

high crimes and misdemeanors. Indeed, in the face of evidence of serious and persistent misconduct that is harmful to the Nation, Congress would be abusing its constitutional discretion and setting a dangerous precedent if it did not begin an impeachment inquiry.

If the evidence of obstruction of justice and other wrongdoing that Robert Mueller explained yesterday is not evidence of impeachable offenses, what is? What damage would a future President have to inflict in order to trigger an impeachment inquiry?

I have no illusions about where an impeachment inquiry will lead. My Republican colleagues have thus far shown themselves unwilling to hold this President accountable. They believe that everything is “all over.” But the evidence in the Mueller report and the special counsel’s testimony yesterday explaining it, defending it, and reaffirming it compel us to do what is right and what is necessary, and that is to exercise our authority and begin an impeachment proceeding against Donald Trump. Nothing less than our democracy is at stake. I call upon my colleagues in the House of Representatives to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I have one message for my colleagues in the Senate and those who might be watching. It is about this chart, which is very simple. This is the line of what we call discretionary spending. This is about 31 percent of the budget. That is the budget agreement you have read about in the newspapers the last couple of days. That is what we are talking about.

It is a blue line. It has to do with paying for our national defense, so it is about half of the dollars; then for our national parks, America’s best idea; then for the National Institutes of Health, the source of medical miracles ranging from restoring your heart to curing Zika to the National Laboratories, which are the sources of our competition with the rest of the world. That is what this money is for.

What the blue line recognizes is that for the last 10 years, the growth in spending for national defense, national parks, the National Institutes of Health, and National Labs has gone up at about the rate of inflation, and for the next 10 years, including the budget agreement that the President and the congressional leaders recommended this week, it will go at about the rate of inflation.

The point is, for 20 years—2008 to 2029—the increase in spending for the amount of money we are talking about and for the type of spending in the budget agreement is not the source of the Federal deficit. What is? Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest—that is the red line that 10 years ago was \$1.8 trillion. At the rate we are going, it will be \$5.4 trillion in 10 years.

That is not the type of spending we are talking about in the budget agreement.

My message today is in support of properly funding national defense, national parks, National Institutes of Health, and National Labs and not beating our chest and pretending that we are balancing the budget on the backs of our soldiers, our medical miracles, and our national parks when, in fact, it is the entitlements that the President and the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress need to address.

I will talk about the blue line today. I have talked about the red line plenty before. Former Senator Corker and I introduced legislation a few years ago that would have reduced the growth of this red line by \$1 trillion over 10 years. The only problem was, we were the only two cosponsors of the legislation.

The budget deficit is vitally damaging to our country, but the budget agreement that President Trump recommended is not the source of the budget deficit. That part of the budget is under control. That is 31 percent of all the dollars we spend in the United States. Just add to that, if this continues for another 10 years, this blue line—national defense, national parks, National Institutes of Health, National Laboratories—is going to go from 31 percent of the budget to 22 percent of the budget, and mandatory spending is going up to 78 percent. This is the budget deficit. This is the budget agreement we are going to be voting on next week. That part of the budget is under control.

Here is what the budget agreement, which the President recommended and our Democratic and Republican leaders in the House and Senate have recommended and which I strongly support, does. The first thing it does is suspend the debt limit—the amount we can borrow. If we don’t do that, we have a global fiscal crisis. We all know that, so we need to do it.

Second, it raises the defense and non-defense discretionary budget caps. That is this blue line down here. That is the amount of money we can spend, as I said, on national defense. That is about half of the spending—and then our veterans, National Labs, biomedical research, and national parks.

Let’s talk about the military for just a minute. Former Secretary of Defense James Mattis, who had enormous respect here in Congress, said that “no enemy in the field has done as much harm to the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act’s defense spending caps, worsened by operating for 10 of the last 11 years under continuing resolutions of varied and unpredictable duration.”

In plain English, what that means is that because of the President’s leadership and the recommendations of our bipartisan leaders, we will avoid what Secretary Mattis said has been so damaging to our military.

Here is what happened. Back in 2011, we passed the Budget Control Act to try to limit this part of the budget. That came after a special committee was appointed, which everyone hoped would deal with this part of the budget—the problem part, the part that is causing the deficit.

The Budget Control Act came up with a formula that everybody thought would work. They said: Well, if we put in there that we will have dramatic reductions in military spending, Congress will never do that, so they will be forced to finally do something we all should have had the courage to do a long time ago, and that is deal with entitlements.

What happened? We didn’t deal with the red line, and we cut the military. We cut the military badly over the last 10 years, and we are just now beginning to catch up. Last year, Congress avoided sequestration and increased discretionary spending for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

Let me say it again, because I am going to repeat it over and over and over: We increased spending last year at about the rate of inflation. That is not the cause of the Federal deficit. Reaching that agreement, though, meant that for the first time in nearly a decade the Department of Defense received its budget on time, and it received a record funding level for research and development.

This new 2-year budget agreement that the President has recommended will rebuild our military by providing \$738 billion for defense discretionary spending for 2020 and \$740 billion for 2021.

It will also allow us to fulfill the commitment we made as a part of the New START Treaty in 2010 in December. I voted for that, and part of the deal with President Obama was that if we passed the treaty limiting nuclear weapons, we would make sure that ours worked. President Trump said the other day that Russia has 1,111 nuclear weapons, and they all work. We don’t want them to use them, and the best way to keep them from using them is to make sure ours work.

We have reached a budget agreement so that we can get to work on the appropriations bills and hopefully get many of them done before the end of the fiscal year, which is the 30th of September. That is important to the military especially.

When I met with Secretary of the Army Mark Esper, who was approved by a big vote yesterday as Secretary of Defense, we talked about what it meant to have an appropriations bill passed into law on time, instead of a so-called continuing resolution, which is just a lazy way to go. It just says to spend next year what you spent last year, which means we don’t spend for the things we need to spend, and we don’t stop spending on the things we shouldn’t spend.

Here are some of the benefits of passing the appropriations bill on time,

which would mean October 1. It keeps large projects on time and on budget. That is true in the Defense Department, and it is also true other places. We have a big project called the Uranium Processing Facility at Oak Ridge, TN, which comes through the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee, which I chair, and Senator FEINSTEIN is the ranking member. We made sure that is on time and on budget—\$6.5 billion by 2025. But if we don't appropriate the money on time and on budget, we can't finish the project on time and on budget, and who is hurt by that? Our national defense and our taxpayers or the Chickamauga Lock in Tennessee.

All of the Army Corps of Engineers leaders have told me: Don't start these projects and then stop them. Don't stop and start and stop and start. That wastes money and slows things down.

So, for the last several years, we have continued steady reconstruction. We need to pass these on time and on budget.

Also, it keeps equipment maintenance at the Department of Defense on schedule. That saves money. There is more research and development for new technologies. It speeds up modernization of current equipment and keeps military training on schedule. That means soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are properly prepared for prompt combat, and it prevents accidents.

This new 2-year agreement also helps our veterans. In 2018, President Trump signed the VA MISSION Act, which the Senate passed by a vote of 92 to 5. The MISSION Act gave veterans the ability to seek medical care outside the Department of Veterans Affairs and see a private doctor closer to home. So if you are 60 miles away in the State of Nebraska or Kansas or Tennessee and you need medical care and you can't be seen at a VA facility, you can see a private doctor close to home. This budget agreement makes sure we have enough money to support that, and I will ask the staff here how much that is.

Senator PERDUE said yesterday that 40 percent of the increase in the spending in this budget agreement, on the discretionary side, is to help veterans with the Choice Program. So it is not even in the national defense part of the budget; it is in the nondefense part of the budget. It helps veterans. So 40 percent of this increase is helping veterans on top of what we spend for defense, and we still keep the spending at about the rate of inflation. That is not the source of our budget deficit.

It is important for the American people to know that the Republican majority in Congress has worked together with Democrats to provide record levels of funding for science, research, and technology. In the Senate, Senator BLUNT from Missouri and Senator MURRAY from Washington State have provided the leadership for that in the Appropriations Committee.

In April 2016, Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of

Health, told our Appropriations Committee—I am a member of that, as are Senator DURBIN and others; we worked on this together—that with adequate and consistent funding, he can make 10 bold predictions about some of the medical miracles he expects over the next several years. He talked about regenerative medicine that would replace heart transplants by restoring your heart from your own cells. He talked about vaccines for Zika, for HIV/AIDS, and for the universal flu, which kills tens of thousands. He talked about an artificial pancreas. He talked about cures for Alzheimer's or at least medicines that would identify the symptoms—that would identify Alzheimer's before the symptoms and do something about it.

Since fiscal year 2015, the Appropriations Committee has increased funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$9 billion, or 30 percent. From \$30.3 billion in 2015 to \$39.34 billion in fiscal year 2019, Senator BLUNT and Senator MURRAY did that by cutting some programs and increasing the National Institutes of Health. They did it all down here in the blue line that stays within the rate of inflation—not up here in the red line. That is called good government.

I can't tell you the number of leaders of academic and research institutions I meet who say that the young investigators in our country are so encouraged by this new funding for biomedical research, and they are busy working on the next miracles. That is what consistent funding will do.

Dr. Collins came back to the committee this year, and I asked him if he was ready to update those bold predictions. He said: We are close to a cure for sickle cell anemia—sickle cell disease—and a new, nonaddictive painkiller which in my view would be the holy grail in our fight against opioids. With this new budget agreement, Congress could increase funding for the National Institutes of Health for the sixth consecutive year to continue this life-saving research and do it all within the blue line, which is not the cause of the Federal budget deficit.

Let's go to the Office of Science. Last year, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee that I chair with the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the ranking Democrat, agreed, along with Congress, for the fourth consecutive year—and President Trump signed it—to provide record funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Science. With this new budget, we can do it for 5 years. What does this mean? This means funding for the 17 National Laboratories, including the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which are America's secret weapon. No other country has anything like our National Laboratories. Many Americans worry about competition from China and other parts of the world. How do we meet that competition? Through innovation.

Where does that innovation come from? It is hard to think of a major ini-

tiative that has not come since World War II without some federally sponsored research funding. Funding our Labs is important and helps keep us first in the world in supercomputing. Why is supercomputing important? Because it keeps our standard of living high and keeps our national defense on its toes.

China knows that. Two years ago, China had the two top supercomputers, but today the United States has the two fastest supercomputers in the world and the Exascale computing project will deliver the next generation system starting in 2021. This accomplishment is not the result of 1 year of funding or one political party but 10 years of bipartisan effort through the Bush, Obama, and Trump administrations, Democratic and Republican, to try to make sure America is first in the world of supercomputing. We did it all under the blue line over the last 10 years. The funding went up at the rate of inflation, not through the Moon like in entitlements which is the source of the Federal budget deficit, not the money we spend to keep ahead of China and Japan in supercomputing.

On national parks, Ken Burns and others say America's national parks are our best idea. There are 417 of them. They have a badly deferred maintenance backlog. Senators PORTMAN, WARNER, KING, myself, and others are working with President Trump, who supports our legislation, to try to cut half of the deferred maintenance in the national park backlogs in the next 5 years. We are going to use money from energy on Federal lands to do that.

Americans are often shocked to find when they go to Federal parks that bathrooms don't work, roofs leak, and campgrounds are closed because there is not enough money for maintenance. This budget helps make sure our national parks are something Americans can continue to enjoy—all 418 of those parks—and we do that under the blue line that goes up at the rate of inflation, not at the budget-busting rate of the entitlements line.

I have said this over and over, and it needs to be said over and over. The red line is mandatory spending. The blue line is discretionary spending. The blue line will be \$1.6 trillion at the end of 10 more years. The red line will be \$5.4 trillion at the end of 10 more years. Ten years ago, the blue line was 1.1 and the red line was 1.8. What do you think the problem is for the source of the Federal budget? You don't need a Ph.D. in mathematics to figure this out. It is not this line. It is not national defense; it is not biomedical research; it is not supercomputing; it is not the Army Corps of Engineers. It is this one line—entitlements. It is our fault for not having dealt with it, but we shouldn't beat our chest and pretend to balance the budget by decimating the work on that blue line. Discretionary spending is only 31 percent of the money. Mandatory spending is the rest of the funding. It will increase from 69 percent of

total spending to 78 percent in 2029. The spending on national parks, national defense, National Institutes of Health, and National Labs will be reduced to 22 percent. I don't believe we can properly defend our country, properly keep up our parks, stay first in the world in supercomputing, and expect to continue biomedical research that produces lifesaving miracles if we squeeze all the money out of the blue line and let it go up in the air on the red line.

The United States is experiencing robust economic growth, and there is a lot of political talk in this Chamber but no one really disputes that. Our economy is growing and growing. We have not seen anything like it in a long time. There have been 6 million new jobs created just since President Trump was elected, with the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years, at 3.7 percent.

Before Congress passed the major tax reform in 31 years, our gross domestic product was projected to be a little less than 2 percent over the next 10 years. For the first quarter of 2019 this year, actual gross domestic product was a little over 3 percent. Higher GDP and lower unemployment leads to higher family incomes and more revenue for the Federal Government. More revenue for the Federal Government reduces the debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this 2-year budget agreement. To those who are worried about the Federal debt, I am worried about it too. That is why Senator Corker and I put our bill in to reduce by a growth of \$1 trillion over 10 years what is happening with this red line. If we want to talk about the Federal budget deficit, let's talk about where it really is. Let's talk about the red line, which has gone from \$1.8 trillion 10 years ago and is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to go to \$5.4 trillion 10 years from now.

Let's not pretend we are balancing the Federal budget by focusing on the part of the Federal budget that is under control, the part that funds our military, national parks, biomedical research, and National Labs. For the last 10 years, it has gone up at about the rate of inflation, and for the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office—including this 2-year budget agreement which only affects the blue line, not the red line—it goes up at the rate of inflation. So I am proud to support it. I believe it is the right thing to do, and when the House sends us a chance to vote for it next week, I hope it gets a big vote from the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me just take a few minutes here to share an idea that when we come back next week, we will be talking about the budget. We are going to be talking about making really difficult, very difficult decisions.

I would state that we on the Senate Armed Services Committee have an ad-

vantage over some of the other people because one of the critical areas in the budget coming up is how we treat the military. I think it is important for people to understand that if you are a member of the Armed Services Committee, you are in a position to know something the other Members don't know. It may sound like someone is not doing their job, but that is not true at all.

When you are on the Senate Armed Services Committee, there are hearings that take place. Starting in January, there are posture hearings. Posture hearings normally take about 6 hours a week. In posture hearings, we find out about matters that others just don't have time to find out about unless you are a member of the committee. If you are a member, you are sitting there for 3 hours a week.

I don't say this critically of the previous administration because—I would say, in the Obama administration, the top priority was not defending America. In fact, he established something called parity. Parity meant that for every one dollar put into the military budget, we have to put one dollar into the nonmilitary budget. That had never happened before, at least it had not happened since World War II. At that time, it was established that national defense would be our priority. Every Democrat and every Republican President at that time all the way up until the Obama administration had defending America as the top priority.

What happened during that administration was that we actually had a dramatic reduction. If you use constant dollars, that reduction took place between 2010 and 2015, using constant dollars. For this description, we used 2018 dollars. Going into 2010, it was about \$794 billion. Going into 2015, it was \$586 billion or something like that. So there was about a 25-percent reduction in the defense budget in a 5-year period. That had never happened before in the history of this country. Yet we suffered through, and we paid dearly for it.

A lot of people are not aware of it, unless you are on the Armed Services Committee because we see it. When the current President came in, President Trump, his budget boosted that back up. Now we are talking about real dollars, and it was \$700 billion in fiscal year 2018. Then for fiscal year 2019 it was \$716 billion.

Now we are getting into where we are today in the current budget. We passed a defense authorization bill, and in it we actually came out agreeing that we had to get to \$750 billion. Someone might ask why. We had something called the National Defense Commission report. It was a document that was a good document that talked about how we were going to need to appropriate because during the Obama administration we saw China and Russia become peer competitors in many areas. In fact, they ended up with some things better than ours. Let me give an example. Artillery during that period

of time for both China and Russia had us outranged and outgunned. How many people know that? People assume America has the best of everything. Well, that was true up until this time.

Air and defense, there were only two Active-Duty battalions with no new technological advancements. Nothing happened during that time. That allowed China and Russia to start creeping up and getting ahead of us.

On nuclear triad modernization, we had no modernization increases at that time, but Russia and China did. In fact, China actually has today a nuclear triad, and Russia is actually building one. The U.S. defense against electronic warfare—we didn't have that kind of a defense. With Russia, you can remember what happened in Ukraine.

Hypersonic weapons is the newest thing that people talk about. It is a type of weapon system that moves five times the speed of sound. It is the weapon system of the future. Prior to the past administration, prior to the Obama administration, we were ahead in our research on hypersonic weapons, but by the end of that time and up until this new administration came in, we were actually behind Russia and China. I only say that because we really took a hit.

The only time—we have had three opportunities, one in fiscal year 2018, one in fiscal year 2019, and then another on the budget we are going to be voting on this coming week. That was our opportunity to catch up.

I would just say this: If you are on the Armed Services Committee, you have an obligation because you are in a unique position of knowing the efficiencies that we have. Others don't have that. Many of the Members take the time and they find out that they can get this done.

But we are in a position where—General Dunford, as an example, said that we have lost our qualitative and our quantitative edge in artillery. We are actually outnumbered 5 to 1 by China and 10 to 1 by Russia. In air and missile defense, China and Russia have weapons that prevent access—we call them SAMs, surface-to-air missiles. Nuclear modernization—no real U.S. modernization took place during that time. We had some of our top people admitting that we had deficiencies, and we quickly tried to correct them.

Along came fiscal year 2018. In fiscal year 2018, we got back up to a \$700 billion budget, and we started working on things. We had the manual. It is a manual I normally bring down with me to the floor when we talk about this because this is something that everyone agreed on as the manual was put together. It was the NDS Commission report. It was put together by 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans—all experts in national defense—and everyone agreed that would be our blueprint to pull us out of where we were at that time, and it was working. We were on schedule to do it. We are currently on schedule with this budget.

It says that while we are rebuilding our military, we should be anticipating that we have to increase our military spending by between 3 percent and 5 percent over this period of time. That is a net increase. Well, the budget we came out with in the defense authorization bill was \$750 billion, and it was a budget that almost gets us there but not quite.

The President's budget agreement that came out the other day has a figure of \$738 billion. That is very close to where we are supposed to be. It is a 2-year budget, and that is a good thing for the military. Those of us on the Defense Committee understand that. So that brings that \$738 up to \$740.5 billion for 2021, so it is very close to the \$750 billion defense authorization.

I only say that because that makes it more important for anyone who is serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee to be in a position to know what I just said. And that is something that most people don't know, and I don't believe that most of the Members of this body know, but those who are on the committee do know it. We have to keep in mind that this budget is going to be the only way that we are going to be able to do what needs to be done.

This is the short version. I will come back and talk more this coming Monday and give a lot more details than I gave now. I will say this: I would encourage any member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to understand that they are in a position to know what the problem is, and a lot of other people do not know this. I would anticipate that members of the committee would be in that unique position to know and would be supporting a budget that gives us enough room to get back into position to recover from the losses that we took from the previous administration. That is what is at stake. That is what we are anticipating. I would anticipate that our members from the committee should be doing that.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNT). The Senator from Ohio.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am on the floor this afternoon to talk about an issue that I have come to this floor other times to speak about, and that is the drug crisis we face in this country. In fact, I am told that over the last 3 years, I have now come to the floor 58 times to address this topic—to talk about the opioid crisis, talk about the new resurgence of crystal meth, and talk about what we can do about it.

I will tell you, during those 3 years, we made a lot of progress, not just in talking about this issue but doing something about it. We put new policies in place at the Federal level for better prevention, better treatment, better longer term recovery, and to also help our first responders—specifically, to give them access to this mir-

acle drug naloxone, which reverses the effect of overdose.

Congress passed legislation, like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the Cures legislation, and the STOP Act. We have provided actually more than \$4 billion of additional funding for these programs—particularly for treatment—over just the last few years. In Ohio alone, we have received \$140 million through CARA and Cures since they were signed into law. That money has gone toward innovative, evidence-based programs that are actually making a difference. We had to do this because this crisis has gripped our country in the worst drug epidemic ever. More people are now dying every year from overdoses from these drugs than died in the entire Vietnam conflict, as an example. We have never seen anything quite this bad, so we responded, as we should have, at the national level to a national crisis.

Working with States, localities, nonprofits, people out there in the trenches doing the hard work, we are beginning to make a difference. Last week, the Centers for Disease Control—CDC—issued a report with their latest statistics on overdose deaths. While drug overdose deaths are still way too high, they show we are actually seeing a reduction.

By the way, this is the first time we have seen a reduction in opioid overdose deaths in more than 8 years. Think about that. Every year for 8 years, we have seen increases in deaths, to the point that we had over 70,000 people a year dying of overdoses in 2017. In 2018—we now have the numbers in from CDC—it went from roughly 71,000 to roughly 68,000. Again, that is way too high. No one should be satisfied with that. But after increases every year, to have a 4-percent decrease nationally shows that we are beginning to turn the tide. Let's keep doing what we are doing. We cannot pull back now. If we do, it will just go back up again. Actually, it is the first time since 1990, I am told, that nationwide overdoses from any kind of drugs—opioids and other things—have decreased in a calendar year. That is the first time since 1990.

In Ohio, we did even better from 2017 to 2018. We had more than a 4-percent drop; we actually had a 22-percent drop in Ohio. That is partly because my home State has been ground zero for this. Like West Virginia, Kentucky, and other States, we have been hit really hard. To go 22 percent below where we were the previous year is progress, and we should be proud of that. Still, we are seeing overdose rates that are way too high. Overall, around the country, 33 States had reductions.

As I said earlier, the area where we made the most progress is in combating opioids, partly because of legislation we passed here. Particularly, we tried to address this issue of prescription drugs, heroin, and fentanyl.

The Washington Post recently published a stunning analysis showing why

it is so important that we continue to push back and how we got here. They showed that for the 6 years between 2006 and 2012, there was an absolutely unbelievably high number of shipments of prescription pain medications. Oxycodone and hydrocodone were the ones they focused on, which account for three-quarters of the total opioid pill shipments to pharmacies.

In a single CVS pharmacy right outside of Cleveland, OH, more than 6.4 million pills were delivered during that 6-year period. Think about that. In one small pharmacy, there were over 6 million pills. Overall, the Post found that over that period, more than 3.6 billion prescription pain pills were supplied to Ohio. That is “billion” with a “b.” That is an astounding number. That means that during those 6 years, there were approximately 313 opioid prescription pain pills prescribed for every single man, woman, and child in Ohio. That is what we are talking about here.

Obviously, this was used as a way for people to take these pills and spread them, not just in Ohio but in other places, causing immense harm because people got addicted to these pills and turned to heroin and fentanyl. Many of these people are people who not just have an addiction but end up having overdoses, and many of them died.

This week, the largest civil trial in U.S. history will begin in my home State of Ohio. I think it is appropriate that it is in Ohio. This will consolidate cases from around the country. More than 2,000 cities, counties, Native American Tribes, and others will sue some of the biggest pharmaceutical companies and major distributors for their role in this drug crisis. The pharmaceutical companies and the distributors are going to be sued in court in Ohio through a consolidated case. This is the biggest civil trial, they say, in the history of our country.

Two of the Ohio plaintiff counties—Cuyahoga and Summit—have been among the areas in my State that were hardest hit by opioids. No wonder they are part of this lawsuit. In 2016, the death rate from pharmaceuticals—opioids, painkillers—in Cuyahoga County was 3.26 times the national average. In Summit County, so many people died from overdoses that a mobile morgue had to be created in order to help process the bodies. I was there in Summit County during that time period. They actually had to bring in a mobile unit to be able to deal with all the overdose deaths.

The more we find out about the sheer number of pills these drug companies pumped into the United States—more than 76 billion overall during that period—the more it is clear that lawsuits like this are going to be necessary to get to the bottom of what happened and require these entities to help those who were affected by these pain pills. A lot of these people turned to other substances that were more accessible and less expensive, like heroin, but had