stations are still unmanned, but the Democrats cannot stop salivating over the possibilities for partisan gain.

Former Vice President Biden says he sees this tragedy as an “incredible opportunity . . . to fundamentally transform the country.” Biden said it is an “incredible opportunity . . . to fundamentally transform the country.”

Speaker Pelosi said: “I see everything as an opportunity.”

A bill of the Congressional Progressive Caucus said: “For me, the leverage is that there is enormous suffering.” “The leverage is that there is enormous suffering.” There are 80,000 Americans who have died and more than 20 million who have lost their jobs. I call that a crisis; they call it leverage.

This week, the Speaker published an 1,800-page seasonal catalog of leftwing oddities and called it a coronavirus relief bill. So here we go again. It includes a massive tax code giveaway to high earners in blue States. Working families are struggling to put food on the table, but the House Democrats are prioritizing millionaires on the coasts.

It would be another round of checks—listen to this—specifically for illegal immigrants. Can you believe it? We forgot to have the Treasury Department send money to people who are here illegally in our system. What an oversight. Thank goodness the Democrats are on the case.

The Speaker’s bill also tries to use the virus as cover to implement sweeping changes to election laws that the Democrats have literally wanted for years, like forcing every single State to embrace California’s sketchy ballot harvesting whether they want to or not.

Then there is the cherry on top. It is the bold new policy from the Washington Democrats that will kick the coronavirus to the curb and save American families from this crisis. Here it is—new annual studies on diversity and inclusion within the cannabis industry. The House gave itself no assignments for 2 months except to develop this proposal. Yet it still reads like the Speaker of the House pasted together some random ideas from her most liberal Members and slapped the word “coronavirus” on top of it—an unseemly product from an unseemly House majority that has spent months dealing itself out of the crisis.

The House Democrats have been missing in action for months. While the Senate was passing the CARES Act, the Democratic House was on the sidelines substantively and literally. They had already gone home. Nearly 2 months later, the Senators are back at our duty stations with new precautions. We have been back for 2 full weeks. We have held major hearings on the pandemic. We are legislating and confirming nominees. Yet the House is still at home. And when it does contribute, it is not serious.

The House Democrats have checked out of this crisis governing left to the Senate. They even intend to shutter congressional history and jam through remote voting so they can continue to be counterproductive from the comfort of their homes. Let me say that again. They even intend to shutter congressional history and jam through remote voting so they can continue to be counterproductive from the comfort of their own homes.

Look, here in the real world, the Senate Republicans are working seriously to help the country reopen. The crushing unemployment figures, even with the CARES Act, show that no amount of Federal spending could substitute for the entirety of the U.S. economy. We need to be smart, and we need to be safe, but we have to find a more sustainable middle ground.

This week, Chairman Alexander and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions heard from Dr. Fauci, that top experts on exactly this subject. There are at least two big things our Nation will need to start recovering: stepped-up testing nationwide and legal liability protections so that K–12 schools, universities, charities, and employers are not invaded by trial lawyers the instant they unlock their doors.

On testing, fortunately, the Senate has already done a great deal. The executive branch and especially the States are in the driver’s seat, but we have already spent billions of dollars to help scale up testing nationwide. On legal liability reform, the work lies ahead of us. As my Republican colleagues and I have made clear, strong legal protections will be a hard redline in any future legislation.

That is what is happening here in the Senate—serious leadership on a serious crisis like we have been doing for months. This half of the Capitol is doing our job.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, as the majority leader just pointed out, the Senate has been and will be focused on responding to the coronavirus crisis in this country in a way that hopefully will enable the American people to recover and that will restore our economy—that will get us back to normal. As he pointed out, that requires dealing with the health emergency as well as with the economic emergency crisis that has been created by this.

With respect to the health emergency, the leader pointed out that there are literally tens of billions of dollars being spent now on vaccine research, on anti-viral therapeutics, and on testing. We believe that, in order for us to get our economy fully back, we have to deal with the health emergency in front of us, so dollars have been made available—hundreds of billions of dollars—to healthcare providers, hospitals, doctors, nursing homes, and providers who are on the frontlines of this crisis and trying to deal with the challenges it presents every single day.

That is what we have focused on. In addition, we have focused on the economic crisis and the impact it has had on our small businesses and on our workers.

The language that has been included in the bills that have already been passed here in the U.S. Senate—now we have No. 4—and have been signed into law by the President have been singularly
focused on trying to assist people and get them through this time as a bridge to hopefully get the worst of this behind us and get us to a time at which the economy begins to open up again.

Clearly, the focus was on helping families—small businesses, families who particularly needed the help the most get some additional financial assistance. So checks went out—$1,200 per individual, $2,400 per married couple, and $500 for each additional person. But as you pointed out, very clearly, it is the opposite that is happening. It has been directed directly at families and workers. Everything we have done has been designed to keep jobs, to be very pro-worker.

Yet, in part of the 1,815-page proposal that the Democrats have out there, they have a couple of tax proposals, one of which would deliver 56 percent of that tax cut to the top 1 percent of the wage earners in the country. This is 56 percent of the benefit of a proposal under the House Democrats’ fantasy wish list that would go to the top 1 percent of the earners in this country. Now, that doesn’t sound to me like something that is very pro-worker or that is trying to help people who are in the crisis, who are suffering the most economically as a result of the coronavirus crisis. It seems, to me at least, like something that is sort of a payoff to some of their big donors and to the big blue States.

Now, the average loan in the most recent round of PPP funding is about $80,000 on a payroll of about $28,000. Businesses can use that principally for payroll. Seventy-five percent has to be used to be able to keep their employees employed. They do want to keep those jobs, hopefully, until that time when the economy starts to open up, so they heavily subscribe to this program.

Interestingly enough, there has been a lot of talk on the other side, as there usually is—a demagoguing of how this helps rich people and all of that. Yet, the amount of the most recent extension that was passed unanimously by the House is $28,000. Businesses can use that principally for payroll. Seventy-five percent has to be used to be able to keep their employees employed. Their workers are employed, to keep those jobs there, while 25 percent has to be used for some fixed cost, which might be utilities, which might be rent, which might be debt service, those types of things. The whole purpose of the program is to keep workers employed. It is a pro-worker program, and it has been from the very beginning.

Then also, for those who through no fault of their own have lost jobs and have been laid off, there has been a significant plus-up in the unemployment insurance accounts—to the tune of $600 per person per week for individuals in this country—on top of what their States might already pay. There is a significant number of dollars being put out there for people who have lost jobs through no fault of their own.

These are pro-worker pieces of legislation, pro-unemployed people legislation. These are pro-small business—keeping small businesses working out there. Obviously, they are very much pro-health emergency—trying to drive dollars toward the solutions, the cures, the vaccines, the anti-viral therapeutics, and the testing that are necessary to help us get through this. That is what Republicans here in the Senate have been focused on for the past several months and will continue to be focused on in the future.

As the leader pointed out, the House Democrats, who are not here but who, remarkably, from afar have evidently put together this fantasy wish list of things they would like to see accomplished—if you can imagine an 1,815-page bill, they mention “cannabis” way more times than they mention “jobs.” The amazing thing about this—and they will come here and argue that the Republicans’ proposals benefit the wealthy, benefit the rich. As I just pointed out, very clearly, it is the opposite that is happening.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation when we vote on it later today.

**REMEMBERING TOM COBURN**

Madam President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to my friend and a former Member of this body, Senator Tom Coburn, who died in March.

Tom and I first met in the House of Representatives, where we both served, and then came to the Senate at the same time as part of the class of 2005. I have been privileged to meet many principled men and women in my time in this service, especially, Tom Coburn, who was one in a million. He was fiercely principled and uncompromising, often to the chagrin of fellow Senators. He didn’t care if he were 1 against 99 if he believed he was in the right. He stuck to his guns come hell or high water. He voted against politically popular legislation and bills that no other Senator would oppose. Yet he held the enduring respect of his constituents and, indeed, of his colleagues, proving that sometimes principle can win lasting friendship than compromise. He was here for a purpose—in particular, to protect our children and grandchildren from the burden of an ever-increasing national debt by exposing government waste, and Washington’s spending habits.

He got into fierce fights on the floor in service to that mission, but he knew how to keep fights to the office. Prickly on the floor, outside of it, he was warm and personalizable, and he didn’t let politics get in the way of friendships. As he once said himself, he disagreed with President Obama on 95 percent of the issues, but that didn’t stop him from developing a lasting friendship with the President or from working with him on legislation when he was in the Senate.

No discussion of Tom would be complete without mentioning his deep faith. He was one of a million. He was one in a million. He was fiercely principled and uncompromising, often to the chagrin of fellow Senators. He didn’t care if he were 1 against 99 if he believed he was in the right. He stuck to his guns come hell or high water. He voted against politically popular legislation and bills that no other Senator would oppose. Yet he held the enduring respect of his constituents and, indeed, of his colleagues, proving that sometimes principle can win lasting friendship than compromise. He was here for a purpose—in particular, to protect our children and grandchildren from the burden of an ever-increasing national debt by exposing government waste, and Washington’s spending habits.

As I said earlier, Tom Coburn was one in a million, and it will be a long time before we see his like again. That is a particularly great loss because the Senate should always have a Tom Coburn—a man or woman of uncompromising principle, of fierce dedication to the national good, someone willing to stand alone in defense of the right, who provides a constant reminder that principle is more important than politics.
and that what is important is not winning elections but doing the right thing.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Carolyn, and his daughters, Callie, Katie, and Sarah, and his nine grandchildren.

Your husband, your father, and your grandfather is sorely missed. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has been 2 weeks since Leader MCCONNELL called us back into session. In that time, it was announced that 30 million Americans filed for unemployment. Just this morning, we learned another 3 million Americans filed jobless claims this week. Yet the Republican leader has scheduled exactly zero votes—zero—on legislation related to the coronavirus. Instead, Leader MCCONNELL has resisted urgent and necessary action to fight the pandemic. He said that now is the time to “press the pause button.” Tell that to someone trying to feed his or her children. Tell that to workers at every level of every tool in his monetary toolkit. He knows we need fiscal relief—more of it. But Leader MCCONNELL has so far rejected doing another emergency relief bill. His party is slowly drafting legislation to give legal immunity to big corporations that put workers in dangerous situations.

That is not the nub of the issue. We know that. We have so many diversions and distractions, and the American people are wise to this kind of stuff. There are over 30 million people without work, tens of thousands losing their lives, and pursuing baseless conspiracy theories is what the Republican majority seems to be focused on.

Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress aren’t the only ones unwilling to feel the urgency and scale of the moment. President Trump and his administration are guilty of the same folly. The Republican majority seems to be focused on pleasing elections but doing the right things. They are not asking a legitimate question. Do you agree with Senator McCollum that we have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately? How many? I would urge the constituents of Senators in every State to call them and ask them that question. Do you agree with Senator McCollum that we have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately?

We are staring at a period of prolonged economic misery for millions of American workers and families—Americans who for the first time don’t know if they will be able to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, pay the rent; Americans who for the first time are waiting in staggering lines at food banks, cars lined up for miles, snaked across parking lots, people who would never have imagined they would be lining up at a food bank. How long will it take and how much economic hardship will suffice before Senate Republicans feel the urgency to act?

It is not just Democrats who are pleading with the Republican majority to wake up to the economic reality in this country—oh, no. Governors spanning the country in both parties know darn well that this is not a blue State/ red State issue. How cheap. A firefighter who is laid off in Florida and a firefighter who is laid off in New York are both hurting, and they are not looking to what kind of State they are in. So the Governors are calling for help. States, cities, and localities are being forced to lay off teachers, police officers, firefighters, and food health workers. It is Governors of both parties. Last week, the SBA, led by Republican Governor. They need to get unanimous consent for most of the things they do. It is not just Governors and politicians. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jay Powell, appointed by President Trump, telling Republican colleagues to do something. Powell has used almost every tool in his monetary toolkit. He knows we need fiscal relief—more of it. But Leader MCCONNELL has so far rejected doing another emergency relief bill. His party is slowly drafting legislation to give legal immunity to big corporations that put workers in dangerous situations.

That is not the nub of the issue. We know that. We have so many diversions and distractions, and the American people are wise to this kind of stuff. There are over 30 million people without work, tens of thousands losing their lives, and pursuing baseless conspiracy theories is what the Republican majority seems to be focused on.

Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress aren’t the only ones unwilling to feel the urgency and scale of the moment. President Trump and his administration are guilty of the same folly. The Republican majority seems to be focused on pleasing elections but doing the right things. They are not asking a legitimate question. Do you agree with Senator McCollum that we have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately?

We are staring at a period of prolonged economic misery for millions of American workers and families—Americans who for the first time don’t know if they will be able to keep a roof over their heads, put food on the table, pay the rent; Americans who for the first time are waiting in staggering lines at food banks, cars lined up for miles, snaked across parking lots, people who would never have imagined they would be lining up at a food bank. How long will it take and how much economic hardship will suffice before Senate Republicans feel the urgency to act?

It is not just Democrats who are pleading with the Republican majority to wake up to the economic reality in this country—oh, no. Governors spanning the country in both parties know darn well that this is not a blue State/ red State issue. How cheap. A firefighter who is laid off in Florida and a firefighter who is laid off in New York are both hurting, and they are not looking to what kind of State they are in. So the Governors are calling for help. States, cities, and localities are being forced to lay off teachers, police officers, firefighters, and food health workers. It is Governors of both parties. Last week, the SBA, led by Republican Governor. They need to get unanimous consent for most of the things they do. It is not just Governors and politicians. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Jay Powell, appointed by President Trump, telling Republican colleagues to do something. Powell has used almost every tool in his monetary toolkit. He knows we need fiscal relief—more of it. But Leader MCCONNELL has so far rejected doing another emergency relief bill. His party is slowly drafting legislation to give legal immunity to big corporations that put workers in dangerous situations.

That is not the nub of the issue. We know that. We have so many diversions and distractions, and the American people are wise to this kind of stuff. There are over 30 million people without work, tens of thousands losing their lives, and pursuing baseless conspiracy theories is what the Republican majority seems to be focused on.

Unfortunately, Republicans in Congress aren’t the only ones unwilling to feel the urgency and scale of the moment. President Trump and his administration are guilty of the same folly. The Republican majority seems to be focused on pleasing elections but doing the right things. They are not asking a legitimate question. Do you agree with Senator McCollum that we have yet to feel the urgency of acting immediately?
Dr. Fauci; on Wednesday, Jerome Powell; today, HHS officials Rick Bright is testifying in the House. The President may try to shroud the truth from the American people or even from himself, but eventually, inevitably, the truth will come out. This is how poorly this administration has dealt with this crisis. It is one of the worst performances by a President in American history.

The American people have been following stay-at-home orders for months on end, doing their part to slow the spread of this disease. Those many millions who sacrificed their routines and livelihoods have bought this country precious time to prepare for life after the pandemic; precious time to ramp up testing; produce PPE, and formulate a plan for nationwide contact tracing. What has the Trump administration done with this precious time? They have wasted it—wasted it.

The President wants to reopen the country as quickly as possible but could care less about the strategies that would allow us to do it safely.

President Trump, do you want to get the country open quickly? Do you want to get people back to the malls and riding on the airplanes? Get the kind of testing that other countries have done. We are still leagues behind on testing. He said 2 months ago—another Trump fantasy—on March 6 that any- one who wants a test can get one. Tell that to millions and millions and millions of Americans who want testing and cannot get it.

A de facto nationwide lockdown has been going on for weeks. Yet our test- ing capacity has not approached the number just about every expert says is required. The President, in an emer- gency, which we certainly have, hasn’t requisitioned American manufacturing to produce the tests we need and has been slow to dispense congressional funds intended to help the States do the job. We voted for those a few weeks back. The States are still waiting.

Businesses, schools, sports leagues, and families are going to need guidance from public health experts on how to open as safely as possible. I talked to hotel executives and sports executives yesterday. They know that without testing, they are not going to come back. If they could test every person walking into a large arena, I’m sure in any- one who might have COVID, people would be far more likely to sit in the seats. In Georgia, where Governor Kemp has been most forward, pushing people to open up, something like 6 to 8 percent of the people showed up. This is 2 weeks after he opened up the malls and the stores. People are not going to go out unless they are sure they won’t get COVID, and they can’t be sure they won’t get COVID unless we have many, many more tests.

What is the President waiting for? He cuts his nose to spite his face. He wants to get us back to work, but he doesn’t push testing. The anomalies of this man—and that is a kind word—just go on and on and on.

People also want to know the guid- ance—what should they do, what they shouldn’t. They want it from sci- entists. The CDC prepared guidance. The President put it back so that he and his political appointees can edit it to suit their purposes.

Yesterday, I tried to ask the Senate’s consent to release the unredacted, un- edited CDC guidance, and Senate Re- publicans led by Mitch McConnell have refused. The junior Senator from Indiana said he didn’t want “career regu- lators”—meaning the experts, meaning scientists at the CDC—to advise the country on how to reopen safely. That the President and his team of political advisers should be able to decide that— is there anyone left in this country, ex- cept the most diehard partisans, who trusts this administration to issue medical guidance properly? Come on.

Here is the bottom line: The sac- rifices of the American people gave this administration time to prepare the country to return to some semblance of normal. Those sacrifices have been squandered by Trump and his Republic- acylates. We are going to get back to work—I certainly do—but there is a smart way to begin reopening the country, a way to do it safely, with precautions and testing and tracing, to avoid a resur- gence of the disease, and then there is a reckless way. President Trump has so far chosen the reckless way and seems to have no plan to right the ship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen- ator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I wanted to start by stating that I know a lot of people look at us speaking on the floor and think, you know, well, why aren’t they wearing masks?

I saw Senator KEMP. He put on his mask after he finished his talk and left. I have my mask here. I just took it off. I am going to put it on after I finish speaking.

You know the way this works. I wear this mask to protect you, and you wear a mask to protect me, and that is the way we protect each other in this pan- demic. I don’t think there is any doubt that wearing a mask saves lives, and that is how we are going to overcome in this pandemic.

I see people around New Mexico all the time when I am back home wearing masks and really taking this pandemic seriously and taking our Governor’s orders seriously.

Mr. President, reauthorization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, is now before us. We have an opportunity to reform this statute, to protect both our constitutio- nal rights and our security. In the immediate aftermath of 9/11 Congress hurriedly passed the PATRIOT Act and author- ized extraordinarily broad authority to the Executive and the executive branch that threatened America’s and Ameri- cans’ privacy rights and liberty inter- ests.

In October 2001, I was 1 of 66 Members in the House of Representatives who voted against the PATRIOT Act. It was not an easy vote, but in the years since it is clear that the law we passed because the PATRIOT Actulti- mately allowed the government to in- vade the privacy of millions of inno- cent Americans.

Exhibit 1: section 215 of the act. Sec- tion 215 authorizes the bulk collect of hun- dreds of millions of Americans’ phone records and email contact lists.

The Nation was shocked when we found out about this bulk collection in 2013. In 2015, we passed the FREEDOM Act to cure some of the abuses. It did not cure them all.

Section 215 and two other provisions of the PATRIOT Act are up for reau- thorization. That is the bill before us. Congress has the opportunity to pro- tect the individual rights and liberty even as we pro- tect national security.

And while the House bill made improvements, it is still flawed. The House version still allows large-scale collection of Americans’ sensitive in- formation, and it provides the FISA Courts to prevent abuses. We should learn the lesson of October 2001 and not rush this through the Senate. We should include amendments to bet- ter protect Americans’ civil liberties.

I support the Durbin-Daines amend- ment that prohibits collection of Americans’ internet website browsing and internet search history informa- tion without a search warrant. It is a missed opportunity for the Nation that the amendment failed yesterday, al- though by one vote—by one vote.

Right now, the Federal Government can digitally track articles Americans are reading online, social media they are using, where they are shopping, what restaurants they are thinking about going to, and the list goes on and on. Just imagine thinking about every- thing you do on the internet and your devices. That is open game.

The Fourth Amendment protects us against unreasonable searches. In this day and age, when so much of our life is conducted over the internet, Ameri- cans must have assurance that their web browsing, which can reveal highly sensitive information, will not be un- reasonable intrusions of Federal authorities without a search warrant and without probable cause. This informa- tion provides an intimate window into our lives. It can reveal a person’s medical conditions, political and reli- gious views, and family. We need to make clear that govern- ment must demonstrate probable cause to collect this type of personal infor- mation.

Second, we need to strengthen the oversight of FISA Courts. We now know those secret courts singles out abuse. In 2015, Congress authorized FISA Courts to appoint amici—friends of the court—in cases involving novel
or significant interpretation of the law. This was a positive step forward to provide independent oversight, but it appears there have been only 16 cases in which amici have actually been appointed. Yet there have been more cases than 16 in which novel issues were raised, and many issues where an independent voice is needed to defend civil rights in FISA Court proceedings.

The recent Department of Justice inspector general report examining 25 FISA applications underscores this need. The IG found errors and inadequately supported facts in every application. An expanded amicus role is necessary to bring greater accountability to the application process.

I voted in support of the Lee-Leahy amendment that expands amici participation to significant First Amendment activities; to matters where a religious or political organization, a public official or candidate or the news media is involved; or in matters approving new technology or reauthorizing programmatic surveillance.

Third, we must make sure FISA applications are completely accurate and all exculpatory evidence is disclosed. Accuracy and transparency are crucial to maintaining integrity within our justice system.

The Lee-Leahy amendment strengthens the requirements for accuracy and disclosure of all information—including exculpatory information—in FISA applications.

I am pleased this body stood in support of strengthening safeguards in the FISA Court process. However, our failure to protect Americans from the Federal Government intruding upon their private lives of Americans without probable cause and a search warrant.

Our liberties and freedoms define us as a nation. Either we should reconsider the Wyden-Daines amendment—a motion to reconsider is allowed at this point—or we should vote no on FISA reauthorization. We don’t need to sacrifice our liberties and freedoms for an illusion of security.

One of our Founders way back in this country, Ben Franklin, said it a little bit different—‘‘a voice in the wilderness’’—a voice in the wilderness. That was a time when Senators engaged in genuine, spontaneous debate in this chamber. Senator Chavez counseled his colleagues: ‘‘. . . a man is ultimately remembered by what he does in relation to his times, and the fact that we do our assigned duty may not be enough; sometimes we must step out and sound the alarm.’’

And sound the alarm against McCarthy, he would. Dennis Chavez—born Dionisio on April 4, 1888—came from humble and honorable beginnings. He came from generations who had farmed in Los Chavez—a small community along the Rio Grande, south of Albuquerque, in territorial New Mexico. When he was seven, his family moved to Albuquerque in search of better opportunities. He learned English in school but, at age 13, when he was in 7th grade, he had to leave school to help support his family.

Dennis, however, never left his education. He studied engineering, American history, and great political leaders at the Albuquerque Public Library. In his early 20’s, he worked for the City of Albuquerque Engineering Department, and also became active in Democratic politics. He joined the Democratic Party, even though most Hispanics at that time in New Mexico were Republicans, but he saw in ‘‘Democratic party a political philosophy that placed human rights above property rights.’’

In 1917, a newly elected Democratic Senator from New Mexico took Dennis Chavez’s name. He was a young and ambitious man and, as a result, he took his own right the next year. Senator Chavez served in the Senate until his death in November 1962.

In so many ways, he was far ahead of his time. In the 1940s, he fought for civil rights legislation, he chaired the Public Works Committee and sat on the Appropriations Committee, and helped usher in major infrastructure projects all over the nation, including water and military projects critical to New Mexico’s development.

‘‘El Senador’’—as we call him in New Mexico, was the first American-born Hispanic elected to the Senate and, at 27 years, remains the longest serving Hispanic Senator in history.

Joseph McCarthy began his reign of terror on February 9, 1950, a speech charging, without proof, that there were 205 card carrying members of the Communist Party working in the U.S. State Department. By March of that year, McCarthy had accused American scholar Owen Lattimore, among many others, of being a Communist. That accusation, again without evidence, was too much for Senator Chavez and it gave rise to his denunciation on the floor of the Senate.

At that time, in 1950, Republicans held the presidency and both houses in Congress. And no matter one party or another at that time, anti-Communist sentiment could be politically costly.

But Senator Chavez took his chances against Joe McCarthy—in the name of what was right.

He told the Senate that day, ‘‘I would like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all of the legislation which I have considered in this chamber. Senator Chavez spoke with conviction. That was a time when Senators engaged in genuine, spontaneous debate in this chamber. Senator Chavez counseled his colleagues: ‘‘. . . a man is ultimately remembered by what he does in relation to his times, and the fact that we do our assigned duty may not be enough; sometimes we must step out and sound the alarm.’’

And sound the alarm against McCarthy, he would. Dennis Chavez—born Dionisio on April 4, 1888—came from humble and honorable beginnings. He came from generations who had farmed in Los Chavez—a small community along the Rio Grande, south of Albuquerque, in territorial New Mexico. When he was seven, his family moved to Albuquerque in search of better opportunities. He learned English in school but, at age 13, when he was in 7th grade, he had to leave school to help support his family.

Dennis, however, never left his education. He studied engineering, American history, and great political leaders at the Albuquerque Public Library. In his early 20’s, he worked for the City of Albuquerque Engineering Department, and also became active in Democratic politics. He joined the Democratic Party, even though most Hispanics at that time in New Mexico were Republicans, but he saw in ‘‘Democratic party a political philosophy that placed human rights above property rights.’’

In 1917, a newly elected Democratic Senator from New Mexico took Dennis Chavez’s name. He was a young and ambitious man and, as a result, he took his own right the next year. Senator Chavez served in the Senate until his death in November 1962.

In so many ways, he was far ahead of his time. In the 1940s, he fought for civil rights legislation, he chaired the Public Works Committee and sat on the Appropriations Committee, and helped usher in major infrastructure projects all over the nation, including water and military projects critical to New Mexico’s development.

‘‘El Senador’’—as we call him in New Mexico, was the first American-born Hispanic elected to the Senate and, at 27 years, remains the longest serving Hispanic Senator in history.

Joseph McCarthy began his reign of terror on February 9, 1950, a speech charging, without proof, that there were 205 card carrying members of the Communist Party working in the U.S. State Department. By March of that year, McCarthy had accused American scholar Owen Lattimore, among many others, of being a Communist. That accusation, again without evidence, was too much for Senator Chavez and it gave rise to his denunciation on the floor of the Senate.

At that time, in 1950, Republicans held the presidency and both houses in Congress. And no matter one party or another at that time, anti-Communist sentiment could be politically costly.

But Senator Chavez took his chances against Joe McCarthy—in the name of what was right.

He told the Senate that day, ‘‘I would like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all of the legislation which I have considered in this chamber. Senator Chavez spoke with conviction. That was a time when Senators engaged in genuine, spontaneous debate in this chamber. Senator Chavez counseled his colleagues: ‘‘. . . a man is ultimately remembered by what he does in relation to his times, and the fact that we do our assigned duty may not be enough; sometimes we must step out and sound the alarm.’’

And sound the alarm against McCarthy, he would. Dennis Chavez—born Dionisio on April 4, 1888—came from humble and honorable beginnings. He came from generations who had farmed in Los Chavez—a small community along the Rio Grande, south of Albuquerque, in territorial New Mexico. When he was seven, his family moved to Albuquerque in search of better opportunities. He learned English in school but, at age 13, when he was in 7th grade, he had to leave school to help support his family.

Dennis, however, never left his education. He studied engineering, American history, and great political leaders at the Albuquerque Public Library. In his early 20’s, he worked for the City of Albuquerque Engineering Department, and also became active in Democratic politics. He joined the Democratic Party, even though most Hispanics at that time in New Mexico were Republicans, but he saw in ‘‘Democratic party a political philosophy that placed human rights above property rights.’’
Mr. PAUL. The PATRIOT Act was begotten of the most unpatriotic of ideas—that liberty can be exchanged for security. The history of the PATRIOT Act shows that the exchange is a false one.

As our liberty wanes and wastes away, we find that the promises of security were an illusion. The history of the PATRIOT Act is really a history of how power corrupts and how bias and maleficiency grow when power is unchecked.

The PATRIOT Act allowed a secret court, FISA, to grant generalized warrants to collect personal data from millions of Americans. The spies who run these surveillance programs then lied—for years and years—to us.

One of the most notorious of these liars was James Clapper. When cross-examined under oath by Senator Wyden, James Clapper denied that the government was collecting data on millions of Americans.

A month later, the whistleblower, Edward Snowden, revealed that Clapper had lied. Snowden revealed that Clapper and others were using the PATRIOT Act to spy on virtually every American.

Snowden revealed that the secret FISA Court was allowing a single court order to command the collection of millions of Americans’ personal phone data.

Most Members of Congress had no idea that this was going on. In fact, one of the authors of the PATRIOT Act publicly expressed his shock that such a massive surveillance of Americans was occurring with no notification of Congress.

Clapper and others, though, said that is not true. They justified their actions by saying: We have been briefing the Elite 8 Congressmen.

Who were the Elite 8, and who made them elite? The Elite 8 are the major and minority leaders in the House and the Senate and the majority and minority leader of the Intelligence Committees of the House and the Senate—eight people.

When they were quizzed about this program, most of them said they couldn’t remember ever being briefed on it.

But the real constitutional question is, have we not changed and subverted the Constitution to make eight people more important than the rest of us?

So this was a program where they were collecting the data on everybody’s phone calls—everybody in America—and you would think there would have to be a debate and approval by Congress, but there were only eight people, and those eight people seemed to be confused that they had approved the program as well.

The idea that a single court order can allow the collection of personal data from millions of people is antithetical to the intentions of the Fourth Amendment.

The Fourth Amendment dictates that the government must identify an
individual and the items and the location to be searched. The Fourth Amendment was intended to forbid general warrants and/or writs of assistance that, historically, Monarchs had used indiscriminately to collect vast amounts of either belongings or possessions of their subjects.

The Fourth Amendment was written to prevent that from happening.

The PATRIOT Act essentially allows for generalized warrants and the bulk collection of personal data. The Fourth Amendment also dictates that a search can only occur when the government proves to a judge that there is probable cause that a crime has been committed. However, under the PATRIOT Act they have lowered the standard.

So there is the constitutional standard—the Fourth Amendment. But, under the PATRIOT Act, the standard now becomes if it is relevant to an investigation. That is a much looser, broader standard, and it is not a constitutional standard.

So the question is, Through these special, secret courts and through the PATRIOT Act, can we allow things that the Constitution actually prevents. What we have done is eroded precious rights. The PATRIOT Act is a violation of our most precious rights. The PATRIOT Act they have lowered the standard. However, under the PATRIOT Act, the standard now becomes if it is relevant to an investigation.

To those of us who prize the rights guaranted by the Bill of Rights, the PATRIOT Act is a violation of our most precious rights. The PATRIOT Act, in the end, is not patriotic. The PATRIOT Act makes an unholy and unconstitutional exchange of liberty for a false sense of security. I, for one, will oppose its reauthorization.

Today we are also here, though, to discuss the FISA Court that interacts with personal data. The PATRIOT Act also authorizes a search that doesn't follow the Constitution.

I believe that the authors of the FISA Court, who intended to restrain unconstitutional searches, would be appalled at what the FISA Court has become. They would be appalled that this secret court intended to be used to investigate foreign spies and terrorists was turned into a powerful and invasive force to infiltrate and disrupt the political process.

It should not matter whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or a Libertarian; we should all be appalled at this abuse of power.

The question is, How do we fix it? To my mind, there are two approaches. No. 1, we could try to make the FISA Court less bad by adding procedural hurdles to make it more like a constitutional court or, No. 2, admit that the FISA Court cannot be made constitutional, admit that FISA uses a less-than-constitutional standard when it allows searches to be performed that do not meet the Fourth Amendment.

The Fourth Amendment requires probable cause that you have either committed a crime or are committing a crime. The FISA Court only says the government must prove or assert that there is probable cause that you are connected to a foreign government.

As we have seen, the standards were so lax that when they went to the Trump campaign and said that a particular person might be a probable cause, it turns out it was untrue. They didn't present facts to the court that actually argued that he wasn't an agent of the foreign government, and that person had no one to argue for him.

The deficiency of the FISA Court and why it is not constitutional is that you don't get a lawyer. You actually don't even get told you have been accused of a crime. The only reason we know that President Trump's campaign got caught up in this is that he won. Because he won and now has the power to open and put sunlight on this, we are now able to see in.

If this had been an ordinary American caught up in this, you would never be told, you would never get a lawyer, and you would be brought before this investigative body and subjected to a search of vast amounts of your private data. There is no probable cause.

That is not constitutional, and I don't think we can make it constitutional. I think we should admit that we can't constitutionally allow Americans to be subjected to a search that doesn't follow the Fourth Amendment.

I believe there is no fixing the FISA Court to make it constitutional for Americans. I believe the only solution is to exempt Americans from the FISA Court.

If government wants to investigate a political campaign, which should be a very rare and a very unusual circumstance, to have the government involved in a political campaign, governments should request a Fourth Amendment search from an article III constitutional court.

Some will say: Oh, it is hard; we will never get it. Guess what—even constitutional warrants are mostly granted. The way you should investigate them are granted. But guess what—a judge will be a little reticent to get involved in the political process because they know how heated it is and how important it is to our Republic. But that is the way you should investigate a campaign if you are going to.

Opponents of doing the tried and trusted constitutional way will argue that it takes too long and it is too hard. But guess what—the Constitution was meant to be an onerous standard. The Constitution was meant to be rigorous. Our Founding Fathers understood that justice cannot be achieved in secret courts that neither notify the accused nor let their legal representation. You can't find justice where there is no adversarial process, where you don't get a lawyer.

I think it is high time we quit letting foreign or spy on our constitutional duty.

Today, I offer an amendment that restores the Constitution for all Americans and forbids the secret FISA Court from ever again meddling in our political processes.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1586 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Paul] proposes an amendment numbered 1586.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of authorities under such Act to surveil United States persons and to prohibit the use of information acquired under such Act in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 901. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.**

(a) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS**

**SEC. 901. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITIES TO SURVEIL UNITED STATES PERSONS AND ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE.—The terms ‘pen register’ and ‘trap and trace device’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3127 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given such term in section 101.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an officer of the United States may not under this Act request an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court may not under this Act order—

(1) electronic surveillance of a United States person;

(2) a physical search of a premises, information, material, or property used exclusively by, or under the open and exclusive control of, a United States person;

(3) approval of the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device to obtain information concerning a United States person;

(4) the production of tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) concerning a United States person; or

(5) the targeting of a United States person for the acquisition of information.

...
"(c) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING UNITED STATES PERSONS.—

"(1) DEFINITION OF AGGRIEVED PERSON.—In this subsection, the term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under this Act or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under such Executive Order.

"(2) PEN Registers; Trap and Trace Devices.—United States person.—The terms ‘pen register’ and ‘trap and trace device’ and ‘United States person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 901 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a).

"(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

"(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under this Act in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

"(d) WARRANTS.—An officer of the United States seeking to conduct electronic surveillance, a physical search, installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device, production of tangible things, or targeting for acquisition of information with respect to a United States person as described in subsection (b) may only conduct such activities pursuant to a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a Federal court other than a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.”.

"(2) CLEMICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents preceding section 101 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS

“Sec. 901. Limitations on authorities to surveil United States persons and on use of information concerning United States persons.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON SURVEILLANCE UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12333.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AGGRIEVED PERSON.—The term ‘aggrieved person’ means a person who is the target of any surveillance activity under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) or any other person whose communications or activities were subject to any surveillance activity under such Executive Order.

(B) PEN REGISTER; TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE; UNITED STATES PERSON.—The terms ‘pen register’ and ‘trap and trace device’, and ‘United States person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 901 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any information concerning a United States person acquired under Executive Order 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note; relating to United States intelligence activities) shall not be used in evidence against that United States person in any criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of any criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

(3) USE BY AGGRIEVED PERSONS.—An aggrieved person who is a United States person may use information concerning such person acquired under Executive Order 12333 in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding or as part of a criminal, civil, or administrative investigation.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1586

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask that the question be called on the vote.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Alexander), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Sasse).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Alexander) would have voted ‘‘nay’’ and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) would have voted ‘‘nay.’’

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Fischer). Are any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 85, as follows:

[Call of Vote No. 91 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Blackburn    Klein    Kennedy    Paul
Braun        Lee       Moran     Scott (FL)
Cruz         Moran     Murkowski  Sullivan

NAYS—85

Baldwin      Gillibrand  Reed   
Barrasso      Graham     Risch
Bennet       Grassley    Roberts  
Blumenthal    Harris     Romney
Blunt        Hasean     Rosen
Booher       Hawley     Rounds
Boozman      Huffman    Rubio
Brown         Hirono     Schatz
Burr          Hoeven     Schmanker
Cassidy      Hagan      Scali
Casey         Kaine     Scott
Collins       King       Smith
Collins       Kinzinger  Stabenow
Coons         Lankford   Tester
Conner        Leahy     Thune
Cornyn        Leach      Tillis
Cortez Masto  Lamb    Toomey
Currie        Lambder   Udall
Cotton        Manchin    Van Hollen
Cramer         Markley    Warner
Crapo          McConnell  Warren
Duckworth      Menendez  Whitehouse
Darby         Melcher     Wicker
Dmitrov        Menendez  Young
Ernst          Murray     Young
Eisenstein    Peters
Fischer       Peters
Gardner       Portman

NOT VOTING—4

Alexander    Sanders
McSally

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 11, the nays are 85.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1586) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—8, 89

Mr. Cramer. Madam President, I rise today on behalf of the 74 fallen Vietnam veterans whose names have been left off the iconic memorial constructed in their honor. As a parent, I can’t imagine the pain that some of these families must have felt.

I first learned of this injustice during a talk radio townhall in 2018, when a family member of Fargo resident and Frank E. Evans survivor Dick Grant called in to the program.

After hearing his story, I learned about one of his shipmates, Robert Searle, a fellow North Dakotan from Grand Forks, who was also on board the ship and perished in the accident. Robert enlisted in the Navy Reserves in 1967 and reported to the Frank E. Evans in May of 1969. That year, he married his wife, Thelma.

Robert was on watch in the forward fire room with three other men when the collision occurred. All four were killed. His twin sons were just 4 months old.

North Dakota paid a great price when the USS Frank E. Evans sunk. Yet my State does not grieve alone.
The Lost 74 encompasses sailors from 29 different States, and the bill before us today represents that diversity, spanning the political aisle.

Before I ask for unanimous consent, I would like to yield some time to the distinguished Senator from New York, the Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will be brief because I know my colleagues wish to join in this wonderful activity here to try and get good recognition.

I join my colleague from North Dakota in strong support of a cause near and dear to my heart: the effort to add the names of 74 sailors to the Vietnam War Memorial who perished in a training accident that sank the USS Frank E. Evans in June of 1969.

As my friend from North Dakota explained, the names of the 74 who died on the USS Frank E. Evans have been omitted because they died just outside of the combat zone, but they had seen the heat of battle in Vietnam. The USS Frank E. Evans had been part of the Tet offensive and was scheduled to return to the combat zone before sinking.

That these men’s lives ended in the tragedy of a training accident rather than in the fire made no difference in the final analysis. They went off to war and laid down their lives in the service of the country they loved.

I was fortunate to know Larry Reilly, Sr., of Syracuse, NY—known to us as Chief Reilly, who was serving on the USS Frank E. Evans alongside his son, Larry Reilly, Jr., on that fateful day in 1969. Larry Sr. survived that day. Junior did not.

For the rest of his life, Chief Reilly petitioned his country to give his son and his fellow shipmates the very least it could give to them—due recognition.

I sat in Chief Reilly’s living room, and I have sat on Maryann Buettner’s back porch and listened to her tell me all about her son, Terry Lee Henderson, who had also seen combat in Vietnam and also died in that awful accident.

Chief Reilly passed away 2 years ago this month, but his cause does not die with him. These were living, breathing boys who lost their lives wearing the uniform of this great country. To inscribe their names on a memorial is but a small measure of peace for the families they left behind, the rightful act of a nation that recognizes the sacrifices of all its sons.

I yield to my colleague from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here today to add my voice to the eloquence of both Senator CRAMER and Senator SCHUMER about the need to recognize those people who were lost on the Frank E. Evans.

We have two sailors from New Hampshire who were lost that day: Ronald Arthur Thibodeau of Manchester, NH, joined the Navy in 1967, and he was assigned to the Frank E. Evans as radarman. Ron was on watch during the collision, and he was lost at sea, leaving behind a young son.

And Gary Joseph Vigue, of Farmington, NH, was also on watch that night during the fatal collision. Gary had married his high school sweetheart the few weeks before he reported to the Frank E. Evans in 1968. Gary also left behind a young son and his two brothers who still live in New Hampshire.

These two men, Gary and Ron, gave their lives for our country. These heroes were supporting operations during the Vietnam war, and they were planning to return to Vietnam waters once the training exercise was over. So, just like all those other people who were lost in Vietnam, they gave their lives for this country. And just because they were outside some artificially designated combat zone doesn’t mean they shouldn’t be recognized in the same way the others who were lost in Vietnam have been recognized.

Now, the month of May, Memorial Day is approaching, a day during which our Nation honors the men and women who have died while serving in the U.S. military. As we recognize the sacrifices of our fellow Americans, I think it is appropriate that the Senate take up and pass the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans Act, legislation I am honored to cosponsor with my colleague Senator CRAMER from North Dakota because it is legislation that will ensure the Lost 74 are—rightfully honored by adding their names to the Vietnam War Memorial.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I thank the Presiding Officer and Senator CRAMER for this effort to ensure that the Lost 74 are recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, whether North Dakotans, Granite Staters, or New Yorkers, these stories are everywhere.

When I first heard from Mr. Grant’s family, I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I looked into his request and introduced an amendment to the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act to inscribe the names of the Lost 74.

While the measure unanimously passed the House, it was blocked here in the Senate. So, when I came to the Senate last year, introducing this legislation was one of my very first actions and high priorities.

And I have had some success. We have 20 cosponsors—10 Republicans and 10 Democrats—including the chairman and the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee that has jurisdiction. When Members from Montana to Maine, North Dakota to New Hampshire, and New York can come together on an issue as important as honoring the fallen sailors, I would hope this would garner some attention.

It has. Last summer, the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans Act received its first-ever hearing before a Senate Energy Subcommittee. I thank the chairman and my colleague from Alaska for providing the opportunity for the story of these sailors to be heard.

It was there when I first heard opposition to the bill, however. I have yet to hear any real opposition to the legislation voiced by anyone except the bureaucrats and special interests that would actually be charged with carrying it out. In other words, nobody objects to this except the people who would have to do something about it, and that is a common theme in this town, I have noticed.

For example, the Acting Director of the National Park Service said of the bill: “If passed, it would necessitate substantial modification of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall as it exists today.” No kidding. Of course it does. That is the point of the bill.

The idea that we should continue to turn a blind eye to forgotten veterans because the work would be substantial is offensive. It is certainly offensive to service members, and their families and the survivors of the Lost 74.

Forgive my lack of sympathy for bureaucrats who feel inconvenienced by the death of 74 war heroes. The country that landed man on the Moon the very same year that this accident occurred certainly can figure out how to fix a wall to honor these war dead. More to the point, shouldn’t we be looking for more ways to honor our fallen rather than fewer?

The opposition’s argument simply does not add up. Since the wall was built, hundreds of names have been added, and more work still needs to be done. According to the Washington Post, one soldier’s name was etched three times. Thirteen soldiers had their names etched twice. While the wall bears 58,390 names, they represent 58,276 different people. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, which is responsible for the wall, conducted a study which shows there exist with names etched in the memorial.

To think that we would not add the names of the Lost 74 when we know corrections alone need to be made seems counterintuitive, if not downright lazy.

Yet, despite all of this, despite the veterans being forgotten, despite this legislation being sent here twice by the House, despite a successful hearing on the bill, progress in the Senate has stalled. That is why my colleagues and I have asked the Department of Defense to address this issue as well.

The Department has a mixed, if not negative, record with this issue. They tell you what you want to hear until you go away and hope you never come back. Similar to this body, we have been met with complete silence—not a yes, not a no, not a maybe, not a suggestion to make the proposal better.

We find their silence unacceptable; therefore, I am going to ask for unanimous consent to pass the Frank E. Evans Act. The Lost 74, their loved ones, and their shipmates have waited long enough. No matter how it can be spun, the choice before this Chamber is
to give the veterans the recognition they deserve or to stand in their way.

Madam President, with that, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 889, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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 Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have the honor to serve as the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which does have jurisdiction over S. 889, the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans Act, but in that capacity as chairman, I now have the privilege and honor of having to rise to register an objection at this moment.

I want it to be clear to my colleagues from North Dakota, my colleague from New Hampshire and certainly the chair of the committee on Energy and Natural Resources Committee—the secretary—they work for us. We don’t work for them and particularly for the Secretary—等工作 we do. We don’t work for them.

I appreciate the commitment of the chairman. I look forward to working with him and the committee on getting a markup and passing the legislation so that we don’t have to submit ourselves to the bureaucracy but, rather, can get things done and where the bureaucracy submits itself to the legislation. I thank the President, and I thank my colleagues from New York and New Hampshire and certainly the chairwoman of the Energy Committee and look forward to working on a resolution soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The PRESDING OFFICER. The legislative clerk called the roll. Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I ask for the yea and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Sasse).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ‘‘yea’’ and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) would have voted ‘‘yea.’’

Mr. DUBRIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Barrasso Gardner Peters
Bennet Gillibrand Portman
Blackburn Grassley Reisch
Binenbaum Harris Roberts
Bink Hassman Romney
Brockner Hawley Rosen
Boozman Hoeven Rounds
Capito Hyde-Smith Rubio
Cardin Inhofe Schumer
Carper Johnson Scott (FL)
Cassidy Jones Scott (SC)
Collins Kaine Shachter
Connor King Shelby
Coryn Kloubuchar Sinema
Cortez Masto Lankford Smith
Cotton Leahy Stabenow
Cramer Lee Sullivan
Crapo Loeffler Thune
Daines Manchin Tillis
Duckworth McConnell Toomey
Durch Schweiker Van Hollen
Ernst Menendez Warner
Ernst Murkowski The White House
Feinstein Wicker Young
FINN—4

Alexander Baldwin Bates
Bennet Brown Burr
Cantwell Corker Durbin
Heinrich Jordan McSally
Sasse McCaskill McCaskill McMorris
The bill (H.R. 6172), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.