

Mary Naylor played a critical role in the Affordable Care Act. With members of the Budget Committee, she helped to iron out the fiscal details of such a monumental bill, and she captivated a lot of my staffers in the office with tales of the high stakes parliamentary maneuvering she undertook to make sure the reconciliation component of the ACA complied with the Byrd rule.

One of the things that Mary does in my office that my staff loves is the parliamentary minute. At the end of every week, after I have gone back to Richmond, she will do a parliamentary minute and put an interesting problem or challenge on the table from the past and walk my legislative staff through how we should deal with it.

In 2011, the “Washingtonian” named Mary one of the 100 most powerful women in DC, and the “National Journal” named her among the top 14 women on the Hill.

Mary has helped me out in so many ways. She has learned more about aircraft carrier refueling than she ever thought possible and has helped me overcome now two bouts of the decommissioning of aircraft.

All of my staff understands that Mary has really been kind of the brains of the operation. She is in a league of her own. Every single bill of mine that has passed has her fingerprints on it, and I guess I am getting up to—I don’t know—over 40 or 50 bills. She comes up with the ideas. She makes my ideas a lot better. She builds supports for our proposals. She tells me when my ideas are bad, and she is almost always right—not always right. She is almost always right. She helps me on my committees and floor strategy. She recruits, trains, and advises all of the amazing policy staffers I have working with me and all who have worked with me over the years.

That is what Mary has done for me and for the people of Virginia for 6 years. That is what she has done for the Senate for the United States for now 30 years. She is a policy whiz. She is a dogged go-getter, and I emphasize “dogged.” That is a character reference if you know Mary’s love of dogs. She is a walking parliamentary encyclopedia, and her dedication has helped me to achieve much more than I would have imagined as a Senator.

I recognize Mary to say, like so many in the offices in this building, her persistent service to Senator Conrad, to Senator Simon, to me, to the Budget Committee, to the Senate more broadly, and to the country have really made a difference in an awful lot of people’s lives.

Anybody leaving, it is always bittersweet. I think that she is now going to find there is life after the Senate, and she has a cool next opportunity that she can pursue.

Whenever one of my staffers goes on to pursue a new cool opportunity, I am really happy for them, and yet it is hard to imagine what it will be like walking into the office every day and

not having Mary there as the brains of the operation and a great right hand at getting good things done.

So with that, I know my whole staff is thinking the same thought right now. We want to just thank Mary Naylor for her great service and commend her.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, there was an article in the paper today telling us something that surprises nobody in this Chamber, really, on either side, surveying the tax packages, the proposals from Democrats and Republicans, and making the contrast, and it said the Democratic tax packages are significantly better for the middle class than the Republican tax package.

We know what happened 2-plus years ago when the Finance Committee, in the middle of the night, kept writing new language and biasing it towards the wealthiest people in the country.

We know that the Trump tax bill, voted for by the majority, opposed by all of us because over 75 percent of the benefits, over time, went to the richest 1 percent. Contrast that with our Working Families Tax Relief Act, which focuses on middle-class and working-class taxpayers, focuses on the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit under the theory that, if you cut taxes for the rich, which Republicans always do, that the money trickles down, but it doesn’t trickle down. They say it is going to trickle down and help the middle class. Well, it really never does.

I heard President Trump promise a group of us in the White House that everybody would get a \$4,000 raise and several thousand dollars in tax cuts for middle-class families—it just didn’t happen.

The way you grow the economy is you focus on the middle class, you cut taxes for the middle class, put money in their pocket, they spend it in local communities. You cut taxes for the rich, it goes to a Swiss bank account or wherever it goes.

So the newspaper today said what everybody already knows, that the best way to grow the economy, the best way to help this country, the best way to help the middle class is—surprise—cut taxes for the middle class. That is what the Working Families Tax Relief Act does. It helps working class kids.

The Trump tax bill pretended to cut taxes through the child tax credit. For the child tax credit, it actually left 26

million children out. Our legislation focuses on those 26 million children. They are not children of the rich. They are children of the middle class. They are working families. They are low-income kids.

So it is clear that that is the way this body should go. I understand who has the votes. I understand that the President of the United States—where the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives—the President of the United States can always jam another tax cut for billionaires through this body.

But let’s do the right thing and actually put our focus on working families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

S. 151

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate overwhelmingly approved the Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act, known as the TRACED Act, authored by our colleagues Senators THUNE and MARKEY.

I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this bill to help protect consumers from fraudulent, aggravating, and incessant robocalls.

The TRACED Act makes a number of important changes to our laws that will make it easier to fight illegal robocalls.

Most important, the TRACED Act requires telecommunications carriers to implement what is known as SHAKEN/STIR technology to verify whether caller IDs that appear on incoming calls are authentic.

When fully implemented, this technology will be a major advance against the illegal spoofing of calls that have resulted in successful scams.

Combating illegal robocalls has long been a focus of the Senate’s Special Committee on Aging, which I chair, and on which the Presiding Officer serves.

Over the past 6 years, the Special Committee on Aging has held 22 hearings to examine scams that specifically target older Americans. Scams that we have highlighted include the IRS imposter scam, the Jamaican lottery scam, computer tech support schemes, grandparent scams, elder financial exploitation, identity theft, and the notorious drug mule scam.

The number and the kind of these scams are endless in their variety. The criminals are ruthless and relentless, and they will continue to come up with new ways to defraud Americans, particularly our seniors.

These scams are often initiated by robocallers who use caller ID spoofing to perpetrate their schemes. Many of us remember back in 2003 when the Do Not Call Registry was created. At that point, what we were able to do was register our phone numbers and block those unwanted, illegal robocalls. Fortunately, back then, telecommunications equipment could not easily be

used to disguise a caller ID to make it look like the call was coming from someplace other than its origin.

Unfortunately, technology today and particularly the emergence of the voice over internet protocol technology has changed all that to the point where the Do Not Call Registry has become virtually useless for most Americans. Now criminals can use VoIP to hide their identities while generating millions of robocalls from anywhere in the world at practically no cost.

We heard in the Aging Committee some heart-wrenching stories of consumers who have been ripped off because of the combination of the robocall and the disguising of the identity of the caller.

For example, in 2015, we heard from the Auburn, ME, Police Department about a woman who lost \$7,400 because she got one of these calls, and it was followed by another call that appeared to be the Auburn Police Department. That is what appeared on her caller ID. Yet, of course, it was nothing of the sort. But that was sufficient to make her think she really did have to pay what turned out to be \$7,400 of her retirement savings, which she could ill afford to lose.

In 2017, we heard from an 81-year-old veteran from Portland, ME, Phillip Hatch, who was a victim of the IRS imposter scam. In these scams, what happens is the robocaller pretends to be an IRS agent. He or she will tell the person who answers the phone that the consumer owes thousands of dollars in back taxes and penalties and that if they are not paid immediately, they will either be arrested or a lien will be put on their home. They manage to panic people of all ages—particularly our seniors—into paying money they do not owe to the IRS.

Everyone should be aware that if you really do owe back taxes to the IRS, you will get a letter from the IRS. You won't be called up and threatened. But that, unfortunately, is what these con artists, these ruthless criminals, do.

Well, Mr. Hatch was induced to pay some \$8,000 when he got a second call that appeared to be from the Portland Police Department telling him that if he did not pay up immediately, there was a warrant for his arrest—again, completely bogus. Mr. Hatch did not owe back taxes, much less penalties, but it was the spoofing of the call that made it look like it was from the Portland Police Department in this case—the Auburn Police Department in the previous case I described—that caused him to lose a substantial amount of money. His situation would have been even worse if his son had not intervened. He would have lost even more.

This is a problem that is getting worse every day. Oddly enough, lately on my cell phones, I have been receiving robocalls that are in Chinese, which is really bizarre. I don't know whether they are targeting a Chinese-American population in some part of the Washington, DC, area, but that is

what I have been getting lately. But all of us know how frequent, how annoying, and in many cases how dangerous these robocalls can be when they are conducted by these ruthless criminals.

Last year, the Federal Trade Commission logged an incredible 3.8 billion complaints about illegal robocalls. This year, industry sources estimate that nearly half of all mobile phone calls are fraudulent—nearly half. So this is a problem that deserves our attention. The American people are tired of having scammers ring their phones off the hook—or their cell phones—and they want these calls stopped. We have to do all we can to give the regulators the important tools to help fight these illegal robocalls.

I am very pleased that we have taken an important step today and that the Federal Communications Commission is also acting to increase the protections for consumers. We should be able to rely on the veracity of our caller ID identifications. That is why we have caller ID. But the spoofers have managed to defeat the purpose of caller ID, including being able to pretend to be the Department of Treasury, the Auburn Police Department, and other law enforcement agencies. No wonder people pick up the phone when they see the Department of Treasury, the Auburn Police Department, or the IRS is calling, but, in fact, that is not who is calling; it is a relentless criminal who is trying to steal money from the consumer.

It is my hope that this important consumer protection bill, which builds on all of the 22 hearings our Aging Committee has held, will become law shortly and provide relief to American consumers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday I stood on the floor of our esteemed Senate, and I said: The Senate needs to do more. The Senate needs to do more.

I was very careful—and I want to reaffirm today—I was very careful not to say we are not doing anything. I talked about our important work on confirming judges. I think we are putting some very fine men and women on the Federal bench, who are going to make our country safer and better. I was also very careful to talk about the fact that after a logjam had been created on the appointments for the President's administration, we were finally able to break that logjam. We have started confirming some new advisers for the President.

I am very proud of the good work this body has done, but I did make the point that we need to do more. I talked about the fact that, in my judgment, there are many issues—if we think about them—on which my Democratic friends and my Republican colleagues have more in common than we don't, but we can't determine whether that is accurate unless we vote, unless we

bring bills to the floor, unless we get bills in front of the committee and mark them up. That is our word, as you know, for amending a bill.

One of the bills I talked about yesterday was the need for bipartisan support for trying to do something about the spam, fraudulent robocalls the American people are getting, about which Senator COLLINS just spoke so eloquently. I said there would be bipartisan support. I believed it. I believe it even more today. I am very proud of the Senate because we just passed a bill. Do you know how many people voted against it? One. One “no” vote. See what happens when Senators are allowed to be Senators?

There are other efforts that we can work on together. The cost of prescription drugs—I spoke about that yesterday. I don't want to go into it more today.

I will give you another one, and I know this is controversial, but I think it is less controversial than people realize—net neutrality, the importance of people being able to access the Internet freely without being blocked or without their speeds being throttled or without their being censored.

That is a very controversial issue around here, but I still believe we share more in common than we don't on that issue. I talk with my colleagues all the time. I say: We need to pass a bill. Do you know why? Because the businessmen and the businesswomen and the consumers need some predictability in this area. What happens now is, if we have a Democratic President who gets control of the FCC, they pass one set of net neutrality rules, and then if we have a Republican President who gets control of the FCC, they pass a different set of net neutrality rules. The business community and the consumers are like ping pong balls. There is no predictability. There is no certainty. You can't plan. So everybody says: We need to pass a bill. Well, I am going to say it too. We need to pass a bill, but the only way to pass a bill is to pass a bill. And I think that is an area where we can work.

Another area—I understand how hard it is to fix our healthcare delivery system, but we ought to at least try. Our efforts in the last Congress to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act did not work. We could not pass the bill. I do not know a single person, honestly, a fairminded person who thinks the Affordable Care Act is working. But there are things we can do in the meantime while we are trying to reach an agreement on health insurance and the healthcare delivery system that looks like somebody designed the two things on purpose. There are things we can do together in the meantime.

I think there is bipartisan support for the idea that if you have health insurance and you go to the emergency room—and you picked an emergency room at a hospital that is under your policy—and you go and you pay your \$500 deductible, a month later, you

should not get a bill for \$1,000. You call them up and you say: What do you mean? The hospital is listed on my policy. I did what I was supposed to do. I went there. It was an emergency, but I did not go to the closest hospital. I went to the hospital in my policy, and I get a bill for \$4,000.

They say: Oh, that doctor, that radiologist—not to pick on radiologists—that radiologist wasn't covered by your plan.

Well, how am I supposed to know?

We can address that. I guarantee you that there is bipartisan support to do something about that. We might not agree on the details, but that is why, you know, God created the Senate floor. You come down here, you debate, you discuss, and you offer amendments.

There are other examples. Let me say I am cutting this short because we are about to have another vote on a disaster bill. Thank you. Thank you, United States Senate. Thank you, President Trump, for meeting us in the middle.

I am not clairvoyant, but I feel really good about its passing—not good for the Senate as an institution, although I am proud of us today, but good for our farmers and our people in so many States who have been hurt by natural disasters—wildfires and hurricanes. Puerto Rico was hit with two hurricanes right in a row. We are going to do something about that today. I am happy for the Senate, but I am even happier for the American people.

I am going to say it again. We have more in common—our Democratic colleagues and our Republican colleagues—than we don't on certain issues, and I think we would surprise ourselves in what we could achieve if we just try.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 91, H.R. 2157.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 91, H.R. 2157, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2157) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Shelby-Leahy substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; that Senator SHELBY or his designee be recognized to make a motion to waive any budget points of order; further, that if the motion to waive is agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 250) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of the applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of the act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of H.R. 2157, as amended, and 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Baldwin	Casey	Ernst
Bennet	Cassidy	Feinstein
Blumenthal	Collins	Fischer
Blunt	Coons	Gardner
Booker	Cornyn	Gillibrand
Boozman	Cortez Masto	Graham
Brown	Cotton	Grassley
Burr	Cramer	Harris
Cantwell	Cruz	Hassan
Cardin	Daines	Hawley
Carper	Duckworth	Heinrich

Hirono	Merkley	Shaheen
Hooven	Murkowski	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Murphy	Sinema
Inhofe	Murray	Smith
Isakson	Perdue	Stabenow
Johnson	Peters	Sullivan
Jones	Portman	Tester
Kaine	Reed	Thune
Kennedy	Roberts	Tillis
King	Rosen	Udall
Klobuchar	Rubio	Van Hollen
Lankford	Sanders	Warner
Leahy	Sasse	Warren
Manchin	Schatz	Whitehouse
Markey	Schumer	Wicker
McConnell	Scott (FL)	Wyden
Menendez	Scott (SC)	Young

NAYS—9		
Barrasso	Crapo	Paul
Blackburn	Lee	Risch
Braun	McSally	Romney

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Enzi	Toomey
Capito	Moran	
Durbin	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 84, the nays are 9.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CORNYN. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cotton
Barrasso	Cardin	Cramer
Bennet	Carper	Cruz
Blumenthal	Casey	Daines
Blunt	Cassidy	Duckworth
Booker	Collins	Ernst
Boozman	Coons	Feinstein
Brown	Cornyn	Fischer
Burr	Cortez Masto	Gardner