

Mr. LANKFORD. I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 4887

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the Federal Government awards more than \$600 billion in grant awards—\$600 billion. We actually do more in grant awards than we do in contracting. Our current system is riddled with outdated reporting mechanisms that burden grant recipients and inhibit oversight from Agencies in Congress.

The bill, H.R. 4887, which is called the GREAT Act—Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act—tries to put some sense into this process. This is a process that has worked with all of the grant requesting Agencies. Whether they be universities, whether they be entities for research, they have all gone through this for the past couple of years, actually. They have given a tremendous amount of input because they struggle in actually requesting the grants and in getting through all of the chaos of those grants.

The OMB and other entities are not getting the data information to the American people, so there is no transparency in that process. For the past couple of years, we have worked very hard to establish a good process of getting transparency and also of helping the grant-requesting entities get a more efficient process.

The GREAT Act would require, within 1 year, OMB and the leading grant Agency to establish a governmentwide data standard for information related to Federal awards. Within 2 years, guidance must be issued for grant-making Agencies on how to apply those standards and implement them into the existing reporting practices. Within 3 years, Agencies must ensure that all grants and cooperative agreements use the new data standard for future information requests. This is exceptionally important to get through the process so that we are not squandering \$600 billion in grants.

Let me tell you what this process has gone through.

In February, H.R. 4887 passed unanimously out of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Then it went to the House Calendar, and it passed unanimously on September 26. Every Democrat and every Republican in the House voted for this. Subsequently, Senator ENZI and I passed our amended Senate companion to H.R. 4887. It passed unanimously out of the

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee in September.

The bill being considered today is reflective of bipartisan support from both the House and the Senate. This bill, H.R. 4887, cleared the Republican hot-line weeks ago. Every single Republican has already cleared this. They want the transparency in the grant process and want a better grant process for all of the grant requesters. It is not yet clear on the Democratic side.

My simple request doesn't just come from me. This request comes from the Grant Professionals Association, the National Grants Management Association, the Association of Government Accountants, the American Library Association, the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. Leading universities around the country have just asked to improve this grant-making process. Every single Democrat in the House has affirmed this, and every Republican in the House and every Republican in the Senate has already cleared it. We are just asking for this bill to move forward and to be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4887 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the Johnson substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, these are not Mick Mulvaney's decisions to make—or whatever job Mick Mulvaney happens to be in this week. These are not Alex Azar's decisions to make. Congress needs to do its job. On behalf of the minority leader, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I am a little confused when every grant-making and requesting organizations—all of the universities around the country—are requesting this. Every single Democrat in the House has already affirmed this. There does not seem to be a great fear of Mick Mulvaney at the OMB since, by the time this will be implemented, it will be 2022. So it is a little bit confusing to me why getting more transparency in grants and helping grant requesting organizations would be controversial.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### HEALTHCARE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to speak about some of our colleagues who are leaving the Senate. Be-

fore I do that, I want to address what happened late on the Friday night—I think 9 days before Christmas—when a Texas judge basically threw out the Affordable Care Act.

This latest decision comes more than 6 years after the Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Roberts, already upheld the law's constitutionality. That opinion also found that parts of the law can be severed from the rest of the legislation. It comes after the administration has stated emphatically that it would not defend the law.

So, basically, instead of going in there and helping out to save healthcare for millions of Americans and protect them from being thrown off their insurance if they have pre-existing conditions—instead of going into that burning building—the administration has said to basically stand down and throw lighter fluid on the fire. That is exactly what has happened. If this ruling takes effect, the consequences will be devastating.

To start, protections for people with preexisting conditions would be gone. About half of all Americans have preexisting conditions. This isn't just about rare diseases. This is also about asthma and diabetes. The ability to keep your kids on your insurance plans until they are 26 years old will be gone. The work we have done to close the Medicare doughnut hole coverage gap, which makes it easier for our seniors to afford pharmaceuticals and to lower prescription drug prices, will be gone. The provisions that help people to buy insurance on the healthcare exchanges will be gone. Minnesotans will see a loss of \$364 million in premium tax credits, and, roughly, 272,000 people in my State will lose coverage.

We can't allow this to happen. The judge must issue a stay immediately until the appeals are completed so that these protections can stay in place and this decision can be overturned.

It is time to stop trying to start from scratch. The American people spoke in this last election across the country. Do they want improvements to the Affordable Care Act, like making pharmaceuticals less expensive and doing something about premiums? Yes, they do, but they don't want to start from scratch.

We have already seen what kind of healthcare proposals we get when we start from scratch—the ones that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have put forward. The legislation that we saw earlier this Congress would have hurt people by kicking millions off of Medicaid, by letting insurance companies charge people more when they get sick, and by jacking up healthcare costs. Every major group that you trust when it comes to your health—the largest groups of doctors, nurses, seniors, hospitals, people with cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, and diabetes—has said it was the worst repeal bill yet. We cannot spend the next 2 years going backward and fighting