opioid crisis in Kansas will be in attendance to address these issues through all sorts of collaborative efforts at the State level and the local level. They are the ones who will help us find the solution that will help us make real and lasting progress against this epidemic.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I have this important message from a very important staff member.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now recess from 3 until 4 p.m. today for a briefing.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

#### REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am deeply saddened to hear the news on Monday of the death of our former colleague, Kay Hagan.

She is the sister, the wife, and the aunt of Navy veterans; daughter-in-law to a two-star Marine Corps general; daughter of a former Florida mayor; and niece to a former U.S. Senator and Governor. Service was in Kay Hagan's veins.

She spent an early career in financial services, but it was only a matter of time until she decided to get directly engaged in public policy.

In office, she was a fierce and unwavering advocate for our men and women in uniform, a staunch fighter for the right of every American to have healthcare, and a warrior for women and children. The people of North Carolina and the people of the United States are far better off because of her years of service in the North Carolina Senate and the 6 years in the U.S. Senate.

When she was here she worked on so many different issues. She immersed herself in trying to assist our military personnel. She was the founding member of the Military Family Caucus. She championed the program that offers education support for military spouses. She cosponsored the repeal of don't ask, don't tell, and she drove the investigation of the contamination of water at Camp Lejeune and legislation to rectify that.

She introduced the Hire a Hero Act to try to enable our veterans to get jobs and make that transition from military service to civilian life. She led the effort for overdue recognition of African-American marines who were forced to train at a separate camp outside Camp Lejeune, and that led them to being awarded the Congressional Gold Medal.



When it came to women and children, she was there every day in that fight—the fight for a stronger Violence Against Women Act and the fight for the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, so women can be paid commensurate with their male colleagues. She authored the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act to maintain and continue the support for mandatory screening for newborns.

She fought for workers and middle-class America and manufacturing jobs for Americans and for equal opportunity by sponsoring the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, which passed on the Senate floor 6 years ago.

She proceeded to work on banking and financial issues. She was the lead on the SAFE Act Confidentiality and Privilege Enhancement Act, which had to do with some of the nitty-gritty of mortgage licensing. She worked to ensure that groups like Habitat for Humanity could lend money on a zero-interest loan to their homeowners and be able to do so without violating the legal precepts of American law. It was issue after issue.

When I think of her journey, I think about the parallel structure between her life and mine, in that she ran for the legislature in North Carolina the same year that I ran for the legislature in Oregon. I won a seat in the Oregon House and she won a seat in the North Carolina Senate. We both spent 10 years there. We both then decided that we should attempt to take our philosophy of fighting for the people to the U.S. Senate. We threw our hats into the ring at the same moment, running campaigns against incumbent Senators, and we both won.

I recall how every time I checked on how she was doing, she was always doing 5 to 10 points better than I was, and I just kept thinking: I just have to follow Kay Hagan's example. Then, before the campaign was over, she called me up one day, and we hadn't actually met much or talked much, and she said: I just want to check in on how you are doing.

We connected and bonded over our parallel paths and the fight we were in, which was such an intense effort of campaigning with the desire and determination to make this country a better place.

Of course, as I have noted, when she got here, she threw herself into so many aspects of our national life and our legal structure. I was pleased that we were both assigned by Senator KENNEDY to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. We were able to work on the ACA, or the Affordable Care Act, to try to greatly increase health coverage and make it more affordable and available throughout America—really important for the people of North Carolina, the citizens of my State, and citizens across this country.

Then, we were both assigned to the Banking Committee, and it was Dodd-Frank. We worked on questions such as

how do we end some of the predatory lending practices? Both of us worked on payday-loan predatory actions, where interest rates could be 500 percent. We knew the damage done to our families across the country. We didn't succeed on that particular piece of legislation—the payday loan piece—but we were stemming in this fight from the same place. I so applaud her determination to end predatory practices and lending.

Many of the things that we were fighting for did get into Dodd-Frank in terms of fairness and mortgages so that homeownership would be a dream of homeownership that would result in equity for middle-class Americans rather than a nightmare of homeownership, in which interest rates would double after 2 years, and the family would go bankrupt, and they would be foreclosed on and could lose their house.

Apart from all of that, Kay was such a beautiful voice and spirit in this Chamber—cheerful, determined, thoughtful, gracious. She just made you enjoy being here.

I also think about her, as when she served, she was the healthiest Member of this Chamber. She paid a lot of attention to the diet she ate, the food she ate, how she exercised, how she brought balance to her life. That, too, was an inspiration to us.

Here we find that our journeys on this planet are pretty precarious. We never know what is going to happen on the next day or the next week. I think it is a reminder to all of us to use our moments wisely, to treat each other with the sort of graciousness she exemplified—this sort of spirited fighting for “we the people,” the people of the United States for whom she was determined to deploy and champion on the floor of the Senate.

Her illness and her death are a real loss to all of us. It is important that we carry her in our hearts. She certainly has a place solidly secured in my heart and, I think, the hearts of everyone who served with her.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:02 p.m., recessed until 4:03 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 949

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I am very happy to be joined on the floor with Senator MERKLEY, who has worked with me for a long time on the For the People Act, and we will both be speaking here in that order.

The American people sent us here to do the people's business, but under Republican leadership, the Senate is not responding to what the American people need and want. We are not solving the kitchen table issues the American people elected us to face every day.

For example, we are not making sure every American has access to affordable, quality healthcare. We need to lower costs and take on Big Pharma, and we are not doing that. We are not passing commonsense gun safety legislation that 90 percent of the voters support in order to stop shootings in the schools, on our streets, and in our communities. If we can't pass bills that save children's lives, our democracy is not working. We are not even taking on the most pressing issue that faces our planet—climate change. Younger generations are urging us to act, but this body is running away from taking any action.

The number of gravestones in the majority leader's legislative graveyard—where urgent bills are stalled and buried—steadily mounts. Bills keep going into the majority leader's graveyard, but Congress will not and cannot do the people's business when the bills to fix our democracy also rest in that graveyard.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the For the People Act, H.R. 1. It passed it in March. At the same time, I introduced the Senate companion to the For the People Act, which has the support of all 47 Democrats and Independents in the Senate. Yet, along with a pile of other good and necessary bills, Leader MCCONNELL has buried the For the People Act.

The For the People Act repairs our broken campaign finance system, opens up the ballot box to all Americans, and lays waste to the corruption in Washington. These are all reforms that the American people support. Why will the Senate majority leader not let us vote on them?

There is hardly a day that goes by that we don't see evidence of why it is so important that we pass the For the People Act. Foreign influence in our elections is only growing, and 2016 was just the start. Associates of the President's personal lawyer have been indicted for laundering foreign money into our elections. The President's lawyer is under investigation for the same. Political ads from foreign sources are flooding social media.

Our bill fights foreign tampering in our democracy. It prohibits domestic corporations with foreign control from spending money in U.S. elections. It cracks down on shell companies that are used in order to launder foreign money into our elections. Our bill makes sure that American elections

are decided by American voters without there being foreign interference. It protects our democratic institutions, increases oversight over election vendors, requires paper ballots, and supports security upgrades for States' voting systems.

This body should have gotten serious about election security immediately after the 2016 election, but under the majority leader's direction, we have not done that.

At a time of increased foreign interference, the President has invited foreign assistance in any way it might benefit him personally, politically, or financially. Day in and day out, we see this President taking full advantage of his position to benefit himself, his family, and his political prospects.

The President never divested. He never formed a blind trust for his assets. Every day, we see foreign officials and foreign nationals currying favor with the President and padding his pocketbook, wining and dining at the Trump properties. Indeed, Mr. Giuliani and his two close associates lunched at the Trump International Hotel, right here in Washington, just before these two individuals were picked up at the Washington Dulles International Airport with their one-way tickets abroad. The same individuals have been charged with illegally funneling foreign money into our democracy. In addition, the President only relented from hosting the next G7 summit at his Doral resort in Miami after the Republicans told him that even they couldn't defend that.

All the while, the President calls the emoluments clause—intended to stop these very abuses—phony.

The For the People Act requires the President to fully disclose his or her financial interests and disclose the last 10 years of his or her tax returns, which is something this President has never done. It requires the President to fully divest and transfer all of his or her assets to a blind trust. The American people deserve to know their President is acting in the national interest, not in his or her own self-interest, and not being subjected to leverage by foreign interests that seek to corrupt our electoral process.

The intelligence community has been very clear with its disturbing warnings. Adverse foreign interests are actively trying to manipulate our democracy. They did so in 2016 as the Mueller report and prosecutions from that investigation confirmed. They will try to do so again in 2020. We are watching it happen in realtime before our eyes.

These foreign interests are not red or blue—not Democratic or Republican. They will use whomever they can to pursue their interests—interests that are often opposed to ours or are simply corrupt. We must unite in the defense of our electoral system and in the defense of the sanctity of our democracy. Like the other bills the Democrats are seeking to pass this week, the For the People Act would provide that protec-

tion. The House's version, H.R. 1, would do so as well.

We want to partner with the Republicans in these efforts, and we are open to negotiation. Yet, while the American people demand that we fix our out-of-control campaign finance system, make sure elections are secure, and root out the corruption in Washington, bills to address these issues gather dust on the leader's desk.

I, for one, will not stop fighting for the comprehensive democratic reforms that we need and for bringing power back to the people—where the Founders intended it to be. Our democracy will always be worth the fight.

Once again, Senator MERKLEY has been a great partner to work with on the For the People Act.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I am honored to join my colleague who has led this battle for the vision of the For the People Act that will restore the "we the people" democratic republic.

Here we are on the floor of the Senate. It is an institution that once reverberated with great debates on the great issues our Nation faced—issues of war and peace, of civil rights, of healthcare and housing, of education and infrastructure, and of living-wage jobs; issues of equal opportunity and of environmental pollution; issues that affect the fundamental success of each family in America and our collective success as a nation.

Yet, if you are sitting here today and are observing the Senate from the benches up above, you will be hard-pressed to see any of that because those debates are not happening in the U.S. Senate. This Chamber is silent on the great issues that face America.

Before he was the majority leader, the majority leader promised that things would be different under his leadership.

He said:

A Senate majority under my leadership would break sharply from the practices of the Reid era in favor of a far more free-wheeling approach to problem solving. I would work to restore its traditional role as a place where good ideas are generated, debated and voted upon.

Now, one of the fundamental principles is that every Senator should be able to raise any issue and have the chance to defend it, to present it, to see it attacked, to respond to those attacks, and to have the American people see where we stand. But, today, the Senate is not operating in that manner today. The reality is reflected in a different quote by the majority leader from this past year.

He said:

Donald Trump is still in the White House, and as long as I am Majority Leader of the Senate, I get to set the agenda. That's why I call myself the Grim Reaper.

The majority leader is taking great pride in preventing this Chamber from

being the legislative body that was envisioned in the Constitution, one in which we examine the issues that the citizens of our States present to us with great concern and ask us to resolve so as to take this Nation forward. Instead, we are deeply mired in the legislative graveyard that the majority leader has been so proud to create.

How about the Bipartisan Background Checks Act? It is now engraved on a tombstone. The Paycheck Fairness Act? Engraved on a tombstone. Violence Against Women? On a tombstone—or how about Save the Internet? Or the Climate Action Now Act?

How about healthcare? Across my State, in rural areas and urban areas, everybody wants the same fair price, even if they have preexisting conditions. That is the fundamental nature of an effective insurance strategy for healthcare, but the Protecting Americans With Preexisting Conditions Act has never been debated on this floor.

The American Dream and Promise Act, the Securing America's Federal Elections Act? How about the Raise the Wage Act? How about the Equality Act that grants every member of our society, LGBTQ Americans, the full opportunity to have the doors of opportunity opened, rather than slammed shut—debated and passed just down the hall, each and every one of these bills, but here, they haven't been debated. The Senate is failing its constitutional responsibility.

In fact, during the last 2 years, there has only been three priorities that have seemed to have arisen in this Chamber. One was the goal of stripping healthcare from 30 million Americans. It failed by the slimmest of margins. A second is to pack the courts with judges who believe in a supercharged amendment to give power to the powerful, rather than power to the people.

The third is a \$2 trillion tax cut to enrich the richest Americans. In any chamber that truly represents the people, you don't see the goal of destroying healthcare for 30 million Americans and giving \$2 trillion to the richest Americans. But that is what we have seen here, while we fail to see the bills on healthcare, on housing, on education, on infrastructure, on living wage jobs—the fundamentals by which the American families prosper.

Why is it that this Chamber is now a completely owned subsidiary of the most powerful people in this country? It is because of the fundamental corruption of our constitutional system, starting with gerrymandering.

Many of us hear that phrase, "equal representation," and understand we are talking about fundamental fairness of distributed power, but gerrymandering is the opposite of that. The Supreme Court has given complete license to extreme partisan gerrymandering, instead of defending the constitutional vision of equal representation. It is principle in a democracy and in a republic that the citizens choose their legislators, the legislators don't choose

their citizens. But that legislation to address that, to create nonpartisan commissions to prevent that gerrymandering, hasn't been debated on the floor of this Chamber.

A second piece of corruption is voter suppression. The Supreme Court opened the doors by gutting the Voting Rights Act, again failing to defend the vision of the Constitution. But have we remedied that here on this floor? Have we addressed that fundamental corruption in which all kinds of tactics are created to prevent people from voting across this country—all kinds of clever ID laws to disempower communities that are minority communities or college communities or poor communities or Native American communities? We have not.

There is perhaps the most vicious form of corruption, the dark money flowing through our campaign systems. Jefferson was very clear that if you have government by the powerful, you end up with laws for the powerful. So you have to have distributed power so that the power of the people results in laws that reflect the will of the people. That is the difference between the vision of our constitutional system here in the United States of America and the system of kingships that dominated Europe.

But because of the corruption of dark money in our campaign system, it has created the concentration of power, the exact opposite of what Jefferson laid out and our Founders laid out in our Constitution. We start our Constitution with those powerful first three words, "We the people," because that is the vision of our Constitution—not "We the powerful," not "We the privileged."

So a bill has been crafted, H.R. 1, the For the People Act. My colleague from New Mexico has led this charge to address this fundamental corruption in order to restore the vision our Nation was founded on because, if we restore that foundation, then we would be addressing healthcare on the floor of the Senate, making it more affordable, stopping the price gouging of Americans, the challenges of access in communities across this country.

We would be addressing the shortage of housing that is driving a homeless epidemic in this country, partly because of the economics, the structure of our economy, and partly because of unaddressed mental illness and drug addiction.

We would be addressing education because education is the path to full participation; yet today, we have seen a shrinkage of the opportunities through apprenticeships for working people and through college—affordable college for the dreams taking you in that direction if you weren't previously burdened by a debt the size of a home mortgage. We would be addressing infrastructure and jobs. We would be addressing the environmental challenges our planet faces if we restore the vision of our Constitution.

This For the People Act is the most important piece of legislation because everything else we care about as Americans is going to fail if we let this Chamber be controlled by powerful special interests through this corrupted system. So let's take it on. Let's take on the gerrymandering and the voter suppression and the dark money. Let's have the courage to debate it on this floor because that is what we were elected to do, was to work on the big challenges facing our Nation, and there is perhaps no bigger challenge than this.

Madam President, I yield back to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 949, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Reserving the right to object, I would like to object. I would like to talk about this bill for a minute.

In March, the House passed a bill that would give the Federal Government unprecedented control over elections in this country, despite the fact that, for more than 200 years, we have had a history of State-run elections. That diversity is part of the strength of our system. I objected to the request at that time to pass that bill.

S. 949 appears to be almost exactly the same bill. Apparently, the powerful special interests that my friend, Mr. MERKLEY, talked about are the State governments because that is where we are taking authority from here. We are taking authority from the State governments.

The For the People Act is really the For the Federal Government Act. It represents a one-size-fits-all Federal power grab that would take control of election administration away from the States, at the great expense to the American people. It requires all the States to fit into, frankly, what House Democrats saw as a narrow view of what elections should look like and, just as frankly, what House Democrats for 20 years have had in mind that would in every case, in their view, give them an advantage in the election process. The security of our elections comes, in large part, from the very diversity of the way they are set up and the way they are administered. This bill would really undermine that decentralized system.

I spent 20 years as an election official, part of it as the chief election authority in what was then the third largest county in our State, and the rest of it was as the secretary of state, the chief election official. I know for a fact that people who conduct these

elections are unbelievably focused on a fair process before an election day and on election day.

I also know for a fact that the very fact that they can't blame some far-away regulator on their inability to do what needs to be done makes a difference. I have seen that happen at 6 o'clock in the morning. I have seen it happen at 12 midnight as the last precinct comes in. I have seen it happen as people were doing everything they can to be sure that people that are trying to vote are able to vote. I have seen the development of the provisional ballot system that the States all use now if someone for some reason believes they should vote and the records aren't there to allow that.

So there are a lot of things that Senator MERKLEY understands better than I do. I am sure there are a lot of things that Senator UDALL understands better than I do. I look forward to the times when I have and will continue to seek advice for them on those issues. I am pretty sure that this is an issue that, at least from the point of view of the strength of the local election system and the State election system, I have reason to have confidence.

In fact, former President Obama expressed the same view when he said: "There is no serious person out there who would suggest somehow that you could even rig America's elections, in part, because they are so decentralized and the numbers of votes involved." He said that late summer, early fall 2016.

I think that was true when he said it; I think it is true now. This bill tells States how to run every aspect of their elections. It takes away the authority of the States to determine their own process for voter registration. In fact, it requires online voter registration. If you are trying to focus on election security, online voter registration would not be at the top of that list.

It requires automatic voter registration. It requires same-day registration. It requires States to accept voter registrations from people who are not old enough to vote yet. It dictates the criteria that people can be removed from the voter rolls or can't be. It tells the States what kind of election equipment they must use, how their ballots must be counted, how the ballot counts must be audited. It even goes so far as to tell the States as to what kinds of marks must be made on ballot-marking devices and what kind of paper their ballots must be printed on. It tells States they must offer early voting sites. It tells them those early voting sites where they must be and what hours they must operate.

The bill doesn't stop at election administration. It tells States how they redistrict, how they establish redistricting commissions, who can be appointed to that commission, how the lines are drawn. This would be a major Federal takeover of a system that would not benefit from that takeover. It also creates a program for public financing for elections, tax dollars to politicians to run elections with.

And so, Madam President, I do object to the unanimous consent request, and I think for good reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, this bill does just the opposite. It supports States. It doesn't take over from States. The States have asked us for help when it comes to actions like cybersecurity and other things that are happening out there. It roots out foreign interference in our elections which happens in Federal elections and happens in State elections and, I think, can only be done at the Federal level.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri says that these things that are being required, States are adopting all of these. States are moving very aggressively forward with things like automatic registration and moving to make it easier to vote, and we are trying to lay a consistent basis so the States know how to operate. So this is a good bill. It is a solid bill. It puts the American people back in charge.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I might just respond by saying that, if States are adopting these things because they think they are a good idea, that is one thing. For Washington, DC, to tell them they have to do it because we think it is a good idea, that is another thing. If my friend from New Mexico is right and States are adopting many of these changes, I guess there would be no particular reason to have the bill. I am pleased that this is a bill that is going to take further study before it is ready to come to the Senate Floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

H.R. 3055

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, the substitute amendment to H.R. 3055 contains the Appropriations Committee-reported versions of four bills: Agriculture; Interior; Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, one bill; and Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies.

I was very excited to see today's earlier cloture vote, which passed 88 to 5, which means that we can see those four bills to help fund government move forward.

The Commerce-Justice-Science portion of this minibus, or CJS, was reported out of the Appropriations Committee on a unanimous 31-to-0 vote. I particularly care about this bill as ranking member on that subcommittee.

The CJS bill provides \$70.8 billion to protect the Nation from criminals and terrorists, warn us about violent storms and climate change, enable fair trade, promote manufacturing and sustainable fisheries, partner with State and local law enforcement, and provide resources for the census to count every person in the United States fairly and accurately.

CJS Subcommittee Chairman MORAN and I took a collaborative approach to

drafting this important bill. The CJS Subcommittee held substantive hearings, considered 1,564 individual and group requests from 75 Senators, and worked in a bipartisan way to meet the needs of the Nation and our individual States.

Under the Constitution, since 1790, every 10 years the United States has conducted the census, and we only get one chance every 10 years to get it right. In addition to determining the number of Representatives each State will have, Federal programs rely on census data to distribute more than \$900 billion annually, nearly \$4 billion of which goes to my home State of New Hampshire.

Chairman MORAN and I have worked together to make sure the census has the resources it needs. The bill provides \$7.6 billion for the Bureau of the Census—nearly double the amount provided in fiscal year 2019. This fully funds the life-cycle estimate for the 2020 census, along with contingencies that have been recommended by Secretary Ross but were not requested in the budget.

The bill also directs the Census Bureau to invest in partnership and communication efforts in hard-to-count areas in order to increase self-response rates and offset the need for expensive door-to-door followup.

Once again, the subcommittee has provided increases to law enforcement and grant programs that fight gun violence and violent crime. The bill includes at least a 3-percent increase for Justice Department law enforcement agencies—more than \$476 million higher than the fiscal year 2019 level for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI, and the Marshals Service.

Especially important, we have provided \$131 million for the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System, NICS—\$24 million more than last year. This system is the key to making sure firearms are purchased legally and helping keep weapons out of the hands of those who wish to do harm. The bill includes increases for States to improve record submission to NICS and for mental health courts.

We continue to provide the full \$100 million authorized for STOP School Violence Act grants. But as we know, gun violence isn't just happening in schools, so we have included funding for other grant programs, like \$8 million for community-based violence prevention and nearly 10 percent more for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to help keep children and their families safe in their neighborhoods.

We are also addressing another form of violence facing our law enforcement officers, and that is police suicide. I would really like to provide more statistics regarding this important issue of police suicide, but unfortunately I can't, and neither can anybody in this body because no Federal agencies col-

lect data on the subject. That is why in the CJS bill, we direct the Justice Department to begin a national data collection to report on police suicide so we can all better understand the scope of the problem. We also direct the Department to report on best practices for officer mental health and wellness programs, including peer mentoring.

One thing we do know about police suicides, though, is that we lose more police officers to suicide each year than we do to officers killed in the line of duty. Our police officers need help now, so we have been able to add \$3 million for grants to allow State and local law enforcement to provide improved mental health services, training to reduce the stigma of officers seeking help, and programs to address resiliency for departments and officers to handle repeated exposure to stress and trauma.

This is an issue, sadly, we know all too well in New Hampshire, where in the last couple of months, in the city of Nashua—our second-largest city—we lost a very much appreciated, well-respected, and loved police officer to suicide. We were lucky because the chief of the Nashua Police Department and the family of that officer were willing to talk about that suicide to raise concern about this issue so that we can know and try to address it.

Another area of funding in this bill that will help our first responders, in addition to the support to our State and local governments and community organizations, is the \$505 million in dedicated grant programs to fight substance abuse, including opioids, and to fight drug trafficking. This amount is \$37 million higher than the fiscal year 2019 level and \$127.5 million higher than the budget request.

In part because of the resources we have brought to bear on the opioid crisis in New Hampshire and throughout New England, the substance use disorder epidemic is developing and changing, and we are now seeing a rapid rise in the use and trafficking of meth amphetamines. When efforts are focused on preventing and stopping one drug, sadly, we see others gain traction, and that is what is happening.

After hearing from local law enforcement and community organizations, this bill provides more flexibility to allow communities to respond to a variety of substance abuse issues in addition to opioids in the Comprehensive Opioid, Stimulant, and Substance Abuse Program. Communities should not be turning away individuals who have substance use disorders because we have a narrow definition of the programs that can help.

Another way this bill seeks to keep Granite State communities vibrant—and this helps other communities that depend on coastal economies—is we reject the elimination of grants that help our coastal communities and their economies. The bill keeps key weather satellites on track and provides an increase for job-supporting coastal programs like Sea Grant, Coastal Zone

Management Grants, the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund, and the National Estuarine Research Reserve System.

The bill includes continued funding to prevent a burdensome and costly at-sea monitoring fee from being imposed on New Hampshire and other New England fishermen. I have heard directly from our fishermen in New Hampshire that without this support, they would have to stop fishing and declare bankruptcy. So many seacoast communities rely on a strong fishing industry. That is why the bill also includes \$2.5 million for New England groundfish research, including looking at measures to improve stock assessments.

Beyond the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, the bill also supports strong investments in research and development at the National Science Foundation; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA; and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST. The bill includes a 5-percent increase for NIST, which is an agency that promotes U.S. innovation and competitiveness through scientific and technological standards and measurement.

I am pleased that the bill provides \$2 million for NIST to study whether firefighters are subject to PFAS exposure, a chemical that has been linked to serious adverse health implications.

What we have seen is that—we think the actual equipment that is used by so many firefighters has PFAS chemicals in that equipment, so that while risking their lives fighting fires, firefighters also may be exposed to a dangerous chemical that can affect their health. The last thing our firefighters need when they are on duty is to be concerned about the safety of their own firefighting gear.

Within NASA, we have provided balanced funding that enables science supported by decadal surveys, supports the International Space Station, continues developing and flying new transportation systems, and allows for an eventual return to the Moon by humans.

We have also provided more than \$900 million to restore widely supported programs that the administration proposed to eliminate—programs like Space Grant; EPSCoR; the Wide Field Infrared Telescope or W-FIRST; the Plankton, Aerosol, Cloud ocean Ecosystem mission, PACE; and Restore-L. What is important about these programs is that they allow young people—students in every State—to be involved with NASA and implement high-priority science objectives and to get excited about space and the opportunities space investment offers us.

These are some of the highlights of just the Commerce-Justice-Science portion of this minibus. I believe it is a strong, comprehensive bill. I am proud it is on the floor. I hope it is going to pass with as strong a margin as we saw this morning's vote give us, and I hope we will be able to enact this bill into

law before the current continuing funding resolution expires on November 21.

I want to give credit to all of the members of both the majority and the minority on the Appropriations subcommittee that helped negotiate our CJS bill and all of the bills that are on the floor. They do tremendous work, and they deserve our credit for all of their effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. ROMNEY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about two problems that are related. These two problems have been spoken about for I think virtually decades here in this Chamber and across the political spectrum.

One relates to preserving our extraordinary entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, our highway trust fund, and the like. These programs are very much under threat because within 13 years, each of these trust funds, each of these programs will face insolvency.

The other problem I want to talk about is the massive overspending, the deficit and the debt we have. That is something which Republicans and Democrats have been speaking about for a long time, although speaking about it less frequently as of late.

These two problems are related because two-thirds of our spending at the Federal level is automatic. It is associated with our entitlement programs. So let me start with the debt.

When I was running for President and when I had the chance also to run for the Senate, the No. 1 issue among the people in my State was the issue of whether we would stop spending more money than we take in. We took in about \$3 trillion last year in tax revenue, but we spent about \$4 trillion.

There are some people who have decided to stop thinking about the deficit, to stop worrying about the debt, but as the debt reaches almost \$23 trillion, it is beginning to be a real issue. I don't think we are about to face a failed auction where people won't be willing to buy our debt. We are, after all, the reserve currency of the world, and people want to have American dollars. But I am concerned that the interest is beginning to have an enormous impact on our capacity to meet our priorities.

Last year we spent almost \$300 billion on interest on the Federal debt, and over time, this debt, as we add to it year after year after year, is going to mean that the burden of interest payments on the American people will get larger and larger.

There is a small group of people who say: Well, this isn't a problem because interest rates are so low.

Well, it is not a problem until it becomes a problem, because if interest rates start creeping up at some point, it can become an extraordinary burden on the American people.

If we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars to people like the Chinese,

when they use those dollars to confront our military, we have a real problem leading the free world.

The issue is, how come we can't deal with the debt and the deficits, and why haven't we been able to do so? There has been effort to talk about that, even though more recently it has been kind of quiet. It relates, of course, to what I started to speak about, which are our trust funds, with Medicare, with Social Security, our retirement programs. Social Security, the disability program, as well as the highway trust funds—these are scheduled to run out of money within 13 years.

To deal with this issue, Senator JOE MANCHIN, Senator TODD YOUNG, Senator DOUG JONES, Senator KYRSTEN SINEMA, and I have proposed something called the TRUST Act. It is designed to save the trust funds associated with these major programs. It is designed to make sure we have a process for finally getting balance in Social Security—both trust funds in Social Security, as well as Medicare, as well as the highway trust fund.

This is an effort that has been undertaken in the past unsuccessfully, and a lot of people say that it can't be done now. But it has to be done now. If it is not done now, the burden that will fall on our seniors eventually will become extraordinary. And the burden that will fall on the next generation, as they don't know whether Social Security and Medicare can be depended upon, is unthinkable.

The approach that Senator MANCHIN and these other Senators and I have taken is pretty straightforward. We are not laying out a specific plan to change these programs. Instead, we have laid out a process for modernizing these programs.

For each one of these trust funds, our bill proposes that the leaders—Republicans and Democrats—in both Chambers, House and Senate, put together a rescue committee. For each trust fund, there will be a rescue committee that goes to work to see if, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, we can come up with a solution to get these trust funds on a solvent basis for at least 75 years.

That is an effort that will be successful only if both parties agree. If we do get that agreement in any one or each one of these different rescue committees, on a privileged basis, their recommendation, their proposal, their bill will be brought to the floor of the House and Senate and voted upon.

On that basis, we have a process for actually resolving the insolvency issue that faces Social Security, Medicare, and the highway trust fund. We also have a pathway to finally get our budget balanced and end the extraordinary growth in our debt and the burden the interest payments are having on the American people today and in the future.

I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I hope we get great support from people who are willing to sponsor this effort

to be part of these rescue committees, to go to work to resolve the impending challenges that we have in these trust funds and in our overall financial status.

I mentioned the names of the Senators I have been working with to put together this TRUST Act. I also want to mention a number of Congresspeople who are helping out and our cosponsors, original cosponsors: MIKE GALLAGHER, ED CASE, and BEN MCADAMS. Again, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate—together, I think we can finally save these essential programs.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend Senator ROMNEY for taking this initiative and, basically, all of us working together.

Let me say this. We were Governors together—the Governor from Massachusetts and the Governor from West Virginia. The bottom line is, we had the same balanced budget amendment we had to work with. We had to work on a daily basis, a weekly basis—whatever it took—to balance our States' budgets. We had to stay within our means. We couldn't spend more than what we had coming in, and we couldn't put our people in debt.

That was something I thought was pretty simple because it is the same thing you do in your personal life, the same thing you do in your small business or large corporation: You live within your means. If you are going to grow, then you grow, basically, in a balanced way.

As Senator ROMNEY has said, our debt is almost \$23 trillion. You can look back through history when we have hit these numbers, but then if you look back, during the war, we weren't worried about balancing the budget during the war. We were worrying about whether we would survive as nation, and we did.

Coming out of that war, we had over 100 percent debt to GDP. We were able to bring that back down and work in a prudent manner. Then it ballooned up.

Let me tell you how I signed on to Bowles-Simpson. If you look at recent history, the last time—and the only time for 40 years—we balanced the budget was in 1997, up to 2001. That was with Erskine Bowles and John Casey working together—a Democrat working for President Bill Clinton and a Republican Congressman from Ohio. They sat down and worked out a plan and a tax system that worked for America. It worked so well that we were spinning out, basically, surpluses.

We were told that by 2006 we would be debt-free on the path we were going. We had 9/11 come up. We had two wars we never paid for—the first time. I tell people, if you are a Democrat and you want to blame Republicans, go ahead. They are guilty. If you are a Republican and you want to blame Democrats, go ahead. They are just as

guilty. There is basically blame for both sides. But sooner or later, you have to do something.

When Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson came together, Democrats and Republicans said: We have to get our financial house in order.

It made sense to me. I had just been elected. It was in early 2011. I was elected in November 2010. I started looking, and it made sense. We came so close that it would have been forced to a vote, as Senator ROMNEY has just explained the TRUST Act.

We think that someone has to have their eye on the ball here because when these interest rates balloon—and they will—and when people lose confidence and faith and will not put their money in and buy our paper, basically, for the low return we are giving them—or no return at times—and demand more, then we are going to have to outbid, and it is going to cost a lot more to do business in our country.

Sooner or later, we are basically writing checks our kids can't cash. That is about it in a nutshell. If we are responsible to leave our children and the next generation in better shape than how we received it, we have done a very poor job. We truly have.

Again, I thank the good Senator from Utah for basically bringing this fiscal plan we have worked together on and looking at where we are. The roadmap is pretty clear. If you haven't learned from history, you will make history. And it is not going to be a good kind of history you are going to make.

Let me tell you who these recessions hit the most. In my State, I have a very hard-working State, a very rural State, and a State that is not of the highest per capita income in the country by any means. With that, they are the first ones who get hurt. If we don't really care about Social Security, if we don't care about the highway trust fund, infrastructure, if we don't care about Medicare—this is a life-sustaining influx of money they have because very few people who work from paycheck to paycheck are able to put money aside so that they don't need Social Security and they can pay their own medical bills.

I have seen the effect of this. I can tell you, it is not pleasant. I have people on my side of the aisle who talk about Medicare for All. That is aspirational. We can't even pay for Medicare for Some—the "some" who have already earned it and paid into it.

By 2026, we are going to be in default. We are going to be out of funds. By 2032, Social Security could be out of funds. These are things that are fixable now. They will not be fixable in 2026 for Medicare. It will be too late. For Social Security, in 2030, 2032, it will be too late, and that is just around the corner. For the highway trust fund, look at the infrastructure. Everyone who has run for President within the last decade or so basically has talked about a big infrastructure package. It will be the first thing they have done. They get

elected, and guess what happens. Nothing. We don't see an infrastructure package.

It is the most politically right thing you can do. A pothole doesn't have an R's or a D's name on it. It is not partisan. It will bust your tire, and it will break your rim. It doesn't care who you are.

These are things we can fix, and they are things we can do to gain the trust of the public. Yet we fail to do them. We continue to divide this country and push us apart. This TRUST Act is what will bring us back together. It will put our priorities where they should be.

All of us have run for public office. We have put our names out there. We can go out there and explain: We are protecting your Social Security.

If you want to protect Social Security, then do something. The TRUST Act does that.

We are going to take care of your Medicare. Do you want to take care of Medicare? Support the TRUST Act. It will do that.

These are things we can do, and we can do them now. We shouldn't wait. We should bring this back to the floor, and you should go on record to vote. Are you really going to support Social Security? Are you really going to support Medicare? Then vote.

If you don't have the guts to vote, that means you don't support Social Security, and you don't support Medicare, and quit being a hypocrite going out there campaigning and saying you do. That is really what it comes down to.

We are just trying to fix something in an orderly fashion, where everybody has it—bipartisan, bicameral. If we can't do this bipartisan, bicameral, we can't do anything in a bipartisan, bicameral way. This is where we are today.

I thank my dear friend. I really do. I thank my friend Senator ROMNEY for saying: Let's do this, Joe.

I said: Absolutely, MITT, I am onboard. Count me in.

We have other Senators. Not surprisingly, we have former Governors. This is how we had to operate. These were our day-to-day operations. During the crisis of 2007, 2008, I used to meet once a week in West Virginia with my finance people. They would give me the projections, and we had to make adjustments. In 2007 and 2008, with the recession coming on as hard it was, we were meeting twice a day, trying to stay ahead of it and figure out how we could keep from getting in the hole. But we made it. I have never seen that type of attention here. I have not seen one Presidential candidate—right now with all of them out there—talking about the finances of our country, talking about what the children of the next generation will inherit, how they are going to be able to manage, how their mothers and their fathers and all of them are going to have Social Security secured and Medicare taken care of. I haven't heard that at all. Maybe we can get the dialogue started now.



With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to support the funding bill for the defense of our Nation. This funding package provides a well-earned, well-deserved pay raise for our troops—the men and women in uniform, the men and women I had the privilege of visiting earlier this month, part of the Wyoming National Guard deployments in multiple places around the world.

Yet Democrats have blocked a key vote. They did it last month. I want to make sure they don't do it again. It seems they are doing it for purely political reasons. It is a partisan blockade of our Nation's troops' pay raise. It is hard to believe they are doing it, but they did it, and it seems they want to do it again.

Both parties agreed to support our military, and they support our military families as well. They made that promise 3 months ago. Then they went back on the promise. It was part of that bipartisan budget deal that was signed in August.

By moving this defense funding measure, Republicans are keeping our promises; the Democrats are breaking theirs. Now it is time once again to vote. It is time for Democrats to stop blocking the bill. It is time to stop playing politics, especially with our troops' paychecks.

We need to pass this bill to fully fund the Defense Department. It honors our commitment to our troops. It delivers critical resources our military needs to keep us safe, to keep us strong, to keep us prosperous. The bill protects America's standing among our allies and our adversaries.

We need to get this done. It also funds Health and Human Services. That is what we are looking at as well. It includes our Nation's medical research.

It is time for the Democrats to get to yes. It is time to keep our promises to the military; it is time to honor our commitment to our troops; and it is time to get on with the business of our Nation. It is time to pass the bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Tennessee.

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

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

BOEING 737 MAX

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. President.

We just heard Senators ROMNEY and MANCHIN talking about our Nation's economic woes and legislation they are handling on a bipartisan basis. I think

it is always a good and positive thing when we can approach our work in a bipartisan way. It is what the American people are expecting us to do.

Yesterday, in our Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, we had bipartisanship at work again. We were carrying out one of the duties we have in Congress, which is to conduct oversight and to make certain that not only the processes of government and the fiscal health of our government are on a firm footing but also to look at things like consumer protection and public safety.

Our hearing yesterday dealt with these deadly and disastrous crashes that happened with the Boeing 737 MAX. We know that those crashes occurred and remember that one occurred in Indonesia and one in Ethiopia.

I will tell you that, in my opinion, the executives from the Boeing Company tried—and they failed—to explain to members of the Senate Commerce Committee why they allowed the 737 MAX aircraft to reach the commercial market.

We discovered that the company's highest echelon neglected a responsibility to ensure that the aircraft met their highest safety standards. It was of concern to us. I don't know, and I think many of us were left trying to figure out, whether this was something that was a corporate culture problem, whether it was a communication problem, or whether it was a negligence issue.

Until a few weeks ago, executives, including president and CEO Dennis Muilenburg, had not read emails revealing how Boeing officials convinced the FAA to approve training materials and delete troublesome flight systems data and had not read text messages showing that employees lied to regulators about safety problems with the plane's MCAS system. That is the Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System. They had not read the text messages that spelled out there was a problem.

When asked at the hearing for technical details on the science and systems behind the MAX's approval, Muilenburg and his cohort were unable to even give a straight answer. We did not get the answers we needed on questions about their process, test pilots, or simulators.

Yesterday's hearing made it clear that Boeing leadership cannot provide the answers we are looking for, not for ourselves but on behalf of the victims and their families and on behalf of the flying public who, yes, safety is their priority.

The Senate really needs to look at this issue again. Our Commerce Committee should schedule another hearing on the people and the procedures and hear from the engineers and the test pilots behind Boeing's MAX program.

Perhaps these engineers and pilots will be able to do a better job than the executives did yesterday, and perhaps they can explain to the families of

these 346 crash victims how so many people ended up dead after choosing one the world's safest modes of transportation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, first of all, thank you for your flexibility at the chair today.

APPROPRIATIONS

Madam President, the purpose for rising today is to advocate on behalf of our military, the men and women who are the bravest in the world. I feel compelled to do so because I can imagine that in these days of hyperpartisan politics, some of them may feel like some of us are abandoning them, and I want them to know for sure that we are not.

We all took an oath to the Constitution, and the highest priority in the Constitution for the Federal Government is, of course, to provide for the Nation's defense against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues seem to be shirking from this responsibility lately. They are willing to settle for, seemingly, mediocrity, and right now we have excellence, the best. First of all, they are planning to come to this Chamber tomorrow to block the all-important Defense appropriations bill; that is to say, to block the funding for our military; that is to say, to block the largest pay increase for the men and women of our military in over a decade—just to name one topic that is being funded, or would be funded, by this appropriations bill that they are going to block.

Back in July, the House and Senate, on a bipartisan basis—I say to the Presiding Officer, you just gave a wonderful speech about the importance of working together. On a bipartisan basis, we passed a major budget bill. It was a win for our military and a win for our country because it was supposed to provide them with certainty and an important path forward as they chart that path—that strategic path—for America's superiority.

To echo the House Speaker and the Democratic leader at the time: "A bipartisan agreement has been reached that will enhance our national security." These aren't my words—although I agree with them—these are the words of the Democratic leadership of Congress.

After passage, the Democratic leader went on to say: This deal would "strengthen our national security and provide our troops with the resources they need." I agree with the Democratic leader. Please—please—change course while you still can and support this important funding bill tomorrow.

I agreed with my colleague from New York then, and I supported that legislation for the exact reason to "strengthen our national security and provide our troops with the resources they need."

This deal passed with strong bipartisan support. It was widely applauded.

Yet here we are today, this week, with our colleagues preparing to block the funding for our troops for which they were just a couple of months ago patting themselves on the back.

This whole process shouldn't even be this complicated. In fact, I am convinced that the American people are tired of us complicating simple things. We agreed to this 2-year budget agreement just a few months ago. I voted for it. Party leadership pushed for it. The President signed it. Then we voted for a short-term continuing resolution to get in order before getting to the final appropriations deal.

I reluctantly voted for the short-term CR, but the only thing worse than a CR, of course, is a government shutdown. So that was what we were confronted with.

If one asked the military community how they feel about continuing resolutions, they would be quick to tell you they don't work. They don't work at all. They do not provide certainty beyond certainty. They don't allow new programs to be launched. They don't allow the pay increases that our appropriations bill does. So evidently it has not been a priority for our Democratic colleagues, but they do have priorities, as we know.

This impeachment craziness, this obsession with eliminating, getting rid of our Commander in Chief a year before the election of the Commander in Chief is what their priorities are, clearly, not the priorities stated in the Constitution or that they were bragging about a couple of months ago.

Of course, in addition, they are now standing in the way of us passing the reconciled National Defense Authorization Act—the authorization that provides the guidance for these priorities that are also part of our appropriations bill.

We went through all of that, and for what? I didn't agree to the deals we made or take these tough votes just so the Democrats could block Defense appropriations and leave our military stuck with political gridlock that they have imposed on us now.

By failing to pass this appropriations bill, by standing in the way now of reconciling in the conference committee the National Defense Authorization Act, they really are standing in the way of our military. Now there is talk of a "skinny NDAA"—that is to say, a watered-down skinny version.

For 58 years in a row, we have done what you just talked about and what the previous speakers talked about. We have worked in a bipartisan way to pass an NDAA 58 years in a row.

As the first North Dakotan ever to sit on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I treated this NDAA with the utmost importance and still do. We made some significant progress, from nuclear deterrence to UAS development, establishing a Space Force, and honoring the sailors of the USS Frank E. Evans—a provision the Democratic leader and his colleague from New

York supported, I will add. Both the House and Senate versions of the NDAA advanced important policies for my State, for our country, and really for the world.

We should be working collaboratively to combine these versions and pass the best plan possible for our military. Instead, our work is being sacrificed at the altar of partisan politics, caught up in a partisan impeachment process that makes no sense.

Let's make something clear about this skinny NDAA.

Our chairman is not introducing it with haste or without great consideration. He first warned that this could happen well over a month ago. He said it would happen if our Democratic colleagues proved to be so incapable of setting aside their problems with President Trump that they could not advance the interests of our Nation's military. Ever the optimist, I thought they would. I thought they would.

Now, my Democratic colleagues are balking at any and all forward progress on the NDAA because of their opposition to President Trump and his priorities for border security. They want to limit his authority to transfer any more funds in order to build physical barriers at our southern border.

So I want to be clear. The President would not need to use that authority to use any military construction funds to build a wall if our Democratic colleagues would simply provide the necessary funding through the normal appropriations process, as they always have and as we always have. I, for one, will not be so unreasonable in negotiating with them. For example, if—and I mean only if—my Democratic colleagues would fund the administration's border security request through the appropriations process, then count me in for limiting the President's transfer authority. I am willing to compromise, but you can't have it both ways. You can't say we are going to take away the President's constitutional authority on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, make sure you don't fund the priorities that he needs to fund, which is, again, the highest priority of our government.

To reiterate my earlier point, I applaud the chairman for his handling of this process. He has been vigilant and focused on completing the NDAA, and I don't blame him for where we are today. No, House Democrats have not been willing partners and have forced the chairman to devise a backup plan for their intransigence.

That is what I find so disappointing. Surely, our Democratic colleagues know the threat that our foreign adversaries pose. For crying out loud, we just came from a classified briefing. If it is not clear enough, I don't know when it will be.

Whether it is the crisis at the southern border or the critical missions that bring terrorists like al-Baghdadi to justice, I am sure my colleagues want to do whatever it takes to keep our coun-

try safe. Surely, they are capable of putting partisan politics aside in order to pass the 59th straight National Defense Authority Act. Anything to the contrary would be unprecedented.

Yet here we are. I find it astonishing that with all the wannabe Commanders in Chief right here in the Senate, they are playing politics with the funding and authorities of the troops they hope to lead.

Can you imagine one of these Presidential candidates becoming the Commander in Chief and the first talk they have with the troops is, "Yeah, I held up your funding and your pay raises." It is not a great way to start.

If it were up to our committee, this bill would have already passed. If it were up to our conference, this NDAA would be on its way to the President's desk. But unfortunately, it is not. That is the unfortunate reality we face today.

The Democratic Party is continuing to put their hatred of President Trump and his agenda above the needs of our Nation's military, and, thus, our Nation's defense. It is a dereliction of duty. I find it sickening, and I find it embarrassing. We are better than this. This institution deserves better than this. The American people expect and deserve better than this.

I want to make one last plea before they block tomorrow's vote. Please put our military men and women, our highest priority, ahead of partisan politics.

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

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

SOUTH SUDAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will talk just for a very few minutes today about something that has been on my mind and on my heart. We so easily forget how fortunate we are to live in a country like America. I wish all of our world's neighbors were as fortunate as we are, but they are not. We can't lose sight of that fact. I don't know why bad things happen to good people, and I am not suggesting that I have a complete solution to it, but trying to understand it is at least a good first step.

I am talking about the ongoing crisis in South Sudan. As you know, South Sudan is a landlocked country in East-Central Africa, and it is a fairly new country. In the 7 years since South Sudan was plunged into a very bloody civil war, not only have millions of people been displaced from their homes, but over 400,000—think about that—men, women, and children have been killed in the crossfire—400,000.

I would like nothing more than for the recent negotiated ceasefire between the government and the rebels

to hold. We all would. But if we are being honest, we have to express our sincere doubts. I don't have any doubt that the people of South Sudan yearn for peace.

Unfortunately, there are some who are taking advantage of the sad situation in South Sudan. They are taking advantage of South Sudan's conflicts and widespread corruption within its government in order to steal the nation's and the people's natural resources. I am talking about kleptocrats. I am talking about war criminals. I am talking about corrupt multinational corporations that are pilfering South Sudan's natural resources, regardless of the chaos that they are causing and the extraordinary human cost.

Until good people in this world take a stand and say enough is enough, the people in South Sudan will continue to be at the mercy of the corrupt. The predatory extraction of South Sudan's resources not only directs vital capital outside of the war-torn nation, where it is desperately needed inside, but it makes meaningful investment in sustained peace simply impossible.

That is why I am respectfully calling on the U.S. Senate to stand with peace, to stand with right—not with might, with right—and to stand with the people of South Sudan. The people of South Sudan are a proud people. They are a resilient people. They are tired of being ruled by a government that is ripe with corruption. They are tired of seeing their nation torn apart by war. The U.S. Senate ought to condemn the marauding, the stealing of resources, and the widespread corruption within the South Sudanese Government. Furthermore, I also call on the United States to support sanctions against those companies and those individuals outside of South Sudan that continue to profit off of the ongoing conflicts and instability in the region.

Now, we are a powerful nation. I just listened to your very eloquent talk about the men and women in our military who protect our country. Not only do we have the world's most powerful military, but let me put it another way. We have the most powerful military in all of human history. We also have the strongest economy the world has ever seen, and for that, we were blessed.

It is the latter that we have to wield against the internal and the external bad actors taking advantage of the people of South Sudan. Much like our sanctions against the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world—I am, of course, talking about Iran—and much like those sanctions have resulted in a successful economic pressure campaign, I hope the same can be done, targeting crooked government officials and the unethical multinational corporations that target vulnerable nations like South Sudan.

It has been well documented that there are a number of multinational corporations with ties to nations like

China and nations like Malaysia that have taken advantage of widespread corruption in the region, in South Sudan and the surrounding region, to spur their own economic and political gain. It has been reported and it has been independently verified that one of South Sudan's largest multinational petroleum consortiums from outside the country operating in the country, a company called Dar Petroleum Operating Company, has actively funded militia and paramilitary groups within the region.

In fact, when Dar Petroleum isn't funding militia or brokering weapons deals, it keeps busy polluting local communities in South Sudan and water supplies with its industrial waste. The petroleum company has dumped "high levels of heavy metals and dangerous chemical compounds" into the surrounding countryside with no regard—none, zero, no regard—for local populations.

In fact, the contamination from the joint Chinese-Malaysian-owned corporation has extended well beyond merely the soil surrounding Dar Petroleum's production and processing plants. The soil contamination is found to be so widespread and so extensive that over 600,000 of the good people in South Sudan are expected to be affected by it.

From bribery to pollution and even murder, these unsavory actors have found a home in South Sudan, ruining the environment and raping the natural resources of the country, and they are going to continue to find a safe haven and continue business unless we act.

Unless sanctions against countries and individuals that are known to have long taken advantage of South Sudan's weak or almost nonexistent rule of law are implemented, stability in the region is going to be nothing but a dream and nothing but happy talk.

The United States should not remain silent as untold billions are stolen. The monies are being stolen, and the natural resources are being stolen from the people in South Sudan. The people of South Sudan are also being murdered in the process.

We should not stand by. By empowering the U.S. Government to target the illicit financial activity that serves as the root cause for many of the atrocities that I have talked about, the South Sudanese can begin rebuilding their nation without fear of violence and without fear of corruption. The United States is far from the only government on the world stage that has the ability to do this. Now, we both know that, but as is so often the case, we might be the only government with the will and the moral conviction to do what is right.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the importance of the Senate providing the resources needed by our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

We are seeing increasing threats to the homeland from around the world. We need look no further than the recent elimination of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi by U.S. Special Operations forces to show us that there are evil people out there who continue to devote their lives to killing American citizens and glorifying the fall of our Nation. The rise of ISIS proved that radical terrorist ideologies remain dangerous. Despite the elimination of its leader, groups like ISIS will continue to remain a serious challenge across the globe.

We have also seen the emergence of a great power competition with China and Russia. They are investing massive amounts of resources to erode the international order that the United States and our allies have worked so hard to create and protect. Leaders of these nations don't want societies based on liberty and free enterprise; instead, they are focused on promoting the iron precepts of authoritarianism and autocracy. Without American engagement and a strong investment in the Nation's military, our children could live in a world transformed by these malign forces. We cannot allow that to happen.

Clearly, the threats we face abroad are increasing. On that fact, we have bipartisan support. These past few weeks, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spoken about the situation in Syria and the danger that an expansionist Russia poses to nations like Ukraine. We agree about the need for the United States to address these challenges, but I am not convinced that my Democratic colleagues are truly serious about sustaining American leadership and retaining our position in the world. If they are, it is time to show it by advancing the defense funding legislation.

Funding the military in a timely, predictable fashion is one of the most important things we can do in Congress. A failure to do so awards China and Russia with an advantage at a time when we can least afford it. We need to work together to pass our Defense appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year and to focus on implementing the National Defense Strategy to effectively confront these threats.

It is also worth highlighting how many provisions contained in this bill are absolutely critical to our military. This legislation provides significant investments in both basic research and future technologies to allow for continued innovation within DOD. It includes

areas pivotal to implementing the goals of the NDS, including hypersonics, 5G, artificial intelligence, missile defense, and cyber security.

Importantly, it provides robust funding for all three legs of the triad and appropriates funding to enable the modernization of our Nation's nuclear deterrent. There is no question that this is a top priority of mine as chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In addition, we cannot forget that the Department of Defense still has not recovered from the impacts of several natural disasters that affected multiple installations across the country. This includes Offutt Air Force Base and Camp Ashland in my own State of Nebraska, as well as several others. Without the relief funding in the Defense appropriations bill, these bases and their tenant units will not be able to fully recover from these disasters. That poses a major threat not just to the bases themselves but to all of the missions we rely upon them to support. For that reason, it is critical that we move forward with the defense funding process to allow full recovery to take place at these bases.

All of us here also recognize that our military is about more than hardware; it is our men and women in uniform and their families who make our Armed Forces strong. That is why it is so essential that we provide the pay and benefits that are critical for our servicemembers and their families. The Defense appropriations bill delivers a military pay increase of 3.1 percent. That is the largest in a decade.

If we are truly serious about supporting our warfighters, if we mean what we say when we talk about supporting the troops, then step up. We must move forward with the Defense appropriations bill. Now is the not the time to put political grandstanding ahead of serious legislating.

I hope we can look back at the Senate's bipartisan tradition of uniting behind the common defense as inspiration. Let's take up and pass the Defense appropriations bill. In doing so, we honor our commitment to America's warfighters.

We have seen over the past week how the bravery and commitment of our servicemembers can deliver the world's most-wanted terrorist to justice. We must honor their service and the service of all our men and women in uniform by moving this process forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to sound the alarm on the Trump administration's expected announcement of its withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions in an effort to limit global temperature increase in

this century to 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels, while pursuing means to limit it even further to 1.5 degrees.

Article 28 of the Paris Agreement that was entered into in COP 21 2015 specifies that after joining, no country can withdraw for 3 years, after which a 1-year waiting period must occur before the withdrawal takes effect. The United States entered into this historic agreement on November 4, 2016; thus, the earliest date the United States can initiate withdrawal is November 4, 2019. After the U.S. files withdrawal documents, the 1-year waiting period begins, making November 4, 2020, the earliest possible date the United States can fully—and I might add, recklessly—get out of this agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support a Senate resolution that I certainly will be filing expressing our need for U.S. climate diplomacy. Withdrawal is terrible. The cost of inaction is high.

For example, in my State of Maryland, by the year 2100, climate change could force the Navy to relocate the U.S. Naval Academy from where it has made its home in Annapolis, MD, since 1845.

Surrounded by water on three sides, the Naval Academy is especially vulnerable to sea rise. The Severn River runs along the east, Spa Creek extends to the south, and College Creek runs along the north. Parts of the academy adjacent to the water stand 3 feet above the waterline. Sea levels around Annapolis have risen about 1 foot over the past 100 years. The Naval Academy is only one of scores of U.S. military bases that may be inundated by rising seas.

Unlike this administration, the academy is taking action. In 2015, the Sea Level Rise Advisory Council formed to create an adaptation plan and make decisions about flood-related matters. Staff are installing door dams and flood barriers on doorways, repairing seawalls, and installing backflow preventers in storm drain systems to reduce funding. Newly constructed buildings will have elevated entrances and limited first-floor openings to keep rising water out. But these actions have high costs that are compounded by inaction.

On October 12 of this year, a combination of seasonal high tides, a full Moon, and a tropical storm stalled off the eastern seaboard caused a "nuisance flood" in downtown Annapolis, disrupting the festivities at the annual Annapolis Boat Show, flooding booths at the city dock and closing streets.

One week later, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation—the key nonprofit partner in the restoration effort—announced that it will close the Fox Island Education Center due to subsidence and rising sea levels—a casualty of our failure to address climate change. For the past 40 years, the Fox Center has helped educate students on the importance of a healthy Chesapeake Bay watershed. Environmental literacy is an

essential goal of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, and institutions like the Fox Island Center serve a key role.

The marshes and wetlands the foundation is dedicated to protecting are among Maryland's best natural defenses in mitigating the effects of climate-related impacts like more frequent storms and rising sea levels. The untimely closure is a reminder of the very real presence of changes to the bay in our communities and the urgent need to prepare.

On October 17, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco released a report. The collection of 18 papers by outside experts amounts to one of the most specific and dire accountings of the dangers posed to businesses and communities in the United States—a threat so significant that the Nation's central banks are increasingly compelled to act.

Climate change has begun to affect the real estate market, according to a paper by Asaf Bernstein, an economist at the University of Colorado in Boulder. His research shows that properties likely to be underwater if the seas rise 1 foot now sell for 15 percent less than comparable properties with no flood threat.

Our failure to act on climate change has a real economic impact on American families. Coastal cities are already unable to pay for the types of projects that could prevent them from the growing effects of climate change.

On October 23, in a briefing for the Maryland Senate Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee, NOAA oceanographer Will Sweet said that Annapolis is on pace for another record-breaking year in 2019, with 10 high-tide flood days so far.

By 2030, there could be between 15 and 25 high-tide flood days a year. By 2050, that number could rise to between 50 and 170. That compares to how it was at the turn of the century when we only had two such events in a year.

This is not only a coastal issue. In addition to an update from NOAA, the committee heard from officials in Howard County—Howard County, I would state, is a landlocked county in Maryland—about their plan to mitigate flooding in Ellicott City, 35 miles inland from Annapolis, where flash-flooding has claimed the lives of three people since 2016. Officials discussed their \$140 million plan, which includes demolishing some buildings and constructing a tunnel 15 feet in diameter, 80 to 100 feet deep, and 1,600 feet long on the north side of the city's Main Street. The tunnel would divert about two-thirds of the floodwaters.

It is an expensive project. Will it keep Ellicott City safe? It will keep it safer, but the threat will still be there because of our inaction as far as dealing with climate change. That is \$140 million we would not need to find as fast if we were slowing the rate of sea level rise; that is, if we were reducing the use of carbon emissions in accordance with the Paris Agreement.

Many small business owners took out loans in 2016 and 2018 from the Department of Housing and Community Development and are struggling to repay them. These are not international competitors with an agenda being hurt by inaction on climate change; these are local residents, constituents, Americans.

We need to act.

I am proud to lead bipartisan legislation to help critical water infrastructure adapt to natural hazards. We need to do adaptation. I am for that, and it is bipartisan in this Chamber, but adaptation mitigation must go hand in hand, from the local to the international level.

I led the congressional delegation to COP 21 with nine of our colleagues in the U.S. Senate. We had a delegation 10-strong in Paris at COP 21 in 2015 when the United States agreed to lower its gas emissions 26 to 28 percent below the 2005 levels by 2025. Entering the 25th conference of the parties, U.S. carbon dioxide emissions rose an estimated 3.4 percent in 2018—a spike that comes as reports like the Fourth National Climate Assessment and the IPCC special report tell us the world needs to be aggressively cutting its emissions to avoid the most devastating effects of climate change. The findings, published by the independent economic research firm Rhodium Group, mean that our Nation now has a diminishing chance of meeting the pledge it made in Paris. This is a horrible embarrassment for our country, which was once a global leader on climate change. When the United States doesn't lead, other countries are going to step in and take over that leadership, as we have seen with regard to China stepping forward in regard to climate issues. China should be the United States.

I urge this administration to reassert strong leadership in implementing the Paris Agreement. I urge the Senate to act to return America's leadership to this critical global challenge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am thrilled and delighted to follow my outstanding colleague from Maryland coming here to talk about climate change. That is the topic that brings me to the floor today as well. Those of us who are from coastal States not only have the experience of worse flooding in our coastal communities and those coastal communities getting new conversations with their municipal bond folks about what the flooding risk means for their bond ratings, but we are also looking at projections like Maryland is of what happens if we don't act, and the very maps of our State will change.

When historians look back at why the United States failed so badly to take on climate change, they will, of course, focus on the political efforts of the world's largest oil companies: Exxon, Chevron, BP, and Shell. They will note the obstructive role of leading trade associations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Petroleum Institute. They will chronicle the network of phony front groups set up by Big Oil, Big Coal, and the Koch brothers to sow doubt of the science and fear of climate action. Big Oil, the Kochs, the trade associations, the front groups all will deserve plenty of blame. Their climate denial apparatus and their capture of the modern Republican Party is a direct and deliberate cause of America's failure.

There are other less heralded but equally bad actors. I come to the floor today to discuss one of them. Future historians of "anii Trumpi," take note of Marathon Petroleum. Marathon Petroleum is the largest oil refiner in the United States. It refines oil into gasoline, other fuels, and lubricants. It owns pipelines and gas stations. Its 4,000 Speedway locations and almost 8,000 independent gas stations selling Marathon-branded fuels reach across the country. It is No. 31 on the Fortune 500 list of U.S. companies, and it has almost \$100 billion in annual revenue. This is a big company with a big stake in blocking climate action.

What does Marathon want? Well, its annual report filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission makes one thing very clear: Marathon sees laws and regulations that reduce carbon pollution as a threat. One threat Marathon specifically cites in its annual report is fuel economy or CAFE standards. Why? Marathon's 2018 annual report reads: "Higher CAFE standards for cars and light trucks have the potential to reduce demand for our transportation fuels." It is as simple as that. Fuel-efficient cars burn less gas, and that is bad for a big refiner.

Well, in 2012, automakers and the State of California and the previous administration got together, and they agreed to significantly better fuel economy standards. That was a good deal for almost everyone. Consumers were estimated to save more than \$1.7 trillion in reduced fuel costs—up to \$8,000 per vehicle for vehicles purchased in 2025. The air would be cleaner. Carbon emissions from cars and light trucks would be cut in half by 2025, and automakers would have a competitive spur to keep pace with new vehicle technologies being developed in Europe and China—win, win, win.

Well, in 2017, these automakers came back into the Trump administration and asked the Trump administration to revisit the fuel economy standards. It looks, from everything I have seen, like the auto industry primarily wanted technical changes to make the standards easier to meet. I have found

no evidence that the auto industry asked the administration to totally freeze the standards or that they asked the administration then to revoke California's authority to set its own standards under the Clean Air Act.

When automakers asked the administration for these changes, someone else was watching. The oil industry sensed opportunity. The standards may have been good for consumers, the auto industry, States, our global climate, but that \$1.7 trillion in reduced fuel costs that consumers would save would come directly out of oil industry revenues. So the oil industry sprang into action to hijack the rulemaking process.

The oil industry demanded weakening of the standards to the max; i.e., a freeze, and it even demanded revocation of California's longstanding authority to set its own standards, leading more than a dozen other States, including my home State of Rhode Island. We follow the California standard. An administration marbled through with fossil fuel lobbyists and attorneys heard the oil industry call. It must have been a strange experience for the automakers. One minute they are asking for technical changes to a regulation they had agreed to; the next minute the whole process has been run off with by a completely other industry.

Marathon was the ring leader. I obtained an electronic draft of a letter to the Deputy Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration urging her to weaken the fuel economy standards. The metadata of the letter was still in the letter because I got it electronically. According to the metadata in this document, it was written by a Marathon Petroleum inhouse lobbyist. Marathon then shopped this letter around to Members of the House of Representatives to convince them to send letters backing the weakened standards that they wanted.

We got those House letters, and we ran them through plagiarism software against the Marathon lobbyists' draft. Here is what we got. When we compared the Marathon letter with the letter sent by Members of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation, it was an 80-percent match. The red here is all the language that is identical. Members from Indiana and West Virginia sent similar letters also with text lifted directly from the Marathon lobbyists' draft. If you want to give this political stunt a name, you could call it a Pruitt, after Scott Pruitt, who distinguished himself for the Trump EPA Administrator's position by copying a Devon Energy text onto his own official letterhead as attorney general of his State and sending it on as if it were his letter.

Back to Marathon. Pulling a Pruitt with these Congressmen was not enough. We know from Marathon's own reports that it directly lobbied on the standards, and we know that its trade association, the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, AFPM,

also lobbied on the standards. We know AFPM also launched a campaign on social media urging people to support a freeze.

Marathon is a member of a front group that is called the American Legislative Exchange Council, also known as ALEC. This front group pushes the agenda of the Koch brothers' apparatus in State legislatures. It is the tool for the Koch brothers to try to work their will in State legislatures. ALEC passed a resolution in favor of weakening the standards and revoking California's State authority. We know that senior executives from Marathon met personally with EPA leadership and with senior officials in the White House to push for weakening the standards and revoking California's authority.

There is a lot we don't know. We don't know which front groups Marathon and other oil companies fund because neither of them disclose their donations or their donors. We don't know how many other groups were deployed in this effort. We don't know the extent to which Marathon coordinated its campaign with the trade association and the front groups, so we can't assess whether this lobbying effort violated the front groups' 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status. We don't know what role Marathon or its front groups had in the mysterious antitrust letter that came popping out of DOJ shortly after the automakers negotiated separately with California.

When the automakers realized that their negotiations—the process they were involved with—had been hijacked by Marathon and that they were just passengers on the Marathon train at this point, they bailed. When they knew the conversation was bogus, they bailed. They negotiated directly with California, and they came up with their own deal with California. That, obviously, really ticked off the oil guys who thought they had this thing all scoped. Apparently, it even ticked off the President—all the way up to President Trump.

The next thing you know comes this truly bizarre letter out of DOJ that appears to ignore basic tenets of antitrust law, like when you are negotiating with a State government, it is not an antitrust violation. It appears also to violate DOJ's own very elaborate antitrust investigation procedures.

So who pulled those strings? We don't know. More broadly, if Marathon and other fossil fuel companies are purposefully paying a web of phony front groups and trade associations to spread deliberate, known disinformation about climate change in order to obstruct climate action in Congress, does that not warrant congressional investigation? Might it not, in fact, be fraud? It was fraud when the tobacco industry did it.

Over the past 2 weeks, two different subcommittees of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform held hearings that examined how the fossil

fuel industry deploys front groups and trade associations to spread disinformation about climate change and block legislative action.

Yesterday the Senate Democrats' Special Committee on the Climate Crisis held our hearing on how dark money front groups hide the industry's role in climate denial and legislative obstruction. Fat chance we will have Senate committees investigate this masquerade in a Chamber under Republican control, but for our friends in the House, the time is ripe for congressional oversight. Follow the money and the facts wherever they lead. Let the subpoenas fly.

Congressmen Henry Waxman led a successful investigation of lies and deceit from a corrupting industry, Big Tobacco, and that precedent served our country well. It served the American public well. It ended up likely saving lives.

So we go back to Marathon again. Marathon's shareholders are interesting, too, in all of this.

Last month, 200 major investors who had \$6.5 trillion in assets under management, sent a letter to 47 U.S. companies, including Marathon, urging that the companies' lobbying align with the Paris Agreement's goal of global average temperature increase below 2 degrees Celsius and warning the companies that lobbying against that goal is an investment risk.

The letter went to Marathon, but, interestingly, none of Marathon's biggest investors—BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street, and J.P. Morgan Asset Management—signed the letter. Collectively, these four investors own, roughly, 25 percent of Marathon. BlackRock lists climate risk as one of its engagement priorities in 2019, so it says. BlackRock published a report this year that by 2060, 58 percent of U.S. metro areas will see annual average climate-related losses of at least 1 percent of GDP, with some projected to lose a staggering 15 percent of GDP.

JPMorgan's CEO, Jamie Dimon, has said: "Business must play a leadership role in creating solutions that protect the environment and grow the economy."

So it was interesting yesterday, in our Senate select committee hearing, to have a witness put up this slide. This slide shows the positions on climate change, regulation, and the legislation of a number of companies. It is a spectrum. Green is supporting climate regulation and legislation. Opposition is red.

We were talking about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which has been identified as one of the two worst climate obstructors in America as a trade association. The U.S. Chamber and the National Association of Manufacturers take the prize. We were looking at how strange that is because their memberships don't have the positions they take. So we are going to continue to explore why it is that the board members of the National Association of

Manufacturers and the board members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce appear to have let their organizations be run away with by the fossil fuel industry as well.

Here is what was notable. On this graph, this is where the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is—one of the worst climate obstructors. Yet look who is worse. In fact, look at who is the worst of all of them—Marathon. What do you know? You have these four investors who own 25 percent of this company that is on the worst side of this spectrum. They claim to care about solving the climate problem. Yet they are 25-percent owners in the most opposed of all of these entities to the solution to the climate crisis they claim to seek.

They have to get their act together. It is not fair to be JPMorgan CEO Jamie Dimon and say that business must play a leadership role in creating solutions that protect the environment and grow the economy and then to be part of the 25-percent largest shareholders of the company that is the worst of this.

You have to line this up, guys. You can't say one thing to the public and then do the opposite through the companies you own.

The stakes here are high. There are credible warnings of a carbon asset bubble and of crashes in coastal property values, but BlackRock hasn't introduced a single climate-related shareholder resolution since 2001. In 2018, BlackRock and Vanguard—two of these big Marathon owners—voted in favor of only 10 and 12 percent of climate-related shareholder resolutions. They say they are good at this—BlackRock 10 percent, Vanguard 12 percent. The other ones, they didn't support. In 2017, at Marathon—the worst—BlackRock voted against a shareholder proposal for Marathon to test its business operations against the 2-degree Celsius threshold that BlackRock claimed to target and support. By the way, if BlackRock had voted its shares for this proposal, it would have passed.

Just this month, Marathon finally published a report that examines its own prospects in a carbon-contained world. In one scenario, demand for petroleum-based liquids plummets 26 percent by 2040. With the demand for vehicle fuels—Marathon's primary market—it falls even more steeply. If Marathon estimates the market for its main product could shrink by one-third or more, first, you can understand why it got in there to manipulate the auto fuel efficiency standard process. You can also understand why it is that economists and sovereign banks are issuing these warnings about a carbon bubble.

We will get serious about climate change. We must. We have no choice. The costs of inaction are, as Donald Trump once said, catastrophic.

Eventually, all of the fossil fuel money and bullying in the world will not stave off action in the face of mounting climate calamities. This



should be obvious to everyone and certainly to sophisticated investors with supposedly good climate policies like BlackRock and JPMorgan. So why aren't they pushing Marathon to adapt to a low-carbon economy? Why are they happy to own 25 percent of that—of the worst? That is what they want to own?

It doesn't have to be this way. Look at DSM, a Dutch multinational, with roughly \$10 billion in revenues and over 23,000 employees around the world, including many here in the United States. DSM began as a coal mining company over a century ago. Its leaders realized coal mining in the Netherlands would someday end, so they reinvented the company. When the last mine closed in the 1970s, DSM had diversified. It is, today, a vibrant producer of nutritional additives for food, of pharmaceuticals, and of high-tech materials for electronics, automobiles, and construction. By contrast, Murray Coal, which is an American coal mining company that did not diversify, filed for bankruptcy this week.

To the fossil fuel industry, I say that you ought to begin adapting now. You can't ignore what is coming at you. You owe it to your shareholders, and you owe it to your employees. By God, you owe it to your children.

To BlackRock and the other big investors, this means you have to pay attention too. You say you are for climate action. Show that you mean it. Demand change at Marathon and at other fossil fuel companies that you own. Start with mandating that these companies disclose their climate obstruction funding. There is no excuse for that to be secret.

If they will not do it, Congress, let's investigate. We have slept through this mess long enough—in a state of induced narcolepsy. We have sleepwalked for far too long. It is time we woke up. 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.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and I be permitted to speak as in morning business.

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

#### REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the passing of former Senator Kay Hagan was sad news to all of us who were privileged to serve with her and counted her as a friend.

In her final address to the Senate 5 years ago, Senator Kay Hagan reminded us of our obligation to work together on behalf of the American people with these words: "To whom much is given, much is expected."

Kay Hagan was given much. She had the energy, intelligence, dedication, and compassion, and she gave back to her home State over many years of

public service. As a person of deep faith, she fully understood the New Testament "Parable of the Talents." Its message that gifts must be put to use in service of others guided her life.

In this time of sorrow, I offer my deep condolences to Kay's family. I hope that they will find comfort in knowing that Kay left an inspiring legacy. She left the world a better place for her service. The loss felt by the people of North Carolina and by her family, in particular, is felt by people throughout America.

I was privileged to serve with Kay for 6 years. We served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I always appreciated her focus on solutions rather than partisan advantage. She was passionate about many issues, particularly those affecting children.

In 2011, Kay and I introduced legislation to commemorate the work at the March of Dimes by minting a coin to celebrate the 75th anniversary of this organization and directing the proceeds to the March of Dimes Prematurity Campaign. As the author of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, Kay reaffirmed her belief that we in Congress must always remember whom we are advocating for.

When Kay took office in 2009, she was very proud to be one of 17 Senators who were female. It is significant that her very first speech on the Senate floor that January was in support of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to strengthen protections for women against wage discrimination.

It was so refreshing to hear her assert that neither party had a monopoly on good ideas. Throughout her time in this Chamber, she proved the truth of that maxim.

In the "Parable of the Talents," the master leaves on a journey and entrusts a servant with a portion of his treasure. Upon his return, the master is delighted to find that his wealth has been wisely invested and multiplied.

Kay Hagan was entrusted with the great treasure of principles, determination, and spirit. She invested that treasure wisely and multiplied its benefits for all. Like the master in the Parable, to Kay Hagan we say: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

May God bless her and her family and may we all keep her memory in our hearts.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. 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 AGREEMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am about to offer the managers' package for the four appropriations bills currently before us: Commerce, Justice, Science, Agriculture, Interior and the Transportation, Housing, and Urban

Development bill. This managers' package includes 45 amendments, many of which—indeed, most of which—have been offered on a bipartisan basis. They have been cleared by both sides.

The Appropriations Committee has worked very hard with Members to accommodate as many amendments as possible. For the T-HUD appropriations bill, for example, both Senator JACK REED and I worked to review, approve, and clear managers' amendments in our part of the bill.

This package reflects a positive step forward as we move toward final passage of this appropriations bill. It is imperative that we move these bills and go to conference with the House. Therefore, I urge all Members to support this managers' package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to offer the following amendments: Lee amendment No. 1209 and Jones amendment No. 1141, as modified. I further ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments prior to the votes, and that at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 31, the Senate vote in relation to these amendments in the order listed.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that upon resumption of the bill on Thursday, October 31, the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table: Tester amendment No. 953; Smith amendment No. 1023; Hirono amendment No. 1037; Brown amendment No. 1088, as modified; Baldwin amendment No. 1099; Whitehouse amendment No. 1121; Thune amendment No. 1133; Jones amendment No. 1143; Smith amendment No. 1149; Rosen amendment No. 1161; McSally amendment No. 1163; Reed amendment No. 1217; Stabenow amendment No. 1223; Cornyn amendment No. 1224; Warner amendment No. 951; Capito amendment No. 1077; Cantwell amendment No. 1094; Toomey amendment No. 1129; Durbin amendment No. 1146; Gardner amendment No. 1150; McSally amendment No. 1234; Sinema amendment No. 1025; Ernst amendment No. 1079; Ernst amendment No. 1081; Cornyn amendment No. 1151; Cardin amendment No. 1159; Rosen amendment No. 1160; Thune amendment No. 1162; Peters amendment No. 1182; Cornyn amendment No. 1193; Menendez amendment No. 1199; Blunt amendment No. 1211; McSally amendment No. 1215; Collins amendment No. 1220; Schumer amendment No. 1227; Hassan amendment No. 956; Collins amendment No. 1002; Shaheen amendment No. 1005; Kaine amendment No. 1010; Cortez Masto amendment No. 1061; Cortez Masto amendment No. 1062; Heinrich amendment No. 1114; Shaheen amendment No. 1130; Hoeven amendment No. 1214; and Portman amendment No. 1235.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the disposition of the Jones amendment, the postcloture time on amendment No. 948 expire, the pending McConnell amendment be withdrawn, and amendment No. 948, as amended, be agreed to; further, that the cloture motion on H.R. 3055 be withdrawn, the bill be read a third time, and there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with a 60-affirmative-vote threshold required for passage. Finally, I ask that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2740 occur at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Mount Sinai Hospital opened its doors in 1919 as a place where Jewish physicians could train and treat the immigrant community of Chicago's West Side. Founded by Lithuanian Jewish immigrant Morris Kurtzon, Mount Sinai kept its mission as a community hospital even as it evolved into a regional medical trauma center. This month, Sinai celebrates a century of helping everyone who come through its doors.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, German and Eastern European Jews immigrated to Chicago by the thousands, fleeing religious persecution. Chicago lacked quality healthcare for these immigrants, especially in Chicago's South and West Sides.

Maimonides Kosher Hospital of Chicago opened in 1912 to fill the healthcare gap, particularly the lack of kosher hospitals, and to serve this immigrant community. However, Maimonides struggled financially and closed after only four years.

Morris Kurtzon, a board member of Maimonides, was determined to keep the dream alive. Kurtzon was born in Lithuania in the 1870s and came to Chicago as a child. Before the end of the century, he established the Garden City Plating and Manufacturing Company. He was a pillar of the community, and with his \$50,000 contribution, Maimonides Kosher Hospital reopened as Mount Sinai in 1919.

Within 5 years under Kurtzon's leadership, Mount Sinai had five floors, a nursing school, and had grown from 60 to 220 beds.

Kurtzon retired in 1950, but the hospital continued its growth. Mount

Sinai established what is now the oldest home healthcare program in the State of Illinois in 1953. It became a major community anchor as the largest employer in Lawndale.

Mount Sinai established the Midwest's first in-vitro fertilization clinic in 1983. The following year, the Midwest's first rehabilitation hospital, Schwab Rehabilitation Hospital, became part of Mount Sinai. Today, it is among the Nation's top programs for physical medicine and rehabilitation.

In 2012, Mount Sinai found an unlikely partner in Holy Cross Hospital. When Mount Sinai merged with Holy Cross, they found a way to preserve their different faith traditions while committing to the same goal of serving the community.

In 1990, Mount Sinai was designated as a Level 1 Trauma Center, the highest level of surgical care for trauma patients. Today, Sinai is one of the unsung heroes in treating and working to prevent the gun violence epidemic plaguing Chicago. From supporting the Gun Violence Research Collaborative and community engagement programs to providing world-class emergency treatment and trauma care, Sinai is working tirelessly to treat both the physical and emotional wounds that violence causes, and survivors are putting their lives back together at the Schwab Rehabilitation Hospital.

I am proud to work with Mount Sinai on the Chicago HEAL Initiative, which is another example of Sinai's continued commitment to serving the community. Under the HEAL Initiative, 10 major hospitals that are normally competitors are collaborating to use their economic footprint and community engagement to reduce violence and improve health in their neighborhoods.

Mount Sinai has embodied the Jewish values of "tikkun olam," meaning repairing the world, and "hachnasat orchim," meaning the welcoming and caring for a stranger, for a century now. The names and the community have changed, but the values have never changed. Mount Sinai is still repairing the world and caring for strangers every day.

Congratulations on a century of helping people, and here is to another century.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. I was absent from the United States Senate vote on May 9, 2019, for vote No. 106, the confirmation of Michael Park to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on May 16, 2019, for vote No. 114, the confirmation of Wendy Vitter to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on May 16, 2019, for vote

No. 205, the confirmation of Peter Phipps to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 24, 2019, for vote No. 228, the confirmation of Wendy Williams Berger to the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 24, 2019, for vote No. 229, the confirmation of Brian Buescher to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 30, 2019, for vote No. 236, confirmation of Michael Liburdi to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 30, 2019, for vote No. 241, the confirmation of Sean Jordan to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 31, 2019, for vote No. 254, the confirmation of Jeffrey Vincent Brown to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 31, 2019, for vote No. 255, the confirmation of Brantley Starr to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on July 31, 2019, for vote No. 258, the confirmation of William Shaw Stickman IV to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Had I been present I would have voted no.

I was absent from the United States Senate vote on September 25, 2019, for vote No. 305, the Schatz motion to instruct to include the Federal Employees Paid Leave Act in the National Defense Authorization Act. Had I been present I would have voted yes.●

#### 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. 19-65 concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$4.5 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,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,

Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-65

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 Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment \* \$2.4 billion.

Other \$2.1 billion.

Total \$4.5 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Japan is requesting the upgrade of up to ninety-eight (98) F-15J aircraft to a Japanese Super Interceptor (JSI) configuration. The proposed sale will be a hybrid Foreign Military Sale (FMS) and Direct Commercial Sale (DCS). The first phase of this program will consist of upgrade design, development, modification, training, support, and testing of the first two (2) F-15J test aircraft resulting in an upgraded JSI configuration. The follow-on production phase will incorporate JSI upgrade kits to modernize up to ninety-six (96) additional F-15J aircraft.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred three (103) APG-82(v1) Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radar (includes 5 spares).

One hundred sixteen (116) Advanced Display Core Processor II (ADCP II) Mission System Computer (includes 18 spares).

One hundred one (101) ALQ-239 Digital Electronic Warfare System (DEWS) (includes 3 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) with software, training and support; Selective Availability Anti-spoofing Module (SAASM); ARC-210 Radio, aircraft and munition integration and test support; support and test equipment; software delivery and support; spare and repair parts; communications equipment; facilities and construction support; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; studies and surveys; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (JA-D-QES).

(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: October 29, 2019.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—F-15J Modernization

The Government of Japan has requested the upgrade of up to ninety-eight (98) F-15J aircraft to a Japanese Super Interceptor (JSI) configuration consisting of up to one hundred three (103) APG-82(v1) Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radar (includes 5 spares); one hundred sixteen (116) Advanced Display Core Processor II (ADCP II) Mission System Computer (includes 18 spares); and one hundred one (101) ALQ-239 Digital Electronic Warfare System (DEWS) (includes 3 spares). Also included are Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) with software, training and support; Selective Availability Anti-spoofing Module (SAASM); ARC-210 radio, aircraft and munition integration and test support; ground training devices (including flight and maintenance simulators); support and test equipment; software delivery and support; spare and repair parts; communications equipment; facilities and construction support; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; studies and surveys; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total program cost is \$4.5 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a major ally that is a force for political stability, and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region. It is vital to U.S. national interest to assist Japan in developing and maintaining a strong and effective self-defense capability.

This proposed sale will provide Japan a critical air defense capability to assist in defending the Japanese homeland and U.S. personnel stationed there. Modernized F-15J assets will better enable Japan to respond to airborne threats and defend its airspace. Japan will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment and support into its armed forces.

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

The prime contractor for the FMS portion will be Boeing Aircraft Company, Everett, WA. The prime contractor for the DCS portion will be Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (MHI) with Boeing being a sub-contractor in supporting integration of the FMS and DCS elements. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of one U.S. Government representative in Japan.

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

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-65

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

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale will be a hybrid Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and Direct Commercial Sales (DCS) case involving the release of sensitive technology to the Government of Japan related to modernizing its F-15J fleet. The F-15J aircraft is a twin-engine all-weather air superiority fighter aircraft in service since 1980 and built under license in Japan by Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. Previous upgrades were carried out under the Multi-Stage Improvement Program (MSIP). The first phase of this program will consist

of upgrade design, development, modification, training, support, and testing of the first two (2) F-15J test aircraft resulting in an upgraded Japanese Super Interceptor (JSI) configuration. The follow-on production phase will incorporate JSI upgrade kits to modernize up to ninety-six (96) additional F-15J aircraft.

2. The AN/APG-82(V)I is an Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade for the F-15. It includes higher processor power, higher transmission power, more sensitive receiver electronics, and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), which creates higher-resolution ground maps from a greater distance than existing mechanically scanned array radars. The upgrade features an increase in detection range of air targets, increases in processing speed and memory, as well as significant improvements in all modes.

3. The AN/ALQ-239 Digital Electronic Warfare Suite (DEWS) provides passive radar warning, wide spectrum RF jamming, and control and management of the entire DEWS system. This system is designed as an internal suite largely comprised of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technology.

4. Advanced Display Core Processor II (ADCP II) is the mission processor for the F-15 managing the overall mission functions for the aircraft. The ADCP II controls the aircraft's avionics and provides data for the cockpit displays. It contains multiple core processors enabling rapid processing of data and is connected to aircraft systems by redundant MIL-STD-1553 buses and Ethernet interfaces.

5. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware or software in the proposed sale, the information could be used to develop counter-measures, which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

6. The sensitive technology being released under this notification is subject to the security criteria established in National Disclosure Policy (NDP-1) for the Government of Japan. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

7. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Japan.

REMEMBERING JOHN CONYERS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Congressman John Conyers, Jr., a civil rights icon, lifelong public servant, lover of jazz, and champion for his beloved hometown of Detroit.

Congressman Conyers was born in Detroit on May 16, 1929, and spent the next 90 years fighting for his city, our State, our Nation, and the equality of all people. He deeply understood the challenges Detroit families face. In the words of Kary Moss, executive director of ACLU of Michigan: "He was of Detroit and for Detroit."

He knew what it was like to wake up and head to the factory; after graduating from Northwestern High School, he worked as a welder at a Lincoln plant before earning bachelor's and law degrees from Wayne State University.

He knew what it was like to serve this Nation in uniform; he enlisted in the Army and served a tour of duty during the Korean war.

He knew what it was like to fight for equality; he marched alongside Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, AL; cofounded the Congressional Black Caucus; and even hired civil rights icon Rosa Parks as a secretary and receptionist in his office.

He knew what it was like to devote his life to public service, spending 53 years in the U.S. House of Representatives and rising to lead the Judiciary Committee. He fought to make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday, protect the Voting Rights Act, change mandatory sentences for nonviolent drug offenders, and create death benefits for police officers and firefighters who died in the line of duty.

Public service was his calling, and jazz was his passion. He had an encyclopedic knowledge of this most American form of music, gained through hosting a jazz radio show in the 1970s and spending as much time as possible in Detroit's jazz clubs. He introduced a congressional resolution in 1987 designating jazz as "a rare and valuable national American treasure" and helped establish the Smithsonian Jazz Masterworks Orchestra.

Only five people in history have served longer in the House of Representatives than Congressman Conyers, and the people of Detroit always knew that Congressman Conyers, sporting a crisp shirt and dapper suit, was in their corner.

My deepest condolences go to his wife, Monica; his sons, John and Carl; his family and many friends; and the city of Detroit.

#### REMEMBERING SEN. KAY HAGAN

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to remember our colleague and friend, Kay Hagan.

The daughter of a World War II veteran, with many other members of our Armed Forces in her family, Kay made service to others a cornerstone of her life. Indeed, she wove that commitment through her extraordinary career in business and public office.

There was Kay's devotion to her community and family. She served as a church elder and Sunday school teacher at her Presbyterian congregation. Even while rising through the ranks to become an executive at the North Carolina National Bank, she was active in local politics, running county operations for two gubernatorial campaigns. And, in the midst of it all, she and her husband Chip made it to the Girl Scout meetings and school events for their three children.

There was Kay's outstanding career in North Carolina State politics. For a decade, she served in the North Carolina Senate. She earned the gavel on the senate budget committee. She championed financial literacy in elementary and secondary education. Her success landed her on North Carolina's most effective lawmakers list three times.

Then there was Kay's service in this body. She championed fair pay for

women, expanding access to healthcare, improving public education, and nurturing small businesses, which she recognized as the lifeblood of North Carolina's economy.

In the Senate, she honored her family's long record of military service as a member of the Armed Services Committee. She chaired the vitally important Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, which confronts issues such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and drug trafficking. She fought to ensure that funding battles in Washington never impede veterans' access to healthcare. She traveled abroad to Iraq, Afghanistan, and other military installations around the world to visit North Carolina troops.

To Chip, Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie, I am sorry for your loss. Kay left us too soon. She was a kind and gracious colleague and a good friend. She was a servant for good.

In the words of John Ellerton's Hymn, read at President Franklin D. Roosevelt's funeral:

Now the laborer's task is o'er;  
Now the battle day is past . . .  
Father, in Thy gracious keeping  
Leave we now thy servant sleeping.

Rest in peace, Senator Hagan.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO THE 2019 ARKANSAS BLACK HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Arkansas Black Hall of Fame Class 2019 and the contributions made by the inductees to the African-American community and the State of Arkansas.

The 2019 inductees are former legislators, business leaders, entertainers, artists, and mentors. Their accomplishments and accolades demonstrate how much of an impact each has made in their fields, as well as on our culture. Their historical significance is widely acknowledged and bears out how deserving each honoree is of this recognition.

Irma Hunter Brown served in the Arkansas House of Representatives for 22 years and also went on to serve as a State senator. She was the first African-American woman to serve in either body of the Arkansas General Assembly.

Brown is also the president of the Friends of Haven of Rest Cemetery, Inc., an organization dedicated to improving the condition and appearances of the burial ground which serves as a final resting place for several notable Black Arkansans, including Daisy Gatson Bates, and contains a site commemorating the 21 boys perished in the 1959 fire at the Arkansas Negro Boys Industrial School in Wrightsville. In 2008, Brown and a group of Haven of Rest supporters started a project to clean up and restore the cemetery as it is a significant part of Arkansas history. The group is now the Friends of Haven of Rest Cemetery, Inc., which is continuing the fundraising and care for the cemetery grounds.

Wallace "Wali" Caradine was born in 1949 and grew up in West Memphis. He was the first African American ever to graduate from the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design at the University of Arkansas in 1974. Four years later, with his partner Sam Young, he established his first business, De-

sign and Construction Associates. The business venture eventually became one of Arkansas' largest minority-owned contracting firms.

Architecture and design weren't only his profession; they were his passion. In the mid-1990s, Caradine and Ron Bene Woods formed Woods Caradine Architects. In 2007, he established Caradine & Company, where he worked until his retirement in early 2017. As an architect, Caradine left his footprints in many places across Arkansas, designing several notable facilities still in use today.

Wali Caradine was also dedicated to his community. He was a mentor to many minority building contractors in central Arkansas. In 1986, he founded the Arkansas Chapter of the National Association of Minority Contractors. Between 2009 and 2013, Caradine was a member of central Arkansas advisory committee for the University of Arkansas.

John Donley was born in Gould, AR, but has left his mark on our country's entertainment industry. He is a producer, executive, and an award-winning television writer.

Donley wrote for many of the most beloved comedies of the 1970s and '80s, including "Diff'rent Strokes," "Good Times," and "The Jeffersons." He won an NAACP Image Award for his writing in an episode of "Diff'rent Strokes." In addition to writing for hit shows, Donley has also worked with Hollywood stars such as Sinbad and Curtis Mayfield and found a home at the big-name networks ABC and CBS. While he clearly has the ability to make people laugh, John Donley also uses his talent to unite audiences all over the country.

Ed Johnson has coached 27 players who went on to play in the National Football League; however, his impact on the Little Rock community and the United States goes beyond the field. Coach Johnson is a Vietnam war veteran whose service is marked by two Purple Heart Awards, a Bronze Star Award, and Presidential Citations.

Upon returning home in 1971, Coach Johnson helped organize the Sunset Youth Sports Program in Little Rock and by the next year had formed the Sunset Tigers Football Team. While he is passionate about his role as a football coach, Johnson uses this position to change kids' lives off of the field. Coach Ed Johnson has served the Little Rock community for 48 years and is believed to be the longest serving active community youth football coach in Arkansas.

Kristin Lewis is a native of Little Rock and a globally recognized lyric-spinto soprano. She graduated from the University of Central Arkansas in 1999 with a bachelor's degree in vocal performance and also received a master's degree from the University of Knoxville in 2002. Since then, she has performed in many prestigious venues, including the Vienna State Opera, the Berlin State Opera, and the Teatro San Carlo in Naples.

She made her debut at the Metropolitan Opera in New York in January 2019. Lewis has been widely praised for her performances. Her talents have also been recognized with several awards, including the Orazio Tosi Prize from Parma Lirica in 2012, Savonlinna Opera Festival's Artist of the Year in 2010, and the Ferruccio Tagliavini International Singing Competition in 2005.

Lewis's first musical environment was within her family. Having this insight into the role of environment to enhance and develop one's talents, she established the Kristin Lewis Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit corporation that fosters the development of young singers through competition and scholarships. Foundation activities, including fundraising events and vocal competitions, are hosted in central Arkansas. Lewis is also very active in humanitarian work

outside of the U.S., being an ambassador for the Red Cross in Austria and supporter of Animal Care Austria.

Roscoe Robinson is an acclaimed artist across both the gospel and R&B genres. He has performed with popular gospel groups such as the Highway Q.C.'s, the Fairfield Four, Five Blind Boys of Mississippi, the Blind Boys of Alabama, and the Five Trumpets. Though he was successful in the gospel community, his talents did not stop there.

Through the 1980s, Roscoe also recorded a number of popular rhythm and blues songs. Roscoe is originally from Dermott, AR, but his talents have touched the souls of fans across Arkansas and America.

Each of these inductees has earned a place of honor as a result of the lives they have lived and the work they have done over many years. The Arkansas Black Hall of Fame Class of 2019 is clearly an exemplary group, and I congratulate each member and their loved ones, who have also been on their journeys, on this tremendous recognition.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DOTTIE WILSON

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Dottie Wilson of Hill County for her tremendous impact on the north central Montana community of Havre.

Dottie, a former baker at Grateful Bread, took a tremendous leap of faith and made the decision to open her own bakery, Infinity Bake Shoppe LLC in April of 2017.

Dottie's bakery offers a variety of baked goods including cookies, pastries, scones, and cinnamon rolls, as well as three different varieties of baked donuts, soups, and lunch items.

Since Infinity Bake Shoppe opened, it has been a great addition to the Havre community. Dottie did not anticipate her new business would take off so quickly, but folks from all across the HiLine are lining up for her baked goods.

Dottie said she was inspired to start her own business in order to provide her daughter Keeley with a more purposeful future. Keeley, who has Williams syndrome, followed in her mother's entrepreneurial spirit and opened up, Lady Bug Bites LLC, making and selling treats for dogs and cats.

It is my honor to recognize Dottie Wilson for her hard work and talent in opening up Infinity Bake Shoppe LLC. She is a fine example of the type of entrepreneurship coming from Montana Main Street businesses.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER EVANS

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today, I rise to pay tribute to Jennifer Evans, the president of Leadership Georgia for 2019. Leadership Georgia is one of the Nation's oldest and most successful State leadership training programs. Leadership Georgia serves primarily young business, civic, community leaders who have the desire and potential to work together for a better Georgia.

The idea for a statewide leadership development program was first proposed in 1971 during an informal conversation between several key business

leaders at a Georgia Chamber of Commerce meeting. This inspired group included Pat Patillo, then-president of the Georgia Chamber; business leader Jim Lientz, Sr.; Rogers Wade of the Georgia Public Policy Foundation; and community visionary J.W. Fanning, who would eventually serve as the program's longtime advisor and guiding hand.

The first class of Leadership Georgia started in 1972 and included aspiring leaders from across the State. Future U.S. Senator Sam Nunn was a member of the inaugural class who, at the time, was a young lawyer from Perry, GA. The story goes that Nunn was inspired to run for the Senate shortly after attending his first Leadership Georgia Program. I am also a proud alumnus of the organization, as is my former colleague, Saxby Chambliss.

Beyond its founding, Leadership Georgia leads the way in many areas. Thanks to J.W. Fanning's active wife Cora Lee, Leadership Georgia has always stressed partner and spousal participation. Another key focus of Leadership Georgia is diversity among its members. The highly competitive selection process includes participants from every corner of the State and seeks out those from different occupations, genders, cultures, and races. The philosophy behind this diversity goal is that each Leadership Georgia class of 120-plus participants connects on a deeply personal level that highlights different perspectives while learning how to work together as one united force for Georgia's best future.

As president of Leadership Georgia for 2019, Jennifer Evans was responsible for selecting the five locations where the Leadership Georgia class have spent their time together. To showcase the "Georgia United" theme she chose, Jennifer selected the Georgia communities of Young Harris and its Brasstown Resort in the North Georgia mountains; Albany, which has been resilient in the face of recent natural disasters; Gainesville, the poultry capital of the world; and Perry, home to the Georgia National Fairgrounds.

This year, Jennifer also set aside one of these programs to visit us here in Washington, DC, to allow these emerging leaders to interact with their elected and appointed officials to deliver the message of "United We Can" and encourage us to find common ground for the betterment of our State and Nation. That is a message I think all of us need to hear on a regular basis.

Both members of Leadership Georgia's Class of 2011, Jennifer and her husband Lee, have dedicated countless hours of time to Leadership Georgia to ensure the organization maintains its sterling reputation in our State. They served as program chairs for the Leadership Georgia Class of 2012 and planned and executed a successful program weekend in Savannah, GA. Jennifer then served on the board of trustees from 2013 through 2015, where she helped select class members for those

years, and she was asked to rejoin the board of trustees and serve as the vice president of the organization in 2018. She is currently serving as president and next year will assume the role of chair of the board of trustees.

In addition to their volunteer work for Leadership Georgia, Jennifer and Lee both have busy lives and full-time jobs in Vidalia, GA. Jennifer is director of transportation for Dot Foods, and Lee just opened his first Barbaritos franchise. Their children, Rebecca, who is 14 years old, and Cham, who is 12, have practically grown up with Leadership Georgia and have been able to build lifelong friendships with kids from across our great State through the extended Leadership Georgia family.

It gives me hope for the future that folks like Jennifer and Lee Evans are in each of our States and communities focused on nurturing and developing future leaders, working to overcome differences, and focusing on bettering communities for so many.

I want to congratulate Jennifer, current board chair Matt Bishop, the entire volunteer Leadership Georgia Board of Trustees, and the program chair team assembled by Jennifer and Lee on delivering a fantastic year for the 2019 class of Leadership Georgia.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:56 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1623. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for the treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as an authorized campaign expenditure, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4695. An act to impose sanctions with respect to Turkey, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4842. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to provide funds for a United States pavilion at Expo 2020 Dubai, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:



H.R. 1623. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for the treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as an authorized campaign expenditure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4334. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2020 through 2024, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2755. A bill to require a report on the plan to secure the enduring defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3046. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Development Environmental Regulation for Rural Infrastructure Projects" (RIN0572-AC44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3047. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to fiscal year 2018 data mining (OSS-2019-1155); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3048. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, with respect to Burundi; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3049. A communication from the Counsel, Office of the Inspector General, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Export-Import Bank of the United States, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3050. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Restricting Additional Exports and Reexports to Cuba" (RIN0694-AH90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3051. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred in the Department of Agriculture's Working Capital Fund, Agriculture account; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3052. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the notification of the President's intent to suspend the application of duty-free treatment to certain eligible articles that are the product of Thailand; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3053. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System (T-MSIS) Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Data Book, Treatment of SUD in Medicaid in 2017"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3054. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress: Utilization Management of Medication-Assisted Treatment in Medicaid"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3055. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (Financial Markets), Department of Treasury received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3056. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Italy, the UK, Switzerland, and the Czech Republic to support the development, modification, installation, integration, test, operation, and use of mechanical, avionics, environmental, and lighting systems for the C27J in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-024); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3057. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the Republic of Korea to support the manufacture, assembly, and testing of subassemblies for the MK45 Mod 4 Gun Mount in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-034); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3058. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to sections 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment abroad and the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services to the UK to support the design, development, manufacture, productions, qualification, repair, and rework of the guidance electronic assemblies (GEAs), circuit cards assemblies (CCAs), electronic modules, power supplies, and associated electronic and mechanical assemblies, subassemblies, components, and test equipment for the Excalibur Increment 1b Guided Munitions Weapon System in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-040); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3059. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and components abroad controlled under Category I of the

U.S. Munitions List of 50 caliber automatic machine guns and associated parts and spares to Norway in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-065); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3060. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Qatar to support the design, tooling creation, and production line setup to produce, assemble, field, and maintain a weapon mounted flashlight system incorporating visible and infrared lights and laser pointers (Transmittal No. DDTC 19-029); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3061. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on United States Citizens Detained by Iran"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3062. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3421-EM in the State of South Carolina having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3063. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3422-EM in the State of Georgia having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3064. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Federal Emergency Management Agency Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3065. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Thiafentanil in Schedule II" ((21 CFR Parts 1301, 1305, and 1308) (Docket No. DEA-375)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3066. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3067. A communication from the Associate Chief of the Competition and Infrastructure Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment" ((WT Docket No. 17-79) (DA 19-1024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.



EC-3068. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Fishery; Inseason Adjustment to the Northern Red Hake Possession Limit” (RIN0648-XX010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3069. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pollock Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XY045) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3070. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2019 Winter II Quota” (RIN0648-XX014) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3071. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Flatfish Exchange in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands” (RIN0648-XY041) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3072. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, Black Sea Bass and Atlantic Bluefish Fisheries; 2020–2021 Specifications” (RIN0648-XH043) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3073. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Golden Tilefish Fishery; 2020 Specifications” (RIN0648-XX009) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3074. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 50 Feet Length Overall Using Hook-and-line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XY024) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3075. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XY047) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3076. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XY022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3077. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XY040) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3078. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Scallop Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels” (RIN0648-XX016) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3079. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery” (RIN0648-XG606) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3080. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XT026) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3081. A communication from the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XT023) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3082. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Penaeid Shrimp Fishery off Georgia” (RIN0648-XF965) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3083. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Manage-

ment Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3423-EM in the State of North Carolina having exceeded the \$5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the applicable percentage under the premium assistance tax credit for households with young adults; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2736. A bill to increase rates of college completion and reduce college costs by accelerating time to degree, aligning secondary and postsecondary education, and improving postsecondary credit transfer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2737. A bill to provide protections for pensions in bankruptcy proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for angel investors in start-up businesses, to provide a credit for wages paid by start-up businesses to their first employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2739. A bill to provide for the effective use of immigration detainers to enhance public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2740. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved new drug application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 2741. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2742. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2743. A bill to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2744. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to modify requirements for a meat food product of cattle to bear a “Product of U.S.A.” label, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2746. A bill to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide information on suicide rates in law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2747. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance for increasing workforce diversity in the professions of physical therapy, occupational therapy, audiology, and speech-language pathology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2748. A bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2749. A bill to provide requirements for the .gov domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2750. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Operation Stonegarden grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. JONES):

S. 2751. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to innovative new medical devices furnished to individuals with end stage renal disease under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a new device add-on payment adjustment under such part; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2752. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve program requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2753. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2754. A bill to create jobs and drive innovation and economic growth in the United States by supporting and promoting the manufacture of next-generation technologies, including refrigerants, solvents, fire suppressants, foam blowing agents, aerosols, and propellants; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2755. A bill to require a report on the plan to secure the enduring defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria; read the first time.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 386. A resolution supporting international cooperation and continued United States leadership to maintain access to space and achieve advances in space technology; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 387. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, commending domestic violence victim advocates, domestic violence victim service providers, crisis hotline staff, and first responders serving victims of domestic violence for their compassionate support of survivors of domestic violence, and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should continue to support efforts to end domestic violence, provide safety for victims of domestic violence and their families, and hold perpetrators of domestic violence accountable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 388. A resolution calling for the withdrawal of the United States from the Open Skies Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 389. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2019 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr.

INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 390. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Senator Kay Hagan; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 225

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 225, a bill to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 743

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copy-

right small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1294

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1294, a bill to require Federal agencies with jurisdiction over broadband deployment to enter into an interagency agreement related to certain types of funding for broadband deployment.

S. 1443

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1443, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1665

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1665, a bill to modify the procedures for issuing special recreation permits for certain public land units, and for other purposes.

S. 1678

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1678, a bill to express United States support for Taiwan's diplomatic alliances around the world.

S. 1703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, *supra*.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1772

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1817

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1817, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve nutritional and other program requirements relating to purchases of locally produced food.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from North Da-

kota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for summer food service program delivery.

S. 1965

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1965, a bill to authorize actions with respect to foreign countries engaged in illicit trade in tobacco products or their precursors, and for other purposes.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1992, a bill to amend the FAST Act to repeal a rescission of funds.

S. 2059

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2059, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 2365

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2365, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize urban Indian organizations to enter into arrangements for the sharing of medical services and facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2377

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2377, a bill to apply the Medicaid asset verification program to all applicants for, and recipients of, medical assistance in all States and territories, and for other purposes.

S. 2383

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2383, a bill to establish minimum standards of disclosure by franchises whose franchisees use loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

S. 2521

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2521, a bill to award grants for the recruitment, retention, and advancement of direct care workers.

S. 2619

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2619, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Healthy Start program.

S. 2632

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2632, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require more detailed travel disclosure filings from judicial officers, and for other purposes.

S. 2634

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2634, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry.

S. 2641

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2641, a bill to promote United States national security and prevent the resurgence of ISIS, and for other purposes.

S. 2730

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2730, a bill to establish and ensure an inclusive transparent Drone Advisory Committee.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 150

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 150, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States to commemorate the Armenian Genocide through official recognition and remembrance.

S. RES. 385

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 385, a resolution celebrating the 30th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall,

the reunification of both Germany and Europe, and the spread of democracy around the world.

AMENDMENT NO. 949

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 949 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1016

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1016 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1023

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1023 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1025

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1025 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1044

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1044 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1045

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1045 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1056

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1056 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of

Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1076

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1076 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1094 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1114

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1114 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1122

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1122 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1149

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1149 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1150

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1150 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1162

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1162 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a

bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1182

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1182 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1211

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1211 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1228

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1228 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1239

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1239 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2742. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

## S. 2742

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Prisons Accountability Act of 2019".

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Director of the Bureau of Prisons leads a law enforcement component of the Department of Justice with a budget that exceeds \$7,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.

(2) With the exception of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons has the largest operating budget of any unit within the Department of Justice.

(3) The Director of the Bureau of Prisons oversees 122 facilities and is responsible for the welfare of more than 176,000 Federal inmates.

(4) The Director of the Bureau of Prisons supervises more than 36,000 employees, many of whom operate in hazardous environments that involve regular interaction with violent offenders.

(5) Within the Department of Justice, in addition to those officials who oversee litigating components, the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, the Director of the Community Relations Service, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Director of the United States Marshals Service, 94 United States Marshals, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, and the Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices, are all appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(6) Despite the significant budget of the Bureau of Prisons and the vast number of people under the responsibility of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the Director is not appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

## SEC. 3. DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4041 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "appointed by and serving directly under the Attorney General." and inserting the following: "who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve directly under the Attorney General."

(b) INCUMBENT.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a), the individual serving as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons on the date of enactment of this Act may serve as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons until the date that is 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the ability of the President to appoint the individual serving as the Director of the Bureau of Prisons on the date of enactment of this Act to the position of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons in accordance with section 4041 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a).

## (d) TERM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4041 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by inserting after "consent of the Senate." the following: "The Director shall be appointed for a term of 10 years, except that an individual appointed to the position of Director may continue to serve in that position until another individual is appointed to that position, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. An individual may not serve more than 1 term as Director."

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to appointments made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr.

DURBIN, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2755. A bill to require a report on the plan to secure the enduring defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria; read the first time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

## S. 2755

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. REPORT ON THE PLAN TO SECURE THE ENDURING DEFEAT OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND SYRIA.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other appropriate agencies of the United States Government, submit to Congress a report that describes the strategy of the United States to secure the enduring defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and al Qaeda in the Middle East.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

## (1) A description of—

(A) the key United States security interests and the political and military objectives, long-term goals, and desired end-states for Syria; and

(B) how current military, diplomatic, and humanitarian assistance efforts in Syria align with such objectives.

(2) Analysis of the threats posed to United States interests by ISIS, al Qaeda, Hizballah, Russian, Iranian, and other non-state activities in Syria and the region.

(3) An intelligence assessment of the historic and current force strength of ISIS and al Qaeda, and the location of such forces in Syria and the region.

(4) An intelligence assessment of the impact that the death of ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi and other senior ISIS leaders will have on the organization.

(5) A description of ongoing United States and coalition programs to build the capacity of local forces to counter ISIS and al Qaeda, including programs for training and equipping guard forces at detention facilities for detained ISIS fighters operated by the Syrian Democratic Forces.

(6) A description of past, present, and planned efforts by the United States and international community to stabilize areas liberated from ISIS control, including efforts to establish local governance and provide basic services.

## (7) A description of—

(A) the current detention population of detention facilities operated by the Syrian Democratic Forces;

(B) the number of ISIS detainees who have escaped such facilities since October 1, 2019;

(C) efforts to convince the governments of third countries to repatriate and prosecute ISIS detainees who are nationals of their countries; and

(D) efforts to ensure that United States support for the repatriation and prosecution of such ISIS detainees is appropriately coordinated across Federal departments and agencies.

(8) A description of the current efforts by the United States and United States partners to advance a sustainable political settlement in Syria.

(9) A description of the conditions that must be met to secure the enduring defeat of ISIS and al Qaeda in Syria and the region.

(10) A description of the United States military and civilian presence and capabilities required to effectively monitor and target ISIS and al Qaeda in the region, as well as an assessment of the risks and limitations to the effectiveness of such efforts without a United States military and civilian presence in Syria and the region, including the feasibility of programming stabilization assistance without the presence of United States military or civilian personnel.

(11) An explanation of United States efforts to ensure the safety of Syrian Kurds and other Syrian nationals who were or are employed by the United States Government in Syria from retribution by Turkey, the Assad regime, ISIS, al Qaeda, or other armed groups.

(12) An assessment of the risks of the involuntary resettlement of refugees by the Government of Turkey in northern Syria.

(13) A comprehensive description of United States Government activities utilizing social media and other communication technologies strategy to counter ISIS's propaganda, influence, and ability to recruit fighters domestically and internationally.

(14) A description of the efforts of the United States Government, including economic sanctions, to deny financial resources, including revenues from natural resources extraction, sale of antiquities, kidnapping, extortion, taxation, smuggling, access to cash storage sites, and access to international financial networks, to ISIS and its affiliates, in conjunction with international partners and financial institutions.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 386—SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND CONTINUED UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP TO MAINTAIN ACCESS TO SPACE AND ACHIEVE ADVANCES IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY

Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 386

Whereas there are approximately 2,062 active satellites in Earth orbit, 24,000 objects tracked by the Air Force that are debris or inactive satellites, and many more objects that are currently too small to track;

Whereas the United States has a leading role in the management of space traffic;

Whereas space is an increasingly important environment for economic growth due to the development of small satellite technologies and the reduced cost of space launch resulting from innovations by private entities;

Whereas, on a daily basis, multiple countries, businesses, and billions of individuals rely on the information and communications capabilities provided by satellites in space;

Whereas maintaining access to space is vital for the national security and economic interests of the United States;

Whereas increased space traffic at different orbits presents a new challenge for governments, private entities, researchers, and the Armed Forces;

Whereas the goal of the United States is to support development of space by private entities, including the development of space tourism;

Whereas, in 2019, the United States commemorated the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 moon landing;

Whereas the United States completed 6 crewed lunar landing missions, multiple orbital missions, and numerous other robotic missions to the Moon and each of the planets in the solar system and beyond;

Whereas the United States aims to return to the Moon by 2024 and subsequently send the first crewed mission to Mars;

Whereas destructive anti-satellite tests threaten international access to space;

Whereas a collision or other preventable disaster in space would reduce access to space and threaten future military, civil, and commercial missions in space for all countries;

Whereas the United States and 108 other countries are parties to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, done at Washington, London, and Moscow January 27, 1967 (18 UST 2410) (in this preamble referred to as the "Outer Space Treaty");

Whereas access to space and the management of space traffic are international problems that require creative technical and legal solutions;

Whereas Article I of the Outer Space Treaty states that—

(1) the exploration and use of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind;

(2) outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all states without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies; and

(3) there shall be freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, and states shall facilitate and encourage international cooperation in such investigation;

Whereas realization of Article I of the Outer Space Treaty requires sustainable access to space;

Whereas actions that could threaten access to space, such as an inadvertent or intentional creation of persistent debris, threaten the potential to explore and use space for all countries;

Whereas if agreements on the sustainable use of space are not made, the potential for a future trillion-dollar economy in space will be threatened;

Whereas the United States has been a leader in developing the rules, regulations, and best practices for successful operation in space;

Whereas the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space—

(1) furthers the exploration and use of space for the benefit of all humanity;

(2) works on a consensus basis with 92 member states; and

(3) in 2011, was charged with developing guidelines for space sustainability;

Whereas the United States has been instrumental in the development of those guidelines; and

Whereas the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has agreed

on 21 such guidelines for implementation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports improvements in space situational awareness and advances in technology and international cooperation;

(2) recognizes that the use of space by governments and private entities requires a system for deconfliction of space traffic and prevention of collisions to ensure the use of space for current and future users;

(3) supports the efforts of the international community and the United States to implement the 21 guidelines for space sustainability agreed on by the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space;

(4) encourages the Secretary of State to continue to support those efforts;

(5) supports continued interagency efforts—

(A) to streamline regulations relating to access to space; and

(B) to support the continued sustainable use of space by government and private entities in Earth orbit and deep space; and

(6) requests that the Secretary of State notify Congress of any legislative requirements for implementation of the 21 guidelines for space sustainability agreed on by the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 387—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH, COMMENDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM ADVOCATES, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDERS, CRISIS HOTLINE STAFF, AND FIRST RESPONDERS SERVING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FOR THEIR COMPASSIONATE SUPPORT OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT EFFORTS TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, PROVIDE SAFETY FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND HOLD PERPETRATORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACCOUNTABLE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 387

Whereas, according to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey—

(1) up to 12,000,000 individuals in the United States report experiencing intimate partner violence annually, including physical violence, rape, or stalking; and

(2) approximately 1 in 5 women in the United States and up to 1 in 7 men in the United States have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner at some point in their lifetimes;

Whereas, on average, 3 women in the United States are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics;

Whereas domestic violence can affect anyone, but women who are 18 to 34 years of age typically experience the highest rates of intimate partner violence;



Whereas most female victims of intimate partner violence have been victimized by the same offender previously;

Whereas domestic violence is cited as a significant factor in homelessness among families;

Whereas millions of children are exposed to domestic violence each year;

Whereas research shows that boys who are exposed to domestic violence in their households are more likely to become perpetrators of intimate partner violence;

Whereas victims of domestic violence experience immediate and long-term negative outcomes, including detrimental effects on mental and physical health;

Whereas victims of domestic violence may lose several days of paid work each year and may lose their jobs due to reasons stemming from domestic violence;

Whereas crisis hotlines serving domestic violence victims operate 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, and offer important crisis intervention services, support services, information, and referrals for victims;

Whereas staff and volunteers of domestic violence shelters and programs in the United States, in cooperation with 56 State and territorial coalitions against domestic violence, serve—

(1) thousands of adults and children each day; and

(2) 1,000,000 adults and children each year;

Whereas, according to a 2016 survey conducted by the National Network to End Domestic Violence, 72,959 domestic violence victims were served by domestic violence shelters and programs around the United States in a single day;

Whereas law enforcement officers in the United States put their lives at risk each day by responding to incidents of domestic violence, which can be among the most volatile and deadly calls;

Whereas Congress first demonstrated a significant commitment to supporting victims of domestic violence with the enactment of the landmark Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.);

Whereas Congress has remained committed to protecting survivors of all forms of domestic violence and sexual abuse by making Federal funding available to support the activities that are authorized under—

(1) the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.); and

(2) the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.);

Whereas there is a need to continue to support programs and activities aimed at domestic violence intervention and domestic violence prevention in the United States;

Whereas domestic violence programs provide trauma-informed services to protect the safety, privacy, and confidentiality of survivors; and

Whereas individuals and organizations that are dedicated to preventing and ending domestic violence should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) the Senate supports the goals and ideals of “National Domestic Violence Awareness Month”; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(A) continue to raise awareness of—

(i) domestic violence in the United States; and

(ii) the corresponding devastating effects of domestic violence on survivors, families, and communities; and

(B) pledge continued support for programs designed to—

(i) assist survivors;

(ii) hold perpetrators accountable; and

(iii) bring an end to domestic violence.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 388—CALLING FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE OPEN SKIES TREATY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 388

Whereas the Department of State has repeatedly assessed and documented in its annual report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments, that Russia is violating the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002 (commonly known as the “Open Skies Treaty”);

Whereas, in 2015, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lieutenant General Vincent R. Stewart, testified to Congress that “[t]he Open Skies construct was designed for a different era,” and in 2016, that the treaty allows Russia “to get incredible foundational intelligence on critical infrastructure, bases, ports, all of our facilities” and provides Russia with “a significant advantage”;

Whereas, in 2016, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, Admiral Cecil Haney, testified to Congress that the Open Skies Treaty gives Russia “a capability to be able to reconnoiter parts of our country and other nations”;

Whereas, in 2017, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, testified to Congress that “we don’t believe the treaty should be in place if the Russians aren’t complying”;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has recently used the Open Skies Treaty for surveillance of major American cities and infrastructure, including Washington D.C. and New York City;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has installed advanced digital technology for use in Open Skies flights, enhancing its surveillance and espionage capabilities;

Whereas Government of the Russian Federation has limited and at times outright denied access for surveillance flights by the United States and other countries;

Whereas Congress has repeatedly sought to limit implementation of the Open Skies Treaty in response to Russian treaty violations, including in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232);

Whereas the United States Government has developed and deployed technology so that it does not gain significant additional intelligence from participating in the Open Skies Treaty; and

Whereas participating in the Open Skies Treaty costs the United States hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary spending: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) the United States Government should declassify to the maximum extent possible, without materially or immediately threatening the security of the United States, its intelligence and assessments regarding Russian exploitation of the Open Skies Treaty to undermine United States national security; and

(2) the United States should withdraw from the Open Skies Treaty.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 389—CALLING ON CONGRESS, SCHOOLS, AND STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF DYSLLEXIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED, AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2019 AS “NATIONAL DYSLLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 389

Whereas dyslexia is—

(1) defined as an unexpected difficulty in reading for an individual who has the intelligence to be a much better reader; and

(2) most commonly caused by a difficulty in phonological processing (the appreciation of the individual sounds of spoken language), which affects the ability of an individual to speak, read, spell, and, often, the ability to learn a second language;

Whereas, the First Step Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-391; 132 Stat. 5194) included a definition of dyslexia as part of the requirement of the Act to screen inmates for dyslexia upon intake in Federal prisons;

Whereas the definition of dyslexia in section 3635 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 101(a) of the First Step Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-391; 132 Stat. 5195), is the first and only definition of dyslexia in a Federal statute;

Whereas dyslexia is the most common learning disability and affects 80 to 90 percent of all individuals with a learning disability;

Whereas dyslexia is persistent and highly prevalent, affecting as many as 1 out of every 5 individuals;

Whereas dyslexia is a paradox, in that an individual with dyslexia may have both—

(1) weaknesses in decoding that result in difficulties in accurate or fluent word recognition; and

(2) strengths in higher-level cognitive functions, such as reasoning, critical thinking, concept formation, and problem solving;

Whereas great progress has been made in understanding dyslexia on a scientific level, including the epidemiology and cognitive and neurobiological bases of dyslexia;

Whereas the achievement gap between typical readers and dyslexic readers occurs as early as first grade; and

Whereas early screening for, and early diagnosis of, dyslexia are critical for ensuring that individuals with dyslexia receive focused, evidence-based intervention that leads to fluent reading, the promotion of self-awareness and self-empowerment, and the provision of necessary accommodations that ensure success in school and in life: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) calls on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize that dyslexia has significant educational implications that must be addressed; and

(2) designates October 2019 as “National Dyslexia Awareness Month”.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 390—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF SENATOR KAY HAGAN

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN,

Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 390

Whereas the passing of Kay Hagan on October 28, 2019, was a tremendous loss to her family, including her husband, Chip, and their children Jeanette, Tilden, and Carrie, as well as a deep loss for the State of North Carolina;

Whereas Kay Hagan was born in Shelby, North Carolina, in 1953, to Joe Ruthven and Jeannette Charles Ruthven;

Whereas Kay Hagan began working in Federal politics in the 1970s, interning in the United States Senate;

Whereas Kay Hagan graduated from—

- (1) Florida State University in 1975; and
- (2) Wake Forest University School of Law in 1978;

Whereas, in 1977, Kay Hagan married her husband, Chip Hagan, whom she met at Wake Forest University School of Law, and they made their home in Greensboro, North Carolina;

Whereas Kay Hagan rose to the position of vice president at the North Carolina National Bank, now known as Bank of America;

Whereas Kay Hagan worked on the campaign of North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt in 1992 and 1996;

Whereas Kay Hagan won election to the North Carolina General Assembly as a State senator representing Greensboro in 1998, and served in that position for 10 years;

Whereas Kay Hagan won election to the United States Senate in 2008, becoming the first female Democrat to win election to the Senate from North Carolina;

Whereas, as a Member of the Senate, Kay Hagan worked tirelessly on—

- (1) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;
- (2) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;
- (3) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate; and
- (4) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

Whereas Kay Hagan chaired—

(1) the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(2) the Subcommittee on Children and Families of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

Whereas Kay Hagan worked on behalf of North Carolina members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families and supported a strong national defense;

Whereas Kay Hagan advocated for the farmers of North Carolina on issues important to the livelihood of those farmers;

Whereas Kay Hagan worked to ensure that the people of North Carolina and the people of the United States had access to, and opportunities for, hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting;

Whereas, after leaving the Senate, Kay Hagan went on to work at the Harvard Institute of Politics;

Whereas Kay Hagan will be remembered for—

- (1) her tireless work on behalf of the people of North Carolina;
- (2) her passion for her work; and
- (3) her love of her State and her family; and

Whereas Kay Hagan is survived by her husband, Chip, and their children, Jeanette Hagan, Tilden Hagan, and Carrie Hagan Stewart; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That—*

(1) the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Kay Hagan, former member of the United States Senate;

(2) the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the Honorable Kay Hagan; and

(3) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Kay Hagan.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1241. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1088 submitted by Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1243. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1241. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1088 submitted by Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 2, line 2, and insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) There is appropriated \$3,000,000 to carry out section 1673(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926(d)).

(b) The amount made available under the heading "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY" in title I for necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary shall be reduced by \$3,000,000, which shall be derived by reducing the amount provided under that heading for Departmental Administration by \$3,000,000.

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) There is appropriated \$3,000,000 to carry out section 1673(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5926(d)).

(b) The amount made available under the heading "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY" in title I for necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary shall be reduced by \$3,000,000, which shall be derived by reducing the amount provided under that heading for Departmental Administration by \$3,000,000.

SA 1243. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 122, line 19, insert "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$3,000,000 shall be made available to the Office of the Secretary to carry out the duties of the working group established under section 770 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6; 133 Stat. 89)" before the period at the end.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of John Joseph Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Department of State.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing following nominations: Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, and Lawrence VanDyke, of Nevada, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Philip M. Halpern, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Barbara Bailey Jongbloed, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 1:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

The Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The Subcommittee on Intellectual Property of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 30, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Antonio Pena Anaya, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

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

## MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2755

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2755) to require a report on the plan to secure the enduring defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

Ms. COLLINS. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive the second reading on the next legislative day.

## DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR THE WORKERS OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 377.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 377) designating October 30, 2019, as a national day of remembrance for the workers of the nuclear weapons program of the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 377) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 24, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

## CALLING ON CONGRESS, SCHOOLS, AND STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF DYSLEXIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED, AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2019 AS "NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH"

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 389, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 389) calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2019 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 389) was agreed to.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

## HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF SENATOR KAY HAGAN

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 390, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 390) honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Senator Kay Hagan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 390) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2019

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, October 31; further, that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3055, under the previous order.

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

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent

that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 390 as further mark of respect for the late Kay Hagan, former Senator from the State of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:38 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 31, 2019, at 10 a.m.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

#### OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

LANNY ERDOS, OF OHIO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT, VICE JOSEPH G. PIZARCHIK.

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ROBERT J. FEITEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION, VICE HUBERT T. BELL, JR., RETIRED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SARAH C. ARBES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE MATTHEW BASSETT, RESIGNED.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TODD C. CHAPMAN, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

MICHAEL D. WEAHKEE, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE YVETTE ROUBIDEAUX, TERM EXPIRED.

#### THE JUDICIARY

GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE SUSAN G. BRADEN, TERM EXPIRED.

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. LESLIE A. BEAVERS  
COL. ROBERT M. BLAKE  
COL. MELISSA A. COBURN  
COL. VANESSA J. DORNHOFFER  
COL. LYNNETTE J. HEBERT  
COL. JEFFREY F. HILL  
COL. TRACI L. KUEKERMURPHY  
COL. PRESTON F. MCFARREN  
COL. WILLIAM D. MURPHY  
COL. DANA N. NELSON  
COL. ROBERT P. PALMER  
COL. DAVID A. PIFFARERIO  
COL. MITCHELL D. RICHARDSON  
COL. WILLIAM A. ROCK  
COL. MARK V. SLOMINSKI  
COL. MAX J. STITZER  
COL. ROBERT W. VANHOY II  
COL. ADRIAN K. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LEE ANN T. BENNETT  
BRIG. GEN. JAY S. GOLDSTEIN  
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY S. HINRICHS  
BRIG. GEN. BRET C. LARSON  
BRIG. GEN. BRYAN P. RADLIFF  
BRIG. GEN. SCOTT A. SAUTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. DARRIN D. LAMBRIGGER

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN C. BOYD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. DAMON N. CLUCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL J. BLANTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### To be major

LAINA G. CAFEGO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

LYLE E. BUSHONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

ZACHARY B. CICCOLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

GARTH E. COKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

SHAUN J. ARREDONDO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

STEVEN K. UHLMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### To be major

BRENT R. ROBERTSON

#### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

#### To be commander

JOHN N. AMIRAL