

in the NAFTA trade agreement a sweetheart deal for PhRMA so that they can charge higher prices, not just in the United States, but in Canada and Mexico?

This new NAFTA has provisions that will encourage drug companies to obtain excessive numbers of secondary patents that delay generic competition and keep prices high.

So when my farmers come to me and say: Why are you not for NAFTA? And I say to them, if it was just about farmers, it would be one thing. But it is about American families, Canadian families, families even in Mexico paying higher prices for prescription drugs because of the trade agreement that the President wants us to approve. We should be working to bring lower-cost products to market sooner, not allowing Pharma to sneak in a payday into a trade package at the expense of American families.

It should come as no surprise that the main coalition running ads supporting the approval of NAFTA is the pharmaceutical industry of the United States. In fact, PhRMA and BIO, the two largest pharmaceutical associations, have already spent \$30 million lobbying Congress to pass this new NAFTA. Now, we know why.

For all the President's talk, this provision in this trade agreement is a Trojan horse giveaway for Big Pharma at the expense of American patients. I guess we should not be surprised, but I will say this: If Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, are listening to the people they represent back home about the cost of prescription drugs, they will not fall for this new Pharma fleece.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NATIONAL PEANUT FESTIVAL

Mr. JONES. Madam President, it is not often in floor remarks we can often hit a trifecta on topics that are uniquely connected, but I am fortunate enough to have that privilege today. They all center around the glorious peanut. I want to honor the National Peanut Festival currently being held in Dothan, AL, which recognizes the importance of the peanut industry to the State of Alabama and to the United States.

Every year, Dothan hosts the Nation's largest peanut festival to honor local peanut farmers and to celebrate harvest season. The festival began in 1938 and has been held annually each year, except for the years during the hiatus during World War II. This year's festival is a 10-day-long extravaganza with food, fun, and entertainment. You name it, you can find it in Dothan during the peanut festival. It is one of the most popular events in Alabama each

year. In 2017, the festival broke attendance records with over 200,000 people joining the fun.

Unfortunately, my schedule has prevented me from being down there this week, but I wish I had been there. I wish I could go for the end of this because it is a glorious time.

Last week, I introduced a resolution here in the Senate to pay tribute to the National Peanut Festival and the importance of peanuts in our State and the entire country. Over 400 million pounds of peanuts are produced every year in Alabama alone, and nearly half of all the peanuts in America are grown within a 100-mile radius of Dothan, AL, where most of those peanuts are processed. It is no wonder that the city of Dothan—down in southeast Alabama, right in the corner, just right on the border of Georgia and Florida—is known as the Peanut Capital of the World.

The peanut industry is a critical part of Alabama's economy. In 2018 alone, the 400 million pounds of peanuts produced by Alabama farmers was valued at \$118 million. The farm value of the Nation's peanut crop is over a billion dollars. And like all farmers, peanut farmers have their share of challenges. But year after year, the peanut farmers in Alabama and across the country persevere, providing a crop whose importance is often simply taken for granted—well, as peanuts, as it pertains to our overall economy.

But the peanut is an important staple to the agriculture and food industry, thanks in large part to the amazing and extraordinary work of a scientist, an African-American scientist and adopted son of Alabama, Dr. George Washington Carver, who did his work at one of Alabama's great HBCUs, Tuskegee University.

Dr. Carver was born into slavery, but raised by his former master once slavery was abolished. He was forced to attend segregated schools until 1891, when he was accepted as the first Black student at Iowa State University. Only 5 years later, in 1896, Dr. Carver was hired by the great Booker T. Washington to head the Agriculture Department at Tuskegee Institute, now known as Tuskegee University, in Tuskegee, AL.

At that point, peanuts were not even recognized as a crop in the United States, but because of a serious threat to the South's cotton crop from boll weevil infestations, Dr. Carver suggested that Alabama farmers start growing peanuts in the alternate years, which he believed would restore and add nutrients to the barren soil so that cotton could grow the next year.

It worked. He not only was a leading voice for crop rotation but ended up inventing over 300 products made out of peanuts, including peanut milk, peanut paper, and peanut soap—although, surprisingly, he did not invent my favorite, peanut butter, but 300 different types of products made from peanuts.

In 1921, in a highly unusual circumstance in the era of Jim Crow, Dr.

Carver testified regarding the value of peanuts before the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives—an African-American scientist in front of the U.S. House in 1921. In 1938, again during the Jim Crow era in Alabama, Dr. Carver was the featured speaker at the first peanut festival in Dothan, AL.

Peanuts became more and more popular, and by 1940, they had become one of the top six crops in the United States—all in large part due to the work of Dr. Carver at Tuskegee University. It is not an overstatement to say that Dr. Carver, Tuskegee University, and the peanut helped save the economy of the South.

This is just one example of the extraordinary contributions that HBCUs have made to our country over the years and continue to make today. But, as we have talked about for some time, including with my friend Senator CARDIN earlier today, those contributions are threatened because of the expiration of Federal funding that occurred at the end of September.

I have been pushing for the passage of my bill, the FUTURE Act, which would renew funding for HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions that expired at the end of September. We need to continue to invest in these institutions and ensure they have consistent funding.

We have worked with this bill, the FUTURE Act, to make sure the concerns of others—particularly those who might object to the UC we have asked for on the FUTURE Act—to make sure that this is not some Federal budget gimmick. We have answered those concerns. We have answered all the pay-for concerns. All we are asking for is consistent funding because now planning is as important as the money. Yes, the Department of Education has told HBCUs that the funding would be there through September, but by this spring, those institutions have to plan. They have to start making sure they have the necessary resources for the fall and beyond. If their funding is set to expire at the end of next year, they cannot make those plans, both with teachers and their infrastructure.

We need to continue to make sure those HBCUs are funded consistently and appropriately. Let's make sure we put aside any differences and make sure those funds are available so that our great HBCUs and minority-serving institutions across the country can continue to operate and plan.

We need to honor the legacy of Dr. Carver, which is one of the reasons I was so proud to introduce a resolution honoring the National Peanut Festival and the peanut industry in the State of Alabama. It is a testament to the importance of the peanut and a time to celebrate its history, our State, and the peanut farming way of life.

I am hopeful that with the advancements of peanut allergy research, we can make sure more people have the ability to enjoy what so many of us

can. I understand that peanut allergies are a real problem around the country and around the world for a lot of people. But advances in research that is going on right now—right now—can make sure we break through and that all who want to can enjoy the value and the taste of those wonderful peanuts. I am not going to go through specifics. I could name all manner of products. I won't do that here today, but I thank you for this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY POVERTY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss the global fight to end poverty and specifically the problem of energy poverty.

The numbers paint a very grim picture. Worldwide, 840 million people are living without electricity. They can't cook or heat their homes safely or reliably. In fact, nearly 3 billion people—3 billion people worldwide—still rely on wood and waste for household energy.

What should the United States do to help? First and foremost, I believe we should push multilateral development banks, like the World Bank, to invest in affordable energy projects, which will help these people. The World Bank's mission is to lift people out of poverty—to help lift people out of poverty. That is their mission. Specifically, it seeks to end extreme poverty while promoting shared prosperity.

For 75 years, the United States has been working with the World Bank to help developing countries grow. The United States remains the World Bank's largest contributor. Every U.S. dollar at the World Bank should make a difference for people in the developing world.

The World Bank's new policies, however, lead me to call for a review by the United States of how U.S. dollars are being used. Several years ago, the World Bank decided to stop financing certain projects—specifically, oil, gas, and coal projects. I am concerned the World Bank is now blocking affordable energy development—energy that is needed to make a positive difference for so many people in the developing world. Traditional fuels are a vital tool for escaping energy poverty. Yet, with the policy change in the World Bank, only renewable energy projects qualify for funding. It seems that the World Bank is putting its liberal political agenda ahead of our anti-poverty mission.

The question is, Does the World Bank still want to help the people living in poor nations today? That is the question. If so, they should be helping with the use of abundant and affordable energy resources. If not, then I think the United States must reevaluate our support for the World Bank.

Here is a case in point: The Bank restricts the financing of high-efficiency power stations fueled by coal. Last fall, for example, the World Bank failed to honor its commitment to the country

of Kosovo. The Bank pulled its funding from Kosovo's state-of-the-art, coal-fired powerplant—state of the art—needed in Kosovo. Kosovo faces an energy security barrier to grow. They don't have enough energy to grow the way they are prepared to. Kosovo has the fifth largest coal reserves in the world. Kosovo desperately needs to retire its older facility.

I saw this firsthand last month when I was visiting members of the Wyoming National Guard stationed in northern Kosovo. This decision by the World Bank is simply unacceptable.

What are other countries doing? China and Russia, meanwhile, are dramatically increasing their global investment in identical carbon-based energy projects. The World Bank is saying: Go ask China. Go ask Russia. South Africa, for example, is now working with China's development bank on its coal-fired powerplant. There are serious concerns when our allies work with China and Russia. These include lower standards, dependence on these countries, and undue political influence.

A number of Members in the Senate share my concern. On Thursday, I led a group of a dozen Senators in urging the World Bank to immediately lift these harmful restrictions. My letter to the President of the World Bank, President David Malpass, was cosigned by Senators BOOZMAN, CAPITO, COTTON, CRAMER, CRUZ, ENZI, HOEVEN, JOHNSON, KENNEDY, MURKOWSKI, and THUNE. Together, we are pressing the World Bank to recommit to an “all of the above” energy strategy. Developing countries desperately need affordable, reliable energy.

We say in our letter:

People living in poor and developing nations want and need a stable energy supply. They are looking for power generation that provides energy security, helps create jobs, and improves their lives.

People back home in Wyoming know firsthand the benefits of developing abundant energy resources. The United States is a top global energy producer. Wyoming has played a key role in this success. We have produced our way to a booming U.S. economy, and we have created millions of new jobs along the way. People who are struggling worldwide to survive and thrive in developing countries deserve that same opportunity. As an energy powerhouse, America can help empower our allies and our energy exports.

Global philanthropist Bill Gates said: “Increasing access to electricity is critical to lifting the world's poor out of poverty. Let me repeat. “Increasing access to electricity is critical to lifting the world's poor out of poverty.”

Ultimately, the solution to energy poverty doesn't lie in limiting options but in using all available options. In pursuit of its mission, the World Bank must embrace, not exclude, abundant, affordable energy resources.

Let's work together to end energy poverty now for the 840 million people

on the planet living without electricity.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, about a month ago there was a headline in one of the publications that people pay attention to that read: “Senate Republicans Amp Up Pressure for an USMCA Vote.” USMCA, by the way, is an acronym for the new trade agreement between Mexico, Canada, and the United States. I initially thought it was “United States Marine Corps Always,” but that is not the case. About nine of us came to the floor and pointed out this was imperative, and if we were going to have a new trade agreement to replace NAFTA, if we could at least get some price recovery and also make some progress with regard to Canada and Mexico—historically great trading partners—it might be a good thing to get the USMCA passed. That was a month ago.

We were assured, at that particular time, by folks over in the House of Representatives—our colleagues over there—that they would do everything in their power to see if we could get it done. It is not done. Still, it is not done. Still, farmers, ranchers, growers, and everybody connected with agriculture, and, for that matter, trade, certainly have been waiting and waiting. Times in farm country, as I think most people know, are pretty rough these days. So at least passing USMCA would be something everybody could agree to.

I rise in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement again—1 month later. It is time to move forward and pass this important legislation now. “Now,” that is my acronym for “right away,” “yesterday.”

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I want to talk about not only my producers in Kansas but all producers throughout these United States and across the country. Time and again, we have asked why there is a delay. Farmers tell me, time and again, they wonder what on Earth is going on back there. Well, that is obvious to everybody, with the “i” word being considered over in the House, but even with that, this is a situation where, if that were brought up to a vote, both the administration and House Members—both sides of the aisle—it would pass, more so especially since our Trade Ambassador, Robert Lighthizer, has been working with my colleagues across the aisle over there in an effort to settle labor issues and also environmental concerns.