

value on their own lives. They knew the compound was booby-trapped and that Baghdadi kept innocent children as human shields to protect himself against attack.

Nevertheless, these soldiers carried out their mission fearlessly and flawlessly. They breached the compound, eliminated Baghdadi's Praetorian Guard, and then cornered the terrorist leader in a dead end, underground tunnel.

Baghdadi chose the coward's way out, detonating a suicide vest, even though he was surrounded by his own children. True to form, he was as evil in the final moments of his life as he had been throughout it.

Now Baghdadi is dead, thanks to the brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and our canines too. There is no other Nation on Earth whose military could have carried out this raid, and the American people ought to be proud of them.

To commemorate their stunning success, Senator GRAHAM and I have a resolution to honor the leaders and members of the military intelligence community who made it possible and to commend the President for his decisive leadership in ordering the raid.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 394 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. 394) honoring the members of the military and intelligence community who carried out the mission that killed Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to; 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 resolution (S. Res. 394) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

REMEMBERING KAY HAGAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I stand here today to mourn the loss of Kay Hagan. Kay was a warm, kind person with a wonderful sense of humor, and she was an inspiring public servant. I feel fortunate to have been her friend and colleague here in the U.S. Senate.

I am deeply saddened to be among the many who will miss her profoundly.

Kay knew from a young age that her destiny was in politics, starting when she worked here as an intern. She often recalled operating the Senate elevators in the 1970s. She would watch the Nation's leaders and influencers pass by, including her maternal uncle, then-Senator Lawton Chiles from Florida. She would dream of riding those elevators herself as an elected official.

Kay worked incredibly hard to achieve that dream. She earned her BA degree from Florida State University and her JD from Wake Forest University School of Law. Before Kay began her political career, she worked in financial services and became a vice president of North Carolina National Bank, which is now part of Bank of America.

In 1998, she was elected to the North Carolina State Senate, where her talent in setting the State's budget and her devotion to her constituents earned her a spot among North Carolina's "Ten Most Effective Senators" 3 years in a row. Then, in 2008, she became a U.S. Senator in a historic election. Kay was North Carolina's second female Senator ever and its first Democratic female senator.

From the moment Kay arrived in the Senate, she concerned herself with how to use her platform to clear the way for other people, especially other women, to achieve their ambitions. The very first bill she cosponsored was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which created a fairer system for filing claims of pay discrimination. She also worked with Senator SCHUMER to open the Senate swimming pool to female Senators for the first time.

Where Kay saw injustice and where she saw indignity, she saw opportunities to make the world a better place. She was committed to fighting for anyone who needed her help. She was a fierce advocate for servicemembers, veterans, and military families. Both her father and brother served in the U.S. Navy. She also spent much of her Senate career campaigning to improve education, financial literacy, and job training for underserved communities. She rallied people to these causes—not with strong-arming or with steam-rolling but with cleverness and compassion and coalition-building.

Kay was the type of legislator who dug into issues that made a real difference in people's lives, even if they weren't necessarily headline-grabbing. I had the honor of working alongside Kay in the Senate Small Business Committee for 4 years, and I watched her tirelessly create economic opportunity for North Carolinians and all Americans. The programs and policies we spearheaded there may not have made front page news, but Kay knew she was making a difference for entrepreneurship opportunities in our country.

The only thing to rival Kay's dedication to her constituents was her dedication to her family. Kay was endlessly

devoted to her husband Chip and their three children, Tilden, Jeanette, and Carrie, and all of her loved ones.

Her brother-in-law, Henry Hagan, is a fellow Baltimorean, and he has told me over the years how Kay truly was the Sun around which the entire family orbited. She was a source of gravity and life for them, as she was for so many people who were lucky enough to know her.

May her gravity continue to ground us, and may her light continue to warm and guide us. I wish all of Kay's family and friends comfort during this difficult time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, what we heard this week from my Democratic colleagues on healthcare is more of the same—more fearmongering and more misinformation.

The issue this week is about what is called 1332 waivers. These waivers allow States flexibility in how they implement healthcare programs. It is a simple concept. Every State is different. Every State should have the flexibility to design their healthcare programs and regulations in a way to best meet the needs of their citizens.

As a former Governor I know how important this is. Top-down, one-size-fits-all Federal healthcare programs increase costs and aren't the way to best serve the needs of the American people. Even the Democrats realized that when they passed ObamaCare. They created the 1332 waiver for State innovation.

As Governor, I used a similar waiver authority, an 1115 Medicaid waiver to reform our Medicaid system and transition it from a fee-for-service to a managed care system. This resulted in lower costs to taxpayers and better service and access for Florida families—a win-win.

These waivers work, and if you believe in States' rights, these waivers are the way to give States the opportunity to provide better healthcare to their citizens. But here is the problem: The Democrats don't believe in States' rights or allowing State taxpayers and citizens any flexibility to provide better healthcare services to their citizens. The Democrats want these top-down, one-size-fits-all Federal programs. If there is choice and flexibility, they want to restrict it. It is how Big Government works, and the Democrats love Big Government, restrictive mandates, and socialism.

When the Democrats are not attacking Republicans for trying to dismantle ObamaCare, the Democrats turn around to their supporters and talk about their efforts to replace ObamaCare.

They don't want to keep ObamaCare programs as they are. They know ObamaCare is not working. They want to replace it with Medicare for All,

which would be the biggest expansion of government healthcare in history. By some estimates, Medicare for All would cost more than \$30 trillion over 10 years. This one program would double the Federal budget and would require massive tax increases on each and every man, woman, and child in America.

Right now, we collect \$3 trillion in Federal revenue. Medicare for All would require everyone's Federal taxes to more than double. Coincidentally, the Congressional Budget Office has so far been unable to do an official score of the Medicare for All bill. I have asked the sponsor of the bill, the junior Senator from Vermont, who happens to be the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, to join me in requesting the CBO score for his bill. So far, crickets.

Why wouldn't the Senator want a score of his bill? It is because the Democrats don't want you to know how much it would cost. They don't want you to know how many people would lose the employer-sponsored healthcare they have and like. They don't want you to know how much taxes would have to go up.

Medicare for All is the Democrats' dream: every American on a government-run healthcare program, every American reliant on the Federal Government for their healthcare. Any effort to undermine this goal is anathema to them.

So this week they are going after 1332 waivers and claiming they somehow undermine protections for people with preexisting conditions. The Senate Democratic leader claimed yesterday that these waivers are an effort to "sabotage healthcare for millions."

I find that statement interesting. I wonder what Democratic Governor Jared Polis of Colorado thinks of the Democratic leader's claim that he is trying to sabotage healthcare. His State used these 1332 waivers to offer healthcare plans to best meet the needs of Coloradans. They have seen premiums go down by 16 percent.

I wonder what Democratic Governor John Carney of Delaware would say? His State also used this waiver and has seen premiums drop by 13 percent.

I wonder what Democratic Governor Gina Raimondo of Rhode Island would say? Premiums in her State have gone down 6 percent since they got their 1332 waiver.

Contrary to the misinformation from the Democratic leader, these waivers do not eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions. These core protections, which I strongly support, remain unchanged.

This is personal to me. My brother grew up with a preexisting condition, and my mother had to drive 200 miles to a charity hospital just to get treatment for him. The Democrats are misrepresenting the facts about 1332 waivers because they realize they are losing the argument.

Remember the ObamaCare promise: You can keep your insurance plan,

your doctor, and every family will save \$2,500. ObamaCare only benefited hospitals, insurance companies, and the pharmaceutical industry. That is why they originally supported it. But for the average American, millions lost their insurance and their doctors, premiums skyrocketed, deductibles skyrocketed. The result is that while more people have healthcare insurance, fewer people have access to healthcare. Now they want to double down with Medicare for All.

There are three problems with our current healthcare system, all caused by government: cost, cost, and cost. None of the Democrats' proposals would do a thing to address the cost of healthcare. Their proposals only make the problem worse. Keep that in mind as you listen to the Democrats' fearmongering on healthcare. They have to misrepresent information because they can't defend their own position.

The American people don't want and can't afford Medicare for All. We need to reduce healthcare costs and provide a safety net for those who cannot afford their healthcare, not create a Federal Government-organized healthcare market, which causes healthcare costs to skyrocket.

Giving flexibility to the States is an easy way to increase access and quality of care for the American people. So, of course, Democrats oppose that—except for the Democratic Governors who are doing it every day.

If you needed any more evidence of how out of touch Washington Democrats have become, look no further than their criticism and their vote against Democratic Governors for supporting good policies that make sense.

Enough with the misrepresentations, enough with the nonsense, enough with the fearmongering. The American people deserve better.

Let's work together to lower the cost of healthcare so that all taxpayers can get the care they need at a price they can afford.

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

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

H.R. 2740

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to say a few words this afternoon about the funding of our military, the support for our troops, and what just happened on the U.S. Senate floor because it is a pretty sad exercise that, unfortunately, happens way too often in this body. I know it can be confusing to the people who are watching in the Gallery and on TV, but I want to explain what just happened because the

American people should know what is happening right now in this body.

Unfortunately, it is *deja vu* all over again on the Defense appropriations bill. Now, I enjoy my bipartisan work. Some of the best friends I have made here in the Senate have been on the other side of the aisle, but there are also principled disagreements on key issues between some of the parties here. One of them is whether we fully support our military and national defense and if we make that support a priority, not a political football, which is what we just witnessed on the Senate floor.

Now, I know all of my colleagues are patriotic. I have no doubt about that—all 100. We all love our country. Yet, in our looking at history over the decades and also just in the past few years, it certainly leaves one with the impression and the strong conclusion that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle support our military when it is convenient but have much higher priorities for which they are ready and willing to undermine military funding, readiness, and support for our troops who keep us safe.

To put this in context, we just voted to get on the Defense appropriations bill, which is the bill that funds our military. We had a budget agreement several months ago that did that. We just took up a previous appropriations bill. The plan in the Senate was to go from the bill on appropriations that we just passed to the Defense bill. That was the plan. Lo and behold, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said: No. We are going to filibuster the funding for our military. That is what just happened.

America, media, please understand that this is what just happened.

As I mentioned with regard to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this priority for the military isn't always there. I also mentioned decades. If you look at the national Presidential level over the past four decades during which a Democratic President has been in power—think about it: President Carter, President Clinton, President Obama—what has happened? Defense spending has been cut dramatically every time, and the readiness and morale of our military forces has plummeted. That is a fact.

I chair the Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support. From 2010 to 2015, defense spending for our military declined by 25 percent, which was President Obama's second term, and we are still digging out of the hole we dug for our military with regard to readiness. Let me give you a couple of examples.

In 2015, when I first got to the Senate, 3 out of 58 brigade combat teams in the U.S. Army were at the tier 1 level of readiness that we expect. Think about that. The men and women who joined the Army who were ready to fight were in 3 out of the 58 brigade combat teams. The brigade combat team is the 5,000-man building block of