

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 330 Leg.]

#### YEAS—92

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blumenthal	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Johnson	Schumer
Cardin	Jones	Scott (FL)
Carpenter	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	Markey	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Fischer	Perdue	

#### NAYS—2

Blackburn Paul

#### NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Warren
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 92, the nays are 2.

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

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider the motion to proceed to H.R. 3055, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 141, H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING CORPORAL JERRY GARRISON

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, Army CPL Jerry Garrison was reported missing in action on December 2, 1950. After all these years, Corporal Garri-

son is on his way home to be laid to rest with full honor due to a member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Corporal Garrison was one of “The Chosin Few” who fought on that frozen ground to protect his fellow soldiers and the independence of the Korean people against the Communist hordes. God, in His mysterious providence, chose to call Corporal Garrison home during that epic battle, but only recently were his remains discovered in Vietnam.

Corporal Garrison’s funeral today is a long-overdue moment of honor for a brave soldier and a long-anticipated moment of mourning and remembrance for his loved ones.

Let’s also remember in our prayers the many families whose loved ones haven’t yet come home. Corporal Garrison’s recovery is a moment of hope for these families, a reminder that our Nation will not rest until every one of our missing heroes is brought home, and it is a reminder to our troops who are in harm’s way today that we will always bring them home should they fall in the line of duty or go missing in action. We have now fulfilled that solemn pledge to Corporal Garrison. Nearly 70 years after he went missing, we have once again affirmed that the United States leaves no man behind.

Rest in peace, Corporal Garrison.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEIRUT MARINE BARRACKS BOMBING

Madam President, 36 years ago this week, an Iranian suicide bomber detonated thousands of pounds of explosives inside a Marine compound in Beirut, Lebanon. So terrible was the blast that 15 miles out at sea, the marines aboard the USS Iwo Jima could see black smoke building over Beirut like an ominous storm cloud. The devastating attack claimed the lives of 241 Americans who were bravely keeping the peace in a country that was wracked by violence. A separate blast claimed the lives of 58 of our French allies.

This anniversary is a sobering reminder that freedom comes at a price—a price too often paid by brave Americans in uniform. In Beirut, it was paid by 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers.

As a memorial to their valor, I ask unanimous consent to have their names printed in the RECORD.

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

#### NAMES OF THE FALLEN IN THE BEIRUT MARINE BARRACKS BOMBING

Cpl Terry W Abbott, USMC; Cpl Clemon S Alexander, USMC; LCpl John R Allman, USMC; Cpl Moses J Arnold Jr, USMC; LCpl Charles K Bailey, USMC; LCpl Nicholas Baker, USMC; LCpl Johansen Banks, USMC; Cpl Richard E Barrett, USMC; HM1 Ronny K Bates, USN; 1stSgt David L Battle, USMC; Cpl James R Baynard, USMC; HN Jesse W Beamon, USN; GySgt Alvin Belmer, USMC; LCpl Stephen Bland, USMC; Sgt Richard L Blankenship, USMC; LCpl John W Blocker, USMC; Capt Joseph J Boccia Jr, USMC; Sgt Leon Bohannon Jr, USMC; SSgt John R

Bohnet Jr, USMC; Sgt John J Bonk Jr, USMC.

Cpl Jeffrey L Boulos, USMC; LCpl David R Bousum, USMC; 1stLt John N Boyett, USMC; Sgt Anthony Brown, USMC; Cpl David W Brown, USMC; Cpl Bobby S Buchanan Jr, USMC; Cpl John B Buckmaster, USMC; LCpl William F Burley, USMC; HN Jimmy R Cain, USN; Cpl Paul L Callahan, USMC; Sgt Mecot E Camara, USMC; PFC Bradley J Campus, USMC; Cpl Johnnie D Ceasar, USMC; PFC Marc L Cole, USMC; SP4 Marcus A Coleman, USA; PFC Juan M Comas, USMC; Sgt Robert A Conley, USMC; Sgt Charles D Cook, USMC; Cpl Curtis J Cooper, USMC.

LCpl Johnny L Copeland, USMC; Cpl Bert D Corcoran, USMC; Cpl David L Cosner, USMC; SSgt Kevin P Coulman, USMC; Cpl Brett A Croft, USMC; Cpl Rick R Crudale, USMC; Cpl Kevin P Custard, USMC; Cpl Russell E Cyzick, USMC; Maj Andrew L Davis, USMC; PFC Sidney James Decker, USMC; LCpl Michael J Devlin, USMC; Cpl Thomas A Dibeneditto, USMC; Pvt Nathaniel G Dorsey, USMC; Sgt Maj Frederick B Douglass, USMC; LCpl Timothy J Dunnigan, USMC; HN Bryan L Earle, USN; MSgt Roy L Edwards, USMC; HM3 William D Elliot Jr, USN; LCpl Jesse Ellison, USMC; LCpl Danny R Estes, USMC; LCpl Sean F Estler, USMC.

HM3 James E Faulk, USN; LCpl Richard A Fluegel, USMC; Cpl Steven M Forrester, USMC; HM3 William B Foster Jr, USN; Cpl Michael D Fulcher, USMC; LCpl Benjamin E Fuller, USMC; Cpl Michael S Fulton, USMC; Cpl William Gaines Jr, USMC; Cpl Sean R Gallagher, USMC; Cpl David B Gander, USMC; Cpl George M Gangur, USMC; SSgt Leland E Gann, USMC; LCpl Randall J Garcia, USMC; SSgt Ronald J Garcia, USMC; Cpl David D Gay, USMC; SSgt Harold D Ghum, USMC; Cpl Warner Gibbs Jr, USMC; Sgt Timothy R Giblin, USMC; ETC Michael W Gorchinski, USN; Cpl Richard J Gordon, USMC.

LCpl Harold F Gratton, USMC; Sgt Robert B Greaser, USMC; Cpl Davin M Green, USMC; Cpl Thomas A Hairston, USMC; Sgt Freddie Haltiwanger Jr, USMC; Cpl Virgil D Hamilton, USMC; Sgt Gilbert Hanton, USMC; LCpl William Hart, USMC; Capt Michael S Haskell, USMC; LCpl Michael A Hastings, USMC; Maj Paul A Hein, USMC; LCpl Douglas E Held, USMC; Cpl Mark A Helms, USMC; Cpl Ferrandy D Henderson, USMC; MSgt Matilde Hernandez Jr, USMC; Sgt Stanley G Hester, USMC; GySgt Donald W Hildreth, USMC; SSgt Richard H Holberton, USMC; HM3 Robert S Holland, USN; LCpl Bruce A Hollingshead, USMC.

LCpl Melvin D Holmes, USMC; Cpl Bruce L Howard, USMC; LT John R Hudson, USN; Cpl Terry L Hudson, USMC; Cpl Lyndon J Hue, USMC; 2ndLt Maurice E Hukill, USMC; Cpl Edward F Iacovino Jr, USMC; LCpl John J Ingalls, USMC; CWO2 Paul G Innocenzi III, USMC; Cpl James J Jackowski, USMC; Cpl Jeffrey W James, USMC; LCpl Nathaniel W Jenkins, USMC; HM2 Michael H Johnson, USN; Cpl Edward A Johnston, USMC; Cpl Steven Jones, USMC; PFC Thomas A Julian, USMC; HM2 Marion E Kees, USN; Sgt Thomas C Keown, USMC; GySgt Edward E Kimm, USMC; PFC Walter V Kingsley, USMC.

SP5 Daniel S Kluck, USA; Cpl James C Knipple, USMC; Cpl Freas H Kreischer III, USMC; LCpl Keith J Laise, USMC; Cpl Thomas G Lamb, USMC; Cpl James J Langon IV, USMC; Sgt Michael S Lariviere, USMC; Sgt Steven B Lariviere, USMC; MSgt Richard L Lemnah, USMC; Cpl David A Lewis, USMC; Sgt Val S Lewis, USMC; Cpl Joseph R Livingston, USMC; Cpl Paul D Lyon Jr, USMC; Maj John W Macrogrou, USMC; Cpl Samuel Maitland, USMC.

SSgt Charlie R Martin, USMC; PFC Jack L Martin, USMC; Cpl David S Massa, USMC; Sgt Michael R Massman, USMC; Pvt Joseph

J Mattacchione, USMC; Cpl John McCall, USMC; Sgt James E McDonough, USMC; LCpl Timothy R McMahon, USMC; LCpl Timothy D McNeely, USMC; HM2 George N McVicker II, USN; LCpl Louis Melendez, USMC; Sgt Menkins, Richard H II, USMC; Sgt Michael D Mercer, USMC; Cpl Ronald W Meurer, USMC; HM3 Joseph P Milano, USN; Sgt Joseph P Moore, USMC; LCpl Richard A Morrow, USMC; Cpl John F Muffler, USMC.

LCpl Alex Munoz, USMC; Sgt Harry D Myers, USMC; 1stLt David J Nairn, USMC; LCpl Luis A Nava, USMC; Sgt John A Olson, USMC; LCpl Robert P Olson, USMC; CWO3 Richard C Ortiz, USMC; LCpl Jeffrey B Owen, USMC; Sgt Joseph A Owens, USMC; Cpl Connie Ray Page, USMC; LCpl Ulysses Parker, USMC; LCpl Mark W Payne, USMC; MSgt John L Pearson, USMC; LCpl Thomas S Perron, USMC; Sgt John A Phillips Jr, USMC; HMC George W Piercy, USN; 1stLt Clyde W Plymel, USMC; Sgt William H Pollard, USMC; Sgt Rafael I Pomalestorres, USMC; Cpl Victor M Prevatt, USMC.

PFC James C Price, USMC; SSgt Patrick K Prindeville, USMC; LCpl Eric A Pulliam, USMC; HM3 Diomedes J Quirante, USN; Cpl David M Randolph, USMC; GySgt Charles R Ray, USMC; Pvt Rui A Relvas, USMC; LCpl Terrence L Rich, USMC; Cpl Warren Richardson, USMC; Sgt Juan C Rodriguez, USMC; LCpl Louis J Rotondo, USMC; Cpl Guillermo Sanpedro Jr, USMC; Cpl Michael C Sauls, USMC; 2ndLt Charles J Schnorf, USMC; LCpl Scott L Schultz, USMC; Capt Peter J Scialabba, USMC; Sgt Gary R Scott, USMC; Sgt Ronald L Shallo, USMC; Cpl Thomas A Shipp, USMC; LCpl Jerry D Shropshire, USMC; Cpl James F Silvia, USMC.

LCpl Stanley J Sliwinski, USMC; Cpl Kirk H Smith, USMC; SSgt Thomas G Smith, USMC; Capt Vincent L Smith, USMC; Cpl Edward Soares, USMC; 1stLt William S Sommerhof, USMC; Cpl Michael C Spaulding, USMC; LCpl John W Spearing, USMC; Cpl Stephen E Spencer, USMC; LCpl Bill J Stelpflug, USMC; PFC Horace R Stephens, USMC; LCpl Craig S Stockton, USMC; Cpl Jeffrey G Stokes, USMC; Cpl Thomas D Stowe, USMC; Cpl Eric D Sturghill, USMC; Cpl Devon L Sundar, USMC; LT James F Surch Jr, USN; LCpl Dennis A Thompson, USMC; SSgt Thomas P Thorstad, USMC.

PFC Stephen D Tingley, USMC; LCpl John J Tishmack, USMC; LCpl H. Townsend, USMC; PFC Lex D Trahan, USMC; LCpl Donald H Vallone Jr, USMC; LCpl Eric R Walker, USMC; LCpl Leonard W Walker, USMC; Sgt Eric G Washington, USMC; Cpl Obrian Weekes, USMC; 1stSgt Tandy W Wells, USMC; LCpl Steven B Wentworth, USMC; Sgt Allen D Wesley, USMC; GySgt Lloyd D West, USMC; SSgt John R Weyl, USMC; Sgt Burton D Wherland Jr, USMC.

LCpl Dwayne W Wigglesworth, USMC; Cpl Rodney J Williams, USMC; MSgt Scipio Williams Jr, USMC; Cpl Johnny A Williamson, USMC; Capt Walter E Wint Jr, USMC; Maj William E Winter, USMC; Cpl John E Wolfe, USMC; 1stLt Donald E Woollett, USMC; HM3 David E Worley, USN; LCpl Craig L Wyche, USMC; SFC James G Yarber, USA; Sgt Jeffrey D Young, USMC; 1stLt William A Zimmerman, USMC.

Mr. COTTON. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor to discuss last Tuesday's 2020 Democratic Presidential debate and specifically to discuss the topic of healthcare.

Despite all of the political posturing, here are the key takeaways: No. 1, the Democrats still want to take work-

earned health insurance away from 180 million Americans. No. 2, the Democrats want to raise taxes on the middle class and on all Americans to pay for it.

Under the Democrats' plan, people will lose forever the health coverage they have earned at work. That means union workers' hard-fought health benefits will disappear. It means that Nevada's food service workers and Michigan's autoworkers will all lose their earned healthcare.

ELIZABETH WARREN and BERNIE SANDERS want to replace work-based insurance with a one-size-fits-all, government-run scheme. At the same time, the 2020 Democrats want to give free, taxpayer-funded health insurance to illegal immigrants. It is hard to believe, but that is a matter of fact. That is the Democrats' so-called Medicare for All plan. Really, it is one-size-fits-all, government-controlled healthcare, and it is extremely expensive, even more expensive than I mentioned before on the floor, which is according to a new study that has come out by something called the Urban Institute. This liberal group has just reported that the cost of Medicare for All would be \$34 trillion—that is 34 with a "t." Let's put that into perspective. How much money is that? Over the next 10 years, that will be more money than we will spend on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security combined. It will be an astronomically large number.

The Washington Post recently published a story with the headline "Will Medicare for-all hurt the middle class?" The subheadline reads "ELIZABETH WARREN and BERNIE SANDERS struggle with questions about its impact." We have seen them struggle with the impact of this very expensive, one-size-fits-all plan. The story notes that Senators WARREN and SANDERS are scrambling to ease concerns over middle-class costs, because that is what people are concerned about in this country—the cost of healthcare.

Working families back home in Wyoming—and I talked with many this past weekend at our University of Wyoming's homecoming football game—and people from all around the State are not fooled by what is being offered by the Democrats in their debates. They know they will have to pay dearly if the Democrats' scheme is adopted and ever signed into law.

The Washington Post's story quotes and cites Ken Thorpe, who is Emory University's health policy chair. He says: "The plan is, by design, incredibly disruptive." He goes on to say: "You create enormous winners and losers," and he adds: "There is no question it hits the middle class."

For the middle class, it is a double punch in the gut, and here is why. Not only will those in the middle class lose their insurance, but their taxes will also go up.

Senator WARREN will not answer the middle-class tax increase question. She will not talk about it. She dodged the

question again and again. As the Post reports, the Senator writes she will release a plan to pay for her proposal in the next few weeks, but at the same time, she continues to duck the tax question. Last Tuesday, she repeatedly tap-danced around the issue on the debate stage. In fact, Senator WARREN's debate performance reminded me of the Artful Dodger in the Dickens novel "Oliver Twist." She said out-of-pocket healthcare costs will go down, but she failed to mention that much, much more will be taken out of middle-class pockets in huge tax hikes.

It is interesting when you see how this is covered around the world. The British publication *The Economist* knows a lot about socialized medicine, as they have been living with the British healthcare system for many, many years. It points out that ELIZABETH WARREN repeatedly refused to say how she would pay for the plan. They write that she ducked the question six times.

During the debate, it was Senator SANDERS who jumped in to set the record straight. BERNIE SANDERS said: "I do think it is appropriate to acknowledge that taxes will go up." He has even promised to raise taxes for lower income Americans. He said: "If you're making more than \$29,000 a year"—and he is not talking about an individual; he is talking about a family here—"you will be paying more in taxes" under the plan that is promoted by BERNIE SANDERS and ELIZABETH WARREN.

Then there is this warning from University of Chicago's economist Katherine Baicker, who says:

These are going to be big tax increases. The tax brackets may have to shift.

In last week's Wall Street Journal editorial, headlined "Warren's Middle-Class Tax Dodge," it explains: "The only way to pay for this [plan] is to raise taxes on the middle class, which is where the real money is."

To sum up, while Senator WARREN continues to dodge the tax issue, Senator SANDERS admits that Medicare for All will raise taxes on just about everyone.

Under the Warren-Sanders plan, middle-class taxes will rise. Taxes even rise for lower income families. We are talking about those with a family income of \$29,000.

Here is the bottom line. Americans will not tolerate having insurance go away and will not tolerate having taxes go up. They want to keep their healthcare plans, and they want them at lower costs. So we have a choice to make. We can work together to lower costs without lowering standards, or we can follow the 2020 Democrats who are pushing for their \$34 trillion, one-size-fits-all plan.

Don't let this Artful Dodger act fool you. Senator WARREN and Senator SANDERS support the same plan. They will not lower healthcare costs, but they will raise everybody's taxes. They will not improve care, but they will take coverage away from 180 million

Americans who now get it through work.

As a doctor, I want to improve patient care. I want to make healthcare more affordable. The Republicans are 100 percent committed to protecting patients who have preexisting conditions. We continue to work on bipartisan solutions and real reforms to lower the costs of everyone's care.

Meanwhile, the solution we heard last week on the debate stage, the 2020 Democrats' solution, will force all of us to pay more and wait longer for worse care. That is what they have seen in Canada, what they have seen in England, and what we will see in the United States if this one-size-fits-all plan ever goes into effect.

Let's give patients what they want, which is the care they need from the doctors they choose and at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I come to the floor to discuss legislation approved by the House of Representatives that would leave taxpayers holding the fiscal bag for a specific category of underfunded private pension plans.

Throughout most of my professional life, from my days as an accountant, to my service as the mayor of Gillette, WY, and in the Wyoming Legislature, to my membership on the Senate's Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and then on the Committee on Finance, I have worked on pension policy. This experience has taught me many things about retirement security and the need for sound planning.

My concern with the House-passed bill is not just with its immediate cost to the taxpayers but also with what it would mean down the road. The bill would send the signal to private pension plans that regardless of how underfunded they are or how risky their investments, the taxpayers will be there to bail them out.

Pensions are an important source of retirement income for millions of Americans, but many of the private sector's multiemployer pension plans are seriously underfunded. These are plans that are sponsored by a group of private employers as part of collective bargaining agreements with their employees and are separate from the single employers' plans, which are generally better funded.

According to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, multiemployers' pension plans are underfunded by more than \$637 billion. That is \$637 billion that is underfunded. Out of the 1,247 multiemployer pension plans that we have information on, 1,235 are underfunded. That would mean that 12 are not underfunded.

In July of this year, the House of Representatives passed the Rehabilitation for Multiemployer Pensions Act of 2019, which would bail out some of the worst-funded multiemployer plans at

the taxpayers' expense. The bill would provide a combination of low-interest loans and direct cash payments to the private sector's multiemployer plans that are currently insolvent or are designated as "critical and declining."

The official Congressional Budget Office's cost estimate of the bill states it would increase deficits by \$49 billion over the next 10 years, but, as a separate analysis points out, which I requested from the budget office, the true cost and risk to taxpayers is actually much higher.

First, the bill includes a handful of revenue provisions to help offset its cost, but the House included these same provisions in a separate bill it passed earlier this year. Without this \$16 billion in double-counted revenues, the bailout bill's price tag jumps to \$65 billion over the next decade.

Second, the analysis projects that most pension plans would not fully repay their loans without the grant assistance provided in this bill. What that means is that these plan providers are going to use taxpayer dollars to help repay loans made to them by taxpayers. That is quite a deal.

Further, the budget office's analysis shows that even with these taxpayer-provided grants, one-quarter of the plans receiving loans under the House bill would become insolvent within the 30-year loan period. CBO projects that most of the other plans would become insolvent in the decade after they repay their loans. All of this begs the question, then what?

Now, third, as I alluded to a moment ago, much of the bill's cost doesn't show up in the first 10 years. When you consider the total amount of new spending the bill authorizes over the next several decades, along with the added interest costs we will have to pay, the total cost would be more than \$100 billion.

To add insult to injury, the House bill would not resolve the larger multiemployer pension crisis. The bill would apply only to those that are currently insolvent or critical and declining. It would not address the many other plans that are treading water now but will face insolvency in the future. You can bet that if this bill goes through, those plans would be expecting their bailout when the time comes. What a precedent.

All of this is setting up for additional bailouts in the future, potentially putting taxpayers on the hook for hundreds of billions of dollars.

Now, only about 12 percent of private sector workers participate in a pension plan, and an even smaller number participate in these multiemployer plans. This bill would put the vast majority of workers who don't have their own pension plans on the hook for bailing out the small percentage who do. That hardly seems fair.

Hard-working Americans overwhelmingly agree that we can't afford a pension bailout. A recent poll shows that a majority of voters oppose a taxpayer-

funded bailout of unfunded union pension plans. This is because voters know a bad deal when they see it.

Before I close, I am going to remind my colleagues that the Federal Government already has its own unfunded promises that need addressing, and these are programs that will affect the vast majority of Americans. Trustees for Social Security estimate that Social Security's long-term benefit promises exceed its dedicated tax revenues by almost \$17 trillion, and Medicare's long-term spending is projected to exceed its dedicated taxes and premiums by more than \$40 trillion.

We need to work to find solutions to address the Federal Government's own funding shortfalls for the vast majority of Americans and not bail out underfunded private sector pension plans for the few.

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.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am pleased that the Senate is beginning debate on the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill for the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies. This bill has been included in the appropriations package that has just now been brought before this Chamber.

Let me begin my remarks by thanking Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY for their bipartisan leadership in advancing these appropriations bills to the Senate floor. Given that we have reached a 2-year, bicameral, bipartisan budget agreement in August and the new fiscal year began on October 1, it is imperative for the Senate to move these bills quickly and to go to conference with the House in order to avoid further continuing resolutions or, even worse, a government shutdown.

I also want to acknowledge the hard work and strong commitment of my friend and colleague, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, the ranking member of the T-HUD Subcommittee. We have worked so closely together in drafting this bill, which includes more than 950 requests from 75 Senators.

Let me repeat that. We received 950 requests from three-quarters of our colleagues for ideas for this bill, for funding levels, and in support of certain programs. We evaluated all of them very carefully and accommodated as many as we could.

The T-HUD bill passed the full Appropriations Committee by a unanimous vote of 31 to 0. It reflects a truly bipartisan product.

The allocation for the fiscal year 2020 transportation-housing appropriations

bill is \$74.3 billion. That is \$3.2 billion above the current funding levels. This additional funding is necessary because of rising rental costs across the country and a reduction in the receipts from the Federal Housing Administration that are used to offset some of the spending in this bill.

In spite of these considerable funding challenges, our bill not only fully funds the renewal of housing assistance for low-income seniors and other vulnerable populations, but it also continues to provide robust investments in our infrastructure. For example, the bill provides \$1 billion for the highly effective and popular BUILD grant program. The BUILD program helps fund critical infrastructure projects that promote economic development and the creation of jobs.

I am proud to say that Maine has won a BUILD grant every year of this program, including a critical \$25 million grant to replace the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge that is critical to the operations of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME.

Particularly important to States like Maine, the bill also provides much needed highway resources. While only 19 percent of the U.S. population lives in rural areas, 46 percent of traffic fatalities occur in rural America. That is because the roads and the bridges in the rural parts of our country are frequently in much poorer condition than those in urban areas. Building on the success of the rural bridge rehabilitation program over the last 2 years, our bill provides \$1.25 billion in dedicated funding for bridges that are deteriorating and nearing the end or have reached the end of their useful life.

The bill fully funds the INFRA grant program, which provides resources for large-scale freight projects through a competitive grant process.

In fiscal year 2019, I was pleased to advocate for the Maine Department of Transportation's successful application to replace the Madawaska international bridge in Northern Maine. This project will help to replace a critical corridor and connector between Madawaska and New Brunswick on the Canadian side of the border. This is so important to the economy of Northern Maine and supports more than 5,800 direct and indirect jobs. Right now, that bridge has been posted. That means that heavy trucks are unable to cross in the most effective and shortest route between Edmonton, New Brunswick, and Madawaska, ME.

These critical programs support not only much needed infrastructure projects but also jobs and economic growth in each and every one of our home States.

The American Society of Civil Engineers conducts a comprehensive assessment of our Nation's infrastructure every 4 years. Its most recent report card from 2017 shows that America's infrastructure remains in poor condition, with a grade of D-plus. That should be a call to action to all of us. It is simply

unacceptable. It not only creates safety problems, it also impedes economic development.

One in eleven of our Nation's bridges is rated as structurally deficient, and the average age of our country's more than 600,000 bridges is 43 years old. Our National Highway System contains infrastructure that is now well past its useful life. Some bridges are more than 100 years old, and many have had to be posted and are unable to accommodate today's traffic volumes. Without the critical funding in the T-HUD bill dedicated to bridges, as well as the BUILD grant program, we simply will not be able to make progress to improve our Nation's infrastructure.

Let me now turn to aviation. The bill provides \$17.7 billion in resources for the Federal Aviation Administration—the FAA—which allows us to fully fund air traffic control personnel, including more than 14,000 air traffic controllers, and more than 25,000 engineers, maintenance technicians, safety inspectors, and operational support staff. Given the significant challenges the FAA faces in aviation safety, particularly as has become evident with the certification of the Boeing 737-MAX aircraft, the bill increases funding for aviation safety and aircraft certification activities and requires the FAA to respond to each and every one of the recommendations made by the inspector general and the National Transportation Safety Board once their audits and reviews are completed. In addition, it requires the FAA to move forward with a rule-making on safety management systems for aircraft manufacturers and to assess its own internal workforce.

The bill also provides \$1.2 billion for FAA's Next Generation Air Transportation System's programs—also known as NextGen—to improve the efficiency and safety of the national airspace. This funding is critical for reducing delays and addressing congestion at some of our Nation's busiest airports.

Of particular importance to rural communities, the bill fully funds the Contract Tower Program and the Essential Air Service Program.

In addition, the bill provides \$450 million for the Airport Improvement Program in keeping with the authorized level. This supplemental AIP funding has been extremely helpful for small airports in Maine that otherwise would not be able to complete runway extension projects that are vital for air ambulances.

Turning to maritime programs, our legislation provides full funding for our Nation's State maritime academies, as well as the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, all of which play critical roles in training the next generation of U.S. mariners.

The bill provides \$300 million for the third special purpose vessel to be used as a training school ship for the State maritime academies. In accordance with the guidance provided 3 years ago by MARAD, new training ships will replace existing aging training ships in

the order in which those ships are expected to reach the end of their useful lives. Over the past 2 years, we have funded replacement ships for the New York State Maritime Academy and the Massachusetts Maritime Academy. Funding in this bill will replace the aging vessel at the Maine Maritime Academy, which was next on the list. These new ships provide training capacity for all six State maritime academies and ensure that cadets receive the training hours they need to graduate and join the workforce in the Merchant Marine, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

In the area of housing, our priority is to ensure that our Nation's most vulnerable do not lose their housing assistance and become homeless; therefore, the bill provides necessary funding increases to cover the higher costs of rental assistance for the most vulnerable among us, including disabled citizens and our low-income seniors.

Senator REED and I share a strong commitment to reducing and ending homelessness and have included \$2.8 billion for homeless assistance grants. To help our homeless youth and underserved population, we provide \$80 million for grants.

Many Members share my concern that young people are aging out of the foster care system and have nowhere safe to go. Far too frequently, they end up couch-surfing or living on the streets, vulnerable to those who would abuse them. To better support our youth who are exiting the foster care system who are at risk of becoming exploited or homeless, the bill also includes \$20 million for family unification vouchers.

For our Nation's homeless veterans, the bill provides \$40 million for the successful HUD-VASH Program. In the land of the brave, there should always be a home for our veterans. Despite the administration once again proposing to eliminate this highly successful program, the committee continues to provide funding. This program has been so successful that it has helped to reduce veteran homelessness by nearly 50 percent since it was first started in 2010.

Another important issue, particularly to Senator REED and to me, is lead paint in homes. That is a particular concern to families with children under age 6. The bill provides \$290 million to combat lead hazards—a historic level of funding. Lead paint hazards are a significant concern for Maine families, as 57 percent of our housing stock was constructed prior to 1978, the year lead-based paint was banned. These grants will help communities protect children from the harmful effects—what can be lifelong effects—of lead poisoning.

The bill also supports local development efforts by providing \$3.3 billion for the Community Development Block Grant Program—another program that the administration proposed to eliminate but for which we had overwhelming support expressed in letters

from our colleagues. The reason the Community Development Block Grant Program is so popular is its flexibility. It can be tailored to meet local needs. We have also included \$1.4 billion for the HOME Program. These two programs support the development of affordable housing and other infrastructure projects and revitalize downtowns, which in turn promote economic development and lead to the creation of more jobs.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this important legislation to the Chamber as we begin debate on the Transportation-HUD funding bill. I urge my colleagues to support the investments in this bill that benefit our communities all across this Nation and the families, veterans, children, and our seniors who rely on these vital programs.

Let me end my remarks by again thanking my colleague, friend, and ranking member, Senator REED, for his close collaboration and hard work. I am very proud of the fact that once again this year we have produced a bipartisan bill that was unanimously approved by our committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2740

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 2740 ripen at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in concurrence with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 948

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I call up the substitute amendment No. 948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] proposes an amendment numbered 948.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 950 TO AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 950 to amendment No. 948.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make a technical correction)

On page 321, line 14, strike "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$5,250,000".

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 457.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Rick Scott, John Thune, Lindsey Graham, Rand Paul, John Kennedy, John Cornyn, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Patrick J. Toomey, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Richard C. Shelby.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand we are waiting for another Senator, and when he arrives, of course, I will yield.

H.R. 3055

Mr. President, I was just talking with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama a couple of minutes ago. I know he has spoken, and we have begun consideration of a bill containing the fiscal year 2020 Commerce, Justice, Science, Agriculture, Interior, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development.

I mention this because all four of these bills are the product of hard work and bipartisan cooperation by each of the subcommittees. They were reported from the Appropriations Committee unanimously. Every single Republican, every single Democrat voted for it. It makes critical investments in affordable housing and infrastructure, rural development, our farming communities, small businesses, science, and our environment. They are good bills, and I am glad to have them before the Senate.

I want to thank the chairs and ranking members of the subcommittees and their staff for the good work: Senators HOEVEN and MERKLEY, Senators MURKOWSKI and UDALL, Senators COLLINS and REED, and Senators MORAN and SHAHEEN. They all worked so closely together. They show, despite the difficult atmosphere we often operate in, the Appropriations Committee can still put partisan disputes aside and make strong investments in the priorities of our American people.

The Agriculture bill continues the significant progress made by this committee and in the 2018 farm bill to deliver real wins for farmers, families, and rural communities throughout Vermont and across the country. The bill rejects the disastrous cuts the Trump administration proposed for on-farm conservation, rural development, and rural energy programs and, instead, makes important investments in farming communities.

It is disappointing that this bill supports the administration's ill-advised relocation of USDA research agencies. I have spoken out about this relocation effort and remain concerned about the loss of expertise and focus such a move precipitates at USDA.

I am pleased this bill further invests in the viability of our cornerstone Vermont industries, including dairy, maple, and organics.

It significantly increases funding for innovation in the dairy sector, funding that will directly benefit dairy producers in Vermont and across the country as they meet the challenges of a changing marketplace. The bill also takes important steps to preserve the