

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—94

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander | Flake | Paul |
| Baldwin | Franken | Perdue |
| Barrasso | Gardner | Peters |
| Bennet | Gillibrand | Portman |
| Blumenthal | Graham | Reed |
| Blunt | Grassley | Risch |
| Booker | Harris | Roberts |
| Boozman | Hassan | Rounds |
| Brown | Hatch | Rubio |
| Cantwell | Heinrich | Sasse |
| Capito | Heitkamp | Schatz |
| Cardin | Heller | Schumer |
| Carper | Hirono | Scott |
| Casey | Johnson | Shaheen |
| Cassidy | Kaine | Shelby |
| Cochran | Kennedy | Stabenow |
| Collins | King | Strange |
| Coons | Klobuchar | Sullivan |
| Corker | Lankford | Tester |
| Cornyn | Leahy | Thune |
| Cortez Masto | Lee | Tillis |
| Cotton | Manchin | Toomey |
| Crapo | Markey | Udall |
| Cruz | McCaskey | Van Hollen |
| Daines | McConnell | Warner |
| Donnelly | Menendez | Warren |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Whitehouse |
| Durbin | Moran | Wicker |
| Enzi | Murkowski | Wyden |
| Ernst | Murphy | Young |
| Feinstein | Murray | |
| Fischer | Nelson | |

NAYS—1

Sanders

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|--------|---------|--------|
| Burr | Inhofe | McCain |
| Hoeven | Isakson | |

The bill (H.R. 2430) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to H.R. 2430, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. FISCHER. 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.

The Senator from Colorado.

RACE FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I feel sorry for the Presiding Officer. This is the second time in a week he has had to listen to me talk on the floor.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for her graciousness in letting me go first.

America, the Senate has passed the bill. We passed the bill. Today, the Senate passed the RACE for Children Act as part of the FDA user fee bill.

The RACE Act represents a breakthrough for kids fighting cancer. Each year, over 15,000 children will be diagnosed with the disease; 2,000 will lose their lives.

Across America, pediatric cancer is the leading cause of death for our children. Previously, companies with new treatments for adults studied their po-

tential benefits for kids. Companies exploring medication for adult diabetes, for example, also researched its potential for use in children. This research is vital because it provides critical information to doctors for treating sick children. Specifically, it helps them ensure that the treatments and dosages they prescribe are safe for young bodies. But there was a gap in the law as it existed before we passed this law.

Drug companies with new, precision medicine for adult cancers did not have to study possible value for pediatric cancers. That meant our kids continued to receive older treatments—some from the 1960s—which often had harmful side effects and consequences that can last a lifetime.

At the same time, breakthrough treatments have become available for adults, with better results and fewer harmful effects. While these treatments have great promise for kids, we were not doing enough to explore that potential.

Over the last 20 years, the Food and Drug Administration has approved 190 new cancer treatments for adults but just 3 new treatments for children. The FDA saw that gap, and they asked us to close it. That is precisely what the RACE for Children Act will do. For the first time in the country's history, it would require drug companies to study the potential of promising adult cancer treatments for children, closing this gap in the law and opening the door to promising new treatments for children in need.

Before this bill, thousands of kids in America lacked access to cutting-edge treatments and precision medicine that could have made the difference in their struggle against cancer.

During my time in the Senate, I have seen the anguish of too many parents who learned not only that their child has cancer but that they have little or no options for treatment. This bill will give them more options. It will give them more hope.

For Delaney from Grand Junction, CO, this bill could have been lifesaving. She battled cancer for over 5 years but passed away a year ago when she was out of treatment options. I wish to dedicate our work on this bill to her and to all kids who are bravely battling cancer day in and day out around the world.

We also should dedicate it to everyone who called and wrote and shared their family stories over the past months. This bill would never have passed without their voices. For people interested in keeping the system the same way, it was the voices of these families—in many instances, people who faced horrible tragedies in their lives—who made this possible. Because they engaged in this process, we passed a bill that will give thousands of kids a better chance to beat cancer and reclaim their lives.

America leads the world when it comes to treating cancer. We pioneer the latest and safest treatments. Every

American should have access to them, especially our kids, whose bright lives have just begun.

I want to recognize and acknowledge all of the pediatric cancer groups that came together to advance this bill, including pediatric advocates, cancer advocates, and hospitals in Colorado and around the country.

I also want to acknowledge, as always, the great leadership provided by Chairman ALEXANDER, Ranking Member MURRAY, and their staff for their work on this and the FDA user fee bill.

Finally, I wish to thank my partner in this work, Senator RUBIO, from Florida, for his leadership and passionate advocacy on behalf of our kids.

This bill is a reminder that, when we drop the political fights, we can focus on fights that truly matter, such as the fight against cancer, the fight for better healthcare in this country, and the fight for our kids and their future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

NORTH KOREA

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the growing threat from North Korea. Last month, the North Koreans conducted two intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM, tests. The first came as our Nation celebrated its Independence Day. The second test was conducted last week.

According to a number of reports, the second test demonstrated sufficient range to reach much of the United States. This increasing threat is a concern that I often hear about from Nebraskans.

For years, the United States has assessed North Korea to have an ICBM capability, but it was largely unproven. In his 5½ years in power, Kim Jong Un has conducted more missile tests than his father did during his 17-year reign. Under an aggressive testing program, North Korea has turned a theoretical ICBM capability into an undeniable reality.

Adding to the threat, they have made progress beyond ICBM technology. Over the past year, North Korea has conducted several tests of a submarine-launched ballistic missile. In February, the regime demonstrated a new solid-fueled, road-mobile ballistic missile.

Altogether, these developments reveal a dedicated, sophisticated development program that is relentlessly pursuing weapons designed for no other purpose than to threaten the United States and our allies. The rapid pace of development also indicates an increasingly capable scientific industrial base within North Korea.

Questions still remain about the regime's ability to miniaturize a nuclear warhead, deliver it accurately, and shield it from the stress associated with launch and then reentry. We should expect Kim Jong Un to overcome these obstacles if the status quo remains unchanged.

Admiral Harris, the commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, said in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year: "It is clearly a matter of when."

This sense confirms that a drastic change in our approach is required. Our current multilateral efforts have not yielded the results needed to keep the world safe.

The failure of the United Nations Security Council to issue a statement condemning North Korea's July 3 ICBM test was a step backward in the international effort to isolate and to punish the regime for its illegal behavior. With Russia and China preventing any substantive action at the United Nations, I believe we must aggressively implement unilateral sanctions to punish the companies and the countries underwriting Pyongyang's belligerence.

One thing is certain. The principal economic enablers of the Kim regime are China and Russia.

Beijing provides direct food and energy assistance to North Korea and is by far the largest market for North Korean exports, such as minerals. North Korean hackers reportedly conduct cyber crime operations from northern China, and almost all of North Korea's internet access is provided via a fiber-optic cable running between those two nations. North Korea has also used Chinese banks to conduct transactions associated with its illicit proliferation activities and its criminal operations.

Russia's economic ties are more limited, but the Russians have been known to import North Korean labor and provide energy supplies, including jet fuel, to Pyongyang.

These ties provide China and Russia with influence over North Korea. How have they used that influence? Instead of helping to restrain the regime, they appear to be rewarding its bad behavior. Reports indicate both nations are increasing their bilateral trade, with several claiming trade between Russia and North Korea increased by 85 percent in comparison to last year.

Some argue China is unwilling to impose harsh restrictions on trade with Pyongyang because it would risk the regime's collapse and send a wave of North Korean refugees across their border. This argument might explain providing minimal assistance, but it does not justify billions of dollars in cross-border trade, nor does it explain why North Korean ballistic missiles are photographed being hauled by Chinese-made trucks.

China and Russia must believe the Kim regime serves their strategic interests.

For our purposes, these economic relationships are avenues through which we can impose costs on facilitating North Korea's belligerent behavior. Congress gave President Trump broad authority to take action against the nations supporting the North Korean regime's illegal activities, particularly those fostering the regime's hostile

cyber activities, weapons programs, abuse of human rights, and their criminal networks. It is time for the President to use his authority to show China and Russia that continued support of the North Koreans will harm their own interests.

The administration has already begun to implement such measures. In June, the United States announced sanctions against a Chinese bank, two Chinese individuals, and a Chinese entity for supporting the North Korean regime. It appears, though, that this warning shot has fallen on deaf ears, because there has been no change in their behavior.

Chinese officials are sticking to their talking points, and they are objecting to any measures so they don't have to bear the costs of their own behavior. Take China's reaction to South Korea's decision to deploy the THAAD system. South Korea deployed a THAAD battery to improve the defenses against North Korean missiles. This is a defensive system that poses no threat to China.

Yet how did China respond? They shut down South Korean-owned department stores. The South Korean conglomerate who owns the stores also owns the property where the THAAD system was deployed. Moreover, the conglomerate's websites were hit by cyber attacks, and unofficial restrictions appear to have been imposed on imports of South Korean cosmetics and South Korean tourism.

It is clear that the Chinese view North Korea through a narrow lens of immediate strategic interest. That is how we must target our actions. By rigorously applying sanctions, we can make clear to China and any other nation doing business with the North Korean regime that continued support for the DPRK will harm their interests.

Of course, sanctions are not a panacea, and aggressively applying them does carry risk. Indeed, if we could be totally confident that the secondary sanctions would solve this problem, I suspect that they would have been implemented long ago. Time is not on our side and 8 years of strategic patience has narrowed our options. If we want different results, we must change our strategy, and we must make these changes now.

While firmly applying additional sanctions, the United States must also increase its defenses. Of course, our nuclear deterrent remains our country's ultimate protection against nuclear attack. Wednesday's successful test of a Minuteman III ICBM by our military provides continued assurance that our deterrent remains reliable and ready. We cannot rely on deterrence alone, and we must ensure that our missile defense efforts stay ahead of North Korea's accelerating developments.

I am a longtime member, and now the chairman, of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, which oversees our missile defense programs. Through this role, I

have had the benefit of working closely with the Directors of the Missile Defense Agency and the commanders of STRATCOM to improve our missile defenses.

Over the years, the Senate Armed Services Committee has authorized additional funding for the construction of a new missile defense radar, known as the Long Range Discrimination Radar, or the LRDR, to track potential threats from North Korea. The committee is also focused on improving the robustness of our homeland missile defense system, known as the Ground-based Midcourse Defense, or GMD, system as well.

This year in the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, our committee authorized over \$200 million to meet unfunded requirements for that system.

The GMD System is our only defense against North Korea's ICBMs. It consists of silo-based interceptors, which are located in Alaska and California, supported by space-based and terrestrial-based sensors and a vast command and control network.

It provides an effective capability against North Korea's ICBMs, as was demonstrated in a successful intercept test on May 30 of this year. During that test, a single interceptor successfully destroyed an ICBM class target. It was the longest range test, and it was conducted at a greater altitude and closing speed than the system had ever faced before.

This successful test was an important milestone that visibly demonstrated the impressive capabilities of our GMD System. However, shortly after, then-Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Admiral Jim Syring, testified before the House Subcommittee on Strategic Forces that our defenses were not "comfortably ahead of the threat."

These comments came before North Korea's July ICBM tests. I strongly believe the rate of North Korea's technical progress demands a response. There are options before us. For example, additional ground-based radars and space-based sensors would improve our ability to track incoming threats, discriminate warheads from debris and decoys, and conduct kill assessments to confirm that the threats have been destroyed. The Redesignated Kill Vehicle Program, which will modernize the portion of the interceptor that impacts and destroys hostile warheads in space, promises to increase the capabilities of our current system. Deploying more interceptors, whether at the existing facility in Fort Greely, AK, or at a new installation, would add capacity and enable our defenses to better handle ICBM threats.

There are also advanced technology programs, such as the development of lasers mounted on unmanned systems, which hold significant promise for future missile defense. The Missile Defense Agency is pursuing these options, but the question remains: Are our current efforts enough? To help answer

this question, the administration is conducting a review of ballistic missile threats and our missile defense posture—the first of its kind since 2010. There is no doubt that the threat environment of today is far more sophisticated and challenging than it was during the last review.

Our missile defense posture has remained largely unchanged since 2013. When responding to North Korean missile developments, then-Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced the Obama administration's decision to increase the number of deployed interceptors from 30 to 44. The final deployment of these interceptors is expected by the end of this year, which demonstrates another point that we must bear in mind when we consider our missile defenses: Decisions take years to implement.

The fact that we are ahead of the threat today is not good enough. We should be asking ourselves whether the steps we are taking today are adequate to defeat the threats we know are coming in the future. I expect the administration's review to confirm the growing threat and articulate a clear response. The review is expected to conclude in the fall, and I plan to hold hearings to examine whether it is a proposed way forward.

In closing, I would note that the phrase "no good options" is frequently repeated when it comes to confronting the threat that is posed by North Korea. This may be true, but the gravity of the situation demands action. Kim Jong Un has repeatedly threatened to attack U.S. cities with nuclear weapons. His capacity to carry this threat grows with every passing day. We must change our strategy to protect the American people. Strong secondary sanctions and enhanced missile defense should form the basis of that new approach.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MARK BRAUDIS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week, I have been coming to the floor to talk about the wonderful people in my State. A lot of people have visited Alaska. If you haven't and you are watching on TV, we really, really want to welcome you to come. It will be the trip of a lifetime; I guarantee it.

What we like to do when we talk about our Alaskan of the Week is talk about someone who has made a real impact, someone who doesn't get a lot of attention, someone who has made an impact on his community or country,

and let people know we are thinking about them, let people know we are proud of them. Before recess, I want to do that for a couple of Alaskans today, and I would like to start by talking about a gentleman who has gotten a little press lately in Alaska, but I want the country to hear about it. It is really a remarkable story—Mr. Mark Braudis.

Let me tell you a little bit about Mark. Mark came to my attention through a recent column by Charles Wohlforth in the Alaska Dispatch News.

Mark is originally from Pennsylvania. When he was just 17 years old, he joined the Navy, like a lot of Alaskans. We have more vets per capita than any State in the country. He was deployed in 1972.

Mark said:

When I was in high school, everyone had long hair and were anti-government. That's not the way I was. I was for God and country. If my brothers were over there in Vietnam, I wanted to stand with them.

So he went. When a lot of people were avoiding service, he went.

When Mark got out, he couldn't find a job, so he began to hitchhike across the country into Canada and other places, and he wound up in the magical place we call Alaska. Mark arrived in 1976. After leaving once and coming back, he got a job as a taxi driver—a good job. He met and fell in love with one of his passengers, a beautiful woman named Helen. They went on to have seven children—Stephen, David, Kelly, Jared, Michael, and Jenny. Helen was a great mother.

Then, unfortunately, as sometimes happens in families in certain circumstances, tragedy struck their family. In 2007, Helen was walking down a busy road and was hit and unfortunately killed by a car passing by.

Faced with unspeakable grief, Mark knew he couldn't fall apart. He had seven kids between the ages of 6 and 16, and he had to take care of them. One of them was in third grade at the time and couldn't stop crying over the loss of his mom. The school called often, and Mark—still a taxi driver—left work to pick him up. The hours of tending to his kids began to rack up. He couldn't pay the rent. His kids and he had to eventually live in a homeless shelter.

A social worker wanted to put the kids up for adoption, but Mark refused. They had lost their mother, they had lost their home, and they weren't going to lose their dad. The family needed him, and they were a team.

Eventually—and this is so great; it happens all across Alaska, all across America—with the help of the community, in this case, their local Catholic church, Saint Anthony's Parish, Mark was able to afford rent for a three-bedroom apartment with one bathroom where they still live today and to buy his own taxi license.

In the face of adversity, he raised his kids to be strong, proud, caring, re-

sponsible, and to do the right thing. They stuck together. They ran together, sometimes as many as 6 miles a day—the Navy veteran out with his children. They studied together. They were good kids. They didn't miss school or the bus. They never got in trouble. They were a team.

This is what is remarkable about this family: Six out of the seven Braudis children, whom I have been speaking about, have joined the Marines Corps. They have taken after their dad, serving their country—six out of seven. How many families in America can say that? The seventh couldn't because of a medical issue, and he is nearly finished with a degree in electrical engineering from the University of Alaska in Anchorage and tutors students in math at the university.

The youngest one, Jenny, a senior in high school, has already been sworn in to the Marines. She wants to drive tanks. The middle child, Jared, is the only one who joined the infantry. When they all get together, he kids them, telling them he is the tough one, but I am sure they are all tough. Jared said:

When we were growing up, my dad just made things right. He still does.

What did Mark learn from these challenges? He said:

When you're married, you become one. And when my wife passed away, she brought me to God with her. And then I brought my children to God. I didn't understand it then, but I do now. It's been one miracle after another. Also, what I learned? I'm a dad above everything else.

Well, Mark, thank you. Thanks to you, your children, and your family for this amazing example and for doing such a great job of raising your kids. You are a model for all of us. Thank you for being our Alaskan of the Week.

TRIBUTE TO KATHY HEINDL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, I come to the floor every week to talk about my great State and to talk about the people of my great State—the people who make it a better place for all of us. We call these people the Alaskan of the Week. It is one of the most fulfilling parts of my job to come here and talk about people who make a difference, people who don't get a lot of press, people who are doing the right thing for their country and for their community.

Right now in Alaska, we have tourists, people coming from all over, and one of the things happening in Alaska is salmon season. The biggest runs in the world—the bounty of our great State—are happening right now, and the fish are running. If you or anyone listening has ever had the opportunity to catch or eat wild Alaskan salmon, of course, it is the memory of a lifetime. There is nothing better; there is no better fish in the world.

There is great salmon fishing all across Alaska, but one of the most heavily fished areas in Alaska and the