

have them turned on, the escalation of violence, for whatever reason, happens much less frequently. The police officer knows that camera is on, and the person they are dealing with knows that camera is on, and it seems to make a difference.

Reporting when there are deaths or serious injuries due to the use of force—and those are investigated, I believe, in every department in America, but there is no reason they shouldn't also be reported to see if there is a pattern that involves either an individual or a pattern that involves a department that needs to be looked at.

Sharing records, as I said before, is critically important so that one bad officer doesn't get passed from one department to another.

There are things in the realm of training where this legislation helps officers get training on tactics to deescalate a situation when it gets out of control. Officers want this kind of training. Officers want the kind of training that makes it easier for them to understand that if they are in a situation where mental health is the problem or opioid addiction is the problem or drug addiction is the problem, are they dealing with a real criminal here or are they dealing with somebody who has gotten themselves in a situation in which they need to figure out how to get them in a different and better place.

While we need to move quickly to take up this legislation, I think there are some areas where the administration can act and is acting, based on announcements that were made this week and things that weren't announced this week.

I talked to Attorney General Barr a couple of weeks ago as these incidents began to become more clear in the sense of problems that could be within entire police departments and encouraged him to restore more of the pattern and practice reviews that were part of what the Justice Department used for about a decade. They were in place until November of 2018. I think they need to be back in place.

We know from past usage that they don't have to be used on any situation or every situation, but they can be used. We have seen them used in my State in Ferguson, MO, in surrounding St. Louis County, which had a much bigger department and asked for a voluntary review, and the city of St. Louis, which has a big police department but not as big as St. Louis County in 2014 and 2017. Whether that review was voluntary or even if it involved a consent decree, I think that the case can be made that things happened in those three departments that might not have happened otherwise.

The Attorney General and I both agreed that if you don't have a tool in the toolbox, you can't use it. It is important to see what you need to do to put every tool in the toolbox, even if it is a tool that you have previously taken out and said: Well, maybe we

don't need that any longer. If you don't need it, you don't have to use it. But you are certainly not going to be able to use it if you don't have it.

President Trump took some additional steps that I was supportive of and talked about earlier this week when the Presiding Officer and I were at our leadership stakeout: officers with better tools to deal with mental health, homelessness, addiction issues.

Missouri is one of the eight Excellence in Mental Health States. This is legislation—bipartisan legislation—that I have worked on for several years with Senator STABENOW from Michigan. It allows law enforcement to connect people with the help they need and wind up having them someplace more appropriate than either jail or court.

In fact, the Department of Health and Human Services, in monitoring this program, says that it has led to a 60-percent decrease in jail time. Part of that is, a lot of people don't wind up going to jail because it makes it more possible for people in many of the departments in my State and in others to have a constant contact with that mental health professional. Maybe it is on the iPad that they are carrying with them, where they can get that 24/7 connection with a healthcare professional. It certainly benefits from the training that many Missouri officers have had now in crisis intervention.

In Kansas City, in St. Louis County, in St. Louis city, in Springfield, I have ridden with officers and talked to officers and watched how this happens, and that builds confidence. Senator SCOTT's bill builds the same kind of confidence.

I have heard some of our friends on the other side say: Well, I am for 80 percent of what is in that bill. No, they don't even say that. They say: I am for 80 percent of the bill. Now, what is the difference? Being for 80 percent of the bill means that there are things in it you don't want, but they also say more frequently: No, that bill has 80 percent of what I want in it already.

Well, let me remind our friends how you make a law. Under the Constitution, the House passes a bill, and maybe you like that better. The Senate passes a bill, and maybe the Senate has 80 percent of what you would like to see in the final bill in Senate bill, and then you go to conference. It was taught in every civic school book that every Member of the Senate studied, and we don't do it much anymore.

You can't get to conference unless there is a Senate product. No matter how much you love the House bill if you are a Member of the Senate, you don't get to weigh in on the House bill unless you have a Senate bill that allows you to go to that conference.

This would be the perfect time when Members of the Senate say—and you and I should be listening carefully over the next few days when they say “80 percent of what I want is in that bill or 85 percent of what I want is in that

bill,” particularly, if they—usually, they are not saying “There is nothing in the bill I don't want; it just doesn't have everything I do want.” Well, if 80 percent of what you want is in the bill and the House passes another bill that you like better, maybe you come out of that conference with 90 percent of what you want. If a solution that gets you 90 percent of what you want or 80 percent of what you want is the alternative to zero percent of what you want, if you want to be a legislator, you have to figure out that that is a better path for you to take than the zero-percent path.

It would be tragic next week if the result of the House deliberation and, this month, if the result of the Senate deliberation is that there is no further discussion because everybody has decided that if it wasn't everything they wanted, they didn't want to have the process that we used to call—and the Constitution calls and civic books call—the legislative process.

These are not the first struggles we have faced together as a nation. We have come a long way. We still have a long way to go.

Remember, the Constitution doesn't even promise a perfect Union. It promises a more perfect Union. You get to a more perfect Union one step at a time, not all at once. My guess is, we will always be on the journey toward a more perfect Union.

Senator SCOTT has given us an opportunity to take some of the important steps on that journey and make the Union more perfect than it is right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in 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 (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Alaska.

AMERICAN ENERGY INNOVATION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on Tuesday, just a few days ago, I convened a hearing of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and we were focused on the impacts of COVID-19 and how this pandemic has impacted our Nation's energy industry. We had a lot of discussions about the impact of COVID on the Nation, on our economy, and I think it is probably fair to say that every facet of our society has been impacted, but it is certainly clear to me as a Senator for the State of Alaska and as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee that the energy sector has suffered perhaps uniquely and I think acutely.

We have seen limits on business and travel and social activities, and we think about those limitations, the far-reaching consequences they have on our Nation's energy producers, whether it is those who produce oil and gas, coal, renewables, advanced technology such as nuclear power, and all those who help us produce our energy and use our energy more efficiently, all aspects have been impacted.

At the hearing, we had some pretty good testimony that our witnesses were able to explain and quantify some of those impacts. We heard that U.S. oil production has declined by almost 2 million barrels per day. Spot prices for liquefied natural gas have effectively collapsed, creating challenges for export projects. Domestic electricity consumption is projected to decline by 5.7 percent this year, largely due to the closure of businesses and, of course, the shelter-in-place orders.

It is not just the oil and gas sector. The renewable energy sector has also faced substantial supply chain disruptions. The efficiency sector has faced health and safety restrictions in homes and buildings. Overall, we were told that the energy industry has lost an estimated 1.3 million jobs since early March, including more than 600,000 jobs associated with clean energy.

It is a good reminder in terms of where we have seen this direct impact and the impact on jobs, but our hearing was also a reminder that the energy industry can be a key leader, be a sector that can really help lead our Nation's economic recovery.

When you think about energy itself, this is a finished product. It is a feedstock. It is a raw material. It is an input. It is an output. It is value added, a natural resource, tradeable commodity, a precious asset. It is clearly critical infrastructure and emergency reserves. It is financial, collateral, and competitive exports. It is a source of high-paying and high-skilled jobs in its own right.

I think we recognize that current low prices are good for us. We are seeing our families pay less and, thus, they can devote to other priorities. The underlying message here is the energy industry is an important component to how we move to this phase of economic recovery. What can we do to help this industry and, thus, the broader economy recovery?

It was interesting because we had a panel of five witnesses before us. Several of those witnesses all pointed to the same piece of legislation as one of the answers as to how we can help the economy recover, and that is a bill that those of us on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee developed throughout last year. We called it the American Energy Innovation Act. We refer to it as our energy bill. It will ensure that the United States remains a global energy leader while strengthening our national security, investing in clean technologies, and securing our Nation's supply chain.

It is a pretty wide-ranging bill. It covers everything from energy efficiency to renewables. We have a strong focus on carbon capture. The big anchor piece is energy storage. Advanced nuclear plays a key role and also vehicle technologies. We focused on mineral security and recognizing the key aspects of secure supply chains, grid and cyber security, workforce modernization. Really, it is all areas that will work to help our economy, boost our international competitiveness, and protect human health and the global environment.

At the hearing on Tuesday, one of our witnesses described this energy bill, our American Energy Innovation Act, as "foundational." I really think it is foundational.

Where are we with this foundational energy bill that has been the work of such a good, strong collaborative committee process? It was clearly timely for the Senate to be considering this in this year—certainly before the pandemic—and it is even more critical, more timely that we consider it now.

When we had an opportunity to bring this to the floor earlier, there was a desire and an interest in making sure that we were focusing on our clean and renewable energy sector. We do that within that bill.

It has been interesting because in the past several weeks, we have heard calls from Members of this body to prioritize a robust clean energy recovery plan. There was a letter from 24 Members of the Senate who urged Senate leadership to "prioritize a robust clean energy recovery plan." In their letter, they call for investments in renewable energy, energy storage, energy efficiency, clean vehicles, clean and efficient infrastructure, clean fuels, and workforce development. That sounds pretty much like what we included within our American Energy Innovation Act.

I sent many of them just a quick letter detailing how our bill really does accomplish just that, including the specifics that focus on each of these priorities, and encourage them to help me pass it.

As you may recall, we had the American Energy Innovation Act on the Senate floor at the end of February just before the pandemic took hold. Again, I mentioned the collaborative process that went into building that bill. We spent a lot of time in the Energy Committee working through a lot of the issues that had some conflict and to reduce that conflict so we could get a good, strong bipartisan product. As a consequence, we have a bill that contains the priorities for more than 70 Senators. It is supported by more than 200 organizations. We incorporated 18 amendments on the floor working through that process.

The Senate ultimately denied cloture on March 9. This was just before the shelter in place and the work from home orders began. We hit a wall there. The unfortunate reality is we hit that

wall. We were derailed with this important legislative effort not because of an impasse that we had with the contents of our bill, but it was an unrelated dispute from another committee. It was not something that, as chairman, I could have anticipated. There was no warning that it was going to be an issue for our bill. In fairness, we didn't have any power as the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to work it out for this other committee. We were hamstrung by it.

Effectively, what happened then was a year of good, strong committee work by the Energy Committee is now being held hostage in a fight in another committee. I have been patient with this, but I would remind colleagues that we are not getting any more extra legislative days being added. The clock is ticking here. This is a matter that, again, when this came before us while we were on this floor trying to work out the last of the amendments, this came up at the last minute, and we were promised a resolution at that time. We will have this fixed in a month. Well, it has been over 3 months now since this became an issue. Again, we have lost valuable time.

This issue from the EPW Committee is holding back a strong, bipartisan bill that would allow us to modernize our Nation's energy policies for the first time in more than a dozen years.

In a week where I have certainly been reminded about the importance of energy and, again, heard good, strong support for our energy bill, I would tell my colleagues that we need to redouble our efforts on this to advance this bill. We need to unlock this energy bill, which is a good bill that is ready to go, from the complications that have been created within another committee.

I like to pride myself on being a pretty good team player around here. I want to give people space to work their issues out, but I think it is time, again, for those who are able to hold the key to this to help us unlock this so we can move a significant priority—not just for the Energy and Natural Resources Committee but a significant priority for every Member in this Chamber because it doesn't make any difference if you are a Republican or a Democrat, if you come from an urban area or a rural area, when it comes to the strength of our Nation's economy, the foundational interest here, the foundations rest solidly on energy.

So an opportunity to update and modernize our energy policies in a way that benefits us all is something that I would hope we can all agree to. I want to get this bill moving.

We had a win this week that originated in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee when it comes to some of our land and conservation measures. The Great American Outdoors Act passed by a strong margin. It was the work of a lot of good people, but both measures, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as well as the Restore Our Parks Act, began with the

good work of a committee working together to move those pieces of legislation through the committee process. It is not perfect, in my view, but I knew these were good policies that many Members across both sides of the aisle wanted to place a priority on.

Let's figure out how we can make something like that happen. I am proud of the fact that we can move good initiatives through this committee.

I will just remind you we have another good initiative that we are ready to go on.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mrs. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to end my few moments on the floor with an acknowledgement of where we are going to be next week. It has been made clear that we are going to have an opportunity to bring up for discussion legislation that has been drafted by Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina, along with a group of fellow colleagues over here, focused on matters relating to policing reforms.

My hope—it is more than a hope; it is really a prayer. My prayer is that we will come to this floor next week as colleagues and as individuals who want to bring to bear good policy for a country at a time that is so desperate for leadership that is responsive, leadership that has demonstrated a willingness to listen to the raw emotion of what we have seen expressed across this country in the few weeks since the terrible death and killing of George Floyd but recognizing that it is far more than the horrible death of one individual. It is a history that in many parts of our country is raw and open and needs to be addressed.

My prayer is that we can come to this floor not here to debate through a partisan lens but here to debate those issues that are so important and so imperative for the American public to hear; that the response is not a Republican effort versus a Democratic effort, but that these are matters that we must address, whether it is how we ensure that there is full and fair accountability, whether it relates to safe policing practices, whether it is how we address the concerns with modern policing when there are issues before our law enforcement officers that span the scope of how we address mental health issues—those with addictions—and how we respond from a broader view and lens but do so with our hearts rather than trying to project through our political alignment.

I even hesitate to say because some would ask: Well, exactly what do you mean by that?

I guess what I am asking for us to do is to come here and debate honestly about where we are as a nation, and that comes to ensuring that when we speak of justice, that we speak of justice for all in a way that is inclusive, that is fair, that is equal, and that is compassionate; that we recognize that

the men and women who get up every morning or stay out late every evening to protect and defend, that we are there with them and for them as they serve us.

I am asking for us to come into our work next week with open hearts and open minds, having listened well. If we do that, I can only suspect that the outcome will be good.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OBJECTION WITHDRAWAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I previously notified the Chamber of my objection to the nominations of Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security and Christopher C. Miller, of Virginia, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence. On June 12, 2020, I received two letters: one from the Department of State, which contained a copy of recent correspondence between the administration to the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, CIGIE, requesting that CIGIE investigate specific allegations into the conduct of the State Department Inspector General, State IG, Steve Linick, and another separate letter from the White House Counsel concerning the removal of Intelligence Community Inspector General, IC IG, Michael Atkinson. Without making comment regarding the veracity of the allegations made against Mr. Linick, I believe that these letters fulfill the President's requirement to provide Congress reasons for the removal of the IC IG and the State IG, as required by the Inspector General Reform Act. It is for this reason that I withdraw my objection to both Mr. Billingslea and Mr. Miller.

The letter from the White House Counsel regarding the removal of the IC IG repeats a previous letter from the White House which stated that the President had lost confidence in the IC IG. However, the White House Counsel enclosed with that letter a transcript of President Trump providing his reasons for removing Mr. Atkinson to the press and has informed me that those reasons represent the President's official explanation of Mr. Atkinson's removal to Congress. I believe that this transcript and its transmittal to Congress has fulfilled the statutory notice requirement of the Inspector General Reform Act. It is for this reason that I withdraw my objection to Mr. Miller.

Here follow my comments to the President, including my actions and ra-

tionale: although the Constitution gives the President the authority to manage executive branch personnel, Congress has made it clear by law that should the President fire an inspector general, there ought to be a good reason for it. No such reason was provided when the President informed Congress of the removal of Mr. Atkinson on April 3, 2020. Thus, in a bipartisan letter on April 8, 2020, my colleagues and I reminded the President of his requirement under the statute to provide reasons for removing an IG. On May 15, 2020, the President notified Congress of his intent to remove Mr. Linick. This notification also lacked reasons for the removal spurring my solo letter on May 18, 2020, again reminding the President of his requirement to provide reasons.

After a delay, and a personal call with the White House Counsel, I was promised a response to my letters that would fulfill the statutory notice requirement. On May 26, 2020, I received a response from the White House Counsel explaining the President's Constitutional removal authority, which I never questioned. However, the letter still contained no reason for the removals as required by law. This failure to comply with the statute prompted my objection to both Mr. Miller and Mr. Billingslea on June 4, 2020.

On June 6, 2020, I asked the White House to provide written reasons for the removals. We discussed several issues. I took this opportunity to talk to the White House and I told them that I needed reasons for the firing of IGs to be submitted in writing.

On June 12, 2020, I received the enclosed letter from the State Department which finally fulfills the executive branch's legal requirement to provide Congress reasons for an IG's removal with regard to Mr. Linick.

Here is my view on the firing of Mr. Linick. The State Department's correspondence with CIGIE provided four reasons for Mr. Linick's removal, all involving the investigation of the leak of information to a news reporter pertaining to an IG report, which the reporter claims to be based on information garnered from "two government sources involved in carrying out the investigation. The letter to CIGIE requests that they begin an investigation into Mr. Linick's alleged transgressions, including his: 1) "failure to formally refer to CIGIE . . . the investigation of [the] leak"; 2) "hand selection" of the Department of Defense OIG to conduct the leak investigation; 3) "non-compliance with State Department Office of Inspector General (OIG) email policies"; and 4) refusal to supply Department of State leadership with a copy or summary of the leak investigation report despite "repeated requests" from State Department leadership. These claims are as of yet unverified but the President has offered an additional briefing on the matter from State Department officials. I am in the process of scheduling