

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

SPORTS MEDICINE LICENSURE CLARITY ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 302, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 4026 (to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 4027 (to amendment No. 4026), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I unfortunately don't have enough time right now to respond to everything the Democratic leader has said, but I do want to say this: The most accurate statement the minority leader made is, he was against Judge Kavanaugh from the start. No one should be confused about this being a search for the truth. This is about search and destroy.

Now, I think the Judiciary Committee conducted itself appropriately in giving Dr. Ford a chance to tell her story. I have said all along I want Dr. Ford to be treated just the same way my daughters or my wife or my mother would be treated under similar circumstances, and I think we met that standard, but we know the goalpost continues to be moved by our colleagues. This idea that you can assassinate a man's character, resulting in threats against his family, ruin his reputation and his future, and expect him to be a human punching bag and not respond forcefully—it is incredible to me.

This should be about a fair process, but a fair process means the people who ultimately decide should have an open mind at the beginning. You wouldn't want to walk into a courtroom and talk to a jury or a judge where the judge and jury had already made up their mind; you would want them to listen to the evidence. That is what a fundamentally fair process means.

It also means, if somebody is going to make an accusation against an individual for a crime, which is what has been alleged against Judge Kavanaugh,

they would have to come forward with more than just an allegation; they would have to come forward with witnesses, proof, evidence because under our Constitution, people are presumed to be innocent of crimes unless proven guilty. They are accorded due process of law, a fair hearing, a fair process.

Unfortunately, as a result of the mishandling of Dr. Ford's confidential letter to the ranking member, contrary to her wishes and without her consent, leaked to the press, she has been thrust into this three-ring circus. She was not told by her lawyers that the Judiciary Committee had offered to send a bipartisan team of professional staff out to her home in California to interview her confidentially. Why would her lawyers not tell her that? Because they wanted this three-ring circus. Despite Dr. Ford's wishes not to be thrust into the spotlight, they evidently thrust her into that spotlight, raising the question in my mind: For whom are they working? Are these lawyers actually working for Dr. Ford or do they have another agenda and another client in mind?

Well, the idea that now this has all come down to what somebody wrote in their high school yearbook is beyond parody. I mean, you can't make stuff like this up. Oh, we know the judge is belligerent because he allegedly threw ice on somebody in a bar in college. Of course, the reporter who wrote that had previously sent out a tweet demonstrating his bias against Judge Kavanaugh, but now it is accepted as fact—and, man, we are going to defeat this man because he threw ice on somebody when he was in college.

Or we are going to go through his high school yearbook. I wonder what the high school yearbook of every Senator in this Chamber says. I hope that is not the standard.

The Senate as an institution is one that operates based on precedent. If this is the precedent for future nominees, woe be to us because we will not be able to recruit the best and brightest people to serve in the judiciary or be subjected to this inquisition of a confirmation process.

As I said, there is more I want to say responding to the Democratic leader's comments, which I couldn't disagree with more. He had already made up his mind, so this is now about trying to build a case against the nominee. The problem is, there isn't any evidence, so in its place, what he wants to do is presume guilt: Because somebody said something in their high school yearbook, they ought to be disqualified; because they allegedly threw ice on somebody when they were in college, that is disqualifying. That is making this whole process a laughingstock. This is the opposite of the sort of fair and dignified process we should be following.

Now, at the request of many Senators, the FBI is going to be reporting back to the Senate on their supplemental background investigation. Will

that be enough to satisfy those who had said, "All we need is one more week in order to allow the FBI to question more witnesses"? We see now that they have moved on. Regardless of what happens with this supplemental background investigation, they will not be satisfied because they had their minds made up already, even before Dr. Ford's letter became public.

This is an embarrassing, disgraceful way for the Senate to conduct itself. We do not honor ourselves or this institution by handling this nominee, this nomination, and these witnesses—including Dr. Ford—like this.

I don't know what it is going to take for us to change. But one thing that can't happen is we can't let these despicable tactics and this strategy win because if they are able to destroy the reputation of a sitting judge based on such flimsy stuff, that means this same precedent will be applied to future nominees. Woe be to us and what a terrible disservice, not only to the good men and women who want to serve in government but also to the American people.

The thing I hate most about Washington, DC, and its insular culture is that some people don't just want to win the argument; some people don't want to just win the election or win the vote; they want to destroy their opposition—destroy them. That is why people are saying that, even if the judge is confirmed, maybe over in the House they will start impeachment proceedings. One of the Members of the Judiciary Committee said: If the judge is confirmed, it will not stop there; I am not going to stop. What does that mean?

We need to vote. We need to get the FBI report and we need to vote because the longer this circus continues, the more embarrassing it becomes to the Senate and to the Senators who work here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

OPIOID CRISIS RESPONSE ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, later today we are going to have an opportunity to vote on the Opioid Crisis Response Act. I want to take some time to compliment all involved in bringing this legislation forward.

First, let me start by acknowledging the problem in Maryland. The problem we have in Maryland is throughout our entire country.

Recently, I was at the MedMark Treatment Center in Baltimore City, and I had a chance to see firsthand the efforts being made by the local community, by the private sector, and by the government to deal with those who have addiction issues as a result of the opioid crisis. I must tell you, they are making progress, but the problem continues. The problem continues in every community in Maryland.

I have had similar roundtable discussions in western Maryland, on the Eastern Shore, in the Baltimore and Washington metro areas, and in all

parts of Maryland. In every community, they tell me that the crisis of overdose is still increasing, despite efforts made by local communities to try to deal with the addiction issue on many fronts—on the front of law enforcement, looking at different ways of dealing with pain medicines, and looking at ways to deal with people with addiction issues.

As we know, with the widespread use of addictive opioids, they hit the market, and people became addicted to the prescription opioid medicines that were not used for their proper purposes. Later, they used heroin, which was cheaper than the opioid medicines, and people became addicted to that. More recently, heroin has been mixed with fentanyl, which can be very deadly and is much more powerful than heroin or prescription opioids, and people end up in the emergency room. In many cases, they end up dead.

Congress has responded. We passed the 21st Century Cures Act, which was a bipartisan bill that set up a framework and alternative ways of dealing with pain rather than using addictive opioids and dealt with providing significant resources to local governments to deal with the issues in law enforcement, in prevention, and in treating people with addictions.

Of course, the passage of the Affordable Care Act provided healthcare coverage for people with behavioral health issues and addiction, which helped not only those in the exchanges on private insurance but also those in the Medicaid system. So we have done a good job in trying to respond to it.

Now we have the legislation before us: the Opioid Crisis Response Act. I am very pleased about the provisions. Many committees have provided input. It is a truly bipartisan product reflecting the will of the House and the Senate and the different committees of jurisdiction.

I am particularly pleased that we have provided additional resources and flexibility for local communities. The one thing I learned in visiting different parts of Maryland is that programs in some communities will work, and in other communities, these programs will not work. So we need to look at what works for each community involved.

The legislation before us reauthorizes and improves the State Opioid Targeted Response Grants in the 21st Century Cures Act. In my State of Maryland, we received \$20 million under that act in fiscal year 2017. I have been encouraged by the Governor, the mayor of Baltimore, and other local officials who support that reauthorization improvement. They know it will help them deal with the problems.

Let me tell you what the additional flexibility means for people in Maryland. In both Baltimore City and the Upper Shore, local governments are looking at establishing what is known as a stabilization center. A stabilization center will serve as a safe place for

those under the influence of drugs or alcohol to sober up and be connected to an appropriate setting, where they can get the help they need and the treatment they need for recovery. The problem with our emergency rooms is that many times people who have OD'd, once they are brought back, can become very disruptive, and they can adversely affect the healthcare in the emergency room settings for other people who are there for other purposes. In addition, they can't always get the services they need, particularly in the middle of the night, to deal with their addiction problems. The stabilization center is set up to deal with those issues and connect people to proper medical care and behavioral health and social services.

The problem is there is no funding for stabilization centers. Fortunately, under this legislation, flexibility is given in regard to the grant program for Comprehensive Opioid Recovery Centers, under the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—SAMHSA—where local governments and community organizations can apply for funds to deal with these innovative approaches dealing with the addiction issue. I was pleased that it was a recommendation I had made and it was incorporated into the final legislation.

Another popular type of program in my communities is peer support. We find that people who have gone through addiction recovery are much more effective in reaching out to those who have an addiction need today and can provide the type of support they need to stay with treatment. The problem is that not all State Medicaid programs cover peer support services, certainly not in Maryland. So I was pleased that this legislation includes an amendment I offered that will get GAO to study State Medicaid programs that currently reimburse for peer support services and how those programs save money and improve outcomes for beneficiaries.

I am also pleased that we remove restrictions on Medicaid reimbursement for inpatient treatment of substance use disorders. We give flexibility to IMDs by removing the cap on the number of beds, which can help us, again, deal with the needs in different communities around our Nation. I worked with other Members of the Senate to get that included in the final bill that we will be voting on later today.

We also provided enhanced reimbursement for medication assistance treatment in the Medicare system. That is an issue I came forward with in this legislation, and I am pleased it was included.

The legislation also provides reimbursement for Medicaid health homes that focus on individuals with substance use disorder. Further, this legislation provides flexibility to deal with addiction issues through telehealth. Many of us have worked on telehealth issues, and this legislation expands the

use of telehealth services for Medicare beneficiaries with substance use disorders.

The bottom line is I was pleased to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle in order to provide the flexibility for local governments and local communities to do what they need to do in order to deal with this crisis and, at the same time, provide Federal Government partnership and resources that can really make a difference.

We do more than just deal with the treatment issues. We deal with law enforcement, and I am pleased that is in the bill. Our Governor had asked that we deal with the challenges of fentanyl shipments coming through international mail into this country; that issue is dealt with in this legislation, and I was pleased to be part of that.

I am also pleased that we are providing first responders with protective equipment and training to deal with fentanyl. Many of our first responders are being accidentally exposed to fentanyl as they respond to an OD episode, and I am pleased there is help in this legislation to deal with that. I am particularly proud about that because Smiths Detection, which is located in my State, is providing the technology to help our first responders.

Maryland is a high-intensity drug-trafficking area designation. This bill reauthorizes many important programs to deal with the current opioid crisis, and there are moneys in this to support drug courts and task forces. All of this will help people in Maryland and across our Nation.

The legislation also deals with workforce and student loan forgiveness for those who go into this field. That is something that is welcome and needed.

Lastly, the bill deals with housing. Housing is a significant challenge for those who have addiction needs. This legislation will allow us to support innovative programs under Medicaid to deal with housing in conjunction with the opioid crisis.

I am proud we were able to work together in committees on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers, and I look forward to the passage of this legislation later today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, what is the order right now? It is my understanding, I say to my good friend from Illinois, that I was to be speaking and alternating back and forth. Is that correct?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order in effect. The unfinished business is the House message to accompany H.R. 302.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have been waiting for 10 minutes. I didn't realize it was going to be an alternating situation, but I will defer to him because of his seniority and our friendship. I wish to ask how long he will

speak, and I wish to ask unanimous consent to follow him.

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask my friend how long he would be, if I defer to him at this point.

Mr. DURBIN. Ten minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. All right, I am going to defer to the Senator for 10 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his remarks, I be recognized for such time as I may consume.

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that it was 3 weeks ago when we first heard the name Christine Blasey Ford. It seems like a lot longer; doesn't it?

In that period of time, a lot of things have occurred. The first thing was the announcement from Kellyanne Conway at the White House when she said that Dr. Ford's testimony and complaint would neither be ignored nor would she be insulted. Last night at a rally in Mississippi, the President of the United States mocked Christine Blasey Ford for her lack of specific memory about this terrible sexual assault, which occurred 36 years ago.

I think most people realize that she testified under oath, gave us all the information she knew, and conceded there were things she couldn't remember. Neither she nor any victim should be in any way belittled because they can't remember all of the details of something that happened in the distant past, something they would much rather forget.

Let me also remind those who are following this debate that it was Dr. Ford who stepped forward and called for an FBI investigation. She was willing to step forward before the FBI and tell her story. It was Judge Kavanaugh who resisted it, even when I asked him directly. Now the FBI investigation is under way.

For the good of the Senate and for our Nation, I hope this is a complete, professional, nonpartisan investigation, and I hope we are given the time to at least read the report from the FBI before the Republican majority leader in the Senate plows through, as he said over and over, to a vote in this Senate.

I hope those who come to this issue in good faith, regardless of their position, will be respectful of the process, which we may be using in the future and should respect as it reaches its conclusion.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. President, on a separate issue, I wish to tell the Senate about an experience I had several months ago. I was at an immigration court in Chicago. I had never been there before. It was at a high-rise office building in the Chicago Loop. The corridors were packed with those who were waiting for an opportunity for a hearing.

I went into this courtroom where a judge was sitting, and I saw the two people who were before the court that

day to have their case heard. The judge called the courtroom to order. She was very respectful to the two individuals who were there, but she had a problem. One of the people before her could not get into the chair to sit down for the proceeding. The reason that young girl, whom I will call Maria, could not get into the chair was because she was 2 years old—2 years old. One of the volunteer attorneys lifted her up and put her in the chair and handed her a stuffed owl, which she clung to through the whole hearing.

The other person who was being subject to a hearing that day had no trouble getting into the chair. He scrambled into the chair and sat down because he was anxious to play with the Matchbox car that was on the table. This young man, whom I will call Hamilton, was 4 years old.

In the United States of America, in the city of Chicago, at an immigration court of this Federal Government, these two individuals were up for a hearing because they had been separated forcibly from their parents. There was no real conclusion to the hearing. They reset the next hearing date for these two children—2 years old and 4 years old—for 4 days before Christmas.

How did we get to this point in America where we are actually having a Federal court hearing of an immigration court for a 2-year-old and a 4-year-old—one too small even to get into a chair by herself and the other who, thank goodness, found a Matchbox car to play with during the proceeding? We reached this point because of the announcement of the Trump administration of something called zero tolerance and the decision to separate over 2,700 children from their parents at the border.

Where are we today? We are in a situation where 136 of these children—months after this policy was started and then discontinued—are still being held by the government. Ninety-six of them have parents who we believe to be outside the United States.

Just this last week, the Department of Homeland Security inspector general came out with a report, which I commend to everyone, analyzing what the zero tolerance policy meant. I will tell you what it meant. It meant the absolute ultimate when it came to cruelty and incompetence. What they tell us in this report was that a decision was made by the Trump administration and by the Department of Homeland Security under Secretary Nielsen to separate children from their parents, even before these children had the ability to speak. They were called preverbal children. They separated them without any plastic bracelets on their wrists, without any fingerprints to trace them back to their parents. They were separated not by blocks or even a few miles but sometimes 1,000 miles.

I came to learn the story of a little boy I will call Hamilton because it was

published in *The New Yorker*. It was a story about his mom from El Salvador and the little boy being taken from her in March—taken from this mother. They left the mother in Texas in detention, and they transported the child to Chicago. Initially, a volunteer lawyer came in and bought a phone card and said to the mother: You can call him. And she did. They would talk for a little while and sing a little song.

The next time she called him, he wasn't as responsive. It has now reached a point where this 4-year-old little boy will not speak to his mother on the telephone, will not communicate with her. The people at the shelter in Chicago had begged the mother: Tell him he has to eat.

Did you ever see a little 4-year-old boy you would have to tell to eat? It says something about his state of mind. Sadly, this 4-year-old has now reverted back to diapers and will not say a word to his mother on the phone—separated by a zero tolerance program of this Trump administration.

What they tell us from the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General's Office is that we are far from the end of this sad, disgraceful chapter in American history.

Who is going to be held accountable for this? Will it be the President, perhaps in some election in the future? Will it be the Attorney General, who proudly announced this new program separating mothers from children? Will it be the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, who separated these children, according to the inspector general's report, putting them in confined spaces, which were unacceptable by humane standards, which we actually have been governed by for years in the United States?

I believe Secretary Nielsen should be held responsible. I believe she should resign. Someone has to answer for this disgraceful chapter in American history, and we still must remember that 136 eligible children are still being held by our government under this policy. It is time for us to reunite these children with their parents. Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, it is time for us to try to put these families back together again. I want Hamilton to start eating again. I want him to be in his mother's arms again. I want him to try to get over this chapter in his young life. It can affect him for as long as he lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, amid all the unfounded, uncorroborated accusations and attacks on a fine jurist, I think it is important for us to remember that other things are happening here at the same time. For one thing, I will only make one comment about the comments of the previous speaker; that is, the program that is somewhat accurately described actually started not in the Trump administration but in the Obama administration.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. President, what I want to say is that something really significant is about to happen; that is, something we have been waiting for for a long time. If you are not on the Commerce Committee, you are not dealing with this issue—actually, there are three committees dealing with it—and you wouldn't be aware of how significant the vote coming up really is.

We are going to be voting to reauthorize the FAA. This is something we have been trying to do now for many years. This is actually a 5-year reauthorization. That is significant. The last time we did a 5-year reauthorization of the FAA was in the 1980s. It is a huge win, not just for the obvious good things that are going on and what we need to be doing to update the system we are working with, but if you single out general aviation and pilots, it is a big, major deal.

The legislation makes needed investments in our Nation's airport infrastructure and supports the general aviation community. It improves commercial service for the flying public and streamlines the FAA regulatory process, eliminating a lot of the red-tape that goes along with any bureaucracy. It enhances aviation security and promotes responsible and safe integration for drones in our national airspace.

As an active pilot, I am especially pleased that many pilot protections I have fought for are in this bill. In fact, I am very proud that I actually introduced in committee and was able to get in the bill six of my amendments that I know are very significant, and they mostly address general aviation. It is going to have more transparency in communicating with the FAA.

We have heard the stories about some of the FAA enforcement proceedings. That is common to a lot of bureaucracies. It strengthens one area: the notice to airmen. That is called NOTAM. NOTAMs are notifications to people who are pilots to let them know if they are going to land on a runway and if there is a problem on the runway and it is under construction or something like that. It came from a personal experience I had when I landed on one where there was work. But there were no NOTAMs. So there was no way of warning people.

I remember that I said: Well, where are the NOTAMs, if you say there are NOTAMs?

They said: Well, that is for you to find out.

This changes all of that. We have the NOTAM reform that is in there. It includes the Volunteer Pilot Protection Act. That is like the Good Samaritan act. I remember that about 30 years ago, when I was mayor of Tulsa at that time, on the island of Dominica—not to be confused with the Dominican Republic—there was a radio conveyor that reached the entire Central America and a lot of South America, and it was wiped out by a hurricane.

I remember getting 12 pilots together and 12 aircraft together and going to take medical supplies and take food and all of these things to that island. I actually had to fly through a hurricane to get down there. There were four people who were going to go and did not go because they might incur some kind of liability or they might do something on the way that would create that problem.

The Good Samaritan law that is in this bill is something we have been working on for a long period of time and will allow people not to be punished for their generosity, which has been the case before. The bill directs the FAA to update regulations and policies related to this selection and training and designation of pilot examiners.

There is a big problem. I experienced this personally just about 3 months ago. They are called DPE, or designated pilot examiners. There are not enough of them around. What we did with this bill was to add a new form of inspecting pilots that is going to allow one examiner to do twice as many pilots. Here it is in this bill.

Without the proper examiners, the commercial pilots are prevented from obtaining the recurring qualifications, and flight schools are prevented from graduating students. There is a problem right now in the numbers of people who are out there who have passed and want to take examinations and are not able to do that. It also addresses the problem of contract towers. Contract towers are mostly towers you see around the country. The largest ones are called FAA towers. However, some of them are contract towers, so they are contracting with the private sector. Well, this is good. They do a good job. I would just suggest, though, that if we had not allowed for these contract towers, we wouldn't have, in my State of Oklahoma, some seven towers that would be out there. Two of those contract towers are in the cities of Stillwater and Norman, OK. Well, Stillwater happens to be the home of Oklahoma State University, and Norman is the home of Oklahoma University.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, on game day, if you are in there, going in with sometimes up to a thousand aircraft, and if you don't have a tower there, how is that going to work? Well, that is a recognition that that is a problem which needs to be dealt with, and that is in this bill. It also affects a lot of the airports that are adjacent to military bases.

It updates the FAA's dated benefit process, ensuring that communities invest resources without unnecessary paperwork.

The FAA reauthorization unlocks the economic growth potential of aviation it provides to local communities. We have in Oklahoma—not far from Tulsa, actually—a very small community called Bristow, and Bristow had two large industries that wanted to move in there and were not able to do it and

were making a decision to go not to another community in Oklahoma but to another State. It wasn't as far as Alaska; it was not too far away from Oklahoma. So what we were able to do was leverage the State funding to put in these improvements to the airport. I was there during the dedication. Those two very large industries are moving in. People don't realize what an airport means to a local community in rural America. So this has provisions in there that will allow that to take place.

There is another one I want to mention. If you are in a general aviation airport environment—now, that is not like DFW or Dulles or one of those; it is the smaller ones. In the Chair's State of Alaska, that is about all they have up there. If you are in that type of an environment, if you get Federal funds—and they all get Federal funds—if you don't use those in a general aviation airport, they automatically, under current law, go to DFW or one of the giant airports. Under this, it is guaranteed that they will go to another general aviation airport, which is a huge win.

Our Nation's aviation industry is facing a dire shortage of pilots. We have language in here that is going to be helpful. We all know about the problem—particularly those of us who are serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee—about the pilot shortage we have. We have some 2,000 pilots right now who are actually fighter pilots, but we have a shortage of pilots.

One of the problems is that during the 8 years of the Obama administration, in the process of starving the military, they were not allowing their pilots in the Navy and the Air Force to fly more than 12 hours a month. This was something that can't be done, and consequently they were in the position of not being able to have them—well, in this bill, we are starting out and actually have language in a pilot program to allow students in high school to go through ground school, to get people interested in aviation. All that is in this bill. The programs—there is a wide array of public and private sector stakeholders dedicated to furthering aviation and an accessible future career path for pilots.

I applaud the reforms in the FAA's process for certifying aircraft and aircraft products.

One of the problems we have had out there is that people are building—I am talking about major builders or experimental builders—aircraft and then not being able to get them certified because of the long certification process. We have shortcut that and have the same amount of requirements in this bill, but we will be able to almost double the number of certifications.

So that is happening right now. I thank Senator THUNE and Senator NELSON and the committee for acknowledging that we finally have to do it. For 10 years now, I have been sitting around waiting for a reauthorization

bill and have been talking to people about the consequences. Now, finally, after about 30 years, we have a reauthorization bill that is a 5-year bill. We are going to be voting on it shortly. It is going to be a great improvement.

So other things are happening here. We are passing things. We are being productive. We will continue to do so as soon as this fiasco is over, the challenges to our fine Justice Kavanaugh.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I stood here to commend this body for developing and passing much needed legislation to help families and communities respond to the opioid overdose crisis. This crisis is a tragedy, a scourge, an epidemic that claimed an estimated 49,000 lives just last year. It is one that knows no political, territorial or demographical boundaries.

Soon, the Senate will consider a bipartisan, bicameral, consensus opioid package, which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives last week.

Contained within the conference bill are several of my provisions from the Senate-passed legislation, including Opioid Milestones, a bipartisan bill I introduced with Senators MURKOWSKI and HASSAN to create a scorecard to measure our Nation's response to the opioid crisis. In other words, as we spend more money, how do we now give a grade to each one of the programs that we are funding so that in 2, 3, 4 years, it is best practices across the whole country, so that we are ensuring that we learn the lessons of what is, in fact, occurring? So that is a milestone, a scorecard so that we know what is happening with the money, with the programs we are funding.

The final package also retains important legislation I introduced with Senators YOUNG and BALDWIN to help address increasing rates of infectious diseases associated with injection drug use, such as HIV and viral hepatitis.

Two weeks ago, while highlighting these provisions, I also called on my House and Senate colleagues to include in the conference legislation a critical policy that was noticeably absent from the Senate-passed bill: expansion of medication-assisted treatment, or MAT, for opioid use disorders.

In 2016, I worked with Senator RAND PAUL to expand access to MAT by enabling nurse practitioners and physician assistants to temporarily prescribe SUBOXONE. This year, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator PAUL, Senator COLLINS, and Senator HASSAN to provide permanent MAT prescriber authority for nurse practitioners and physician assistants. Our legislation would also extend this authority to other nursing professions already stepping up to address the opioid crisis—certified nurses, midwives, clinical nurse specialists, and certified registered nurse anesthetists.

As this consensus legislation was being negotiated, Senator PAUL and I led a bipartisan, bicameral letter urging leadership to include the House-passed version of our legislation in the final bill.

Today, I am pleased to report that we succeeded in this endeavor. Section 3201 of the conference legislation would permanently allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to prescribe MAT. It would also provide that authority to the other nursing professions for 5 years. This policy will immediately save lives and improve our overall response to the opioid overdose crisis.

I thank my partners in both the House and Senate for fighting to ensure that we reduce the demand side of this epidemic by enhancing access to treatment.

In addition to expanding MAT, the conference package takes important steps to help connect vulnerable populations to healthcare, particularly substance use treatment.

As we work to address our Nation's opioid crisis and right the wrongs of the failed War on Drugs, we must do all we can to remove barriers to care, including for those who have been incarcerated.

Last month, I reintroduced my legislation, the Supporting Positive Outcomes after Release Act, which prohibits States from terminating an inmate's Medicaid coverage during incarceration. My legislation would instead require States to temporarily suspend Medicaid coverage, ensuring immediate access to healthcare services upon reentry into the community. In other words, when the prisoner is let out of incarceration and they go back into the community, they will have access to healthcare services. Otherwise, the likelihood of relapse is very high.

I am pleased that the conference opioid package includes a version of my legislation requiring States to suspend rather than terminate Medicaid coverage for young people under 21 years of age during incarceration. This provision will help bridge the precarious time after release by ensuring that these individuals can access their benefits as soon as possible.

I applaud the work of Senators HATCH and WYDEN to include this important provision in the conference package, and I hope that this is a step forward in expanding this suspension policy to other Medicaid populations. I don't think it should be just 21 and under; I think it should be anyone who is leaving prison. A high percentage of people who are in prison have some drug-related problem, and if we don't provide them with the treatment they need as they are leaving, then it is almost—not a guarantee but a high probability that they will take a U-turn and come right back with the same problem again.

This final opioid package represents a critical component of our response to the Nation's opioid overdose crisis. I

commend Senators MURRAY and ALEXANDER on their incredible and tireless work to put this legislation together, and I thank them for working with me throughout the process on all of those provisions. However, this should not and will not be the end of Congress's efforts to tackle the opioid epidemic. There remain a number of other outstanding proposals, like mandating prescriber education and clearly labeling the risk of opioids on prescription bottles. That could pay big dividends in addressing this crisis.

I would say in conclusion that it is a missed opportunity when we don't mandate physician education across the whole country on the prescribing of opioids. We should do it. There are a lot of physicians out there who are prescribing bottles of opioids who have never had the correct training in order to ensure that they understand what the consequences are.

Simultaneously, Senator HATCH and I have introduced legislation that says, in the absence of mandatory physician education, the bottle cap of every opioid have a warning, as they are taking the bottle from the pharmacy, so that the mother, the wife, the father, the responsible party in the family can actually see that this is dangerous and that it is addictive. The warning is right on the bottle cap in a color—red, orange, green—that says “this medicine is different from anything else you have in your cabinet.” At least give the mothers and fathers and family members the tools they need or the information they need to say: The physician didn't tell us this because they weren't mandated to have the education, but at least I can read it and say to myself that this is something I should be very careful with in allowing my family member to take these pills.

That is for another day, but I think it is important, and I think it is something that we are going to have to include, ultimately, down the line just to give families the information they need.

Again, I thank everyone, Democrat and Republican. This is a perfect example of how bipartisanship prevails over paralysis. And there can't be a more important issue that would prove that this institution can work. I thank everyone involved.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the bipartisan, bicameral 5-year reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration Act that we will be voting on, and I believe passing, in about one-half hour.

This is the first 5-year reauthorization for the FAA since 1982, providing long-term certainty for our aviation infrastructure while ensuring that we continue to have the safest, most efficient aerospace system in the world.

The bill continues to provide stable funding for the Airport Improvement Program which supports the construction, rehabilitation, and development

of airports of all sizes, including the construction of the new Williston Basin International Airport in North Dakota, the first new air carrier airport built in the United States in over 9 years, and very much needed because it is right in the heart of the Bakken.

We have had incredible energy development there. We now produce between 1.2 and 1.3 million barrels a day, second only to Texas, so we have a lot of people coming in, a lot of infrastructure being developed, and obviously our service is incredibly important. I can't thank the FAA enough for recognizing that we not only needed an expansion of airport facilities, but we needed to build a whole new airport because they were closed in by the community of Williston. This is the first new air carrier airport built in the United States in 9 years, and it is tremendous. It is not just about serving Williston, it is about serving Northwest North Dakota, as well as parts of Eastern Montana, and a very important, growing energy industry area for our Nation. That shows the importance of the kind of provisions we have in this legislation and how it affects every part of our great Nation.

Ensuring long-term certainty for FAA programs like the Airport Improvement Program are essential for our airport construction projects, as I have described, in the Williston Basin. It is particularly important that we have this funding and are able to utilize it in an efficient way. For example, in cold-weather States like my State or the State of our Presiding Officer, there is a relatively short construction season so we have to get out there and get after it and get it done when we can. That is what we are doing with this legislation, as well as in the appropriations bill, making sure the funding is there so we can deploy it cost-effectively, getting the funding out there and construction done when it can actually be done.

The FAA reauthorization includes a number of provisions I worked on and authored to expand upon work we are doing in North Dakota on unmanned aircraft systems. This is a big part of the future of aviation. I thank the Commerce Committee chairman—the Commerce Committee being the committee of jurisdiction—and I would like to thank Chairman THUNE, my good buddy from the other Dakota, and also the ranking member for their work on the UAS legislation with me that we have included in this bill.

As my colleagues well know, North Dakota is one of the leading States when it comes to development of unmanned aviation systems technology. As a matter of fact, Eastern North Dakota has been referred to as “the Silicon Valley for drones” by one of the prominent media outlets. Our Northern Plains Unmanned Aircraft Systems Test Site in Grand Forks, ND, is one of seven UAS research and development sites in the Nation, providing the proving grounds for a range of UAS testing

from one-pilot operations and precision agriculture to military applications, defense applications, border security, as well as the energy industry—just a whole gamut of military, border protection, and commercial agricultural uses for unmanned aviation.

For example, one of the golf courses in Grand Forks, the King's Walk Golf Course, which was actually designed by Arnold Palmer and is a very nice golf course, has begun delivering food to golfers on the golf course by drones. That is pretty cool. It is a sign of things to come. We have companies there such as General Atomics, Northrop Grumman, and leading aerospace companies developing applications such as Predator, Reaper, Global Hawk—all of these ISR military applications and so forth.

We also have Customs and Border Protection there. We have 900 miles of border responsibility, and they are using unmanned drones on the border. I want to assure the Presiding Officer that is not just to keep an eye on Alaska, but we work with our good friends in Canada. So we have Customs and Border Protection and military applications but also these ag and energy applications, also this idea of small product delivery, where products can be delivered right to your home with drones. They are actually starting that on the golf course. You walk before you run, right? Here you are on the golf course getting food and beverages delivered. That is a first step in this process.

I look at these young people, and I think about what we all carry now, our smartphones that are amazing computers that can do so much. Ten years ago, obviously, and when we were their age, we never dreamed of something like that. Even 10 years ago, we had no idea what this device could do. Think what unmanned aviation systems—drones, if you will—are going to do in 10 years, right?

Looking at these pages—they will be developing these applications. We will be trying to keep up. You know, guys like me and the Presiding Officer, we will be trying to keep up with these young people. It is going to be amazing, and we have no idea about all the amazing applications that are going to be developed. That is why we worked so hard in this area, and that is why I am so pleased.

Back in 2011, I actually worked on the legislation and authored a lot of it that set up the test sites we have. We were actually the first test site named. What we have been able to include in this bill is another 5-year extension of those test sites. That is really important because the work we are doing out there—as I mentioned, some of the great companies we have, they have to know they will be able to continue to operate on those test sites. We have a lot of special things going into making sure they have the airspace so they can fly these unmanned aircraft and do the testing and development. Whether it is

high level, as I described with something like Global Hawk, which is a very large jet aircraft, all the way down to these small drones that are delivering food products on the golf course, we have to do it all. Having those test sites is a huge part of it.

The second aspect of the legislation I was able to include in this bill really goes to spectrum. We actually have a program in there that allows us to help develop the spectrum, and that is very important as well. The amendment I offered will enable us to evaluate the best and safest spectrum for UAS use. We need that for command and control.

It is amazing the things we have to figure out, including privacy, safety, how we do the command and control, high-level satellite, low-level, is it communication towers, like cell towers, what spectrums we use. All of these things, including redundancy, sense-and-avoid—all of those things go into developing contract airspace use for manned and unmanned aircraft.

Another provision we included has to do with the language that will allow us to develop the best spectrum for UAS use. It is important to ensure that UAS operates on a spectrum that provides the safest command and control of the aircraft and involves the least interference with other spectrum users. I thank Chairman THUNE for working with me to include this provision in the final bill that enables us to move forward in that very important area.

As we see growth in UAS development and use, it is also important that we address vulnerabilities. In the wrong hands, Unmanned Aircraft Systems can pose a serious threat to our country, our people, and property. So I was pleased this legislation includes the Preventing Emerging Threats Act legislation I helped introduce along with the chairman of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, Senator RON JOHNSON. I truly appreciate his work and the fact that we were able to include this provision in the legislation which Secretary Nielsen at the DHS wants. She was very clear that the Department of Homeland Security needs this legislation to have the authority not only to protect our Nation's borders but internally as well in case of any kind of unmanned aircraft attack on a facility and to be able to protect and prevent that. DHS needed this authorizing legislation to do that. So our bill will help protect important facilities from the security risks posed by anyone using unmanned aircraft improperly or dangerously. We do this by providing the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice with the authority to protect covered facilities and assets when there is a security risk posed by unmanned aircraft. I am pleased we were able to work in all these areas and include them in this large, important bill. These are all different areas of aviation that are so important to address for our Nation.

Our Nation leads the world in aviation. We always have. We lead in technology development, whether it is manned or unmanned aircraft. We are pushing the boundaries whether it is rocketry or anything else. The President now is advocating a space force. Again, we are pushing the boundaries of aviation. We will continue to do that because of the innovation, creativity, ingenuity, and the adventurous spirit of the American people.

We have to make sure we are doing our job in this body as well as our fellow Members of Congress. Our responsibility is to make sure we create the framework for our great companies, our great inventors, and our great scientists—for these amazing young people with all their brilliant and bright ideas—to have the forum and the opportunity to support the legal and regulatory environment so they can go out and do truly great things, where the sky is the limit. Right, guys? Where the sky is the limit.

That is what this bill is about. It is not about the government doing it, it is about empowering the great people of this country to do all those great things and continue to lead the world forward with aviation. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

INTERNATIONAL AID AND NAFTA

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there is a lot going on in the world right now, and obviously there is a lot going on in Washington, DC, but I want to take a global look at what is happening in trade.

I want to begin by mentioning what is happening in Indonesia. It is a part of the world where Americans don't travel too often or interact with. It is not in our typical sphere, but right now the people of Indonesia are digging out from a massive earthquake and tsunami that followed.

The latest death toll numbers are over 1,400 people they identified right now. Many of the most remote villages that were deeply affected by the earthquake haven't been reached yet. We don't know how high the death toll is going to climb.

Our State Department has already engaged, as we should, to help them in any way we can. We have already released some initial aid relief to them. We are offering our help in any way we possibly can to assist the people there as they try to make sense of how to go forward on relief efforts. There are private organizations, such as World Relief, that provide a global response that are already on the ground engaging to help. There are Americans helping the people of Indonesia—and rightfully so that we should. We should keep our focus on what is happening around the world, and where we can help, we should help and engage. So we should continue to pray for and reach out in practical ways to help the people of Indonesia. We will try to keep people updated on that in the days ahead on how people can stay engaged.

The President made an announcement earlier this week dealing with international activities with our closer neighbors of Canada and Mexico. This is an issue that has been discussed for quite a while. The President brought it up in his campaign and immediately went to work on trying to reshape the NAFTA agreement.

Interestingly, States have different opinions about NAFTA, but in Oklahoma our No. 1 and No. 2 largest export locations are Canada and Mexico. Our manufactured and agricultural products often are moving north and south to our closest neighbors, and NAFTA has been a win for us as far as building our own economy and reaching out to export our products.

So I was very attentive when the President said he wanted to revisit NAFTA. Our team quickly engaged with the President and his team to talk about what can be done to help. It is one of the issues I brought up with Robert Lighthizer before he was even appointed to the position of U.S. Trade Representative. We talked about NAFTA; we talked about the importance of trade agreements as well.

I met with Gregg Doud, the Chief Agricultural Negotiator, multiple times through this process. I met with the White House to talk numerous times. I met with the President and with the Vice President. I met with different individuals with their team to talk about how important trade is and how essential it is that we get to a good deal.

Initially, the focus was on resolving it with Mexico, leaving Canada out. My conversations with the White House have been that I understand the pressure on Canada, but Oklahoma's No. 1 trading partner is Canada. So I encouraged them to finish this out, as well, because it is exceptionally important to us.

There is this perception that only the people who border with Canada care about trade with Canada. That is not so. We continue to interact with them in letters, meetings, and phone calls.

I was pleased to see a trade agreement that actually came forward this week. There is a lot to resolve. We are still going through the details on it, but the important thing to come through it is locking in some of the things we already have with trade agreements.

When I speak with the people in my State about trade, they say: We want to resolve the trade issues with our friends, but the main focus we want to have is reaching out to make new friends internationally. Let's resolve the markets we already have and make sure those are stable. Let's try to find new places to sell our products and establish new trade agreements. It makes sense for our economy. It makes sense, quite frankly, worldwide for us.

I was pleased to see the administration step forward, saying that we are resolving the issues with Canada and Mexico and resolving some of the unanswered issues.

If you go back to the 1990s, we weren't talking a lot about e-commerce when the NAFTA deal was first done. It was time for an update on that.

It was time, quite frankly, for a State like ours that deals with a lot of wheat to have Canada acknowledge that the wheat we grow is quality wheat. Canada had a bad habit; every time we sent quality wheat to them, they would downgrade it as soon as it came across the border and say that American wheat was never the same quality as Canadian wheat. Sorry to say, our wheat is the same quality, so that is finally being resolved, back and forth, between Canada and the United States.

There are simple questions, such as what are de minimis products to be able to carry across the border between Canada and Mexico? It might not seem like a big deal, but allowing an individual to cross the border from the United States to Canada—to go back and forth with a small number of goods they have purchased is significant to someone who is a normal consumer crossing back and forth across the border. That has been a problem for a long time that finally will be resolved.

Dairy issues have famously been a problem. Opening up their market a little more to dairy products is very significant for us. This preserves and expands access for U.S. poultry and egg producers and makes updates to the areas where we need modern updates. I am pleased to see we are finally moving to resolve this.

There are some areas that I think are still unresolved, such as the issue about an expiration date. I have spoken with the administration multiple times about that. I think trade agreements can be revisited at any moment. We don't have to set an expiration date on it. Clearly, they can be revisited because we are revisiting NAFTA right now to renegotiate the deal. I don't think we need to set a future date and say that this whole thing goes away. I think that sets an arbitrary deadline on a trade deal. If it is working, we can renegotiate the areas that need to be tweaked, but leave it in place. It creates greater stability.

I look forward to having the debate about some of those issues and trying to resolve some of those things. But in the meantime, I want to thank the Trump administration for doing the work that was required, taking on the trade issues that have needed to be taken on for quite a while, and trying to actually get them resolved. Now that NAFTA is wrapping up, we look forward to seeing the details in the days ahead and coming before Congress for a vote, as we see all of the details, and all of the American people will be able to see this final negotiation.

I look forward to the next year. The next year will include the new markets. We have trade issues, for instance, with Japan and U.S. beef. The whole world wants to have our beef.

They know the quality of the beef we put out. Japan has arbitrary tariffs that well exceed the norms against American beef coming into Japan, which other countries don't face. That needs to be resolved with Japan.

We need to continue to expand our exports into multiple other countries. The Trans-Pacific Partnership that was discussed in the previous administration—this administration set aside it and said: We are going to do bilateral negotiations rather than multilateral negotiations. I understand that. It is time to take on those bilateral negotiations, deal with those trade agreements, and expand into new markets and new places.

As the American economy is thriving right now, we are continuing to create greater efficiencies and greater products. The world continues to want our products, and the more we can negotiate those deals and find places to send them and people who want to buy them, let's do it.

I would add one more thing. We have a unique relationship with England. As the UK, because of their Brexit vote, breaks away from the EU and from that trading bloc, they are working on negotiating a deal with Europe. We should be aggressively negotiating a deal with the UK to form a trading relationship. There is no reason the United States and the UK shouldn't be the first major trade negotiation that they take on and that we solve.

We have a lot of products back and forth. Aerospace is one of those primary areas in which the UK and the United States should be able to cooperate extensively. Let's get that trade agreement going and make sure we can get that locked in.

In the days ahead, we will want to continue to have our close alliance with the UK, including a close free trade agreement between us, to make sure we can knock down tariffs. This is a moment when the UK can walk away from Europe's high tariffs and high barriers to trade, and we can actually say: Let's establish a closer relationship with our close allies of the UK.

There is a lot to be done in trade. There are a lot of new places to go, and there are some areas that I would tweak and do differently, even in this new deal on NAFTA with the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. But I am proud of the administration; they have actually taken this on to be able to solve it.

As I have jokingly said: They have the ability to break things; now it is time to prove they can fix some things. This is one they are fixing, and it will be good for the American economy in the days ahead to see it done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Americans are taking to the skies like never before. According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, a new high of 74.8 million domestic and international passengers flew in June of 2018, a 5.8-percent increase compared to

last year and a 1-percent increase compared to May. June was the fifth consecutive monthly increase in system-wide passengers. In the midst of this growth, Congress has been working on legislation to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, which sits at the center of this tremendously important industry.

Today we are sending a 5-year FAA reauthorization to the President's desk. While certainly not perfect, on balance, this is a good bill that takes positive steps for airline workers and customers and also reauthorizes funding for key programs that help rural airports. At a time when the Trump administration has sought to either eliminate or dramatically slash discretionary funding for the Essential Air Service, EAS, this bill sends a strong, bipartisan signal about the importance of EAS to rural communities across the country. In addition, this agreement will end the requirement that airports use toxic firefighting foam that can poison groundwater. Communities in Vermont have been forced to confront the aftereffects of the use of these dangerous chemicals. It is long overdue that we put an end to their use.

I am also pleased that this bill contains a small but important provision I worked to include that will authorize reimbursement for preclearance activities in the rail environment. As a long-time advocate for preclearance, I appreciate the willingness of Chairman THUNE, Ranking Member NELSON, and Chairman GRASSLEY to work with me and Senator JOHNSON on this language, which is necessary for establishing preclearance facilities at Canadian rail stations.

I am concerned, however, about one unrelated piece of legislation attached to this bill that grants vague and overly broad authority to the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security to mitigate threats posed by drones. The Preventing Emerging Threats Act would allow the government to take control over, destroy, and wiretap drones that pose a "credible threat" to an undefined class of Federal property. Crucially, it exempts DOJ and DHS from the protections contained in the Wiretap Act and the Pen Register and Trap and Trace Act, opening the door to warrantless wiretapping.

While there is undoubtedly potential for drones to be misused in a manner that could pose a serious threat to citizens and government buildings, this bill fails to achieve the right balance between granting DOJ and DHS reasonable authority to confront such threats and protecting civil liberties. The vague definitions of "credible threat," "safety and security" and "covered facility or asset" leave the door open for serious abuse. It is imperative that Congress remain vigilant in conducting oversight to prevent misuse of this vague authority.

Despite my serious concerns about the Preventing Emerging Threats Act,

I am supporting this package because it brings stability and certainty to the FAA and includes other important provisions that benefit airline passengers, employees, and Vermont. I appreciate the hard work that went into crafting this compromise. I do not support everything in this bill, but on balance, it is legislation I will vote in favor of.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today to provide clarification surrounding section 317 of H.R. 302, the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, Reauthorization Act of 2018.

New section 44737 of title 49, as added by section 317 of the bill, allows for the consideration of other means acceptable to the FAA Administrator that provide an equivalent level of fuel system crash resistance. I want to state clearly for the record that the intent of Congress in new section 44737 subsection (a), paragraph (1), subparagraph (B) is to provide flexibility for the FAA to consider innovative fuel system designs when determining an equivalent level of fuel system crash resistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senate is going to vote shortly on legislation called the FAA bill. It addresses the concerns of air travelers across the country. The bill before us has some key safety and security aviation measures.

We have worked across the aisle to bring to Congress a 5-year authorization of the Federal Aviation Administration. This is the first 5-year bill of the FAA that has passed and will pass this Congress since the 1980s.

Why is that important? There needs to be stability for planning purposes for the aviation industry. Fortunately, this bill is a new mark of bipartisanship that would allow us to get an extensive bill charting the authorization for aviation for the next 5 years. Remember, there was a time during one year in which we had multiple extensions. That has caused an inability to bring bipartisan agreement to the FAA's governing of aviation.

Well, we have that agreement, and it is going to be a 5-year bill. I have already commended Chairman JOHN THUNE in another hearing this morning on another topic in the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. It is that bipartisanship that brings us to this point.

Along with the FAA bill, the bill will also provide long-term stability and continued focus on security and safety at the Transportation Safety Administration, the TSA, and the NTSB, the National Transportation Safety Board, which is charged with determining the cause of aviation and other transportation accidents.

This bill greatly benefits the flying public. It ensures the FAA's core mission remains safety, and it helps American aviation and aerospace companies remain competitive and produce good-paying jobs. In Florida alone, my

State, aviation and aerospace companies employ over 98,000 people. It is “big time” to us in Florida.

Most important of all, we have heard weary travelers loud and clear with their cries for help, and help is on the way. That is why this bill contains a number of comprehensive consumer protections.

We have all experienced the indignity and the frustration of being squeezed into smaller and smaller airline seats. Under this bill, the FAA will be required to establish minimum dimensions for passenger seats. For airline passengers who purchased airline services that were never received, the legislation requires prompt refunds. Remember how infuriating it is if your bag doesn't arrive or if it is completely lost—the indignity that you have already paid for that bag. You are going to get a refund.

We also addressed the needs of traveling families by requiring early boarding during pregnancy, private space in airports for nursing mothers, and ensuring that strollers can be checked at the gate.

By the way, do you know how cigarettes are prohibited on flights? This prohibits e-cigarettes, electronic cigarettes, on flights.

The bill calls for the development of a bill of rights for passengers with disabilities.

We also established an aviation consumer advocate within the Department of Transportation. The aviation consumer advocate will now be there to help travelers who have been mistreated by the airlines.

Those are just some of the consumer-oriented reforms. It will be incumbent on the Trump administration to carry out these improvements. This Senate will be enacting our constitutional responsibility of oversight to see that the executive branch is doing just that.

Aside from the consumer wins, I would also like to mention that the bill advances the TSA's mission of securing our transportation system by expanding the use of bomb-sniffing dogs, speeding up the deployment of technology, and addressing gaps in surface transportation security.

The bill also addresses another topic, disaster recovery and response, by including protections for local governments that have experienced a natural disaster, by limiting the number of years the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, can demand repayment of disaster assistance in cases that don't involve fraud or abuse. That is a real problem in Florida, where years later—they call it a clawback—FEMA is trying to clawback disaster assistance funds that it had already sent to the State or local governments and then claimed years later: No, you shouldn't have had that. Of course, those funds have already been spent. It is a very important issue for Florida and for so many of our cities and counties that are put in this economic, fiscal bind.

For the residents of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, there is also an

extension of disaster unemployment assistance. Believe me, after those island territories—our fellow U.S. citizens—had been hit by the hurricanes that roared through that part of the world last year, there is still a lot of unemployment, and they need that unemployment assistance as a result of the natural disaster that occurred.

In the case of Puerto Rico, not just one but two hurricanes, Irma and Maria, hit and devastated that island. This is, certainly, going to help those who lost their jobs or those who were unable to work due to Hurricane Maria to get back on their feet.

As the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, I have always sought to address the national challenges by reaching across the aisle to find bipartisan consensus, and this bill does that. As I said in my comments, Senator THUNE has been a great partner to work with. I appreciate the opportunity to have worked with him, along with Senators BLUNT and CANTWELL, as well as with Representatives SHUSTER, DEFAZIO, MCCAUL, and THOMPSON, on this important legislation—5 years, an FAA bill.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired, and the question occurs on the motion to concur.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Enzi	Kyl
Baldwin	Ernst	Lankford
Bennet	Feinstein	Leahy
Blumenthal	Fischer	Manchin
Blunt	Flake	McCaskill
Booker	Gardner	McConnell
Boozman	Gillibrand	Menendez
Brown	Graham	Moran
Burr	Grassley	Murkowski
Cantwell	Harris	Murphy
Capito	Hassan	Murray
Cardin	Hatch	Nelson
Carper	Heinrich	Perdue
Casey	Heitkamp	Peters
Cassidy	Heller	Portman
Collins	Hirono	Reed
Coons	Hoeven	Risch
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Roberts
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rounds
Cortez Masto	Isakson	Rubio
Cotton	Johnson	Sanders
Crapo	Jones	Sasse
Daines	Kaine	Schatz
Donnelly	Kennedy	Schumer
Duckworth	King	Scott
Durbin	Klobuchar	Shaheen

Shelby	Thune	Warner
Smith	Tillis	Warren
Stabenow	Toomey	Whitehouse
Sullivan	Udall	Wicker
Tester	Van Hollen	Young

NAYS—6

Barrasso	Markey	Paul
Lee	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to concur having been agreed to, the motion to concur with amendments is rendered moot.

SUBSTANCE USE-DISORDER PREVENTION THAT PROMOTES OPIOID RECOVERY AND TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As if in legislative session, under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the House message with respect to H.R. 6.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6) entitled “An Act to provide for opioid use disorder prevention, recovery, and treatment, and for other purposes,” with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. THUNE. As if in legislative session, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 6 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

The Senator from South Dakota.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, it is oftentimes easy to believe the news reporting on how the Senate is broken and bipartisanship is dead, but then you work with your colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans, from the House and the Senate—on something like the FAA Reauthorization Act, which we just passed, and you are reminded that we can still come together and get things done for the American people.

The bill we just overwhelmingly passed and sent to the President's desk is the longest FAA reauthorization since the 1980s, and it will improve our aviation system for travelers, manufacturers, and innovators alike.

The bill also reauthorizes the Transportation Security Administration, ensuring improved screening technologies and more explosive detection K-9s, additional focus on security and surface transportation to public areas, and new pathways to mitigate airport security delays for an overall better travel experience.

It also reauthorizes the National Transportation Safety Board, providing key reforms to modernize and improve transparency in this important safety agency's investigations, recommendations, and Board member discussions. These important provisions are just the three-quarters of the