

have long known they have been the ones left alone to step up to assist migrants who arrived in poor health, many times with nothing but the clothing on their back. They provide warm meals, a safe place to sleep, and some of the basic necessities of life before these individuals head off to communities across the United States where they await their court dates with immigration judges.

Sadly, those of us who live in border States have also seen the toll this treacherous journey takes on migrants, and we have had to face the dark reality that many don't survive the journey from Central America across Mexico into the United States. Migrants travel with human smugglers known as "coyotes," who are all too willing to leave their customers for dead if they become sick or injured. I have seen photos and, of course, heard heart-breaking stories from the Border Patrol, as well as local officials and ranchers, about finding the remains on ranches or open terrain along the border of those who died in the desert trying to make their way to the United States.

I have been to Sacred Heart Cemetery in Brooks County, TX, near the Falfurrias checkpoint, where I saw graves of these unknown who are labeled with terms like "skull case," "bones," and "unknown female."

Here is a chart of a photograph depicting one of those graves. As you can see, it is marked "unknown male." Literally, the remains are identified not by the name but, in this case, by the sex, obviously listing the fact that they are unknown.

This is not a rare occurrence. While exact figures are hard to find, there is no question that thousands of migrants have died while attempting to enter the United States illegally. It is one of the toughest parts of the job for Border Patrol, and it takes a toll on communities as well that are obligated to do what is right to ensure the dignity of the deceased.

The process of identifying these remains is expensive, and it also often falls on local taxpayers, like the taxpayers of Brooks County, TX. Frankly, they don't have the tax base and can't afford to deal with this without our help. We know they have limited staff and budgets, and it puts serious strain on local resources. It is an issue I have worked on for a number of years.

I will soon be reintroducing a bill I authored last year to provide some relief. It is called the Missing Persons and Unidentified Remains Act. It will provide local jurisdictions with the resources they need to identify the remains of those who died along the border and solve missing persons cases. This bill will expand the eligibility for jurisdictions to receive grants through Jennifer's Law and make desperately needed funds available. With this expansion, State and local governments, forensic labs, medical examiners, nonprofits, and others will be eligible to

receive funding to support their work. They will be able to use these grant funds to support transportation, processing, identification, and reporting.

These funds can also be used to hire additional analysts, technicians, and examiners to support identification as well as purchase the necessary state-of-the-art equipment.

This legislation would take steps to improve the recording and reporting of missing persons and unidentified remains, which is a major challenge, particularly when it comes to notifying family members.

I have the great honor of representing more than 28 million Texans. I know that in order to do my job—as all of us attempt to do—we need to listen to our constituents and act on suggestions they make to us. The Missing Persons and Unidentified Remains Act is a prime example of that. Border communities have borne the brunt of the humanitarian and security crisis at the border, and they are often forced to do the job of the Federal Government without any help from the Federal Government.

This bill would go a long way helping to defray some of those costs. It would provide additional resources to local communities working to identify those who have gone missing as well as process unidentified remains and invest in the forensic equipment needed to provide closure to families in the United States and abroad.

I appreciate the feedback of the folks who live and work in our border communities, and I look forward to heading to the Rio Grande Valley tomorrow with the Vice President and a number of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to hear more about the challenges they are facing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, as I begin my remarks, I would like to thank the Senator from Texas for the work he has done on arranging our travel to the border tomorrow. I am one of those committee members who will make that trip.

How wonderful it is that he is working with Chairman GRAHAM to make certain that we are going to be able to visit with the Border Patrol to see and hear firsthand what is going on, making certain that we all focus on the security of this great Nation and provide the resources that are needed. I thank him for that good work.

ONLINE PREDATORS

Madam President, I want to talk about another issue that is related to what is happening when it comes to trafficking. This has to do with our children.

In 2017, ICE agents arrested Francisco Javier Soledad on charges of producing child pornography using the popular social media app Snapchat. He assumed a variety of false identities—first a teenage boy, later an adult woman—and coerced at least six under-

age children into sending him sexually explicit pictures and videos. When one victim realized this was wrong and attempted to block Soledad's account, Soledad turned around and threatened this child—threatened him—with posting this video on social media unless—guess what—he sent more videos. He did that on Snapchat.

Imagine this happening to a frightened child. Imagine this happening to a child who is close to you. Unfortunately, it is not an isolated incident.

Matthew Murphy, of Massachusetts, was recently charged with the sexual exploitation of children after he posed as a teenage girl in order to extort nude photos from a middle school-aged boy. Again, it was via Snapchat. Federal investigators found evidence that Murphy used his fake account to victimize other children in the area.

Before I continue, let's talk about exactly what is happening here, which is horrific. Pedophiles are using popular social media apps to trick underage children into creating and distributing homemade pornography. If we are going to talk about these things, we have to be focused and direct on what is happening here and on the distribution methods that are being used.

By its very nature, Snapchat is a child predator's dream. Its auto-delete feature allows individuals to ensure their pictures and videos will erase themselves after only a few seconds. Its public location-sharing feature allows anyone, even underage children, to share their locations in real time. If left in public mode, the Snap Map will reveal their locations and their Snap video feed to complete strangers. Even if underage users haven't fallen prey, they are still exposed to provocative and age-inappropriate material via the app's Discover feature—recommendations generated by Snapchat itself that are free from parental control or monitoring.

If you have guessed that some of these channels specialize in porn and suggestive content, you would be right. It is not small business. The 2018 revenue for Snapchat was \$1.18 billion. How many teen users has it attracted? There have been 16.4 million children exposed to what I have just laid out. That is why, this week, I sent a letter to Snap executives and asked how they plan to fight this predatory behavior and if they will give parents more control over the content to which their children are being exposed. To their credit, Snap executives have already reached out and responded, and it is my hope that they will take these questions seriously and do something about this—do something about their ratings, do something about the Discover section, do something about how it leads children to these pornographic sites.

As we talk about social media, I think it is also important to note that Snapchat is not the only offender.

Last month, I and my friend and colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL sent a letter to YouTube and asked why the

video service's recommendation mechanism continues to push content that involves children being in suggestive or exploitative situations. By "suggestive or exploitative," I mean content that features partially clothed children—children in bathing suits and children dressing and undressing themselves.

YouTube's recommendation system works by promoting similar videos to the one the user is already watching, which means that, by design, one vile video can lead to another and another and another until the user is buried in smut that shouldn't even exist. The comments on these videos have turned into a predator's chat room that allows users to share time stamps that mark the most explicit moments in a video.

YouTube did disable comments in videos that involve children, but its algorithms continue to push this content via the recommendation feature. YouTube needs to stop this. It needs to fix this.

The point of describing these things is not to throw individual companies and their technologies under the bus, but it is crucial that we understand that even at home or at school, our children are very vulnerable and exposed. Even benign technology that doesn't necessarily expose children to pornography can pose a risk.

In 2015, the Electronic Frontier Foundation filed a complaint with the Federal Trade Commission against Google. It alleged that the tech giant's Google for Education program was exploiting minors' personal information and potentially exposing it to third parties. Think about that. It was exposing their information to third parties.

The Chromebooks that were issued to students were loaded with Google Sync, which allowed for the collection and storage of students' browsing history, information, and passwords. Program administrators were given complete access to a cloud system, which allowed them to alter settings. This exposed students' data—educational data and personal data—including physical location data. This was exposed to Google's development team and to third-party websites. One wrong click would expose students' "virtual you"—their presence, all of their information—online.

In Tuesday's Judiciary Committee hearing, I asked the founder and CEO of Protect Young Eyes, Christopher McKenna, what steps he would take, what he would recommend, to protect our children from online predators. His answer was really simple: Give parents the option to control content access, and don't hide the tools that are necessary to do this. Give them to the parents. Make certain that they have them.

Now, I am not suggesting a takeover or a ban of these social media apps, and I am not suggesting we drop a regulatory anvil on these companies. What I am suggesting is that we should not have to ask the makers of popular dig-

ital services to stop catering to child predators. They should choose to recognize that predators lurk in every corner of society, and they should change the age ratings on these apps. They should issue the warnings to parents. They should choose to make parents aware of what a simple click or a tap on a screen might unlock right before their children's eyes. They should choose to stop this horrific cycle of dehumanization and exploitation before it begins. They should choose to work with us to make certain that consumers have all of the information they need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, on Tuesday, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals heard oral arguments in the *Texas v. United States* case to overturn the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, although the Affordable Care Act is currently the law of the land, the Department of Justice—our Nation's highest law enforcement authority—was not there to defend the law of the land, the Affordable Care Act. The DOJ was not there because it had been instructed by this President and this administration to join the effort to overturn the Affordable Care Act.

Sadly, the stakes of the *Texas v. United States* litigation are profound. This year in New Hampshire alone, approximately 90,000 Granite Staters obtained health insurance coverage through the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion or through the ACA's health insurance marketplaces. Across the country, more than 17 million Medicaid expansion enrollees and 11 million people in the marketplaces' health plans depend on the Affordable Care Act for their coverage. Yet the Department of Justice refuses to defend them. It refuses to defend the law of the land in court.

In this case, if the courts side with the Trump administration and the Republican attorneys general, millions of these people will return to the days when they were one cancer diagnosis, one medical complication, or one car accident away from medical bankruptcy.

The Affordable Care Act's coverage expansion is also our most powerful tool in combating the opioid epidemic. This is critically important in New Hampshire as we have the third highest overdose death rate from opioids of any State in the country. In New Hampshire, more than 11,000 people receive substance use disorder treatment thanks to the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion, and many more Granite Staters are able to get substance use disorder treatment thanks to coverage obtained through the ACA's health insurance marketplaces.

Just think. Without the expansion of Medicaid, which is a bipartisan effort in New Hampshire, and without the ACA's health insurance marketplaces,

we would have thousands of people affected by substance use disorders who would not be able to get treatment. There is no plan B if the Affordable Care Act is overturned.

In 2017, a mother named Nansie, from Concord, wrote to my office. I will not use her last name.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Nansie's 2017 letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR SHAHEEN: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my story about ACA. It saved my son's life.

Benjamin went to Keene State College with the same hopes and dreams many have when building their American dream. While there he tried heroin. Addiction overcame him but did not stop him from graduating. After graduation he suffered a long road of near death existence. After a couple of episodes where he had to be revived (fentanyl) he chose recovery. It was due to Obamacare that we were able to get him insured so that he could get the proper help he needed and a suboxone program that assisted him with staying "clean". In April it will be a year for Ben in his recovery. Without Obamacare this would not have been possible. In early 2016 we had very long waiting lists for rehab and then the ones with the means to pay were the first accepted.

I can't find the words to define my gratitude to President Obama. I believe my son would not be alive today if it were not for this plan that provided the means he needed to get the help he needed at the time he needed it. Ben still has a long road ahead of him but I will see to it that he never walks it alone.

It is one of my greatest wishes that one day I could shake President Obama's hand and thank him for providing the tools that saved my son's life.

Sincerely,

NANSIE J. GARNHAM FEENY.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, in Nansie's letter, she writes:

The ACA saved my son's life. It was due to ObamaCare that we were able to get him insured so that he could get the proper help he needed and get into a Suboxone program that assisted him. Now, if the courts side with the Trump administration, this critical source for treatment and recovery could be ripped away.

We don't have enough time for me to go through the whole list of all of the benefits under the Affordable Care Act that will be lost if the ACA gets overturned. One of the benefits, though, that would be thrown out yet is critically important to the people of New Hampshire and across this country is that of the consumer protections against skyrocketing prescription drug costs. They will be gone.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at a hearing in the Committee on Aging, and we had someone from the FDA who was testifying. She talked about the fact that the major driver in prescription drug costs under Medicare and Medicaid was the cost of biologic drugs and that what was bringing down that cost was the pathway for biosimilars to create alternatives of those biologic drugs for those people. What she failed to point out was that this provision