

But her mother died—my grandmother—when my mother was 17. She had to be the mother and raise her three younger sisters so she never got to go to college. She ultimately finished raising the first family. Then, at 37, she married my father who was a milkman and then had me at 39 and my two brothers at age 40 and then she raised us.

Now, my mother was a completely brilliant woman. She could do calculus for fun at the table, even though she never had calculus in school. And my father used to say, after my mother contracted Alzheimer's, your mother was a brilliant woman. It was an honor that your mother married me. Your mother is never stepping foot in a nursing home. No one is touching your mother at 2 a.m. in the morning. It was an honor that she married me.

And so at age 80, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, my father kept my mother in our living room. That is my story. That is my family's story. That is Senator COLLINS's story. That is the story of millions of families in our country.

Alzheimer's is a scourge that needs to be defeated.

And so I learned a lot from my father and his dedication to my mother. He was a milkman for the Hood milk company. He was 6 feet 1 inch, 265, so he could do it. But many families cannot do it, especially when it is the man who has Alzheimer's and not the woman—although, two-thirds of all Alzheimer's cases are women. Can I say that again? Two-thirds of all Alzheimer's cases are women in our country. So these families are heroes, but heroes need help.

So in the House, as Senator COLLINS is leading in the Senate, we were able to pass the first law. And the first law said to the National Institutes of Health: Break down all the silos at NIH and all of your institutes. You all have information on the brain, and you don't even share that information on the brain. The Institute on Aging is not sharing with Infectious Diseases what you know about the brain. Break down all the silos and put together a plan to find the cure by 2025.

I was leading in the House; that was my bill. Senator COLLINS was doing it in the Senate; that was her bill. That became the law in 2011.

But we realized by 2014 that a vision without funding is a hallucination. Right now in our country between Medicare and Medicaid, our country spends the equivalent of one-third of the defense budget's money every single year just on Alzheimer's patients—one-third of the defense budget.

By the year of 2050, at the pace at which Alzheimer's is advancing, the Alzheimer's budget in our country will equal the defense budget because no one is saying that grandma shouldn't have a nursing home bed because she has Alzheimer's. That is not going to happen in our country. So finding a cure is absolutely not an option.

And so in 2014, we passed another law. And that law said that each year

the NIH has to tell the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee how much money they needed to find the cure for Alzheimer's by the year 2025. Well, back then, it was about \$500 million a year that was spent to fund research.

Last year, because of that law—Senator COLLINS leading in the Senate, along with me—we are up to \$3.7 billion a year because, obviously, prevention is preferable to cure. Let's stop it. Let's try to get this right at its beginnings.

And we made some progress, but we are not going to find the cure by 2025. So what this legislation says is we are extending it out to 2035, and we are going to continue both of these programs to make sure that it gets the focus at the NIH so that we will find the cure because research is medicine's "field of dreams" from which we harvest the findings that give hope to families that there will be a cure for the disease which has been ravaging their family for generations. Alzheimer's is the one disease that we all know almost every family in our country has in common.

So President Kennedy created a mission to the Moon in 1961, and our country responded to it. And what these two bills that we are passing today have done is they have created a mission to the mind. They have created a mission to find what is going wrong with the brains of not just people in our country but all around the world because we are going to have to find the cure. And it is our responsibility here to provide leadership in the U.S. Senate, to keep the plan in place, and to find the funding that will have the best, brightest young scientists in America make careers out of finding the cure for Alzheimer's.

The same thing is happening with cancer. The same thing is happening with HIV. But we have to focus here on Alzheimer's and keep that investment rising and rising because patients deserve it; families deserve it; caregivers across our country deserve it.

We have millions of families right now—as Senator COLLINS just said, 7 million families—who have this disease in their families right now, and there is no cure. The end result is always inexorable. It is always inevitable. It always ends the same way. And so we are the only way in which this can be solved.

So 3.7 billion a year—or 4 billion a year—that is a small price to pay against the disease which will ultimately cost the Federal Government the equal amount as the Defense budget every single year by 2050. So we have to act. And we have come a long way on research. But we have a long way to go.

So here is what we hope: We hope to promote healthy aging; to reduce risk factors; to require the National Alzheimer's Plan to include recommendations on reducing health disparities for Black, Brown, and disabled Americans,

because that is all part of this storyline—along with women, they are in a separate and higher risk category than men are—and expanding the National Alzheimer's Advisory Council to ensure a true whole-of-government approach to preventing, treating, and curing Alzheimer's and supporting family caregivers. That is why we can't delay another day.

So I urge my colleagues to celebrate today. We have just passed two historic pieces of legislation. And it sets 2035 as the target date. And we can get this done, but we have to finish the job.

And today's vote is going to clear the path for millions of Alzheimer's patients and their families, for them, their loved ones, and for the communities all across our country.

And so I thank Senator COLLINS for her great, great leadership on this. And my family and Senator COLLINS's family, we stand here speaking for the 7 million families. And there will be many more to come if we don't find a cure. And we thank the Members of the Senate for passing this historic legislation today.

With that, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad I was in the Chamber to witness this passage of these bills pertaining to the scourge of Alzheimer's by unanimous consent. This is a rare bright spot in our activities where we actually all come together and agree on good policy.

KOSA-COPPA

Mr. President, we have also taken the step to pass another piece of bipartisan legislation today, something that used to be standard operating procedure in this Chamber. We would call up bipartisan legislation that would address everything from the opioid crisis to medical innovation. Members would debate the bills; we would offer amendments; and, in the end, hold an up-or-down vote.

But, sadly, this has become too rare a phenomenon. In recent years, the Senate, controlled by our friends on the Democratic side, have strayed from our core legislative duties. Instead of voting on bipartisan bills, marking them up in committee where everybody can participate, this Chamber devotes, instead, the vast majority of its time to things from relatively unimportant nominations to partisan show votes.

As a result, major tasks like funding the government, strengthening our defense, are left to the last possible moment and then rushed across the finish line. But I am glad for today that the Senate has gotten back to basics and passed a strong, bipartisan package to help keep our kids safe online.

Every day, our children seek content online about suicide, eating disorders, and drug use—and other topics that are not suitable for children. At the same

time, online bullying and harassment run rampant. And the statistics on teen suicide and mental health paint an alarming picture for the next generation.

The bill that passed today includes two important pieces of legislation to help address that crisis. The Kids Online Safety Act, introduced by Senators BLUMENTHAL and BLACKBURN, provides children and parents the tools and safeguards they need to keep harmful content out of children's social media feeds. More than two-thirds of the Senate sponsored these bills, including this one. And I am proud to be one of them.

We also passed another bill that I was proud to cosponsor called the Children and Teens' Online Privacy Protection Act, introduced by Senators MARKEY and CASSIDY. That bill prohibits internet companies from collecting personal information from their youngest users and establishes better safeguards to protect children's privacy. It protects and prevents Big Tech from tracking and targeting kids with the most addictive content possible.

Congress has been working on legislation in this area for many years, and I want to commend Senators BLACKBURN and CASSIDY for getting us to this point.

There are a number of other bills that have passed the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan basis, as the Presiding Officer knows. And I hope we will be able to turn to those soon. But these bills we passed today struck the right balance between the First Amendment and safety, which is no easy task—which is, perhaps, one reason why it has taken us so long to get here.

But I appreciate these Senators' leadership. And I am proud the Senate has finally taken an important step to help keep America's children safe online.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. President, on another matter, I want to speak briefly about President Biden's proposal to, essentially, unconstitutionally transform the Supreme Court into another political branch of government.

Every student of government, every high school civics class, teaches that ours is a government of three coequal branches: the two political branches being the Senate and the House, the legislative branch, and then the executive branch. The reason they are political is because they are accountable to the public through regular elections.

Conversely, the Judiciary is unique in that it is unaccountable to the voters. Judges are nominated by the President and then confirmed by the Senate. But as long as they are conducting themselves appropriately, they can serve as long as they live—literally, have life tenure. Rarely—very rarely—there is remedy of impeachment for extraordinary cases. But, as I said, that happens almost not at all.

But in recent years, our Democratic colleagues have floated a litany of in-

stitutional changes to try to tilt the balance of power in the Judiciary in their favor. They are not content to allow the Courts to do their job, which is to call balls and strikes. Again, judges are supposed to interpret the law and the facts and apply that to a given case and not decide ahead of time who should win and who should lose.

Judges don't take public opinion polls and decide what is popular, because they take the same oath we do to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States. But they do so in a framework of judicial independence.

Former Justice Scalia used to say that the independent judiciary is the gold standard, is the secret sauce for the United States form of government, because there has to be some neutral arbiter to basically decide contested cases, and that is our independent judiciary.

But our Democratic colleagues, since they have been upset about some of the decisions of the Court, have gone so far as to suggest that the Court be restructured. This was tried back in the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the famous court packing cases. He wanted to add additional Justices to the Supreme Court because he thought that would change the receptivity of the case to causes that he supported.

But we have also seen changes advocated here in this Senate, institutional changes by our Democratic colleagues who were unhappy with the fact that they don't win 100 percent of the vote. They have advocated eliminating the filibuster to clear the path for radical and unpopular policy ideas. They have attempted to federalize or nationalize our voting laws and take over America's elections as opposed to having those decided at the State level. They pushed for statehood for the District of Columbia as well as Puerto Rico. And, presumably, each of those would get two United States Senators and a Member of Congress and thus tilt the balance of power here in the Senate.

But when it comes to the Supreme Court, it is clear that the left is outraged over some of the Court's recent decisions. As a matter of fact, not that long ago, the majority leader stood on the front steps of the Supreme Court and called out two sitting Justices by name and, essentially, threatened them if they decided these cases in a way that he disagreed with.

That was an extraordinary act of bad judgment by the majority leader. He actually went so far as to say: Justice Gorsuch, Justice Kavanaugh, you won't know what hit you.

Again, it was shocking to, I think, most of us who regard the Court as an independent and separate branch of government immune from politics.

But, of course, many Democrats are upset that the Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* has now returned the issue of abortion to the States, where on a State-by-State basis, legislators and voters will decide what the appropriate

limits are on abortion, which divides much of our country.

They are upset with the decision on Presidential immunity. They want the President to be subject to ordinary litigation on a regular basis, using what has now come to be known as lawfare to achieve political objectives.

And they are concerned that the Court has done away with something as arcane and relatively poorly understood as Chevron deference, basically saying if an Agency decides something, there is not much that the courts or that Congress can do about it.

Our colleagues don't want to keep losing cases in the courtroom. So they have adopted a new strategy: If you can't win the game, change the rules. And their playbook has gone something like this: No. 1, villainize the Supreme Court. I mentioned the comments of the majority leader, which are not unique. The strategy is to make the Justices seem evil or biased out of touch when they rule against progressive causes in the courtroom.

The second step in the playbook is to offer a solution—or a proposed solution—to address the problem that Democrats have manufactured. That involves an act which itself is unconstitutional and irresponsible, which is the overhaul of the Court-packing I mentioned a moment ago.

And, No. 3: It is to go on the attack and stay on the attack and vilify anyone who dares oppose these changes as somehow corrupt and anti-Democrat.

From packing the Court with liberal Justices to dictating recusal requirements for the Justices to holding security funding hostage if the Supreme Court doesn't do what our Democratic colleagues want them to do, our colleagues have offered many plans to fully assert control over this independent branch of government—the Judiciary.

For a long time, these proposals were only supported by a fringe of the Democratic Party. But now, they have become more commonplace and infiltrated the Oval Office itself.

President Joe Biden used the pages of the Washington Post to advocate for exactly the sorts of dramatic and unconstitutional changes that I just mentioned. He wants to somehow establish term limits for Justices. He wants to craft a schedule for new appointments, force a code of ethics on the Justices written by Congress, and destroy the longstanding precedent of Presidential immunity.

These proposals are not to enhance the fairness of the Court or promote equality or justice or any other good government objective; they are about power, about control. They would turn our most independent branch of government into a partisan branch to ensure that our Democratic colleagues are the ones who ultimately wield the power.

It is bad enough that President Biden has promoted these radical changes, but even more concerning is that his