

with this problem. This is not a moon-shot from Washington. It is everything, though, we could think of to do; more than 70 different proposals to support patients and support communities as they continue to fight our No. 1 public health epidemic.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

Mr. ISAKSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—98

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

NAYS—1

Lee

NOT VOTING—1

Crux

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR— CONTINUED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senators be allowed to present legislative items at the desk during today's session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

SUPPORT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to thank my

colleagues Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY for this important opioids legislation. Parts of it passed out of the Senate Finance Committee as well. So I want to thank Senators HATCH and WYDEN for their work on this very comprehensive package.

This important legislation, which, I think, is the third in the bills we passed related to opioids, couldn't come at a more important time. This crisis is ravaging our communities. It is impacting families.

We need to do all we can to help those on the frontlines. That is why I have been from Port Angeles to Spokane, to southwest Washington, to Everett to talk about this issue and to try to provide the solutions that my law enforcement and community people want in this legislation.

I am so excited that the legislation will mean that there are more available beds through Medicaid to treat those addicted to opioids. This is something we heard about in every community in Washington. We heard that those coming out of our jails addicted to opioids, who had some modicum of an ability to maybe get off of opioids, then had to wait weeks and weeks for treatment in places like Tacoma or Spokane, where there simply weren't enough beds.

This legislation allows Medicaid to cover treatment at institutions with more than 16 beds for up to 30 days. It means that funding will be available to States and local governments to help treat opioid addiction, and it is very important in the State of Washington because we have received \$43 million in the past 3 years to help us with these tools. It means funding tools for law enforcement so that they can help combat drug trafficking rings.

Specifically, this legislation includes more than \$4 million in tools to support our State of Washington through the HIDTA Program, which fights drug-trafficking rings.

In 2016 alone, the Seattle-based Northwest High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area helped to disrupt and dismantle 81 different drug-trafficking organizations.

This support and help for our law enforcement and our sheriffs to keep doing their job is incredibly important. I have heard from our sheriffs who played great roles in this. Sheriff Pastor in Pierce County, the King County Sheriff, and our Snohomish County Sheriff have all done great work on this very important legislation.

This legislation also includes stiffer penalties for those who illegally distribute opioids that have been flooding our communities. We have talked to so many people about this problem. I joined with our attorney general, Bob Ferguson, and 39 other State attorneys general in pushing legislation that I and Senator HARRIS of California authored that basically said we are not doing a good enough job in tracking the distribution of these opioids, and we need to have stiffer fines and pen-

alties for those who don't do their job in tracking the distribution of this drug.

Our communities have been flooded, and those attorneys general said: Please ensure that effective penalties hold manufacturers accountable and help stem the diversion of this product.

How did we get here? When Congress passed the Controlled Substances Act in 1970 to regulate highly addictive drugs, including prescriptions for opioids, they did so because they were so addictive; yet Congress said you must follow a network of laws to track these controlled substances. You need to know exactly where the manufacturers are distributing these drugs, to whom, and how much.

Why did they want that? Because they knew they were so addictive that, if they got on the streets and flooded communities and marketplaces, we would have a devastating impact.

Well, because the fines and penalties were so small, these manufacturers paid no mind to this provision of the law. Despite the requirements, large quantities of opioids flooded into communities. Because law enforcement didn't understand how much they were flooding their communities and didn't have the records, there was little to track. So you had excessive shipments from manufacturers.

In one example, a physician in Everett, WA, wrote more than 10,000 prescriptions for opioids. This number of prescriptions was 26 times higher than the average prescriber in Everett. I know that sounds suspicious, but the drug manufacturer didn't even report the activity. The DEA didn't have the information. Instead, the physician continued, and the manufacturer continued to distribute to them.

Why did this lack of reporting continue? It is because the fines currently in place for failing to track distribution were so small. They did not feel they were a threat, given the other aspects of the business. Current fines for failing to follow the Federal law just weren't enough. That is why we put new standards in place.

I traveled throughout our State to talk about this and to talk about how our communities have been flooded with this drug. Every time, law enforcement and local communities said: We need new tools—tools to stop the distribution, tools to help our law enforcement break up rings and track the drugs, and new tools to help those who have been impacted by opioids.

That is why we are bumping these fines up to \$500,000 per criminal violation. These penalties increase the chances that opioid manufacturers will think twice about not reporting this distribution. In the case of Everett, that manufacturer could have been fined \$900 million because of their activities. I guarantee you that this is a deterrent if a manufacturer thinks they are going to receive hundreds of millions of dollars in fines.

I hope they will take this seriously. This legislation is needed and will go

to the President's desk. It is so important for our communities to have tools.

I also want to commend my colleague the Senator from Ohio for putting in language to increase the tools for U.S. mail inspections. We know we are seeing product being shipped into the United States and that we haven't had all of the tools we have needed to make sure we are checking the U.S. mail for this product. The STOP Act, hopefully, will help us catch and stop more of the illegal distribution of this product through the U.S. mail.

There will be longer coverage for beds to help with treatment, more tools for our sheriffs and police forces, better ways to penalize manufacturers, which is the key to helping us stop the diversion of drugs into communities, and better inspections of those who are using our mail system.

These are all great tools to give to law enforcement. I am glad our colleagues could come together on this, and it is so needed in the State of Washington. I thank the law enforcement throughout our State and thank the providers for helping us work together to get this legislation passed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, across the country, women and survivors are angry; they are energized; and they are making their voices heard. They are inspired by Dr. Ford, and they are sharing stories of their own, often of the worst moments of their lives—some for the first time ever with their families, with their friends, and their Senators. There are too many to share in one speech on the Senate floor, but I want to touch on just a few.

I heard from a woman in Sequim, in Washington State, who wrote to me.

She writes:

There have been rare moments in my life when I have felt compelled to speak out. This is one.

She told me, when she was in junior high school, she dated a boy she thought was "one of the nicest guys ever." Then, one day, she went to his house while his parents were at church, and he assaulted her—he tried to rape her. She only barely managed to escape and run from his house. She said she never told anyone about this because she didn't know who would believe her. She was worried that people would think it was her fault. She told me that after Dr. Ford found the courage to come forward with her experience, she found the courage to share her own.

Another woman from Everett, WA, reached out to me to share that she

was sexually assaulted in a hotel elevator in the early 1970s. She didn't tell a soul for 40 years—until just a few days ago. She said that since that day all those years ago, she has avoided getting into an elevator alone with another man if she possibly could, taking the stairs instead. She told me: "It happened a long time ago, but it still matters," that she was inspired by the women who had so bravely spoken out about Judge Kavanaugh, and that she shared her story with me in the hopes that I could make sure her voice and the other voices of so many women were heard.

I heard from another woman who lives on the Olympic Peninsula in my home State of Washington. She told me that when she was in college, she was raped by a man with whom she was out on a date. She remembered his name, but because she believes she was drugged, there were a whole lot of details she didn't remember. She didn't tell anyone about her experience for years. She reached out to tell me that she understood why Dr. Ford didn't come forward and to express her anger that people continue to attack survivors, doubt them, and say they are "just mixed up."

There are so many more. I have received tens of thousands of letters and calls on this nomination with hundreds and hundreds of personal stories that my staff and I are still working to get through. They are heartbreaking, they are real, and they are just one small slice of the experiences being shared, the stories that are being told, and the voices that are bravely speaking up.

While these women and survivors are so bravely sharing experiences and while so many of us in the Senate are making it clear we do believe them and support them, others are going in a very different direction.

Last night, the President of the United States stood on a stage and openly mocked Dr. Ford for not remembering some details of what she has described as the most traumatic moment of her life. It was disgusting. Some of my colleagues in the Senate are doing everything they can to undermine the women sharing their experiences, saying they are "mixed up." They say that the Senate is going to "plow right through this."

The word coming out from the White House is that they are doing everything they can to limit and rush the FBI investigation that they assured Democrats and Republicans would be full and thorough.

I come to the floor today to ask three questions.

When this is all said and done, will the Senate—the U.S. Senate—be a place where women are heard, where their voices are respected, or still a place where women are ignored, undermined, and attacked?

Will the Senate do its job—truly do its job—to properly vet and investigate the President's nominee for a lifetime position on our Nation's highest Court,

including pushing for a full FBI investigation where at least Dr. Ford and Judge Kavanaugh are interviewed, making sure all relevant witnesses are heard and all relevant information is brought forward, or will we allow politics and partisanship to take over and rush this through before our job is complete?

Finally, will the Senate make sure we don't put someone on the Bench who has repeatedly had problems with the truth under oath, who has displayed truly serious temperament issues, who has not demonstrated the judicial independence that we expect for a nominee to the Supreme Court, and who has displayed a shocking lack of fitness for that role?

Those are the questions I believe we need to be asking today, and there is a lot of work that needs to be done before we can answer them.

There have been a whole lot of distractions in the past few weeks—from yelling and screaming and outrage, real and feigned, to the finger-pointing, to the partisanship, to the spin and the kicking up of mud—but if you cut through all of that and focus on what is real and what is important, there are some things we do know.

First and foremost, we all saw Dr. Ford testify under oath. I can't imagine anyone watching her and not being moved by her honesty, how real she was, her pain, and her commitment to what she described as her "civic duty." I believe her, and I know so many others watching that day here in the Senate and across the country did as well.

Then we had Judge Kavanaugh. He came into that hearing angry, defensive, and aggrieved. He clearly acted as if he is owed a seat on the Supreme Court and didn't understand why the U.S. Senators had the audacity to question him.

Even worse than his rage, even worse than his condescension and arrogant entitlement, and even worse than the raw partisan bitterness from someone who would be entrusted to make impartial decisions regarding the biggest issues facing our Nation were the serious challenges he had with the truth under oath, in public, to the U.S. Senate, from his small, seemingly unnecessary mistruths about what words used in his yearbook meant—words I will not repeat on the Senate floor, but the people who went to school with him don't understand why he would say what he said; to those about his connections to Dr. Ford, such as claiming he and Dr. Ford didn't "travel in the same social circles," when we know that is just not true; to claiming that he never attended a gathering like the one Dr. Ford described, when there is one very similar to that on the calendar that he himself released; to those my colleagues have talked through before, such as those involving his level of involvement in the confirmation of President Bush's judges, which we learned about as emails to and from him were uncovered and released; to