

as we were gathered together in the Russell Senate Office Building. The question was this: Why was there more than one? It is a question we would always hope to answer. There should never be a victim or survivor of sexual abuse. And if there is one, there should never be a second.

The sad thing about this circumstance in which we found ourselves and in which the athletes found themselves was that not only was there one, but there were many more. We should be able to take that call—why was there ever more than one?—and make certain that we do everything to keep it from ever happening again.

I thank my colleagues in the Commerce Committee for their support on this critical legislation. I look forward to working with the leader and my Senate colleagues as we push to enact these necessary reforms.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, before I get into my comments on Agent Orange, I just want to thank Senator MORAN and Senator BLUMENTHAL for leading the charge on making sure that our Olympic athletes are protected. There are some who say that government has no business in this realm; I couldn't disagree with them more. The fact is, this is a wrong that I think Senator MORAN and Senator BLUMENTHAL have tried to right. I just want to thank them for their leadership.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Senator.

AGENT ORANGE

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I stand here today because the Trump administration continues to turn its back on our Nation's veterans, many who are suffering from illnesses relating to Agent Orange.

Agent Orange is a very toxic defoliant that was used in Vietnam. Everybody who was there was exposed to it because it was used in such great volume.

By denying eligibility to the folks who have suffered from that exposure the benefits and care they need, they are not doing right by our veterans. The fact is, there is no logical reason behind it except for the fact that they don't want to pay for it. They don't think the exposure to these toxic chemicals in Vietnam are a cost of war. Well, they are.

Today, we are telling Acting Chief of Staff and Acting Office of Management and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney and other White House officials to do their jobs and make sure these veterans are taken care of.

It is time for this White House to do right by the 83,000 veterans—that is 83,000—who are currently suffering and dying from significant health conditions associated with Agent Orange exposure. This administration—the Trump administration—needs to stop ignoring the overwhelming scientific evidence put forth by medical experts, scientists, and veterans.

Internal documents obtained by a veteran through the Freedom of Information Act revealed that in 2017 President Trump's first VA Secretary, Dr. David Shulkin, tried to do right by these veterans. At that time, the VA proposed to expand the list of presumptive health conditions associated with this toxic herbicide to include bladder cancer, Parkinson's-like symptoms, and hypothyroidism so that these veterans could become eligible for the benefits they earned if they had these conditions, but Mick Mulvaney and the White House objected. They didn't want to spend the money. They said they wanted more studies—studies that would have effectively run out the clock as more and more of these veterans suffered and died.

Since then, the National Academy of Medicine found evidence that hypertension has even greater evidence of association to Agent Orange exposure than the conditions Dr. Shulkin attempted to address. Yet the White House still refuses to take care of these veterans. They refuse to expand the list to include these four conditions: parkinsonism, bladder cancer, hypertension, and hypothyroidism.

More have suffered and more have died. These are Vietnam veterans who are in their sixties, seventies, and eighties. But this administration—the same folks who are quick to beg for nearly \$20 billion for an ineffective border wall that Mexico was supposed to pay for and who are happy to put a \$1.5 trillion tax bill on the government's credit card—refuses to recognize that this is a cost of war and that they need to do right by the Vietnam veterans—veterans who have already waited decades for the benefits and the care they desperately need.

It is pretty simple. Do the right thing. If you claim to be an advocate for the veterans, no more excuses and end the wait for these veterans and their families. These veterans and their families have already sacrificed greatly, and they should not be forced to wait 1 minute longer. This issue needs to be dealt with, and it needs to be dealt with today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. 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 HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH
AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about a resolution that I have introduced with my fellow Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, and 11 other fellow Senators from both sides of the aisle—truly bipartisan—to designate November 2019 as National Homeless Children and Youth Awareness Month.

Specifically, this resolution highlights the issue of children and youth homelessness and supports the efforts of businesses, organizations, educators, and volunteers who are dedicated to meeting the needs of homeless children and youth.

In the 2016-to-2017 school year, there were 1.3 million children and youth—I repeat, 1.3 million children and youth—who experienced homelessness in the United States.

In West Virginia alone, our schools have identified more than 10,500 students experiencing homelessness. This is simply unacceptable, and we must do more to support our future generations. That is why I am a firm believer that there are five promises—five promises—we, as adults, should make to every child.

No. 1 is every child must have an unconditionally loving and caring adult in their life. That is the first. Every child must know that someone loves them unconditionally. No matter what you do and no matter what mistakes you make, at the end of the day, that person loves you. It could be your mom or dad; it could be a grandma or grandpa; it could be an aunt or uncle; or it could be a neighbor, someone who knows they have your back no matter what.

No. 2 is every child must have a safe place to call home where harm cannot enter. I would hope it is the home they live in. Sometimes it is not always the case. Sometimes it might be a school. It might be an after-school program. It could be a church. It could be a neighbor's home. Every child growing up has to have somewhere safe in their life where harm cannot enter and they are protected.

No. 3 is every child must have a healthy start and access to a nutritious diet. I think that is why you have seen in our school systems that we have expanded our nutrition programs from breakfasts to lunches. When I went to school way back when in rural areas, we had no cafeterias and no lunches, but for some reason, I could always tell when my mom or other parents had put an extra sandwich in the lunch pail knowing that we couldn't eat it but somebody could. There were always those who kind of stepped in and helped others.

Now we have that. Every child has to have a healthy start and access to a nutritious diet if they are going to grow and be engaged and, basically, be productive.

No. 4 is every child should be taught a livable skill so that they can make their own way through life. Primary and secondary education is free in America. It makes us different from every other country in the world. We commit to every child that they can get an education to be literate—every child. That is why education should be held to a higher standard to make sure that they have a skill set.

There should be no child graduating from high school who is not ready to

work or ready to learn more. We should be able to identify in 7th, 8th, or 9th grade what their interests are going to be, whether they are going to be skill-set driven or whether they are going to be academically driven. Both are needed, and we should not make them feel like failures if they don't go to college because a lot of people aren't desiring to go to college. A lot of them want to work with their hands. They want the skill sets; they have that ability, and we should identify that very early.

No. 5 is the hardest promise because you cannot teach it. You can't teach this promise that you should keep to every child—that that child should grow to be a loving, caring adult and give something back. They can learn that fifth one only by how you conduct your life, how that special adult in their life—mom, dad, aunt, uncle, cousin, neighbor, after-hours group, school—someone in their life has given them hope: Hey, I can be that person; I can give something back; and I can help somebody like me.

Those are the five promises. If we can't keep those, then God help us all. We owe that to every generation. To have one child homeless in this country is wrong. Homelessness means you have no stability; you have no functional family; and you have no biological mom or dad to go home to. You are either couch surfing or basically living with another relative—whatever it may be—and this is something we have to intervene in and make sure we can correct.

We must keep these promises to our children so that our future generations will grow up to be the best they possibly can and meet all their expectations. We expect our children and youth to care about their education, but if they don't have a roof over their head or a place to sleep, if they don't have adequate nutrition and meals, they can't focus on learning as they should be able to.

I heard one child say: I am just trying to survive. I am just trying to make it through the day and survive. I would love to get the education you want me to get, but when it becomes basically survival tactics or educational tactics, survival will kick in first.

That is what they are dealing with. This crisis is affecting not just these students in their homes, but it affects their school life, too, and we must do better to ensure that they can learn and give back to their communities.

Speaking of doing more, there is a lot of great work being done in my State of West Virginia and nationally and, I am sure, in all the States. One wonderful example is the Children's Home Society in West Virginia. I know they are watching and are gathered for their annual conference today. I want to thank them for the incredible work they have been doing. They have been strong leaders in helping children and families who experience homelessness in West Virginia. We truly appreciate their

leadership on this issue in our State and hope that their work can be used as a standard for the other States to combat this issue.

Recently, I visited South Charleston Middle School to see the work they are doing to address the child and youth homelessness crisis facing our State from the perspective of a student's life, much of which is spent at school. They use Federal funding to help correctly identify students who are homeless so that they can provide services to those who need them.

I hope my resolution will help raise awareness on this issue so that more schools can use the funds available to support the students who are experiencing homelessness. In West Virginia, the child and youth homelessness crisis is intensified by the opioid crisis that has ravaged our State. The lasting effects of the epidemic on our children and future generations are terrible, from the increase in children and youth homelessness to a rise in youth substance use disorder.

This crisis will continue to affect communities like those all across West Virginia for decades to come, which is why we must begin to combat and address issues like child and youth homelessness now.

In the middle of this crisis, there are success stories, too, like Hannah's. Hannah's parents could not care for her because of substance use issues, so she went to live with a family friend, who subsequently removed all support. A high school counselor referred Hannah to the Youth Services System Transitional Living Program, which helped her finish high school and go on to college. She is a recipient of the YSS Ronald Mulholland Futures Scholarship and attends West Virginia University, where she is now a junior studying chemistry. Last summer, she completed an internship in Tennessee.

The Youth Services System is a wonderful national organization that works to provide shelter for children and youth across America. Organizations like the Youth Services System and the Children's Home Society deserve recognition for their incredible work because, without them, success stories like Hannah's and so many others wouldn't even exist. This is why we must raise awareness of this issue so that we can support the wonderful work being done across the United States every day.

I am so proud to be here today to advocate for those 1.3 million children and youth across our Nation who need our help and deserve our help. We must do better for them, and I believe strongly that this resolution is the beginning to work toward solving this major crisis our Nation has with broad bipartisan support. If there is one thing that brings us together, it is the children. It is not a Democrat or Republican problem. It is a problem for all of us. It is an American problem, and we have to face it.

With the support of 23 national organizations, I hope this resolution will

pass quickly. I look forward to working with my colleagues who have signed on to this resolution and those on both sides of the aisle to bring us back together to combat child and youth homelessness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

5G TECHNOLOGY

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I will talk for a few minutes today about 5G technology and taxpayer money. We have all heard the term "5G." 5G stands for fifth generation—fifth generation technology. In short, what 5G means is incredibly fast data transmission—data going from my cell phone to the President's cell phone, my internet to your internet, and the ability to connect a lot of different devices at the same time.

Through 5G technology, which is wireless technology, we will be able not only to transmit data very quickly, but we will also be able to transmit huge amounts of data—almost breathtaking amounts—and it is going to have a huge impact on American society. It is going to have a huge impact on the world.

In some respects, it is going to change the world. If technology has changed the world thus far—and indeed it has; among other things, it has made the world smaller—5G is going to change it even more. For example, you will be able to use your smartphone to open your garage door. You will be able to use your smartphone and be a mile away but turn on your coffee maker. We will be able to do surgery by internet. Surgeons will be able to be in one place 1,000 miles away from a patient, and that surgeon, through robotics and other means, will be able to transmit the data to operate on that patient.

Driverless cars are going to change the world dramatically—not only the way we get around. It is going to change our need for roads; it is going to change our tax base; and it is going to change the insurance market.

5G is going to allow farmers to be prewarned about encroaching diseases. Farmers will not have to wait to see their crops attacked by certain diseases; through 5G technology, they will be able to know and predict that those diseases are coming. It is going to help us feed the world.

5G technology is going to allow our young people to have virtual apprenticeships. If you are a young woman or a young man and you are right out of school and you are offered an apprenticeship or an internship, let's say in San Francisco, and you are living in Duluth—say you are a student and you say "I don't have the money to move to San Francisco, and I don't have the money to live in San Francisco," you will be able to do an internship through technology.

It is going to be 100 times faster. In terms of the amount of data, I don't know how to quantify that, but it is going to have an extraordinary impact on wireless technology.

What are we talking about here? When my phone calls the President's phone, what are we talking about? Really, we are just talking about radio waves. We are talking about radio waves. A radio wave is nothing more than electromagnetic radiation. I don't want to get off the subject here. When my phone talks to the President's phone, we are just sending radio waves through the air. Sometimes you might have heard that referred to as a spectrum. That is basically how a cell phone and the internet works, except with 5G, the speed with which that data is transmitted and the amount of data will be substantially larger.

Who owns those radio waves and the air through which those radio waves travel? According to Federal law—the Federal Communications Act of 1934—we do. We all do. The American people do.

The Federal Government, through the Federal Communications Commission and other agencies, including but not limited to Congress, regulates those radio waves going through the air, which we call spectrum, but those radio waves and the air through which they pass are owned by the American people. Just like a national park, just like the oil and gas offshore in Federal waters, just like the Rocky Mountains, they are owned by us, the American people.

Now there are certain types of radio waves that are owned by the American people that are perfect for 5G technology. These radio waves and this spectrum, if you will—I will use the term "spectrum," but remember, I am just referring to radio waves moving through the air. This particular spectrum that is perfect for 5G technology is called the C-band. I don't know why they call it that, but that is what they call it. It is between 3.7 gigahertz and 4.2 gigahertz. Don't worry about what that means; just know that this part of the overall spectrum is perfect for 5G. It is perfect because it strikes a balance between coverage and capacity. And this C-band, if you will, is not too hot, not too cold. It is just right for 5G. It is critical to our development of 5G technology.

Since the American people own this C-band and since many of our wireless companies want to develop and offer 5G technology to the American people, given those facts, the FCC is going to play an integral part. The FCC licenses spectrum to companies that want to use it. In other words, if you are a wireless company and you want to use a portion of the spectrum—the radio waves going through the air that are owned by the American people—you go to the FCC and say: I want to license that spectrum, and I want to pay for it.

By law—not by custom; by law—the FCC says: OK. To be fair, we are going to hold an auction, and everybody who wants to bid on this portion of the spectrum can submit a bid.

In the last 25 years, the FCC has done an extraordinary job, by the way, of

getting spectrum out to the private sector and getting the American taxpayer paid for its property interest. In the last 25 years, the FCC has conducted over 100 of these auctions. The FCC has brought in \$123 billion for the American people—billion. That is nine zeros. I have met with folks at the FCC who handle the public auctions. They are incredibly experienced. They know what they are doing.

Let me get back to the C-band. When we left off, we were talking about the C-band being perfect for 5G. We have a lot of wireless companies that want to lease it, if you will—want to license it—and the FCC is there in the middle. You would expect that what we would do in this instance is what we always do—we hold a public auction.

It has been estimated that if we hold a public auction, if the FCC holds a public auction and tells all the wireless companies that want to bid to come on down and bid, it will bring in \$60 billion for the American people—\$60 billion. Do you know what we could do with \$60 billion? With \$60 billion, we could put 1 million kids through college for all 4 years. With \$60 billion, we could hire 1 million new cops for a year. With \$60 billion, we could build 7,000 miles of interstate. With \$60 billion, we could make sure that broadband reaches every crevice and corner of America because right now it doesn't.

If you are in a rural area right now—I don't want to overstate my case, but in many instances, if you are in a rural area, you don't have the same broadband both in terms of reach and coverage and speed that people have in a large city, and that is true even before we get to 5G.

We could even give the money back to people. We have 140 million taxpayers in America. If we gave \$60 billion back to 140 million taxpayers, that is about \$430 for every taxpayer in America. I am not suggesting we do that. That is above my pay grade, making that decision. For a lot of people, \$430 isn't that much money, but I have a lot of friends who would say \$430 is a lot of money.

But in the middle of what I just described, we have a hair on the biscuit. We have three companies—and I am not disparaging them. Two of them are headquartered in Luxembourg, and one is out of Canada. They are foreign satellite companies. They have gone to the FCC and they have said: Look, we are going to make you a deal. We know we need to get this 5G, this C-band spectrum, into the market as quickly as possible. We will do the auction for you.

It doesn't matter that the FCC has already done 100 auctions and brought in \$123 billion. These three foreign companies have gone to the FCC and said: Let us do the auction for you because we can do it better and quicker even though we have never done a public auction.

Then they told the FCC: By the way, we want to keep the money. We can do

it faster than you, FCC. Even though you have done 100-plus auctions and we have never done one, just trust us. We can do it faster than you, and we want you to give us the spectrum and let us keep the \$60 billion.

The FCC is considering doing it.

My State has a lot of oil and gas. The Federal Government—the American taxpayer—owns the seabed of much of the Gulf of Mexico. Periodically, on behalf of the American people, the Federal Government leases that seabed to oil and gas companies to explore for oil and gas. When the Federal Government leases the land, the Federal Government takes an upfront cash payment and a portion of any oil and gas that is found.

Can you imagine what would happen if I went to the Federal Government and said: Even though I have never done an oil and gas auction, I can do it faster than the Federal Government even though the Federal Government has done thousands of them. So I want you to give me all the minerals in the gulf and let me do the auction and keep the money.

Can you imagine the reaction if I approached the Federal Government? The people in charge of those oil and gas leases would do one of two things. I would end up in either handcuffs or a straitjacket. But that is what is being proposed here, and for the life of me, I do not understand why the FCC is taking this seriously.

An article just came out a couple of days ago. I will read the first sentence of it. It came out of a periodical called Market Watch on November 11, just a few days ago.

It starts: "A big step in the U.S. deployment of 5G wireless could take place by year's end as the Federal Communications Commission is expected to back a plan from the satellite industry for auctioning off radio spectrum."

They called a couple of investment bankers. One investment bank group is called Height Capital Markets, and another one is called Beacon Policy Advisors. I don't know where they are getting their information, but they are saying that the FCC has already agreed not to do a public auction but to let these foreign companies have the spectrum and get the \$60 billion.

The article goes on to explain that these three companies—these three foreign companies, the two Luxembourg companies and the Canadian company—spent \$515,000 lobbying regulators and lawmakers on its auction plan.

Then I go back and I look at another article that came out not too long ago, and it talks about one FCC Commissioner. It sounds like he is already sold. He was asked about the idea of just giving the spectrum to these foreign companies and letting them keep the money.

Here is what he said: "Most of the criticism of what is known as the CBA proposal"—that is the proposal by the private companies—"shows a lack of

understanding of how the Internal Commission works. . . . [D]on't let anyone try to lecture me on the commission's . . . efficiency and timeliness.

This Commissioner goes on to say:

If someone or some entities make a profit for being at the right place at the right time, I will live with that outcome. In the grand scheme of things, if it is a contest between speed and government trying to extract a significant piece of the transaction through a lengthy process, I'll take the speedy resolution."

Are you kidding me? What planet did he just parachute in from? This is a current member of the FCC. Somebody needs to tell him about the President's Executive order, right here: "Buy American and Hire American." It doesn't say "hire Luxembourg companies." I have nothing against Luxembourg companies; I just prefer American companies. It doesn't say "buy Canadian companies and hire Canadian."

I can tell you what is going to happen if the FCC does this. First of all, the American people are going to lose \$60 billion. No. 2, they are going to get sued. They say they can do it faster—I don't believe them—but I know this much: I know a little something about litigation. I used to do it for a living. They are going to be tied up in court for about 10 years—I can tell you that—because the Federal Communications Act requires a public auction.

I can tell you what else is going to happen. The people who live in rural communities are going to get the little end of nothing because we won't be able to control who gets this C-band. I will bet you that the companies that end up with it start—and I hope I am wrong—and remain in the cities. So if you live in the country, where I was raised, you won't get the benefit of 5G.

Also, if we give it to these three foreign companies and they get to decide who gets the C-band, how do we control who ends up with our spectrum? What if they give it to Huawei? What if they give it to a company that violates our national security and our national intelligence?

This is a really bad idea, folks. There is a bill that has been offered. It is a bipartisan bill in the House. I am going to sponsor it in the Senate. It is offered by two Republicans and two Democrats. The bill is very simple. It says: Do the right thing. This spectrum belongs to the American people. This C-band belongs to the American people. That \$60 billion belongs to the American people. I am asking my friends at the FCC to do the right thing. Do what you have done 100 times already, and let everybody bid. Let everybody bid. Take the \$60 billion that you get from the American people, and let's spend it on something the American people need.

I thank you for your time and attention.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S.R. 420

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, earlier this week, we celebrated Veterans Day, a day we honor the sacrifice and the service of those who fought in Normandy and Pearl Harbor and Inchon, at Khe Sanh, Somalia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kandahar, Mosul, and everywhere else where veterans work to protect our country. We owe them and their families a debt that we often fall short in repaying. That is what this is about today.

For years, the VA has been presented with scientific information from the National Academy of Sciences making it clear that the list of the conditions stemming from Agent Orange exposure is extensive. It includes hyperthyroidism, bladder cancer, Parkinson's-like symptoms, and hypertension. In the late iteration of the Veterans and Agent Orange Exposure Update 11, published a year ago, the National Academies recognized that those illnesses—hyperthyroidism, bladder cancer, Parkinson's-like symptoms, and hypertension—all have suggestive or sufficient evidence associated with Agent Orange.

Historically, the VA added illnesses in those two categories to the list of presumptive medical conditions associated with Agent Orange exposure. On a bipartisan basis, this Congress has done the right thing time after time. We are all on the same side when it comes to helping veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange in Vietnam.

We recently found out that former VA Secretary Shulkin decided to add three of these conditions to the list of presumptive medical conditions associated with that exposure only to have OMB—the Trump administration—block his decision. In an email to Director Mulvaney, Secretary Shulkin said adding these conditions was "imperative." Yet no action took place. There are 83,000 veterans living with at least 1 of the presumptive medical conditions—83,000. They are in Tennessee. They are in Georgia. They are in South Dakota. They are in Ohio. In a discussion with blue water Navy veterans last week, I learned that since the Department put a stay on adjudicating their Agent Orange claims earlier this year, 12 veterans have died. Time is running out. Some might accuse this body of waiting until they all die. As hard as it is to say that and hear that, we are waiting until they all die before we move.

For whatever political reason the administration seems to place on this, we need to ensure that veterans receive the healthcare and the compensation they earned. They shouldn't have to fight these one at a time when there are sick men and women veterans of

Vietnam. We did this to them. The American Government decided to spray Agent Orange. We knew it was harmful. We know it is harmful. We knew it then, and we know it now. The chemical companies knew and the government knew. Why does the administration now think it is OK to abandon our commitment to these veterans? If you are exposed to poison while serving our country, there should be no question that you deserve the benefits you earned. Period. No exception.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 420, encouraging the President to expand the list of the Department of Veterans Affairs of presumptive medical conditions associated with exposure to Agent Orange to include parkinsonism, bladder cancer, hypertension, hypothyroidism, which was submitted earlier today; I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ISAKSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to my committee member how much I appreciate his dedicated work. In the committee, we work on a lot of things, including the diseases in here, getting presumptive conclusions done so we can cover as much as possible, but medicine is not exact. Diseases are not exact. Circumstances are not exact. When you make a decision to include a benefit for our veterans, you are making a commitment to spend that money from the taxpayers of the United States of America.

In the committee—and the Senator is part of it, and he knows this because I helped him a lot—we just approved blue water Navy funds, which is going to be one of the largest increases in the history of benefits going to our veterans. We are circumventing into that some of the due diligence—which you really ought to do before you make a presumption of the diseases caused in all cases.

I am an alumni of the Georgia Air National Guard and a veteran. I am chairman of the committee. I think the world of the Senator from Ohio. What he is trying to do is great and right, just as he wanted to lead us to help get us where we got to on the blue water Navy funds, but I object to this motion as one who would benefit because I have Parkinson's. I went into service during the 1960s, during a year that would be considered the Vietnam era. I didn't serve in Vietnam, but I served in that era, so I would have consideration if I got Parkinson's disease—which I have Parkinson's. Then they can use that as a conclusion to find out if it