

the floor and said “What is the problem?” because we can’t seem to figure out what the problem is. We learn today that the problem is that he doesn’t want the program inventory to be public because if the American people and the Congress and the Office of Management and Budget see the programs, they might actually do things with efficiency. That seems surprising to me, but if you read the transcript, that is what he just said. The fear is that they will actually find out what the Federal Government does in the programs.

Surely that is not his objection. Surely no one in this body would say: I hope the American people and the Office of Management and Budget never find out what the Federal Government does.

Here is what this bill does. The reason we could not have a good listing—Senator SCHUMER mentioned that there is no way to do a list right now—is because there is no definition for a program. The Federal Government has struggled with that simple definition, so this bill fixes that. The reason that inventory doesn’t exist gets solved with this. So literally Senator SCHUMER’s objection as to why we shouldn’t do this is nonsensical.

The second issue with this is the fear of OMB and Mick Mulvaney actually trying to slash programs. OMB and Mick Mulvaney have no authority to take down a program. Congress does that, and Senator SCHUMER knows that better than anyone in this body. While OMB can make recommendations, Congress has to actually vote to act on those recommendations. He can’t just slash programs. He can recommend it. He can say: Here is an issue of inefficiency. It is the exact same as the Obama administration could have done, the exact same as any future administration could do, but Congress must act on that.

It seems exceptionally shortsighted to say: I don’t want the American people to know what the government is doing, because of the current administration and someone I don’t like.

In a few years, there will be a different administration. That may be in 7 years, or that may be in 4 years, but in a few years, there will be a different administration, but this problem will still remain. Agencies can’t see what other agencies are doing, this Congress can’t see what the agencies are doing, and the American people cannot see what the agencies are doing.

I would say that for the benefit of the taxpayers—not the benefit of Washington bureaucracies but for the benefit of the taxpayers—we should allow this information to go public. I hope we can continue to work with Senator SCHUMER’s office, after making 27 changes that his staff recommended, to finish this document.

Yesterday, Senator SCHUMER was caught in the hallway and was asked what the problem is in the Senate, and his response to a reporter was that the

Senate needs more comity. I would agree.

The House approved this unanimously. Our committee approved this unanimously. It has come to the floor and has but one person who believes that the American people should not have access to the information on the programs they pay for.

I would love to see more comity in this body and for us to work this out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, an opioid epidemic is sweeping the country. More than 60,000 Americans are dying from opioid overdoses every year—more than the number of Americans who died in all 20 years of the Vietnam war. What a staggering fact that is, but behind each number is a tragedy for a family who loses their loved one.

Today, I want to tell the story of the Hacala family from Rogers, AR. It is a story of love, persistence, courage, and, I hope, a story that will save other families from the tragedy they felt.

Betty and Steve Hacala are joining us in the Gallery today. I met Betty and Steve 3 weeks ago at a roundtable on the opioid epidemic in Little Rock with Attorney General Leslie Rutledge, State and local law enforcement, and the families of opioid victims. The news is full of tragic deaths from heroin, fentanyl, and prescription drugs. I met families that day whose children died from those well-known drugs, but I learned from the Hacalas about another killer: unwashed poppy seeds.

Their son, Stephen Junior, died in his sleep from an overdose 2 years ago. Stephen was only 24 years old and was a recent graduate of the University of Arkansas. He loved to play guitar, and he was very accomplished at it. He was the joy of his parents’ life, and he was the joy of his sisters Christina and Lauren’s lives. His sudden death came as a shock to them, but they got another shock when an autopsy determined that Stephen died of morphine intoxication. There were no drugs in his apartment—no pill bottles, no needles, nothing. What had been found was a 5-pound bag of unwashed poppy seeds. Stephen had ordered the seeds on Amazon. The Arkansas crime lab soon determined that the poppy seeds were the source of the morphine that killed Stephen.

Stephen’s death resulted in part because of a dangerous gap in our Nation’s drug laws. It has been well known for ages that poppies are dangerous, both addictive and toxic. That is why it is illegal to grow or own almost any part of the poppy—the straw, the pod, the latex. There is an exception, of course, for poppy seeds, which many people enjoy on bagels, muffins, cakes, and other pastries. The seed itself isn’t addictive, but unwashed seeds tend to still have bits of the plant on them, which can be washed off and used to create a powerful narcotic.

To give a sense of just how deadly poppy seed tea can be, a lethal dose of morphine is about 200 milligrams, but researchers at Sam Houston State University, commissioned by the Hacalas, concluded that there were about 6,000 milligrams of morphine in that 5-pound bag of seeds that Stephen bought. That is over 30 times the lethal dose. Stephen had no way of knowing just how toxic these seeds were.

While there are plenty of legitimate uses for washed poppy seeds, there are no legitimate uses for unwashed seeds. Yet drug dealers and unscrupulous merchants are abusing the legal status of washed seeds to profit and to push unwashed seeds, which are widely available through online retailers. And when you read the user comments, you can easily find instructions for how to brew poppy seed tea and a description of its narcotic effects.

So there is no question of these unwashed seeds being used for grandma’s poppy seed cake; it is plain they are being used to smuggle the banned drug into our homes, and the manufacturers and distributors should know that. And Betty and Steve made sure they did. It is hard to imagine the grief they feel. It would have been easy to despair, but they did not. They want to save other families from their fate, to be sure Stephen’s death would have meaning. They researched the issue, commissioning that report from Sam Houston State and studying the market for unwashed poppy seeds. They also became advocates, meeting with community leaders and elected officials. As I said, I only learned about the danger of unwashed poppy seeds by meeting the Hacalas.

After that meeting, I put in a call to the leadership of Walmart and Amazon, which at the time both allowed unwashed poppy seeds to be sold on their websites. They listened to our case and quickly agreed to stop selling poppy seeds that are labeled as unwashed. This is important. The two behemoths of online commerce agreeing to take down those seeds was a victory and a testament to what normal citizens like Steve and Betty can accomplish.

This is more than a labeling problem. In fact, some of the most potent and deadly seeds, which we know about thanks to the work of Steve and Betty, are not labeled as unwashed and are still available for purchase. Therefore, I will work in the Senate and with the Drug Enforcement Agency to ban unwashed seeds entirely. But today I do want to take a moment to thank Amazon and Walmart for taking an important first step for our country, for our State, and for the Hacalas and families like theirs.

It is always hard to lose a loved one, and a child is the hardest loss of all. I suspect nothing can assuage that kind of grief. But because of the Hacalas’ courage and determination, we can hope that a few more families will be spared it. That is an act of true love for Stephen and for their fellow Americans.

Mr. President, the office of Secretary of State has always held a place of special prominence in the President's Cabinet. The conduct of foreign policy is the highest craft of statesmanship. In the Secretary's hands rest matters of the most sensitive, delicate, and consequential nature, affairs of war and—we always hope—peace. President Kennedy put it simply when he said: "Domestic policy can only defeat us; foreign policy can kill us." That is why Presidents across the ages have filled the office of Secretary of State with some of the most distinguished statesmen in our history, names such as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Adams, Clay, Webster, Marshall, Kissinger.

Now we will add the name of Mike Pompeo. Very soon, the Senate will confirm Mike to be our 70th Secretary of State. I strongly support his nomination, as I have made widely known in recent days. Before we vote, I want to emphasize what a truly impressive nominee he is—a man of noble character whose name future generations, I suspect, will include on the roster of those great statesmen.

Mike has succeeded at every stage of life. He graduated first in his class at West Point and then joined the 2nd Cavalry on the frontline of freedom in West Germany. After his military service, he excelled at Harvard Law School. He later started one business and served as president of another. He became a respected community leader in his adopted home of Wichita, where his fellow Kansans elected him in repeated landslides to serve them in the House of Representatives. Wichita is also where he had his biggest victory of all—winning the hand of his bride, Susan. Of course, he has served as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency for the past 15 months after being confirmed by the Senate on a bipartisan vote of 66 to 32. Since then, I have watched Mike lead the CIA, boost its morale, and put the right people in the right places, driving them to succeed and holding them accountable.

None of this surprises me because I have known Mike for as long as I have been in public life. When I was an unknown candidate for the House, he called me out of the blue to encourage me and offer support. He was one of my best friends in the House and one of my strongest supporters and smartest advisers in my Senate campaign. As Members of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees, we traveled the world together to learn, to conduct oversight, and to engage with foreign leaders.

Mike and I have collaborated on several occasions to highlight gathering threats to our Nation. In 2013 we wrote an op-ed in the Washington Post calling on our party to support a strike against Bashar al-Assad for using chemical weapons. It was a lonely place for Republicans to be, but we were right then, and we are right now. I only wish more Republicans and President Obama had heeded our call.

In 2015 we traveled to Vienna, where we discovered and revealed Iran's secret side deals with the International Atomic Energy Agency. In 2016, after a trip to Norway and Sweden, we wrote an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal drawing attention to Europe's growing challenges with mass migration and what it means for our own country.

Mike has gone from one success to another because he is a consummate professional—a man who treats everyone with respect but who doesn't pull a punch or shade a view to please his audience.

Democrats don't deny his professionalism. The senior Senator from Montana has said that he has led an "exemplary career in public service." The junior Senator from Delaware said he would be a "good advocate for the career professionals at the State Department and USAID." Even former Secretaries of State Hillary Clinton and Madeleine Albright have expressed their hope that he would reinvigorate the State Department, and nonpartisan experts agree that Mike Pompeo's integrity and record of accomplishments cannot be denied. As ADM James Stavridis has said, Mike is "a solid, thoughtful and accomplished leader." It is why 30 national security professionals—including former NSA Director Keith Alexander, former CIA Director Michael Hayden, and former Attorney General Mike Mukasey—submitted a letter endorsing Mike's nomination.

Unfortunately, many Democratic Senators are opposing Mike's nomination, and they have given their reasons. But I have to say that these reasons don't hold up very well under scrutiny. Some say Mike is adverse to diplomacy. In fact, he simply knows that diplomacy is most effective when it is backed with a credible military threat. As Frederick the Great said, "Diplomacy without arms is like music without instruments."

He also knows that some situations may not be susceptible to diplomatic solutions no matter how much one might wish it so. That is a fact of life. It is not a reason to oppose Mike's nomination.

I would add that he recently demonstrated his commitment to diplomacy by meeting with Kim Jong Un to lay the groundwork for the President's upcoming summit. It is hard to think of a worse regime than North Korea, but Mike was willing to sit down with Kim to try to find a peaceful solution to the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula. That should show us all, definitively, that he is committed to diplomacy.

Others say they are opposing Mike because they disagree with him on social issues. Here I would simply note that most Republicans surely disagree with Hillary Clinton's and John Kerry's views on these issues. Yet they still voted to confirm them. For that matter, Hillary Clinton opposed same-sex marriage when the Democrats voted to confirm her back in 2009. So it

hardly seems fair to hold Mike Pompeo to a different standard.

Still, others oppose Mike's nomination because he refused to say that he would resign if President Trump fired Special Counsel Robert Mueller. I have to say, that is quite a stretch for a Secretary of State nomination. This isn't the Department of Justice. On the merits, I would ask: Do they think it would have been a good idea for Henry Kissinger and Jim Schlesinger to resign in 1973 or 1974? Would it help or hurt America to have our top diplomat suddenly leave the world stage at a time of domestic turmoil? And if that is to be the standard, have those Democrats asked Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis that question? I bet they haven't.

Finally, there are those who worry that he will not be a check on the President. But since when is a Cabinet member supposed to do that? Regular elections, the separation of powers, and all that entails are the checks on the executive branch under our Constitution. The President's Cabinet owes him candid advice, especially when he doesn't want to hear it, but they aren't supposed to undermine him. The State Department, in particular, is the last place for open conflict between the President and a Cabinet member. If the world doesn't believe that the Secretary has the President's confidence and conducts foreign policy on his behalf, he is of little use to the President or the country.

In fact, I would say it is the President's confidence in Mike that cinches his readiness for the job. When Mike Pompeo speaks, the world will know that the Secretary of State speaks for the President. He is well respected by the President's national security team, and he is well respected by the world.

I know Mike Pompeo will excel as our Secretary of State, and I regret some Senators will oppose him for shortsighted, political reasons, but since they all profess grave concerns about the lack of personnel at the State Department, I look forward to them all confirming Secretary Pompeo's sub-Cabinet nominees promptly once he submits them.

But even better is to put politics aside and to do the right thing for our country. Mike Pompeo has served his country with distinction. He is eminently qualified to be Secretary of State, and we need him on the job now. I call on every Senator to vote for confirmation and to send to the State Department a strong leader, a wise counselor, and a good man—Mike Pompeo.

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.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to voice my strong

opposition to Director Pompeo's nomination to be our next Secretary of State.

This position is too important. The stakes are too high to let this nominee slide by without full consideration of what it would mean for Director Pompeo to be our Nation's top diplomat—the person whose every word and action broadcasts America's values to the rest of the world.

Some of my opposition concerns Director Pompeo's harsh views on matters of war and peace, and his blatantly false accusations regarding members of the Muslim community. Some of my opposition surrounds my deep concern about Director Pompeo's ability to stand strong against President Trump's erratic and uninformed foreign policy positions.

But what I wanted to take a few minutes this afternoon to do is to express my serious concern about what Director Pompeo's ideological, extreme positions on women's rights and reproductive freedom would mean for women across the world.

Our Nation has an important role to uphold as a global champion of women's rights. We need a Secretary of State who will be a strong advocate and continue our legacy of leadership in fighting for women's health and reproductive freedom and the rights of women and girls around the world. Instead, I am afraid Director Pompeo would undo much of that legacy and undermine much of the global progress we have made.

An advocate for women doesn't repeatedly support the global gag rule, which keeps funding from clinics and programs that provide women important medical care. Director Pompeo did.

An advocate for women doesn't vote to defund the United Nations Population Fund, which provides family planning services for women around the world who live in poverty. Director Pompeo did.

When it comes to fighting for the survivors of rape and against those who would use rape as a tool of war, it is clear we should stand by survivors, fight for them, and work to make sure they have access to the medical care they need. However, Director Pompeo has said he would prevent women who have been raped from access to abortions. That is an unacceptably cruel response to women and war survivors, and it is one of the many clear indicators that Director Pompeo is an unacceptable choice to serve as Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State is always a critically important position, but it takes on even more important meaning in 2018. The President not only needs good counsel in navigating our complex global relationships, but he also desperately needs someone who can tell him when he is wrong and who can stand up to him and be a check on this President's worse impulses.

Throughout his nomination process, Director Pompeo failed to convince me

that he is that person. So I will be voting no on his nomination to be Secretary of State. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF FRANCE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I don't know if the Presiding Officer was able to be present in the House of Representatives earlier today when the President of France, Emmanuel Macron, spoke to us about a variety of things, including the Paris accords, the Iran deal, the long history we have between their country and our country; the fact that the American Revolution and the French Revolution were really contemporaneous. We share the birth of democracy in our country and, to an extent, in their country at roughly the same time.

Those who have studied American history know that one of the ways we won our freedom and independence from the tyranny of that British throne was with the support of the French. We have not always agreed with one another in the years since then, but mostly we have. The bond between their Nation and our Nation continues to be strong, not just between our leaders but also between our people.

We are fortunate to have a number of French tourists who come to our country. From time to time, some of us are fortunate to go to that part of the world and to visit them, to know them as human beings. The bond between our countries is a benefit for both them and for us, and, I think, for the world.

I have never come to the floor to start reading someone else's speech, but I am really tempted to read some parts of what President Emmanuel Macron said today. I speak a little bit of French. I spoke to him briefly in French before he gave his remarks. His English is a lot better than my French. I want to mention a couple of things that he said and add some comments of my own.

He talked a bit about the Paris Agreement, and he talked about climate change. These were his words, and I think they are worth repeating and reflecting on.

He said:

I believe in building a better future for our children which requires offering them a planet that is still habitable in 25 years. Some people think that securing current industries and their jobs is more urgent than transforming our economies to meet the global challenge of climate change.

He went on to say:

I hear these concerns, but we must find a smooth transition to a low-carbon economy.

Because what is the meaning of our life, really, if we work and live destroying our planet while sacrificing the future of our children?

President Macron then said:

What is the meaning of our life if our conscious decision is to reduce the opportunities for our children or for our grandchildren? By polluting the oceans, not mitigating carbon dioxide emissions, and destroying our biodiversity, we're killing our planet.

He went on to say:

Let us face it. There is no planet B.

I turned to my colleague sitting next to me and I said, I am going to steal that line: There is no planet B.

He is right.

I like to say this is the only planet we have, and it is going to be the only one we ever have in our lifetime, and probably the lifetime of anybody around this planet.

Then President Macron went on to say:

On this issue, it may happen that we have disagreements between the United States and France. It may happen. Like in all families. But that's, for me, a short-term disagreement. In the long run, we will have to face the same realities, and we're citizens of this same planet, so we will have to face it. We have to work together with business leaders and local communities. Let us work together in order to make our planet great again—

Isn't that terrific? "Let's work together to make our planet great again"—not just to make America great again; not just to make France great again but to make our planet great again—

and create new jobs and new opportunities. While safeguarding our earth.

He concluded this part of his speech by saying:

And I'm sure, one day, the United States will come back and join the Paris Agreement. And I'm sure we can work together to fulfill, with you, the ambitions of the global compact on the environment.

I had the opportunity last week to speak at the University of Delaware to a couple hundred graduate students. It is an annual gathering that they have and they were nice enough to invite me to come and talk to them about leadership. One of the things I mentioned is that leaders are aspirational. We appeal to people's better angels. Leaders unite, not divide. Leaders build bridges, not walls.

I thought we were privileged today to hear that kind of leader. When I spoke to him in French, I wished him well. I wished him good luck, and I thanked him for joining us in the kind of message he brought to us.

I don't suspect he would have any reason to know this, but when people got up today and went to work in this country, 3 million people went to work in jobs that probably didn't exist 20, 30 years ago—3 million people. The jobs they went to work on are jobs where they are creating renewable energy, sustainable energy, clean energy, carbon-free energy, or they are going to work in jobs which conserve energy so we just use a whole lot less altogether. Think about that. Three million people