

I am not opposed to competition. I favor competition. I favor an American-made engine. That is not the issue. Here is the problem: You can't just waive a wand or pass an appropriation and recreate a new rocket engine. It can take up to 5 years. What will happen in that 5-year period of time while we in America are developing at least one new American-made reliable rocket engine? We will have to be dependent either on that Russian engine in transition or run the risk that we are not going to have any engines available when we desperately need them for satellite launches. That is exactly what the Secretary of Defense has told the senior Senator from Arizona, and he just will not buy it. He has said: We have to cut the cord and walk away from the Russian engines.

Here is something he can't answer: NASA also uses engines to launch satellites and people into space. Why would we launch people into space? For the space station. How do we get those folks up to the space station and bring them home? On Russian rocket engines.

If the senior Senator from Arizona says that's it, cold turkey, no more Russian engines, what in the world is he going to do about NASA's needs for this engine in supplying the space station and making sure that the folks in orbit can safely come home? He can't answer that question because the answer truly tells him the problem he is creating here.

What we are trying to do is this: Transition to American-made engines. I am for that. Create competition for space launches in the future. I am for that. And make sure we do it in a thoughtful, sensible way and not at the expense of America's national defense, our national intelligence, or the future of our space program. We can work with the Senator from Arizona. I would like to do that, but when he comes to the floor and suggests that all of us who oppose him are somehow cronies of Vladimir Putin or marching to the orders of Donald Trump, it doesn't create a very productive environment for conversation.

Let's do the right thing. Let's work together on an appropriations authorization. Let's put the Russian engines behind us in an orderly way, let's create the American engine, and let's push for competition. That is where I got started on this, and that is where I am today.

We need to listen to the experts—the experts at the Pentagon—who have told us repeatedly that to do this cold turkey and to cut off the Russian engines is, frankly, to jeopardize our national defense, security, intelligence gathering, and even our space program. That is something I hope the senior Senator from Arizona can agree is an outcome which we should avoid.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue we are confronting in the Senate, and it is an issue folks in Pennsylvania and across the country are dealing with every day; that is, the opioid crisis. There are a lot of ways to describe this crisis. I am pleased to be able to talk about this issue with two of my colleagues who will be following me in succession after my remarks have concluded.

This Senator wants to thank, in a particular way, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator SHAHEEN, and our leadership for bringing this issue to the forefront within our caucus and here in the Senate. I know the effort to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—known by the acronym CARA—is a bipartisan effort. I certainly appreciate that.

In the case of Senator WHITEHOUSE, he brings a deep reservoir of experience as a Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney, as well as the attorney general of Rhode Island. He brings a law enforcement set of experience as well as his caring and concern about those who have addiction issues. We appreciate his leadership. Senator BROWN has worked on this for many years in the Senate and as a Member of the House of Representatives. This is an issue that confronts all of us in our States. Our efforts have to be commensurate to match the severity of the problem.

This week the Senate missed an important opportunity to invest substantial resources in our Nation's heroin crisis. The amendment offered by Senators SHAHEEN and WHITEHOUSE would have provided \$600 million in emergency funding to aid public health professionals and law enforcement, the two main segments of our society that deal with the challenge of addiction on a daily basis. That amendment was defeated, and I think that was the wrong conclusion for the Senate and wrong for the country.

While the Senate failed to act on this amendment, there is no reason we shouldn't find other opportunities to invest in anti-heroin strategies or, expressed another way, strategies that will lessen or reduce the likelihood that more people will be addicted to some opioid which often leads to other kinds of challenges such as heroin. It too often leads not just to the darkness of addiction but literally to the darkness of death itself. We have some work to do.

We know we can pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the CARA Act, as I mentioned before. That is good, but it is not nearly enough. We

have to do more than simply pass good legislation that will authorize policies to better confront the challenge. That will not be enough. If we have in place new programs, new approaches, and new strategies, that is a measure of progress, but we can't ask medical professionals to do more to treat addiction if they don't have the resources. We cannot ask law enforcement to do more if they don't have the resources.

Heroin overdose deaths have increased 244 percent from 2007 to 2013. In roughly a 6-year timeframe, heroin overdose deaths are up 244 percent. It is hard to even comprehend that kind of increase of a death statistic—not just a number but a number that indicates the increase in the number of deaths. That alone should motivate us to do everything possible to do whatever it takes. Whatever authority, whatever policy, whatever dollars we need to invest in this, we have to do that. There are lots of other numbers, and sometimes you can get lost in reciting the numbers. I will mention a few that are relevant to Pennsylvania before I conclude.

In addition to just passing the CARA bill, we ought to focus on taking measurable steps to solve the crisis. We don't want to just address the issue, confront the challenge, we want to solve the crisis. It will not happen in 1 year, and it will not happen because of one bill or one policy, but we have to put every possible resource or tool on the table to actually solve the crisis.

There are lots of ways to illustrate the degree of the problem. I will talk about a couple of communities in Pennsylvania, just by way of example.

The Washington Post—a great newspaper here—went to Washington, PA. We have a county and city just below the city of Pittsburgh, just south of Pittsburgh, Washington County and the city of Washington. The Post went there last summer and began to interview people at the local level.

In one of the more stunning statistics they found in their reporting, in 70 minutes there were eight overdoses related to heroin—in this case not yet deaths but overdoses. A newspaper could track in 1 hour 10 minutes, eight overdoses in one community in one State. Then they tracked it over a 2-day timeframe. In 48 hours there were 25 overdoses in Washington County, PA, and 3 deaths, in a 48-hour period. I cite that not just for the compelling nature of those numbers but because of where it happened. This is not happening in communities we used to think of as having a major heroin or drug addiction problem. We tended to think of it, at least in my lifetime, as being an urban issue that big cities have this problem and less so in small towns, suburbs, and rural communities. In this case, this horror, this evil knows no geographic or class boundaries. It is happening in big cities and very small towns in Pennsylvania. It is happening in suburban communities, high- and low-income communities and

in middle-income communities. It is happening everywhere. There is no escaping it.

If it is happening in places like Washington County—the city of Washington, PA, is not a big city but a moderate-sized city. Other parts of that county tend to be more rural, small towns to rural. If it is happening there in those kinds of numbers, in 70 minutes or 48 hours, overdoses and overdose deaths, that gives you an indication of the gravity of the problem.

The Coroners Association in Pennsylvania, which has to track the number of deaths in their counties, reported that in just over a few years in Pennsylvania, the number of deaths from overdoses went from less than 50 to hundreds of deaths in just a couple of years. The gravity of this problem is self-evident.

It is not good enough to diagnose the problem and recite statistics. We have to solve the crisis. There is no doubt this is a huge issue for the country.

By not passing the funding that we tried to pass, we are missing a chance to support, for example, the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant, the so-called SABG, or the SA block grant. That is an existing program—an existing block grant program—that works. The only good news here, in this debate about what policy to put in place, is that local officials know what they are doing. Addiction and medical professionals know exactly what to do. They know exactly what works. They know exactly what they need. What they are asking us for is a little bit of policy or a significant amount of policy, maybe. But they are also asking for research and resources, and we have to give those resources to them.

I conclude with the following. We know that good treatment works. All the professionals tell us it works. We know so much more today than we did 25 years ago about what works. We know that good treatment works. It takes a long time. There is no 90-day program here because it takes a lot longer than that. So we know that for sure. There is no dispute about that. We also know that good treatment costs money. You cannot just have good intentions here.

Lifesaving overdose reversal drugs such as naloxone cost money. The good news is we have a drug to reverse the adverse impact of an overdose, and yet a lot of communities cannot afford to get this very important drug called naloxone, the so-called reversal drug as some call it.

Intercepting drugs before they reach our streets costs money. The worse this epidemic gets, the more these services are in demand.

So Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—must provide additional funding to make sure local communities can meet the demand. We know that investing in programs that treat addiction and save lives is an abiding obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

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

Mr. CASEY. It is an abiding obligation that we must fulfill. We have to tackle this problem. We can't do it without resources.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am delighted to join Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania and Senator BROWN of Ohio on the floor this morning to applaud what appears to be the imminent passage of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. So far we have had less than a handful of votes against this bill at any stage through the voting on it, and I suspect that some of those votes may have had to do with amendments and so forth. We might even do better than that on final passage.

I thank my cosponsors. This was not a bill that was just dreamed up in back offices. We had five national seminars in Washington, bringing people in from all around the country to share their experiences, to share their advice, to share their best practices, and to inform the development of this bill. It has been years of work in the making.

On our side of the aisle, Senator KLOBUCHAR has been an extremely valuable colleague. On the other side of the aisle, Senator PORTMAN and Senator AYOTTE were our coconspirators on this bill. I thank them and extend my appreciation to all of them.

This truly is a comprehensive bill: everything from at the point of overdose getting naloxone into the hands of first responders so that lives can be saved; through the prescribing process and the prescription drug monitoring process; through a whole variety of new treatment programs; and through intervention for people who are incarcerated and the prevention of incarceration, particularly for our people in veterans courts and so forth, who can be diverted out of the prison system through new means of treatment such as medically assisted treatment that is emerging as a very promising new strategy; and all the way, ultimately, to disposal of excess drugs. This truly is a comprehensive bill.

Its only faults are ones that the Republican leadership are in a terrific position to remedy, if they would.

The first is that there is no additional funding to support any of these new programs that I have described. The funding for the accounts in question was determined months and months and months ago in the Appropriations Committee before anybody could know what this bill was going to look like on the floor.

When the final deal was reached, the numbers actually matched the Presi-

dent's budget, and the President's budget was issued even before the appropriations measure came out of its relevant subcommittee. So the President's budget folks would have had to have been astonishing masters of prediction in order to put in money for programs that weren't even law at that time.

There has been considerable commentary from the other side that there is funding for this, but what they overlook is that, yes, there is funding for these programs, but you would have to take it away from other treatment and recovery programs to fund these. It would be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Now, an argument could be made that under this bill, Paul will be a more effective program than the pre-CARA Peter would have been, and, therefore, robbing Peter to pay Paul is a net good. But, please, let's not pretend there is money for this.

If there is one indication of how there really isn't new money for this, it is the fact that our friends on the other side can't agree on how much money there is for this. Some Senators have said that there is \$78 million for funding CARA. The majority leader has said there is \$400 million to fund CARA. The deputy majority leader has said there is \$517 million to fund CARA. If the money were real, I suspect they could agree on the amount of it. I think the fact of the matter is that there is no new money for this, and the sooner we can get this funded, the sooner it will save lives.

The second problem is that the House, under Republican leadership, has taken no action on this bill. No committee has taken it up and passed it. So I take this opportunity to call on the leadership here and in the House to put money where their proverbial mouth is to pass this bill, to get some funding behind it—Senator SHAHEEN's measure would have been terrific—and to get some action out of their colleagues in the House. If we pass it in the Senate and the House takes no action, this will be a sham, and that will have been a shame.

With that, I yield the floor for Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you to my colleagues for the terrific work they have done on such an important issue, which in my State sort of began in the most rural of the areas of the State and spread and spread and spread. This is the right kind of comprehensive response for this, but as Senator WHITEHOUSE just said, it means real funding for CARA and what we are doing.

I am pleased we are coming together in a bipartisan way overall, finally taking action on the opioid epidemic that is devastating communities across our country.

We know some of the statistics. More people died in my State than in the country as a whole in 2015 from opioid

overdoses rather than they did from auto accidents. We are experiencing a record number of fatal overdoses. There is no State and probably county untouched by the scourge.

We need to remember the human cost of addiction. In Warren, OH, a couple of weeks ago, there was middle-age woman who now has a child now in his midtwenties who has suffered addiction for a dozen years, has been in and out and is doing better, and then falls back. His family is affluent, so his treatment has been better than some. But she says that when there is an addiction, it afflicts the whole family. Nobody is really exempt.

In my State, 2,500 Ohio families in one year lost a loved one to addiction. Thousands more continued to struggle with opioid abuse or with a family member's addiction. It is not an individual problem or a character flaw. It is a chronic disease. Right now, it is placing an unbearable burden on families and communities in our health care system. That is why we need to tackle this at the national level.

It is why I am encouraged to see us debate this Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or the CARA Act. The ideas in this bill are an important first step in tackling the epidemic, but they are just the first step. On their own they are not nearly enough to put a dent in this epidemic. The initiatives are going to mean very little—and here is the key point that both Senator CASEY and Senator WHITEHOUSE made—without additional funding to back them up.

My colleagues Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire and Senator WHITEHOUSE introduced an amendment that would have provided an additional \$600 million to fight the opioid epidemic. That would be a serious commitment in putting the ideas in this bill into place into action.

But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked this investment. Again, they want to do things on the cheap. They want to pass things to pat ourselves on the back but not provide the funding to actually accomplish things. It would block the investment in health professionals and communities who are on the frontlines of this battle.

You simply can't do a roundtable with health professionals and people working toward recovery and families affected by it without hearing from them. They need resources locally. The States aren't coming up with it adequately. They need resources, and they need real investment in prevention programs. We need real investment in treatment options to help patients not just get cured and get clean but stay clean.

Earlier this year, I introduced the Heroin and Prescription Drug Abuse Prevention and Reduction Act with my colleague Senator BALDWIN of Wisconsin. Our bill would boost prevention efforts that would improve tools for crisis response. It would expand access

to treatment, and it would provide support for lifelong recovery, the kind of serious investment we need to back up our rhetoric.

In public health emergencies, we are sometimes, somehow able to come up with necessary money—swine flu, Ebola, Zika virus. But addiction is not a public health emergency. Addiction is a public health problem, but one we need to fund in an ongoing way. You can look at the spike in the number of deaths. You can conclude nothing else but that it is a long-term public health problem. Too many lives have been destroyed. Too many communities have been devastated. I am just puzzled why my colleagues won't come up with \$600 million for this very important public health program. It is time to get serious. It is time to call it what it is—the public health crisis that demands real and immediate investment, not more empty rhetoric, not more empty gestures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

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

#### FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about what I have been hearing from people in Wyoming about the issue of whether President Obama should nominate the next Supreme Court Justice.

This past last weekend, I was around the State of Wyoming in Rock Springs, in Rawlins, and in Casper and the weekend before that, as well, in Casper, Cheyenne, and Big Piney. I am hearing the same thing from all around the State of Wyoming.

What I am hearing is that President Obama should not be the one to put another nominee on the Supreme Court and that it should come down to the people: Give the people a voice. That is what I am hearing back home.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, is doing exactly what the people of Wyoming are insisting upon—the right thing. He is doing the right thing by insisting that the American people decide. I think Senator GRASSLEY is doing a great service to this body, to the American people, and also to whomever the next President nominates for the Supreme Court.

On Monday, after traveling around the State of Wyoming, Senator ENZI, who had also traveled around the State of Wyoming this past weekend, and I jointly held a telephone townhall meeting. Folks at home are very familiar with these. We do these just about every month. We have a chance to visit with people about what is on their mind. Then there is a little way you can do a poll during that telephone

townhall meeting, and 88 percent of the people of Wyoming agree with Senator GRASSLEY, agree with Senator ENZI and with me about the next Supreme Court Justice and giving the people a voice.

Democrats want to turn this all around into a fight on the Senate floor. They want this to be a backroom deal between the President and the special interest groups. These are the groups that are pushing the President to appoint someone who will rule the way they want. But that is not what the American people want.

The American people—and certainly the people in Wyoming—want this to be a fight about what happens and what they decide in the voting booth in November. When an election is just months away, the people should be allowed to consider possible Supreme Court nominees as one factor in deciding whom they will support for President. This shouldn't really even be controversial.

Democrats in the past have come to the floor, and they said it would be a bad idea to let the President make a lifetime appointment in his last months in office. In 1992 Senator JOE BIDEN came to the Senate floor to explain his rule. He called it the Biden rule, and it had to do with Supreme Court nominations.

On the Senate floor, JOE BIDEN—now the Vice President, former chairman of the Judiciary Committee—said that once the Presidential election is underway—and I will tell you, Madam President, the Presidential election is underway—“action on a Supreme Court nomination must be put off until after the election campaign is over.”

Those are the words of JOE BIDEN. Senator BIDEN said that a temporary vacancy on the Court was “quite minor compared to the cost that a nominee, the President, the Senate, and our Nation would have to pay for what assuredly would be a bitter fight.”

That is what Senator BIDEN at the time was worried about. He was worried that a bitter fight over a nominee would do damage to the nominee and to the Senate. He knew there would be Senators who would come to the floor and try to politicize this process for their own purposes, and we are seeing the Democrats doing that right now. He knew it because that is what Democrats have done for years.

This is politics as usual for the Democrats. It is the way they tend to live their lives here on the Senate floor—talking this way. It is exactly what Democrats did when Robert Bork was nominated to serve on the Supreme Court. So Vice President BIDEN, former Senator BIDEN, understands it completely. It is what they did when Miguel Estrada was nominated to the circuit court. It is what Democrats did when Samuel Alito was nominated to the Supreme Court. Democrats in the Senate even filibustered Justice Alito when he was the nominee. They did everything they could to slander good, qualified people to try to score political points. It is what they do.