

allow appropriators to get a bipartisan agreement for fiscal year 2020.

One program that has not received enough attention is the agricultural relief program known commonly as the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is an important program that should help all farmers suffering from certain exigencies of the market, like price declines and natural disasters.

Unfortunately, over the past year, the President turned this important agricultural relief program that we all support into a giant slush fund. The relief payments have gotten political. Crops in red States have received outsized subsidies, while crops in blue States were shortchanged. Cotton, for example, has gotten a huge subsidy, compared to dairy and specialty crops, fruits and vegetables. The payments were not matched to the damage caused to each crop. Even soybeans, the supposed reason for this at the beginning, were greatly shortchanged for cotton, and even now cotton is being treated better.

In addition—and just as bad, if not worse—there have been huge amounts of waste and abuse in the program. Large agribusinesses, including some foreign agribusinesses, like a Brazilian beef corporation, are receiving funding through this program while American dairy farmers are passed over.

There are limits on the CCC program. If you make over \$900,000, you shouldn't get any money. The most any farm can get is \$250,000 if there are two farmers in the family, a husband and a wife. Those don't seem to abate either.

We are very pleased that Republicans acceded to our wish. Democrats were able to inject some transparency into the agricultural relief program.

In this short-term CR, we require reporting on whether the funding is going to foreign sources and justification for why money went where it did. We are going to look at this report before we move to the full appropriations bill in a month or two to make sure the money is going to our American farmers who need it—not foreigners, not wealthy agribusiness, not all slanted to one product like cotton when there are so many other needs.

This is a good victory for Democrats in a day of some victories for Democrats.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. President, there is another bright spot, election security. This morning, after months and months of Republican resistance and months of insistent Democratic pressure, Senate Republicans have finally agreed to support our Democratic request for additional election security funding in advance of the 2020 elections.

This is similar to an amendment Democrats offered during last year's appropriations process to help States harden their election infrastructure to protect against Russian or Chinese or Iranian interference.

A year ago, our Republican friends, unfortunately and shortsightedly, re-

jected this amendment. Maybe, just maybe, Republicans are starting to come around to our view that election security is necessary; that if Americans don't believe their elections are on the up and up, woe is us as a country and as a democracy.

It is not all the money we requested and doesn't include a single solitary reform that virtually everyone knows we need, but it is a start. Leader MCCONNELL kept saying that we don't need the money. I made umpteen speeches here, in this chair, and the Republican leader denied the need. But now, thank God, he has seen the light. We need more money for election security; ask election officials, Democrat or Republican, throughout the country. I hope today's vote means Senate Republicans are beginning to see the light on election security.

While this funding is important, it is not the only thing we need to do to secure our elections from Russian, Chinese, Iranian, or any other foreign country's interference. There are multiple bipartisan pieces of legislation awaiting action on the floor that would counter foreign influence operations against our democracy, safeguard our elections, and deter foreign adversaries from even attempting to interfere.

We have been warned time and again by our national security leaders—nearly all of them Republicans appointed by President Trump—that China and, of course, Russia are potential threats in 2020. We cannot sit on our hands while our adversaries try to replicate and outdo what Putin accomplished in 2016.

Leader MCCONNELL should bring the bipartisan bills. We are getting the money in approps, but we need more legislation to refine where the dollars are.

Leader MCCONNELL, now that you have seen the light on the money, go one step further: Bring the bipartisan bills—the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act, the Secure Elections Act, and the DETER Act—to the floor for a debate and a vote. Otherwise, the job will remain incomplete and our democracy vulnerable.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Mr. President, finally on guns, yesterday, according to reports, Attorney General Barr came to Capitol Hill to discuss a one-page proposal on gun legislation that he had put together. It became clear soon after that the White House, seemingly out of fear of reprisal by the NRA, was unwilling to embrace its own Attorney General's proposal. Once again, the White House refused to take a stand on what they propose to do on the question of gun violence.

President Trump and Senate Republicans are trying to find a way to have their cake and eat it too—searching for a plan that the public will accept and won't offend the NRA. It is a fool's errand.

Leader MCCONNELL, President Trump, you can't please the NRA and

at the same time do good gun legislation that will save lives. You cannot please the NRA unless you do something that is either regressive or, at the very best, toothless. Get it through your heads. That is how it is.

If you want to do something real on gun legislation and save lives, you have to reject the NRA's ministrations. The NRA is wildly out of step with the views of the American public. Its policies are reactionary; its leadership, recalcitrant and divided.

Look no further than the universal background check bill. Ninety-three percent of Americans, the great majority of gun owners, and 80 percent of Republicans support the idea. But not the NRA. As for yesterday's plan floated by the Republican Attorney General, a plan that would only modestly expand background checks, representatives of the NRA called it a nonstarter.

The views of the NRA and the views of the American public are fundamentally incompatible. President Trump, Leader MCCONNELL, Senate Republicans, which side are you on? Are you with the NRA or are you with the American people?

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today Speaker PELOSI unveiled the House's plan to try to lower out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs. This, of course, has been a priority for many of us in Washington, including the Presiding Officer.

We have been working on it really hard here in the Senate. Actually, three standing committees of the Senate have now reported out legislation dealing with this issue: the Judiciary Committee, the Finance Committee, and the HELP Committee, or the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. All are working together to try to come with up bipartisan packages to lower prescription drug costs.

These bills, of course, include ideas from Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. President, apparently, we have some technical difficulties here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I can hear you better now.

Mr. CORNYN. It sounds like we have fixed that. Thank you.

As I was saying, while these bills include ideas from both Republicans and Democrats, it shouldn't surprise people that in an area as complex as this, there are going to be some disagreements along the way. But that is what we do here: We work through those disagreements and try to build consensus.

While I know that it is only a bipartisan bill that has any chance at all to

make its way to the President's desk for his signature, Speaker PELOSI appears to have a different approach. House Democrats want to replace our free-market healthcare system with the heavyhanded government approach that puts us on a path to socialized medicine. They want to allow the government to set prices and put bureaucrats at the center of our healthcare system, instead of patients.

The Speaker's plan is just the latest example of a partisan messaging document masquerading as legislation, and it has absolutely no chance—zero, zip, nada—of passing the Senate or becoming law.

In contrast, the ideas we have been working on would lower out-of-pocket costs by increasing competition and transparency, while stopping the bad actors who try to game the system. Unlike the House, we have been considering bills that have broad bipartisan support, as I said, which means they have the potential to actually become law, to get something done.

Speaker PELOSI should take note that we in the Senate have done the hard work of finding consensus with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I encourage our friends in the House of Representatives to stop wasting time and, instead, start working in a bipartisan fashion and work on legislation that can actually become law. Only then will the American people see the benefit of a reduction in out-of-pocket costs for their prescription drugs.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, on another matter, with the end of the fiscal year just a week and a half way, we know the clock is running out for us to pass funding bills. After the longest government shutdown in history earlier this year, I thought there was bipartisan support to get the regular appropriations process back on track. Both parties knew there was a funding crisis at stake this fall if we couldn't come together and reach a compromise.

So that is exactly what we did before the August break. Our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, led by the chairman, Senator SHELBY, worked day and night to reach an agreement that was acceptable to both parties in both Chambers, as well as earning the support of the President. That is not easy to do. That was the 2-year budget caps agreement. But they got it done. That is until the August recess occurred, and, apparently, memories faded about what exactly had been agreed to, or people reconsidered their previous agreement and decided to withdraw their consent.

We knew this caps deal, as imperfect as it was, would lay the foundation for the appropriations process this fall and get us out of this reoccurring movie called the looming shutdown.

At the end of July, we passed a 2-year budget agreement. It was a fair compromise, considering everybody's interests. While there are still details to be

hashed out in the individual appropriations bills, it was a strong start. We thought we had made it past this shutdown movie and scenario.

We agreed to top-line defense spending and nondefense spending. There was a promise not to derail the appropriations process with poison pill policy riders, and we got it done with plenty of time to spare.

Now it appears that our Democratic friends are backing down from their commitments, which is a serious mistake on their part. If we can't work together in good faith and trust that our colleagues will actually stick to their word and keep their commitments, then, that is going to do nothing but further erode our ability to function on behalf of the American people.

Imagine my surprise when, yesterday, the Senate voted to begin debate on the first batch of funding bills and Democrats blocked it. They stopped it dead in its tracks. Even though they had agreed to the spending caps and a process to go forward, they blocked it. They voted to deny our troops the largest pay raise in a decade. They voted to withhold vital funding from our military at a time when we face growing threats around the world. They voted to derail the very process they had agreed to before August. In so doing, they once again put partisan politics above our responsibilities to the American people.

What is the reason for this? A disagreement over funding allocations of 0.003 percent of the total budget—0.003 percent of the total budget. That is like robbing a bank in order to steal the change from the gumball machine. I am really disappointed. We are better than that, and I hope our colleagues will reconsider.

Our national security is on the line. If there is one thing we ought to do above all else, it is to provide for the defense and to make sure that the American people are safe and that those who put themselves in harm's way and who volunteer to wear the uniform of the U.S. military are treated with respect and fairness. It is inappropriate and it is just wrong to play games with national security or with our military, as our Democratic colleagues appear to be doing.

DEBBIE SMITH ACT

Finally, Mr. President, 4 months ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill that I introduced with the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, to reauthorize what has arguably been the single greatest driver behind our progress to reduce the rape kit backlog.

The Debbie Smith Act was first passed in 2004 to provide State and local crime labs with the resources they need to end the backlog of unsolved crimes. At one point, we learned there were perhaps as many as 400,000 forensic kits, or rape kits, sitting either in evidence lockers or in labs that had been untested—400,000. In each one of those kits is the evidence needed to identify the assailant in a sexual as-

sault or, conversely, to rule out somebody in a sexual assault.

Also, as a result of uploading of this information, if it is tested, into the FBI system, or the CODIS system, it can help to solve a myriad of crimes, not just sexual assault cases.

The Debbie Smith Act is one of those rare cases where there has always been bipartisan and bicameral support. More than \$1 billion has been provided to forensic labs because of this law, enabling them to get untested evidence off the shelf so we can provide victims with answers and we can take these assailants, which, characteristically, don't just do it one time—they do it multiple times until they are ultimately caught—off the street.

As I said, while the primary goal of the legislation was to reduce the rape kit backlog, under the Debbie Smith Act, this has provided an abundance of DNA evidence that has been used to solve other numerous crimes. That is because once the evidence is tested, it is uploaded in the FBI's DNA database, called CODIS. Similar to the fingerprint databases, this DNA database can help to identify and convict people who commit any type of crime that is under investigation.

For example, if a criminal commits a burglary in one State, DNA from that burglary case can later be used to connect this criminal to an unsolved rape case in other States. It is that powerful.

According to the National Institute of Justice, 42 percent of the hits in the FBI's DNA database system are the direct result of Debbie Smith Act funding—42 percent.

Last month, I visited a living community in Grapevine, TX, called The Gatehouse. This is a place where women and children who have been victimized by domestic violence find the care and resources they need to restart their lives. I spoke with survivors of sexual assault, advocates, and law enforcement about the impact of the Debbie Smith Act and the need to reauthorize this critical program before it expires at the end of the month.

Here is the thing that completely confounds me. The Debbie Smith Act is not partisan. It is not even controversial. It is not divisive. The last time we voted on it, not a single Senator voted no. So there is no reason for the House to stall on this critical legislation. If the House doesn't act by the end of the month, it will expire.

Once again, I urge Speaker PELOSI to allow this bill to go to the floor of the House without further delay. It would be simply shameful to allow this program to expire, especially when she has a bipartisan bill in her hand and all she has to do is allow it to go to the floor of the House for a vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.