The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Butterfield).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, June 24, 2020.
I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. Butterfield to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Amen.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day’s proceedings is approved.

LETTER SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 4(b) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON RULES

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 965, we are writing to inform you that the Committee on Rules has met the requirements for conducting a business meeting outlined in regulation E.1 of the remote committee proceedings regulations, inserted into the Congressional Record on May 15, 2020, and that the committee is prepared to conduct a remote meeting and permit remote participation. In meeting these requirements, the committee held a non-public business meeting rehearsal on May 22, 2020; a public full committee hearing with remote participation on May 27, 2020; and a public full committee hearing with remote participation on June 24, 2020.

Thank you,
James P. McGovern, Chairman, House Committee on Rules; Norma Torres, Member of Congress; Jamie Raskin, Member of Congress; Joseph D. Morelle, Member of Congress; Doris O. Matsui, Member of Congress; Alcee L. Hastings, Member of Congress; Ed Perlmutter, Member of Congress; Mary Gay Scanlon, Member of Congress; Donna E. Shalala, Member of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2020, for
morning-hour debate, and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 7 o’clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker, and referred as follows:

4563. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank’s statement with respect to transactions involving exports to Turkey, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 650(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4564. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to various countries, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 650(b)(1945), ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4565. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting proposed legislation to implement an essential benefit for consumer Lamar Title Insurance in order to attract consumers and to provide for reinsurance payments to lower premiums in the individual health insurance market; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5532) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations”; and for other purposes (Rept. 116-436). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 7301. A bill to prevent evictions, foreclosures, and unsafe housing conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ESCH, Ms. FINKELSTEIN, Mr. GOLDEN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KING, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LORBECK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. MENDOZA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAHAN, Ms. SHEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHUCKS, Mr. TIVOLI, Mr. TOHOT, Ms. TONGUE, and Mr. VALDEZ):
H.R. 7302. A bill to make high-speed broadband internet service affordable for all Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 7303. A bill to provide additional funds for Federal and State facility energy resiliency programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 7304. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Department of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants to eligible entities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at ports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):
H.R. 7305. A bill to toll statutes of limitations during the COVID-19 emergency period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRISP (for himself and Mr. COHEN):
H.R. 7306. A bill to improve the safety of school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. MALINGOWSKI, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. YOHOS):
H.R. 7307. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require information on the status of excessive surveillance and use of advanced technology to violate privacy and other fundamental human rights be included in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. UPTON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. ESCH, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 7308. A bill to authorize appropriations for offsetting the costs related to reductions in research productivity resulting from the coronavirus pandemic; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7309. A bill to prohibit certain assistance for inverted domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. WALBERG):
H.R. 7310. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to submit to Congress a plan for the modernization of the information technology systems of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GAETZ:
H.R. 7311. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to purchase drones manufactured in the People’s Republic of China or by Chinese state-controlled entities; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SAN NICOLAUS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSEN of California, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HOWE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BEKER, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):
H.R. 7312. A bill to reauthorize the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and for
other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.
By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:
H.R. 7333. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a pilot program for intermodal transportation infrastructure grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 734. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish Workers’ Memorial Day as a Federal holiday; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. Lee of New York, Ms. Schrier of Washington, Ms. Norton, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, and Ms. Ocasio-Cortez):
H.R. 735. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the penalty for use of force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:
H.R. 736. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment or operation of a center to be known as the Emergency Mental Health and Substance Use Training and Technical Assistance Center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. Norton, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mrs. Dingell, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Ms. Trahan, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Pocan of Wisconsin, Mr. Harris, Mr. Shires, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Gallego, Ms. Lee of California, Ms. Scanlon, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Bass, Ms. Scott of Virginia, Ms. Khanna, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Soto, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Vela, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Payne, Ms. Wild, and Ms. Scanlon):
H.R. 737. A bill to authorize a public service announcement campaign on the efficacy of cloth face coverings in reducing the spread of COVID-19, to authorize a program to provide cloth face coverings to any American who requests one free of charge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. Beyer):
H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide exempt facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHALALA:
H.R. 7319. A bill to improve quality and accountability for educator preparation programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAUFFER (for himself and Mr. Golden):
H.R. 7330. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require equitable adjustments to certain construction contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. Moulton):
H.R. 7321. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish grants to support the establishment of personal accounts to assist Americans in gaining skills and returning to work following the economic disruption caused by COVID-19; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 7322. A bill to prohibit certain individuals from being appointed to positions if the individual was part of that individual’s employment with the United States, on behalf of a special counsel investigation that investigated or prosecuted a President or a candidate for election to the office of President; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. Huizenga):
H.R. 7323. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of Texas and Mr. PAPPAS:
H.R. 7324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions by individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Carson of Indiana, and Mrs. Hayes):
H.R. 7325. A bill to make grants to support online training of residential contractors and rebates for the energy efficiency upgrades of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of this measure, by amendment, demand, or a motion to recommit; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself and Mr. Bera):
H. Res. 1018. A resolution recognizing that in the 25 years since normalizing diplomatic relations, the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and the United States of America have worked toward increased stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia, and expressing the support of the House of Representatives that the United States will continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the Southeast Asian region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Bera, Mr. Young, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Sarban, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, and Mrs. Radwagen):
H. Res. 1019. A resolution recognizing that for 50 years, the Kingdom of Tonga has worked with the United States toward stability, prosperity, and peace in the Pacific and beyond, and expressing the support of the United States with Tonga’s commitment to continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the Pacific; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Bera, Mr. Young, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Sarban, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, and Mrs. Radwagen):
H. Res. 1020. A resolution recognizing that for 45 years, Papua New Guinea and the United States have shared a close friendship based on shared goals of stability, prosperity, and peace in the region, and expressing the support of the House of Representatives that the United States will continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the Pacific; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Bera, Mr. Young, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Sarban, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, and Mrs. Radwagen):
H. Res. 1021. A resolution recognizing that for 45 years, Papua New Guinea and the United States have shared a close friendship based on shared goals of stability, prosperity, and peace in the region, and expressing the support of the House of Representatives that the United States will continue to remain a strong, reliable, and active partner in the Pacific; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself and Mr. Gabbard):
H. Res. 1022. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the commencement of continuous operations of the Stars and Stripes newspaper in the Pacific and the invaluable service of the Stars and Stripes as the “hometown newspaper” for members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian employees, and family members stationed across the globe; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT
Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 7301. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 1, To pay debts and provide for the common Defence and General Welfare of the United States.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 7303. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 7304. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 7305. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18, to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CURTIS:
H.R. 7306. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:
H.R. 7307. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7308. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7309. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:
H.R. 7310. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7311. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7312. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7313. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7314. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7315. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7316. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7317. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7318. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7319. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7320. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7321. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 7322. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I of the United States Constitution.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: the Congress shall have Power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. GAETZ:
H.R. 7311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:
H.R. 7313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 7314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 16 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. OMAR:
H.R. 7315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:
H.R. 7316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.R. 7317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 7318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SHALALA:
H.R. 7319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. STAUBER:
H.R. 7320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 7321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 7322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TONKO:
H.R. 7323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. WALKER:
H.R. 7324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 7325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 208: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 584: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 592: Mr. CASE and Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 1166: Mr. VAN DREW and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 1251: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1380: Mr. TITUS.
H.R. 1379: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. CUSHER.
H.R. 1574: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. Peterson, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. MCCGOVERN.
H.R. 1605: Mr. EMERICK.
H.R. 1754: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1779: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 2166: Mr. COLE, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. DRAL.
H.R. 2188: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2431: Ms. SHERELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2456: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2571: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 2650: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 2653: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CONOLLY.
H.R. 2720: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2626: Mr. TEO LIU of California.
H.R. 2835: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2859: Mr. BAHIN.
H.R. 2865: Mr. DELILLO.
H.R. 2896: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 3107: Mrs. KATKO, Mr. BRINDISE, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3448: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3662: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3654: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3894: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 3929: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 3975: Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4004: Mr. O’HALLERAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOBSEHACK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4104: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 4168: Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4232: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4677: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 4679: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4981: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4701: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TLAH, Ms. FRANKEL, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 7073: Mr. Harder of California.
H.R. 7079: Mr. Smith of Nebraska.
H.R. 7092: Mr. Evans, Mr. Throne, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Cleaver, Mrs. Axne, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mrs. Bustos, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Pascrell, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Neal, Mr. Carraja, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Schneider, and Mr. Castro of Texas.
H.R. 7113: Mr. Sherman.
H.R. 7135: Mr. Vargas.
H.R. 7155: Ms. Chisholm, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Sherrill, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Lankinen, Mr. Carson of Indiana, and Mr. Costa.
H.R. 7178: Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Katko, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, and Ms. Eshoo.
H.R. 7180: Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Upton, Mr. Cox of California, and Mr. Smucker.
H.R. 7191: Mr. Pocan, Mrs. Trahan, Ms. Escobar, Ms. Fudge, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Morell, and Mr. Phillips.
H.R. 7197: Mr. King of New York, Mr. Case, and Ms. Núñez.
H.R. 7216: Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Kaptur, and Mr. Morell.
H.R. 7217: Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Horsford, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Carolin B. Maloney of New York, and Mr. Ryan.
H.R. 7229: Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Kim, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Payne, and Mr. Malinowski.
H.R. 7232: Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Craig, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Garbarino, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Meng, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Crist, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Cisneros, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. McNulty, Ms. Speier, Mr. Costa, Ms. Rose of New York, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Welch, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Rooney, Mr. David of Illinois, Mr. Brendan P. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Olson.
H.R. 7233: Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Steube, Mr. Harder of California, and Ms. Craig.
H.R. 7235: Mr. Lowenthal.
H.R. 7241: Ms. Velazquez and Mr. Allred.
H.R. 7251: Mr. Flores.
H.R. 7253: Mr. Mitchell.
H.R. 7264: Ms. Judy Chu of California and Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 7265: Mr. Emmer, Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Duncan, and Mr. Tummons.
H.R. 7278: Mr. Palazzo, Mrs. Hartley, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Graves of Mississippi, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, and Mr. Babin.
H.R. 7280: Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire and Mr. Cardenas.
H.R. 7292: Mr. Morelle, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Velazquez, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Welch, and Ms. Blunt Rochester.
H.R. 7296: Ms. Velazquez.
H. Res. 114: Mrs. Roney.
H. Res. 446: Ms. Kaptur.
H. Res. 976: Mr. Gosar.
H. Res. 984: Mr. Wright.
H. Res. 990: Mr. Meeks, Mr. Raskin, Ms. Skew of Alabama, Mr. Ryan, Mrs. Demings, Ms. Fudge, Ms. Garcia of Texas, Ms. Haaland, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Norton, Mr. Cooper, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Evans, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Velazquez, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Horsford, Ms. Bass, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. Blumenauer.
H. Res. 993: Mr. Horsford.
H. Res. 1001: Ms. Finkenauer.
H. Res. 1007: Mr. Fulcher.
H. Res. 1008: Mr. Schiff, Mr. Raskin, and Ms. Omar.
H. Res. 1012: Mrs. Demings.
H. Res. 1023: Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. Roy, Mr. Spano, Mr. Budd, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Murphy of North Carolina, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Garcia of California, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Meuser, Mr. Perry, Mr. Hice of Georgia, and Mr. Bishop of North Carolina.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Reform in H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Reform in H.R. 51 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Reform in H.R. 7301 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

111. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Randolph, NJ, relative to Resolution No. R-144-20, urging the State of New Jersey to provide direct stabilization funding to Morris County from the CARES Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

112. Also, a petition of the City Council of Saratoga Springs, NY, relative to a resolution calling upon all of our federal representatives to advocate vigorously for the federal stimulus legislation that will address the needs of this city and help minimize the devastating effect of this pandemic on our residents, taxpayers, and visitors; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

113. Also, a petition of the 21st Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature, relative to Senate Resolution No. 21-11, SS1, respectively requesting the U.S. House of Representatives's Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Energy and Commerce to support the 'Northern Marianas Coronavirus Emergency Assistance Act' to provide funds for general government operations of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce.

114. Also, a petition of the City Council of New Orleans, LA, relative to Resolution No. R-20-135, calling on Governor Edwards to impose immediate rent relief for impacted New Orleans tenants and urging him to call directly on federal legislators and the Trump administration to impose immediate rent relief for impacted tenants in conjunction with an immediate moratorium on mortgage payments; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Ways and Means.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:
Let us pray.
Eternal Father, our souls long for You, for we find strength and joy in Your presence.
Guide our lawmakers to put their trust in You, seeking in every undertaking to know and do Your will. When they go through difficulties, may they remember that, with Your help, they can accomplish the seemingly impossible. Lord, give them a faith that will trust You even when the darkness is blacker than a thousand midnights. May they always find strength in Your providential meaning.
We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds in morning business.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Senate will soon cross the milestone of 200 judicial confirmations since President Trump came to the Presidency in 2017. These have been nominees in the molds of Justice Scalia, just as the President promised nearly 4 years ago. They will strictly interpret the Constitution and Federal statues. Their decisions will be driven by what the law actually says, not their own personal policy preferences.

This landmark achievement is the result of the President keeping his word and the unwavering determination of Leader McCONNELL, Chairman GRAHAM, and the Republican conference.

In the hands of these many strict constructionist judges, the future of American jurisprudence is very, very bright.
I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, in a few hours, the Senate will confirm Judge Cory T. Wilson to join the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Yet again, President Trump has sent up an outstanding nominee for this important vacancy. Judge Wilson holds degrees from the University of Mississippi and Yale Law School. He has held a prestigious clerkship, found success in private practice, and spent years in public service as a lawyer and a judge. The American Bar Association rates Mr. Wilson ‘well qualified.’

Once we confirm Judge Wilson today, the Senate will have confirmed 200—200—of President Trump’s nominees to lifetime appointments on the Federal bench. Following No. 200, when we depart this Chamber today, there will not be a single circuit court vacancy anywhere in the Nation for the first time in at least 40 years. There will not be a single circuit court vacancy anywhere in the Nation for the first time in at least 40 years.

As I have said many times, our work with the administration to renew our Federal courts is not a partisan or political victory; it is a victory for the rule of law and for the Constitution itself.

If judges applying the law and the Constitution as they are written strikes any of our colleagues as a threat to their political agenda, then the problem, I would argue, is with their agenda.

THE JUSTICE ACT
Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, today was supposed to bring progress for an issue that is weighing heavily on the minds of Americans. In the wake of the killings of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd, following weeks of passionate protests from coast to coast, the Senate was supposed to officially take up police reform on the floor today. Instead, our Democratic colleagues are poised to turn this routine step into a partisan impasse.

Frankly, to most Americans, the situation would sound like a satire of what goes on in the Senate: a heated argument over whether to invoke cloture on a motion to proceed to a proposal—a heated argument over whether to invoke cloture on a motion to proceed to a proposal. We are literally arguing about whether to start arguing about something else.

I can stand here for an hour and extol the virtues of Senator Tim SCOTT’s JUSTICE Act. His legislation has already earned 48 cosponsors because it is a straightforward plan based on facts, based on data, and based on lived experience. It focuses on improving accountability and restoring trust. It addresses key issues like choke holds and no-knock warrants. It expands reporting, transparency in hiring, and training for deescalation.

I am proud to stand with this legislation, but the reality is that nobody thought the first offer from the Republican side was going to be the final product that traveled out of the Senate. What is supposed to happen in this
body is that we vote or agree to get onto a bill, and then we discuss, debate, and amend it until at least 60 Senators are satisfied, or it goes nowhere. It goes nowhere at the end until 60 Senators are satisfied.

So are you beginning to see how this game works? Two weeks ago, it was implied the Senate would have blood on our hands if we don’t take up police reform. Now Democrats say Senator Scott and 48 other Senators have blood on our hands because we are trying to take up police reform.

Are you beginning to see how this game works? Two weeks ago, it was implied the Senate would have blood on our hands if we didn’t take up police reform. Now Democrats say Senator Scott and 48 other Senators have blood on our hands because we are trying to take up police reform.

What fascinating times we live in. Armies of elites and Twitter mobs stand ready to pounce on any speech they deem problematic. Yet unhung comments like these get a complete free pass—a complete free pass.

When our country needs unity, they are trying to divide. When our Nation needs bipartisan solutions, they are staging partisan theater. This is political nonsense elevated to an art form.

In a body that has amendments and substitute amendments, it is nonsense to say a police reform bill cannot be passed without a point for a police reform bill. It is nonsense for Democrats to say that, because they want to change Senator Scott’s bill, they are going to block the Senate from taking it up and amending it. If they are confident in their positions, they should embrace the amendment process. If they aren’t confident their views will persuade others, that just underscores why they don’t get to insert these views in advance—without their consent.

Do not let the Senate take up the subject of police reform at all—at all—unless I pre-negotiate with the minority leader and write an equivalent of a fig leaf, something that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass. The only way to a bipartisan product, pass it, is for the minority leader and the majority leader to work together to produce a product that provides a little cover but no real assurance of a product. If you don’t get to insert these views in advance, you cannot expect a final product, it will not pass.
In response to the brutal killing of George Floyd—his wind pipe crushed by a police officer—my Republican friends drafted a bill that does not even fully ban the type of brutal tactics that led to his death.

In response to the death of Breonna Taylor, killed by police executing a no-knock warrant, my Republican friends have drafted a bill that doesn’t even ban that type of tactic—what weak tea. For Leader MCCONNELL to come on the floor with this bill and say he is solving the problem—no one believes that, except maybe a few ideologues who really don’t want to solve the problem to begin with.

The bill doesn’t ban choke holds. It doesn’t back no-knock warrants. It does nothing to stop profiling, the militarization of police or reform, use of force standards, and qualified immunity—all of the things that need to be done, almost none of which are in this bill.

The last piece is particularly surprising. So much of the anger in the country right now is directed at the lack of accountability for police officers who violate Americans’ rights. As far as I can tell, the Republican bill does not even attempt one single-minded reform—not one—to bring more accountability to police officers who are guilty of misconduct.

If you present a bill, as Republicans have here in the Senate, that does nothing on accountability and say they are solving or dealing with the problem in even close to an adequate way, they are sadly mistaken. No one—no one—believes that.

I could spend more time in describing what the Republican bill doesn’t do than what it does do. The harsh fact of the matter is the bill is so deeply, fundamentally, and irrevocably flawed, it cannot serve as a useful starting point for real reform.

Don’t ask me. Don’t ask the Democrats here. Ask the leading civil rights organizations, which have declared their strong opposition not only to this bill but have urged us not to move forward because they know this bill is a sham, a cud-de-sac, which will lead to no reform whatsoever.

Yesterday, 138 civil rights groups sent an open letter to Senators demanding that we vote no on moving to proceed today. I have the letter here.

As former President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


VOTE NO ON THE MOTION TO PROCEED—S. 3985

DEAR SENATORS: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (The Leadership Conference), a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 200 organizations to promote and protect civil and human rights in the United States, and the undersigned 138 organizations, we write to express our strong opposition to S. 3985, the Just and Unifying Solutions to Invoke the Communities Everywhere (JUSTICE) Act. The JUSTICE Act is the largest, most comprehensive and needed response to the decades of pain, hardship, and devastation that Black people have and continue to endure as a result of systemic racism and law policies that fail to hold accountable for misconduct. This bill fails woefully short of the comprehensive reform needed to address the current policing crisis and achieve meaningful law enforcement accountability. It is deeply problematic to meet this moment with a menial incremental approach that offers more piecemeal reforms to try to effectively address the constant loss of Black lives at the hands of police. We therefore urge you to oppose the JUSTICE Act when it is called for vote and as it is brought when this legislation is brought to the floor. The Leadership Conference will score this vote in our voting record for the 116th Congress.

Abusive policing practices, coupled with devastating state-sanctioned violence, have exacted systemic brutality and fatality upon Black people since our nation’s founding. Police have shot and killed more than 1,000 people in the United States over the past year, and Black people are disproportionately more likely to be killed by police. The chronic structural issue of police killings and lawlessness against Black people have escalated to a boiling point in recent weeks following the deaths of individuals like Breonna Taylor, Dreasjon ‘Sean’ Reed, George Floyd, Tony McDade, and others.

The current protests in our cities are a response not only to the unjust policing of Black people, but also a call for action to public officials to enact bold, comprehensive, and structural change.

That is why on June 1, 2020, The Leadership Conference sent Congress a letter outlining accountability principles that must be adopted as a baseline to address rampant, systemic, white supremacy in law enforcement across America. In less than 12 hours, more than 450 of this country’s most diverse civil rights, civil liberties, and racial justice organizations signed onto that letter because what was asked of Congress aligned with what advocates, policing experts, and other stakeholders agree is needed. The priorities are clear. The country is in crisis, but reflecting a bare minimum of what must be included in any policing legislation Congress adopts in order for systemic reform to occur. These priorities are: (1) the creation of a police misconduct registry; (5) the inclusion of a “reckless” standard in 18 U.S.C. Section 242 that enshrines federal civil and law enforcement accountability for criminal civil rights violations; (6) a prohibition on no-knock warrants, especially in drug cases; (7) the elimination of the qualified immunity, which allows officers and other government actors to evade accountability when they violate individuals’ rights; and (8) the demilitarization of law enforcement agencies. This accountability framework is reflected in S. 3912, the Justice in Policing Act of 2020.

Unfortunately, this legislation is brought to the floor. The Leadership Conference hereby score this vote in our voting record for the 116th Congress.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, A Little Piece Of Light, ActionAid USA, AFGE Local 3594, African American Ministers In Conscience, Alabama State Association of Cooperatives, Alianza Americas, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, American Association of Law Enforcement Administrators, American Family Voices, American Federation of Teachers, American Federation of
Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), American Humanist Asso- 
ciation, American Indian Mothers Inc., American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Com- mittee, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Amnesty International USA, Ar-
kanse United.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC, Atrisco Community, Autistic Self Ad-
vocacy Network, Autistic Women and Non-
binary Network, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Borgen Institute, Center for 
Human Rights Education and Awareness, Center for Constitutional Rights, Center 
for Economic and Social Justice, Center for Humane Technology, Center for Non-
violece, Center for Responsibility and Progress, Center for the Study of Hate & Extremism-
California State University, San Bernardino; Chi-Tay Vitit, Church of the Lukomite National Affairs Office, Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues, Climate Reality Project, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, Coalition on Human Needs, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, Common Cause.

CommonSpirit Health, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Constitutional Account-
ability Center, Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), CURE (Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Offenders), Daniel Johnson Set Project, Defending Rights & Dissent, Dem-
and Progress, DemCast USA, Democracy 21, Drug Policy Alliance, Earthjustice, End Pediatric AIDS, Family and Elder Care (FACL), Family Service Agency of Nevada, Farm-
worker Association of Florida, Farmworker Justice, Farmworkers Association of North America, Federation for the Study of Hate & Extremism-Cali-
ifornia State University, San Jose; Foundation for the Study of Ethnocultural Diversity, Foundation for the Study of 
Hatred & Extremism, Foundation for the Study of Hate & Extremism—California State 

Human Rights Campaign, Human Rights First, Integration Hub, Indivisibility, Interac-
culture Project, Japanese American Citizens League, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Joint Action Committee, Justice in Aging, Justice in Primary Care, Justice in Research, Kansas Black Farmers Association Inc, Lambda Legal, Landowners Association of Texas, Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights, League of Women Voters of the United States, MennoNite Central Commit-

Muslim Advocates, NAACP, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Action Network, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Association of Human Rights Workers, National Association of Social Workers, National Center for Transgender Equality, National Council of Churches, Na-
tional Council on Independent Living, Na-
tional Democratic College, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Edu-
cation Association, National Employment Law Project, National Equality Action Team (NEAT), National Housing Law Project, Na-
tional Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Asso-
ciation, National LGBTQ Task Force Action 

National Resources Defense Council, NET-
WORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, New America’s Open Technology Institute, Oklah-
aoma Black Historical Research Project, Inc.; Open Society Policy Center, Oxfam America, People For the American Way, People's Action, Pesticide Action Net-
work, PFLAG National, Prison Policy Initia-
tive, Public Forum, Public Justice, Public In-
ternational, RAICES, Restore The Fourth, Rural Advancement Fund of the Na-
tional Sharecroppers Fund, Rural Coalition, Silver Rights, Silver Rights, Sierr-
aville Nevada.

Southern Border Communities Coalition, SPLC Action Fund, Stand for Children, Stand With Students for Education Rights, T'ruah, Texas Progressive Ac-
tion Network, Texas Watch, The Agenda

Project, The Black Alliance for Just Immi-
grantation (BAJI), The Daniel Initiative, The 
Sikh Coalition, The Workers Circle, Union 
for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, United Healthcare for America, United 
SIKHs, United We Dream Action, Voices for Progress, Win Without War, Wom-
ans’ Equity Action Team, Women Voters Action Network, Texas Watch, The Agenda

Whom do you believe, America—the NAACP or 
the Republican caucus? Whom do you be-
lieve, America—the lawyer for the Tay-
lor and Floyd families or Donald 
Trump, who has these Members quak-
ing in their boots if they do something 
that he doesn’t like?

What’s one of the other reasons we are in 
such a pickle here? They are so afraid of Donald Trump, who is willing to 
say overtly racist statements, like “Kung Flu” several times yesterday, that 
they can’t even bring themselves to pass this bill on the floor. And has a 
modicum of respect from the civil rights community? When you call it “menial,” you are not respecting a bill. 

The NAACP Legal Defense and Edu-
cational Fund, founded by the great 
Justice Thurgood Marshall—here is what it said. They have been fighting for 
these things for 80 on years, not 8 days. “It cannot support legislation that is not an account-
ability framework for law enforcement who engage in misconduct.”

Again, Benjamin Crump, the lawyer, said: The Republican legisla-
tion is “in direct contrast to the de-
mands of the people” who have been 
protesting; and “the Black Community is 
shorted lip service, and shocked that 
the [Republican proposal] can be thought of as legislation.” That is 
the lawyer for the Taylor and Floyd fami-
lies. Leader McConnell has invited 
their names—that is the right thing to 
do—but then deviates totally from 
what their lawyer says needs to be done to deal with these kinds of deaths. 

Again, Benjamin Crump, the lawyer for 
the Floyd and Taylor families: “The 
Black community is tired of the lip 
service, and shocked that the [Repub-
llican proposal] can [even] be thought of as legislation.”

Don’t get on your sanctimonious 
horse, Leader McConnell. You have 
the Black civil rights community 
behind you.

The most prominent civil rights 
groups in our Nation’s history are 
speaking. The lawyer representing the 
families of Americans who have lost 
their loved ones at the hands of those 
who are sworn to protect and serve are 
speaking. They have one simple, urgent 
goal, and it has nothing to do with pol-
itics.

Leader McConnell accuses what we 
are doing as being filled with politics. 
Does Leader McConnell accuse all 138 
civil rights organizations of wanting to 
do this for politics? No, no. I think 
the ship is on the others, too. I think 
the politics here is that Leader McCon-
 nell wants to show that he is doing 
something and get nothing done.

He may be afraid of President Trump. He 
is afraid of the civil rights organi-
izations. I don’t know what it is.

Here is what they say in their letter: “We therefore urge you”—the Sen-
ator—“to oppose the JUSTICE Act and vote no on the motion to proceed.”

I dare the leader to come out here and say they are playing politics—
come right out and say it—because it is false, and we, the Democrats, are aligned with what they believe.

This morning, we heard more predictable histrionics from the Republican leader—the accusation of mindless obstruction and outrageous hypocrisy. Leader McConnell should spare us the lectures about how laws get made. He knows how. It is through bipartisanship. The leader talks about bipartisanship and introduces a totally partisan bill with products of a process where Democrats have had no input. That is partisanship.

Do you want to be bipartisan, Leader McConnell? Sit down, assemble a group on your side, side, side, maybe Senators Booker and Harris, who are greatly respected; and a few others. Let them sit down and come up with a proposal. It does not have to be behind closed doors.

The leader is worried about closed doors? There is something called the Judiciary Committee. It doesn’t meet in secret. Why wasn’t this bill referred to the Judiciary Committee? Something as important as policing reform, as Senator Harris said, they would have gone through that to begin with.

Let me repeat: Republicans came here, dropped the bill on the floor, and said: Take it or leave it. Even if we believed in these ideas, if they believed in these ideas, as Senator Harris said, they would have put them in the bill to begin with. They didn’t.

The Republican majority has given the Senate a bad bill and no conceivable way to sufficiently improve it. Senator McConnell—cleverly, maybe cynically—designed a legislative cul-de-sac from which no bill—no bill at all—could emerge. And whether the bill lacks 60 votes now or 60 votes in a few days, we know the Republican leader will accuse Democrats of filibustering and claiming we are the opponents of progress, as he did this morning.

Please, does anyone believe that Democrats are obstacles to reforming our police departments? Does anyone believe that? We announced a much bolder, stronger, better, more effective bill 3 weeks ago. And, unlike the Republican legislation, the Justice in Policing Act actually passed the House. When it passes the House, the Nation is going to say, Leader McConnell: Get something moving in the Senate. And Leader McConnell knows, and everyone in this body knows, that you have to do that in a bipartisan way. That is how the Senate has always worked and still does.

Senate Republicans and their President, who proclaims we should cherish the memory of Confederate traitors who fought to preserve slavery, who gleefully called the coronavirus “Kung Flu,” with hardly a word of criticism from his party, expects you to believe that Republicans, the true champions of racial justice and police reform? That is what Senate Republicans want America to believe, and America isn’t buying it.

The same majority that has demonstrated a complete lack of urgency to address the public health and economic crises that are devastating Black America, the same Republican majority that has run a conveyor belt of anti-civil rights votes for judicial nominees, including one today—today, the very same day we vote on policing reform—wants you to believe that they want to get something done. As they say in Brooklyn, forget about it.

When you hear President Trump and Senator McConnell trying to cast blame for lack of progress on police reform, I have one word for you: Consider the source. Look at their history. Look at what they have done. Look at just today. Leader McConnell proudly brags that he is putting someone on the Fifth Circuit who has opposed voting rights for his whole career. That is who wants to move things forward? I doubt it.

Here is the truth. Senator McConnell has been around a long time and knows how to produce a workable outcome in the Senate if he really wants to. We have done it before on criminal justice reform, on annual budgets, on the national defense bill, and on the lands package we just passed.

Even on difficult issues like immigration, the obstruction if the leadership allows it to. In 2013, a bipartisan group of Senators produced compromise immigration legislation that garnered two-thirds of this Chamber on immigration, no less. What do bills that pass have in common? Bipartisan sponsorship, and support. What does this bill have? Only partisan support. Not a single Democrat supports this bill, their bill.

While I certainly feel obligated to point out the contradictions and hypocrisy in the Republican leader’s statements and history, I am not dismayed by the likely failure of the Republican bill today. All is not lost. There is a better path and one we should take once this bill fails to go forward.

After this bill goes down, there should be bipartisan discussions with the object of coming together around a constructive starting point for police reform. Leader McConnell can pick a few of his Members as negotiators. I could designate a few from our caucus. They can sit down, talk to one another, and find a bill that we are ready to start debating. We could send that bill to the committee and have an open process, as it would be refined. This is an important issue.

That, Leader McConnell, is what successful legislating will be. I have no doubt that we could with a bill that is ready for the floor in a few weeks. We know how to do this. But in the rush to get this issue off their backs, to check some political box and move on, my Republican colleagues have forgotten or are simply ignoring everything they know about how the Senate works.

My hope, my prayer is that after this bill fails today, after Leader McConnell’s path reaches its preordained dead end, we can start down the path of bipartisanship—real bipartisanship—not a bill designed to be put on the floor by one party.

If Americans of all ages and colors and of all faiths can join together in a righteous chorus calling for change, as they have in big cities and small towns across America, then we in the Senate can at least try to come together to deliver it—Democrats and Republicans working together to solve an age-old problem that is a deep wound in America.

These past few weeks have magnified a very old wound in our country. The binding up of that wound is a project that demands more from all of us: Black Americans, White Americans, police departments, and the protesters in the streets—Democrats and Republicans.

So, please, let us not once again retreat to our partisan corners after today’s vote. Let us appeal, instead, to the better angels of our nature, reach out to one another, Democrats and Republicans, and try to forge a path forward together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Loeffler). The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, in just a few minutes, we will vote on whether to move forward on Senator Scott’s policing reform bill.

We are at a turning point in our Nation’s history—a moment when Americans of every background and political persuasion are united in a call for change. We have a chance to give it to them. Over the course of the next couple of weeks, we will have a chance to pass legislation that will permanently reform policing in this country—legislation that will improve training, increase accountability, and give increased security to families who worry that their sons or daughters could be the next George Floyd or Breonna Taylor. Senator Scott’s legislation, the Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere Act, or the JUSTICE Act, is a product of years of serious work. It is an extensive bill that focuses on a number of areas that call for reform.

Make no mistake about it. When the Democrats vote today, if they do—and, I hope, there will be enough of them
who will not, so as to allow this legislation to move forward—they will be voting to block police reform legislation, because that is what this is. This is not Senator Mcconnell’s bill. The Democratic leader kept attacking Sen- tor Mcconnell and the McConnell legislation. This is a Tim Scott bill, crafted with input from other Sen- ators, with input from communities of color from across this country, and with input from the law enforcement community, who are deeply concerned about not just talking about this issue but about actually solving this issue, people who care about action. The Democratic objection and vote to block this legislation—from moving forward—will prevent an open debate in front of the entire American public about an issue that has generated a tremendous amount of controversy, not only cur- rently but throughout our Nation’s history.

We cannot change our past—there are parts of it that we are not proud of—but we can change our future, and that could start today with this vote to get on this bill and then to have an open debate.

The leader has promised that, if we can get on this bill, we will have an amendment process. If there are things in the bill that people on either side of the aisle think can be improved on, they will have an opportunity to offer amendments to make those improve- ments. Yet, by not even getting on the bill, they will be saying to the American people that we don’t care about your concern about this legislation. That is not a McConnell bill. It is a Tim Scott bill. He is someone who has per- formed as a U.S. Senator. He wants a solution. He wants a debate. He views this as a messaging exercise. He views this as about not talking about this issue. This is about whether or not this body—100 U.S. Senators—has listened enough to what is going on around this country to say: We want to have this debate. We want to get on this bill, and we want to have it in public, in the light of day, in front of the American people, not behind closed doors—an open debate, a fulsome debate, in which amendments can be offered and in- cluded in the legislation. That is what this vote today is about.

Now, the Democrats will say that, if you allow us to get on the bill, then they will have no control over what the final contents. Well, actually, they will, because it is not just a 60- vote threshold to get on the bill; it is a 60-vote threshold to get off the bill. So, if you want to stop this some- where—anywhere in the process—you have to pay that price. You will have to float the bill, because it will take 60 votes to move it forward and to ultimately pass it, not just to get on it.

It takes 60 votes—a supermajority—here in the Senate. I think it is fair to say that, historically, the way the Senate has worked on major pieces of legislation is it ends up being bipar- tisan because of the 60-vote threshold. There hasn’t been a time since the pop- ular election of Senators, at least on the Republican side, when we have had more than 55 votes in the U.S. Senate. The Democrats have had 60 a few times throughout history, but the Repub- licans have never had more than 55. So, the idea that you can change it, and you will have a bipartisan solution, and we know that the Democrats’ voice matters. We know that, in the end, if you are going to have a bipartisan product, you are going to have to have input from both sides.

That is what this is about. It is about getting on the bill that has been ad- vanced and put forward by an indi- vidual, Tim Scott—it is a Tim Scott bill—again, with input from others. It is not a McConnell bill. It is a Tim Scott bill. He is someone who has per- sonally experienced and felt the very frustration and anger that is being voiced by the American people across the country. He wants a solution. He doesn’t want a messaging bill. We want a solution.

Let me just tell you quickly about a few of the things that are in this bill, which I think suggest that it would be really important to get on it and to, at least, have a debate.

One of the most important sections of the bill is the George Floyd and Wal- ter Scott Notification Act, which would correct deficiencies in law en- forcement’s reporting of use-of-force incidents. Right now, the FBI’s Na- tional Use-of-Force Data Collection only receives data on about 40 percent of law enforcement officers—40 per- cent. That needs to change. The only way we can understand the scope of the problems we are facing is to have full and accurate data—a complete data picture—that will allow us to pinpoint problems in law enforce- ment, identify troubled depart- ments, and develop best practices for use-of-force and deescalation train- ing.

There are many police departments across the Nation that are doing an ex- cellent job of policing and that are keenly interested in becoming still better. I recently met with law enforce- ment leaders back in my home State of South Dakota. Among other things, they were interested in the methods of open- ing sessions with the community since George Floyd’s death, and they are supportive of new measures that will help to ensure that every officer does his job in the right way. Yet, while there are a lot of excellent police departments out there, there are also troubled departments—depart- ments that fail to train their officers properly and that overlook officer mis- behavior. We need to identify those de- partments and demand their reform. Collecting full and accurate data on use-of-force incidents will help us to do just that.

Another important section of the JUSTICE Act focuses on police deesca- lation and duty-to-intervene training. Sometimes police end up using force in situations in which force could have been avoided simply because they lack the necessary training to deescalate a situation without the use of force. It may be understandable that well-mean- ing but overwhelmed police officers who are in dangerous circumstances will sometimes resort to the use of force too quickly, but that is not a situ- ation in which we can accept. Every police officer in this country should be given the kind of training that will ensure that the use of force is restricted only to those situations in which it is abso- lutely needed. Another key area of the bill—one that is absolutely essential to getting bad cops off the streets—deals with law enforcement records retention. Too often, law enforcement officers with access to criminal records like multiple ex- cessive use-of-force complaints, man- age to transfer to new jurisdictions be- cause the hiring police departments never see their full records. That is a problem. Bad cops should not be able to abuse homes in new locations. We can prevent that from happening by ensuring that every police department is able to access the full disciplinary record of any officer it is looking to hire.

The JUSTICE Act would help to make sure these records are readily available by requiring police depart- ments to keep officers’ records for at
least 30 years. It would also require any police department that hires a new officer to obtain a full employment and disciplinary record for that officer from all of his previous departments.

There are a lot of other important measures in the JUSTICE Act—including the funding of body cameras to expand- ing minority hiring, to developing best policing practices. With this legisla-
tion, we have a real chance of improv-
ing policing in this country and of en-
suring that every officer is held to the highest standard.

Our ability to do that is going to de-
pend on one thing, and that is the will-
ningness of the Democrats to come to the
table. It was disheartening to see the De-
mocrats dismiss Senator SCOTT’s bill be-
fore it had even been released, especially because, as I said, many of
the proposals in the bill have been taken directly from earlier bipartisan
bills. The word, of course, today, is
that they are planning to block the bill with every tool at their disposal.

The Democrats have spent a lot of
time talking about police reform, but if they want to actually achieve reform
and not just talk about it, they are going
to have to decide to move beyond
politics. Senator SCOTT’s bill is a seri-
sous, wide-ranging bill. It is a common-
sense bill. It is a bill that all of us,
whichever our party, should be willing
to agree on.

As I said, the Democrats have
changes they would like to make, and
the leader has made it clear there will
be an opportunity for amendments. But
to refuse even to allow debate on this
bill suggests the Democrats are more
interested in attempting to score polit-
cal points on this issue rather than to
actually do anything about reform. I
hope that what we are hearing about
the Democrats’ plans to block this bill is
wrong. I hope—I really, sincerely,
hope—by going to see the
Democrats—some courageous ones—
come to the table and vote to move for-
ward with debate on this legislation.

We have a chance to do something
important here—a historic chance.
With the JUSTICE Act, we can perma-
nently improve policing in this country
and bring real hope to those who have
lost faith in law enforcement, but we
are going to have to stand together to
get this done. I urge my colleagues
to vote, in a few minutes, to move for-
ward on the JUSTICE Act and start the
process of reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I
come to the floor to talk about the
civil rights of all Americans and ask
my colleagues to vote for a process
today that will lead to laws that will
protect those civil rights. Unfortu-
nately, the motion to proceed to pre-
determined legislation is just a pre-
determined outcome for a weak bill.

There is no agreement today by the
majority leader and the minority lead-
er on a bipartisan bill. Everyone
around here knows the way to get good
bipartisan legislation. It starts with a
committee process that is open and
public and an amendment process. You
can, and we have, done things like
we did this morning. We had a bipo-
artian group of members together to
discuss legislation and put something
before Congress. Or you could bring up
da bipartisan bill on the Senate floor.
But that is not what is happening. That is
not what is happening.

What is happening is a predetermined
process to get a bill that is not good
enough for the American people. Vot-
ing yes is just an attempt to dictate a
weak outcome when what America
wants more than anything else is jus-
tice. They want justice, guaranteed by
a strong Federal response. Leader
MCCONNELL said, in talking about the
Republican efforts, “it would encour-
age smart reforms of law enforcement
without steamrolling states and local
communities’ constitutional powers.”
Elsewhere, he said Democrats want
to overreach, “Federalize all of the
issues.”

Well, with all due respect to the
majority leader, it is called the Federal
Civil Rights Act. There was no right to
deny Rosa Parks a seat on a bus when she was fighting for her Con-
stitutional rights. It wasn’t right to
deny African Americans access to ho-
tels or lunch counters when they were
calling for their civil rights. It wasn’t
right to use police dogs on Black
women trying to register to vote in
1964 in Mississippi when they were
fighting for their voting rights. I guar-
antee you, it is not good enough and
would not be good enough to give them
75 percent here. Rosa Parks was not
looking for 75 percent; she was looking
for someone to uphold her rights.

I spoke last night with one of my
constituents, Stan Barer, who worked
as a lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
mittee. As a lawyer, he drafted the Accom-
modations Clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as
one of his first jobs on the Senate Com-
merce Committee. Can you imagine
calling to the U.S. Senate as a young
lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
munity Committee and the first thing
you have to do is draft the Ac-
commodations Clause of the Civil Rights
Act of 1964?

I can tell you what I told him. He
tsaid: Advocates then tried to minimize
the Federal role. That is what we are
hearing today, minimize the Federal
role. Where would we be if President
Kennedy had taken that approach? He
fought for equal protection under the
law for access to education and to end
discrimination and segregation when
Southern Governors wouldn’t do so.
There is a Federal role in protecting
the civil liberties of all Americans, and
we should not be abdicating it today
with this vote.

Congress passed the Civil Rights Act
of 1871 after the Civil War when Black
Americans faced violence from the
KKK and White supremacists in South-
ern States. It gave them the right to
seek relief in Federal court when their
Constitutional rights were deprived by
someone acting in official capacity. It
is those same civil rights that we
should be upholding today, upholding
against unreasonable and excessive
force. What is happening is not police brutality. That is what the
U.S. Department of Justice is supposed
to do. It is supposed to fight to uphold
those rights. But we know we have a
problem because President Trump and
Attorney General Barr have abdicated
those responsibilities, have failed to
uphold those civil rights. Be-
cause as the top law enforcement offi-
cer in the land, Attorney General Barr
could be directing and supervising U.S.
attorneys and prosecuting those Fed-
eral crimes as violations of civil rights.

Well, I know that that is what Presi-
don Obama did. I know that he worked
hard to make sure the U.S. DOJ Civil
Rights Division oversaw pattern and
practices of police abuses and entered
a number of consent decrees with major
cities, including in my State. Yes, the
Attorney General is supposed to uphold
the law. But that is why there is a Federal
role in protecting the Constitutional
rights of all Americans. It's right to
fighting for their voting rights. It wasn't
fighting for their civil rights. It wasn't
right to deny access to public places,
there is with voting rights, just as
there is with access to public places,
just as there is a Federal role in prote-
ing bad practices to continue by not
holding someone accountable. It is
wrong to deny African Americans access
to hotels or lunch counters when they were
fighting for their civil rights. It wasn't
right to use police dogs on Black
women trying to register to vote in
1964 in Mississippi when they were
fighting for their voting rights. I guar-
antee you, it is not good enough and
would not be good enough to give them
75 percent here. Rosa Parks was not
looking for 75 percent; she was looking
for someone to uphold her rights.

I spoke last night with one of my
constituents, Stan Barer, who worked
as a lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
mittee. As a lawyer, he drafted the Accom-
modations Clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as
one of his first jobs on the Senate Com-
merce Committee. Can you imagine
calling to the U.S. Senate as a young
lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
munity Committee and the first thing
you have to do is draft the Ac-
commodations Clause of the Civil Rights
Act of 1964?

I can tell you what I told him. He
said: Advocates then tried to minimize
the Federal role. That is what we are
hearing today, minimize the Federal
role. Where would we be if President
Kennedy had taken that approach? He
fought for equal protection under the
law for access to education and to end
discrimination and segregation when
Southern Governors wouldn’t do so.
There is a Federal role in protecting
the civil liberties of all Americans, and
we should not be abdicating it today
with this vote.

Congress passed the Civil Rights Act
of 1871 after the Civil War when Black
Americans faced violence from the
KKK and White supremacists in South-
ern States. It gave them the right to
seek relief in Federal court when their
Constitutional rights were deprived by
someone acting in official capacity. It
is those same civil rights that we
should be upholding today, upholding
against unreasonable and excessive
force. What is happening is not police brutality. That is what the
U.S. Department of Justice is supposed
to do. It is supposed to fight to uphold
those rights. But we know we have a
problem because President Trump and
Attorney General Barr have abdicated
those responsibilities, have failed to
uphold those civil rights. Be-
cause as the top law enforcement offi-
cer in the land, Attorney General Barr
could be directing and supervising U.S.
attorneys and prosecuting those Fed-
eral crimes as violations of civil rights.

Well, I know that that is what Presi-
don Obama did. I know that he worked
hard to make sure the U.S. DOJ Civil
Rights Division oversaw pattern and
practices of police abuses and entered
a number of consent decrees with major
cities, including in my State. Yes, the
Attorney General is supposed to uphold
the law. But that is why there is a Federal
role in protecting the Constitutional
rights of all Americans. It's right to
fighting for their voting rights. It wasn't
fighting for their civil rights. It wasn't
right to deny access to public places,
there is with voting rights, just as
there is with access to public places,
just as there is a Federal role in prote-
ing bad practices to continue by not
holding someone accountable. It is
wrong to deny African Americans access
to hotels or lunch counters when they were
fighting for their civil rights. It wasn't
right to use police dogs on Black
women trying to register to vote in
1964 in Mississippi when they were
fighting for their voting rights. I guar-
antee you, it is not good enough and
would not be good enough to give them
75 percent here. Rosa Parks was not
looking for 75 percent; she was looking
for someone to uphold her rights.

I spoke last night with one of my
constituents, Stan Barer, who worked
as a lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
mittee. As a lawyer, he drafted the Accom-
modations Clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as
one of his first jobs on the Senate Com-
merce Committee. Can you imagine
calling to the U.S. Senate as a young
lawyer and getting a job on the Com-
munity Committee and the first thing
you have to do is draft the Ac-
commodations Clause of the Civil Rights
Act of 1964?
by police? Are we going to uphold the rights of all Americans, or just some Americans? I would say to my colleagues, if we are not upholding all the Americans’ rights, then we aren’t really upholding America’s civil rights. We have to ask ourselves, what most people who wereRavenwood thinks 75 percent is enough, and it is study and analysis, when we are talking about protecting the rights of all Americans?

My mom has been ill and so I’ve been spending a lot of time with her talking about family history, talking about this moment in our history, and she told me a story of how she was a young girl. She was born in 1932, so you can imagine the era that she lived through. But she told me when her older brother got to go to school, she got to stay home and ride his tricycle, so she thought that was the best. You know, he started kindergarten, she could ride his tricycle up and down the alley. And she met a man, an African-American woman, who became her friend—her first real friend as a young child.

And she got to know that woman so well that my grandparents, in the neighboring building, helped with an election and saw each other in this crisis. But the girls were lined up to vote. White people were allowed to come into the building and be warm, but the African-American people had to stay outside in the cold and wouldn’t be allowed to come into the building to vote, a great discouragement. Thank God my grandfather went out and built a bonfire and then left to go to work.

But when you look at the history of our country—and we still see voter suppression issues today—that is why we have to ask ourselves the fundamental question. When it comes to the civil rights of Americans, a report, 75 percent, is not enough. A clear line needs to have the confidence of the American people and our friends and our fellow Americans in the last many weeks. It is clear to us that we have more work to do to make justice all become a reality for every American.

We are a nation of laws, but those laws have to be enforced fairly and equally. To truly be effective, the police need to have the confidence of the communities they serve, and in many cases today, that is just not the case. That trust and confidence must be earned, however. Clearly, there is much work to do on this front to build up mutual trust.

Today we have an opportunity to do something to start a process. Words are cheap in this body. I hope not to add to that empty words. I hope not to add to that
ty to Black preachers in that community.

Deep South, Martin Luther King wrote a letter from a jail cell in Birmingham to Black preachers in that community. He encouraged them to turn away from the violence that had such a poten-

cially devastating impact and to seek reform peacefully; that in the long term, that was the better approach. My father had me read that letter. I gave a speech a couple years ago, and I quoted from that letter. It meant something to me as a young White man in the Deep South.

Almost 57 years ago, on the other end of the National Mall from where we stand today, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., I believe, changed the world—certainly, his dream lives.

Standing before thousands of people, he shared his dream. He dreamed of a world where justice would prevail over prejudice. He dreamed of an America where everyone would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the depth of their character.

Since that day in 1963, a lot has changed in our country for the better. Unfortunately, Dr. King’s vision of racial justice and, and have spent a lot of time reflecting and praying for our country

We need to make sure that the fundamental issue of fairness is upheld by all law enforcement agencies so everyone is treated equally, fairly, period. The tragedies we have seen are unacceptable by any measure, and I don’t think anybody in America thinks that what we have seen is right. Those who are responsible need to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we need to put a full stop to it right now. But that fight starts today, I believe, here in the U.S. Senate.

Like so many Americans, my wife Bonnie and I, have spent a lot of time reflecting and praying for our country and our friends and our fellow Americans in the last many weeks. It is clear to us that we have more work to do to make justice all become a reality for every American.

We are a nation of laws, but those laws have to be enforced fairly and equally. To truly be effective, the police need to have the confidence of the communities they serve, and in many cases today, that is just not the case. That trust and confidence must be earned, however. Clearly, there is much work to do on this front to build up mutual trust.

I had a conversation with two grandmothers last week—well-educated, successful women of color, in positions of tremendous responsibility—and we talked about how their perspective and my perspective differed and how we saw the world, but the most telling thing in that conversation was how they told me their No. 1 concern was for their grandchildren and how their grandchildren would be treated by members of the police force in their communities. That is a tragedy, and we can do something about it.

This issue is personal to me. Growing up in middle Georgia in the 1960s, I have seen the devastation of racism, discrimination, a lack of equality, prejudice. As the son of two public school teachers, I saw how it weighed on my parents during that time. All they wanted was for every child to be treated equally, regardless of where they came from, what their name was, or the color of their skin.

Understand, I grew up in a military town, and we had people there from all over the world. So this wasn’t an idle conversation; this was an objective need to live the single day. They wanted every child to have the same simple opportunity.

As superintendent of schools in our county, my father successfully integrated our school system—I remember that as a young kid—one of the first counties to do that in our State. They did it there without incident. It was a military town. We had people, again, from all over the world, and it was a joint effort. My dad did not do it because it was the easy thing to do; he did it because it was the right thing to do.

In my own life, I have been blessed to have interacted with people from all over the world in my career. My hometown of Warner Robins is a military town. I went to school there, went to church there, and played ball there with people literally from all over the world. Later on, my wife Bonnie and I had the opportunity to live around the world and see different places. This challenged our perspective in many ways. It helped us develop a deeper appreciation of how America’s diversity is at once our greatest asset and, yes, sometimes our greatest challenge.

However, I also recognize that as a White man, my perspective is by definition very different from those of African Americans in my own community. We have these conversations all the time. I know I could never fully appreciate the pain and struggle many African Americans have faced in my lifetime and still face today. That is wrong. We can fix that starting today or at least start down that road again.

Yes, we have made a lot of progress—I can see that in my own lifetime—but that is no reason to ignore the situation today or to sit back and not do anything. However, as Dr. King said at the Lincoln Memorial, we will “not be satisfied until justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream.”

Right now, the Senate has the opportunity to fight for justice for all. Today we will be voting to—it is a technicality, but it is a motion to proceed. This is nothing more than to just start on the bill.

I hear my Democratic colleagues talking about, well, it is not perfect; it is only 75 percent of the solution. Well, OK, Great. Let’s start there. The purpose of a motion to proceed is to put a bill on the floor and actually debate it, have amendments. This bill is not perfect. It doesn’t satisfy all the things I want to do. But it is a start. I plan to
offer amendments. I am sure the Presiding Officer wants to offer amendments. We welcome amendments in this process. The majority leader has said we will have an open amendment process. What we want to do is offer up this as a starting point, not a final solution.

Today we will have the vote on whether to start actually working on the JUSTICE Act. Senator Tim Scott has led a small task force to come up with the starting point—a bill that we can actually put our hands on, read, and then start changing. I am proud to be a cosponsor. We have many cosponsors. I think that we will probably have a unanimous vote on that on the Republican side today. My prayer is that we will have many on the Democratic side say: Look, we understand it is not perfect. We want this. We want that.

Let’s put in the work, and let’s start working on this now. It should be a foregone conclusion that we get overwhelming bipartisan support to debate the bill. Let’s make it a good law. If it is not to your satisfaction, fine. Let’s debate it.

Some say: Well, we don’t trust the majority leader.

You don’t have to trust the majority leader. The rules of the Senate protect each individual Senator once we put the bill on the floor. We have allowed the Democrats to do things like this where we went on the floor and tried to debate a bill to even go to the final vote.

All we are pleading for today is a motion to proceed to allow this bill to go on the floor and be fully debated. It is simply a starting point for debate and true compromise. Isn’t that what our job is? Isn’t that what we are supposed to do?

I ask my Democratic colleagues this: What major bill has come before this body in perfect form at the very outset? I can’t think of any. If you have issues with this bill, let’s debate it and offer amendments. Don’t let perfect be the enemy of the good, please.

On major issues like this, it is our duty to come together. It is our duty to find common ground. It is our duty to fight for what is right.

This bill offers meaningful solutions that will help build trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. These are just ideas. It provides solutions that all of us can get behind right now.

In addition to modifying the rules concerning the use of force and providing body cams, this bill does several critical things to establish that trust and provide additional funding to help improve police forces.

First, it incentivizes police recruiting to reflect the demographics of the communities they serve. How simple is that? This is a big step. If the police live in the communities, if they reflect the demographics of that community, if they identify with the people of that community, it is a lot easier to develop trust and common ground.

Second, this bill encourages deescalation training for law enforcement officers. This will help law enforcement develop the skills and techniques they need to prevent public interactions that lead to the violence we have seen of late.

Third, this bill creates a database that helps our communities root out those who do not serve the public even though they are enforcing law.

The bottom line is that the bill increases funding for law enforcement. It doesn’t defend law enforcement or eliminate the police force.

These solutions we are offering up as a starting point today are meaningful. They will restore the confidence of our communities and hold accountable police officers whose positions or who are poorly trained.

Most of us who truly want change also understand that eliminating police forces is not the answer, as some suggest. Our police forces are to serve and protect our communities—all of our communities—and there needs to be change before they can be successful in that.

We have proven in the past that we can come together to fight for what is right. We did when we provided permanent funding for our HBCUs, our historically Black colleges and universities. We did it when we created opportunity zones in hundreds of communities of color around the country, many of them economically challenged. In 2018, when we passed the bipartisan criminal justice reform bill—the biggest one in the last 50 years—that was true progress. We did it. We can do it again today, but first we have to start the debate. We have to pass this motion to proceed, or—guess what—no debate will happen. They will talk to their base, Republicans will talk to our base, and nothing will happen. A pox on all of us if we let that happen.

If Democrats shut down this bill today, it will demonstrate a lack of sincerity, in my opinion, to at least engage in finding solutions. This is no different from the immigration conversation we had just a couple years ago. When the President of the United States, Donald Trump, offered up a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million DACA recipients and we couldn’t even get a debate going with the other side—they turned it down out of hand because it was President Trump’s suggestion.

All of us need to remember that while we look different, we might talk differently, we certainly may think differently, we really are one Nation under God.

Our diversity is our strength. It makes us different. It makes us stronger. It makes us the leader of the world in the 21st century. What unites us is far greater than what divides us.

Let’s work on this bill today and start building a more perfect union for every American. Let’s vote yes on this motion to proceed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the roll-call vote.

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

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, we come here today with an opportunity to say to America and specifically to communities of color: We see you. We hear you. I have experienced your pain.

I have been stopped 18 times in the last two decades, and 1 year, I was stopped seven times, as an elected official in this body, trying to get into the Chamber and into the office buildings on the congressional side.

I understand some part of what too many have experienced. This police reform legislation addresses that. It provides clear opportunities for us to say: Not only do we hear you, not only do we see you, but we are responding to your pain, because we in America believe that justice should be applied equally to all of our citizens, with no exceptions, and when we see exceptions, it is our responsibility to do something about those exceptions, and this legislation helps us get there.

I say to my colleagues on the other side, we received a letter from Senator Schumer saying that there were five things about the JUSTICE Act that did not meet their principles. My response was a simple one: Let’s have five amendments on those things. If we can get the votes on these two sides of the Chamber, we should include that in the legislation.

I have talked with other Senators on the other side who said that there are more than five things that we need to have a conversation about. I said: Let’s include an amendment for every single
issue you have. They did not stick around for that meeting.

My concern is that 80 percent just won't do. My concern is that our friends on the other side will not take advantage of this opportunity to say to the communities that are suffering: We see you. We hear you. We are willing to respond as one body.

I implore all of us to vote for the motion to proceed so that if there are recommendations that come in the form of amendments, we have a vote up or down on those amendments. I have offered as many amendments as necessary for this bill to be seen by the public, and, in consultation with the other side, let it be their bill—not Tim Scott’s bill, not the Republican bill, not the Democrat bill, but a bill that starts to address the issues that have plagued this Nation for decades.

This is not my first start at this legislation. I started on this bill 5 years ago, but I could not find voices that would push forward reforms brought to our attention by the Walter Scott shooting in 2015.

I will close with this: I respect people with whom I disagree. They have the right to disagree. My pastor tells me I have the right to be wrong, which means I am not right all the time. But on this bill, if you don’t think we are right, make it better. Don’t walk away. Vote for the motion to proceed so that we have an opportunity to deal with this very real threat to the America that is civil, that is balanced. This is an opportunity to say yes—to say yes not to us but to those folks who are waiting for our leadership to stand and be counted.

VOTE ON WILSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wilson nomination?

Mr. LEE. I call 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

{[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexander</th>
<th>Gardner</th>
<th>Portman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barasso</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Risch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>Romney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
<td>Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
<td>Sasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappo</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Scott (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Scott (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td>Lankford</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td>Loeffler</td>
<td>Thune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>Tillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>McSally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>Toomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>Markowski</td>
<td>Wicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Perdue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS—48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldwin</th>
<th>Harris</th>
<th>Reed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benet</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker</td>
<td>Hirano</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Schauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
<td>Shaheen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Sinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Leaky</td>
<td>Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Markley</td>
<td>Udale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Masto</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
<td>Van Hollen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Merkley</td>
<td>Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinsteins</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilibrand</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Wyden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3966, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Ben Sasse, Steve Daines, Rob Portman, John Cornyn, David Perdue, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Todd Young, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3966, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory for this bill, not the Republican bill, not the Democrat bill, but a bill that starts to address the issues that have plagued this Nation for decades.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to explain the reason I changed to no.

I am in strong support of the bill that has been crafted by the Senator from South Carolina. In order to have an opportunity to reconsider the vote without waiting for 2 days, I changed my nay and moved to reconsider, which means that it could come back at any time should progress be made.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA-

TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR

2021—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

{[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldwin</th>
<th>Harris</th>
<th>Rosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benet</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker</td>
<td>Hirano</td>
<td>Schauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Shaheen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
<td>Sinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
<td>Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Leaky</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
<td>Udale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Markley</td>
<td>Van Hollen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez Masto</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
<td>Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Merkley</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinsteins</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Wyden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilibrand</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS—45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldwin</th>
<th>Harris</th>
<th>Rosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benet</td>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker</td>
<td>Hirano</td>
<td>Schauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Shaheen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
<td>Sinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
<td>Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Leaky</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
<td>Udale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Markley</td>
<td>Van Hollen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilibrand</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Wyden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3966, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Ben Sasse, Steve Daines, Rob Portman, John Cornyn, David Perdue, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Todd Young, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3966, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory for this bill.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

{[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexander</th>
<th>Crapo</th>
<th>Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barasso</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Enzi</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>Ern</td>
<td>Lankford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Loeffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappo</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>McSally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
<td>Markowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
<td>Perdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Perlman</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>Perdue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Portman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Risch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The closure motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOSURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4099, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Marsha Blackburn, Joni Ernst, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Cory Gardner, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Lamar Alexander, Shelley Moore Capito, Rob Portman, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, John Thune.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I stand in strong support of and solidarity with my colleague and good friend from South Carolina, Tim Scott.

It was 5 years ago when a White man walked into a church in Charleston, SC. After going through 1 hour of Bible study—after they prayed for him and read the Bible to him—he pulled out a gun and shot the nine people in that church who were praying and Bible studying.

Not long after that, the Presiding Officer and I attended one of the services in Charleston, SC, and Tim was there. Any other city in America would not have dealt with it the way Charleston, SC, did. Charleston, SC, dealt with it with love, which is something we don’t talk about very often, and Tim Scott was there. Because of his time in grade and because of that mayor and because of the Black leaders in that town and the time in grade they had had with each other, they moved forward and overcame that tragedy.

Five years ago, Tim Scott put a bill on this floor, and we ended up then in exactly the same place we are now—doing absolutely nothing. How many more Black men and women will have to die in America before this body stops playing politics with race?

It is very clear to me, in having worked hard on justice reform, that there are opportunities—with $75 billion going into the most economically challenged communities in our country—because of Tim Scott, President Trump, and all that we are doing. HBCUs—our historically Black colleges and universities—are stronger today because of President Trump than they ever have been.

The time to act is now and to stop playing politics and pandering to the Democratic base, and let’s get something done. This bill was never intended to be an end all. It was intended to be a platform for constructive debate, and here we are with only two Democratic Senators voting to even start the debate.

I yield to Senator Tim Scott.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, there is scripture in the Bible in the Book of Ezekiel, chapter 33, somewhere around verse 6. This scripture talks about a watchman on a wall, and his job is to simply say there is danger coming. It is a very important job. The watchman’s job is to simply say there is danger coming.

As Senator Perdue said, I had that conversation, I didn’t find anyone on the other side who was willing to engage in that conversation then, and here we are 5 years later. There is danger coming. I want us to hear this clearly because, as we look out on the streets of America and we see more unrest and we see more unrest and more challenging situations, realize that there is danger coming.

The watchman’s responsibility is to call out the danger, and as the bloodshed happens, this bill was never intended to be on the hands of the watchman, but if he does not shout out, if he does not articulate that there is danger coming, then the blood will be on his hands.

There is danger coming. We are in dangerous times. The source of this danger is not the failure of this bill on this floor at this time. No, this is merely a symptom of the danger that, I believe, is right in front of us. This is only a symptom of a much deeper issue—a systemic problem. Let me explain.

I am a kid who grew up in poverty—in abject poverty in many ways. There is much worse poverty in America and, certainly, around the world than that in which I grew up. I am talking about the poverty of when you come home and hit the light switch, and there is no light. I am talking about the kind of poverty of having a phone attached to the wall, and when you picked it up, there was no one there. I am talking about the poverty of when you come home and find that your mom, who was working 16 hours a day, because I felt there was no hope in this country for a little Black boy like me—14 years old. I failed Spanish, English, world geography, and civics.

Civics, as we all know, is as close as it gets to failing politics. I will say this to my friends on the other side: I am not a Black, and I am a Republican. I don’t have the same experiences they do. I am not a Black, and I am a Republican. I don’t have the same experiences they do. How many more of our communities need a Tim Scott?

This legislation spoke to the importance of giving our communities—our neighborhoods—resources so that we can engage in justice reform, and I am hopeful that there is an opportunity with $75 billion to do exactly that, to have the opportunity to engage in that conversation.

Mr. President, there is scripture in the Bible in the Book of Ezekiel, chapter 33, somewhere around verse 6. This scripture talks about a watchman on a wall, and his job is to simply say there is danger coming. It is a very important job. The watchman’s job is to simply say there is danger coming.

As Senator Perdue said, I had that conversation. I didn’t find anyone on the other side who was willing to engage in that conversation then, and here we are 5 years later. There is danger coming. I want us to hear this clearly because, as we look out on the streets of America and we see more unrest, realize that there is danger coming. The watchman’s job is to call out the danger, and as the bloodshed happens, this bill was never intended to be on the hands of the watchman, but if he does not shout out, if he does not articulate that there is danger coming, then the blood will be on his hands.

I am a kid who grew up in poverty—in abject poverty in many ways. There is much worse poverty in America and, certainly, around the world than that in which I grew up. I am talking about the poverty of when you come home and hit the light switch, and there is no light. I am talking about the kind of poverty of having a phone attached to the wall, and when you picked it up, there was no one there. I am talking about the poverty of when you come home and find that your mom, who was working 16 hours a day, because I felt there was no hope in this country for a little Black boy like me—14 years old. I failed Spanish, English, world geography, and civics.

As the Lord would have it, I had an amazing mother who believed that it was her responsibility to pray me out of those hard situations. I found myself in, and I had the good fortune of meeting a mentor after I got through summer school, who redirected me. I pulled myself together with the help of a powerful family, a praying grandmother, and a whole lot of faith. I caught up with my class, and I graduated on time. I earned a small football scholarship. I went to college and earned a degree in political science.

Along the way, as a youngster, I joined the NAACP, I joined the Urban League. I joined many organizations in the community because I knew that part of my responsibility was to be socially engaged and to make a difference no matter how small that difference would be. Tim Scott, I didn’t even think about joining was the Republican Party. Why would I ever think about joining the Republican Party? While growing up, every African American and every Black person knew of what was wed to the Democratic Party because it was better to have a seat in the room than to be outside. That was the heritage I grew up in.

Let me fast-forward to where we are today, and I will return to that.

We lost—I lost—a vote today on a piece of legislation that would have led to the systemic change in the relationship between communities of color and the law enforcement community. We would have broken this concept in this Nation that somehow, some way, you have to either be for law enforcement or for communities of color. That is a false binary choice. It is just not true. There are problems that need to be solved. There are important issues that have brought us here today. We wouldn’t be here, as Senator Perdue alluded to, if it were not for the death of yet another African-American man, George Floyd. His murder is why the country has given us the opportunity to lead, but my friends on the other side just said no, not to the legislation. They just said no.

Why am I saying that they didn’t just say no to the legislation? It is that, along the way, I sat down with many of them and asked: What do you need?

Senator Schumer sent a letter, telling me, believe it was, Senator McConnell, that there was an amendment to the legislation that needed to be improved. I said: Let’s give them the five amendments.

I sat down with more Senators, and they said: Wait. It is not just five. Everyone asked: How about 20 amendments? And they walked out.

You see, this process is not broken because of the legislation. This is a
thought—you know, I don’t have any hair, so I didn’t pull it out, but here is what I said next. I said: Well, let’s talk about tactics, then. They said: Well, you don’t ban choke holds.

I said: Like, I could have sworn I banned choke holds in there somewhere, and then I read the bill. They don’t ban choke holds at the local level, at the State level. Do you know why? There is this little thing called the compellence of authority and power in this Nation, because we are playing small ball. We are playing with those in insulated chambers. We are playing for Presidential politics. That is small ball. Playing the big boys’ game is playing for the kids who can’t represent themselves, and if you don’t like what they are doing, you can’t change it.

I offered them opportunities—at least 20, I offered—to change it, and their answer to me was, you can’t offer us 20 amendments.

I said: Why not?

They said: Well, because MITCH MCCONNELL won’t give you 20 amendments.

I spoke to MITCH MCCONNELL. He said: You can have 20 amendments. I told them that.

We went to a press conference yesterday, and we said: An open process. They didn’t want an open process. They want one thing. I am going to get to that.

I asked my friends—I said: What is it you don’t like about where we are going?

They said: Well, tell me the problem.

We have a problem is that we are not collecting data. I am like, well, wait a second. I could have sworn when I wrote the legislation, we were collecting data. So I flipped through the pages and realized we are collecting data for serious bodily injury and death.

They said: Well, we want to collect data on all uses of force.

I said: Put it in an amendment, and I will support it.

They said: That is a Black one bone of contention. I said: Well, tell me another one.

They said: Our bone of contention is that we need you to ban no-knock warrants because of the Breonna Taylor situation.

I said: Your bill does not ban no-knock warrants for the Breonna Taylor situation; your bill bans it for Federal agents. There was not a Secret Service agent showing up at Breonna Taylor’s door; that was a local police department.

So the fact that they are saying they want to ban no-knock warrants knowing they cannot ban no-knock warrants tells me that this is not about the underlying issue. It is bigger than that.

I said: Well, I will give you an amendment, though, and we can have that fight on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

As a matter of fact, I said: Tell me any issue you have with the legislation.

Well, we went through deescalation training, the duty to intervene, best practices.

I said: In the legislation. In the legislation. In the legislation.

I thought—you know, I don’t have any hair, so I didn’t pull it out, but here is what I said next. I said: Well, let’s talk about tactics, then. They said: Well, you don’t ban choke holds.

I said: Like, I could have sworn I banned choke holds in there somewhere, and then I read the bill. They don’t ban choke holds at the local level, at the State level. Do you know why? There is this little thing called the compellence of authority and power in this Nation, because we are playing small ball. We are playing with those in insulated chambers. We are playing for Presidential politics. That is small ball. Playing the big boys’ game is playing for the kids who can’t represent themselves, and if you don’t like what they are doing, you can’t change it.
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They said: Well, tell me the problem.

We have a problem is that we are not collecting data. I am like, well, wait a second. I could have sworn when I wrote the legislation, we were collecting data. So I flipped through the pages and realized we are collecting data for serious bodily injury and death.

They said: Well, we want to collect data on all uses of force.

I said: Put it in an amendment, and I will support it.

They said: That is a Black one bone of contention. I said: Well, tell me another one.

They said: Our bone of contention is that we need you to ban no-knock warrants because of the Breonna Taylor situation.

I said: Your bill does not ban no-knock warrants for the Breonna Taylor situation; your bill bans it for Federal agents. There was not a Secret Service agent showing up at Breonna Taylor’s door; that was a local police department.

So the fact that they are saying they want to ban no-knock warrants knowing they cannot ban no-knock warrants tells me that this is not about the underlying issue. It is bigger than that.

I said: Well, I will give you an amendment, though, and we can have that fight on the floor of the U.S. Senate.
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that because the Democrats have a monopoly on the Black vote. No matter the return on their loyalty—and I am telling you, the most loyal part of the Democratic construct is Black communities—no matter the loyalty of the people we say we serve, but instead of having a debate on that today and not getting 5 amendments but 20 amendments, a managers’ amendment—instead of going forward and getting what you want now, they have decided to punt this ball until the election. Do you know why? Because they believe that the polls reflect a 15-point deficit on our side; therefore, they can get the bill they want in November. All they have to do is win the election, and then say: You know, there is a lot of work that needs to be done around the country when, instead of getting 70 percent of what you wanted, or more, you are going to get zero, and you are going to wait until the election to get more? OK. Well, why wouldn’t you take the 80 percent now, see if you can win the election, and add on the other 20 percent? You have got to be kidding me.

Because, Mr. President, they cannot allow this party to be seen as a party that reaches out to all communities in this Nation. Unfortunately, without the kind of objectivity in the media that is necessary to share these messages, what is actual law—a law that no one will ever know because if you don’t read it in the paper, it must not have happened. If you don’t see it on TV, on MSNBC or CNN, it must not be true. That is a problem.

Let me just tell you this: I think we are willing to compete for every vote everywhere, all the time. That might not be true in every corridor of the Nation, but it is true of most corridors of the Nation. And this party has reinforced that truth, not by the words coming out of my mouth but by the actual legislation signed into law.

Senator PERDUE started talking about important work that we did on opportunity zones—and I am going to wrap it up in 2 minutes here. It is lunchtime.

In 2017 we passed tax reform. I included in the opportunity zones—$75 billion. That was for the most distressed communities in this Nation. How did that happen? Well, President Trump and I had a serious disagreement on his comments after Charlottesville. He, being a person I was not looking forward to having a conversation with, invited me to the Oval Office. I sat down with him, and I said: What do you want to talk about?

The President said: Tell me about your perspective on racial history.

I was stunned because if you know President Trump like I know President Trump, his love language is not words of encouragement. It just ain’t. I know “ain’t” ain’t a word, but it is not. He listened, and at the end of our conversation, he simply said: Tell me how to work with those I have offended.

I didn’t know what to say, so I pulled out my back pocket and got opportunity zones. I didn’t go there prepared for him to listen. That is not supposed to be funny, but it is. I mean, I didn’t expect him to listen, but he did. He listened. He leaned in, and he said: Tell me how to help the folks I have offended.

I said: Let’s work on opportunity zones together.

He said: What?

He said: Yes.

He was concerned enough about the communities he had literally just offended. He was concerned enough to go for a working relationship. And that is why we have opportunity zones.

I was like, well, this might work again. So I went back to the President and said: You know, there is a lot of work that needs to be done around the HBCUs, historically Black colleges and universities. He said yes. He said yes. We said yes.

Let me just tell you this: When we started saying yes, we controlled the White House, we controlled the Senate, and we controlled the House. So it wasn’t because some Democrat came over here and said: In order to get our votes, you have to do this. That is not what happened. He said yes because the Republican Party said yes. We stood together with all three leaders of government under our control. We got opportunity zones done. We started a process of reinvesting in historically Black colleges and universities. And the head of the United Negro College Fund said at my last fly-in that this is the best race ever—his words, not mine. I am not sure what “ever” is. Maybe that is longer than I have been alive. Literally more money for HBCUs than ever—brought to you by the Republican Party.

I said: Well, that is working. Let’s do it again.

So we went to stem cell research, which—stem cell research for sickle cell anemia, which is basically speaking, 99.5 percent—African-American disease. He said yes.

LAMAR ALEXANDER, the chairman of our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—we were fighting over funding for HBCUs. We made it permanent—permanent funding for the HBCUs led by a Republican chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, President Trump signs it, and we have delivered historic funding and permanent funding for HBCUs.

Because I am running out of time, I am not going to go through the pre-pandemic numbers in minority communities for unemployment—unemployment not only at a point but what we had labor force participation rates increasing. Let me say that differently. Not only did we get more jobs for Black folks and Brown folks, but the number of folks in the community—we started having an increase in the number of folks working.

This is called basic conservative politics. It works, creating 7 million new jobs benefiting two-thirds of African Americans, Hispanics, and women, and with a full economy, all boats started rising. Don’t believe me, check your account. That is what it looks like.

COVID-19 hit us, and what did we do? We not only approved $2.3 trillion and then another $500 or so billion dollars, and $150 billion that would be multiplied in the commercial facilities by probably 7 or 8—a $6 trillion relief package. What did we do inside that package? We targeted small businesses to save small businesses, and, by the way, we added $1 billion for historically Black colleges and universities. He said yes. He said yes. We said yes.

Let me tell you what the biggest threat is. The biggest threat is that this Republican Party keeps showing up and delivering. I have 12 more pages to go. It is like being at church with my closing. I have 12 more pages of accomplishments to talk about. I am not going to talk about it. Don’t look relieved. I am not going to talk about it.

I am just here to state that if we are going to be serious about criminal justice reform—and we are—the President, the House, Senate, and the White House in the hands of Republicans. We passed criminal justice reform to make up for the Democrat bill—the 1994 crime bill that locked up disproportionately African-American men. The Republican Party passed crime justice reform with the three leaders of our hands.

I am frustrated. I am frustrated because it is not a competition for the best ideas. It is not a competition for how to improve the poorest performing schools in America in the public education system that is consistently in Black and Brown communities—that your ZIP Code determines the outcome.
of your life because you are not going to have a good education because we will not touch teachers’ unions and we will not touch education in the way that needs to be touched.

Governor Scott did it before he was a Senator. That was one of the reasons why I went down there and campaigned for him, because he was serious about helping poor kids get up and move on.

Let me just close with this. I don’t know what it is going to take to wake up and about the importance of a duopoly and not a monopoly. Look at the results. Look at the results you are getting.

By the way, when this bill is gone, and next week we are on the NDAA or something else, we will forget about this. We will move on. People will forget about it. And do you know what is going to happen? Something bad. And we will be right back here talking about what could have been done, what should have been done, why we must act. I had that conversation 5 years ago, and I am having this conversation right now. We could do something right now.

You know, here is the truth. Detroit, Atlanta, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, all of these cities could have banne d chokeholds themselves. They could have increased the police reporting themselves. They could have more data information themselves. They could have deescalation policies. They could have duty to intervene themselves, Minneapolis as well. All of these communities have been run by Democrats for decades—decades.

What is the ROI for the poorest people in this Nation? And I don’t blame them. I blame an elite political class with billions of dollars to do whatever they want to do. And look at the results for the poorest, most vulnerable people in our Nation. I am willing to compromise. Are you?

(Applause. Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I came to the floor to hear my colleague from South Carolina, with no notes and with an open heart and open ears, because I knew he would be very disappointed that the motion to proceed failed and that he would have strong feelings about that because of his earnest desire to do. I don’t question that desire or the desire of any of the cosponsors of this bill, just as I hope colleagues on the other side don’t question the sincerity of Senators Booker and Harris and those who cosponsored their bill. But I came with no notes to listen to my colleague and then to offer a word of explanation.

I am one of the 45 people who voted no. The Senator from South Carolina said that those who voted no on the motion to proceed didn’t vote on the what, we voted no on the who. That is a stiff charge. That is a stiff charge.

What I want to say is this. I voted no on the what and not on the who, but I voted no on the how. We tried it the wrong way. Let’s try it the right way. My colleague from South Carolina acts as if this discussion is over. It is only over for those who want it to be over. We tried it the wrong way. Let’s try it the right way.

What do I mean by that?

I think everyone in the Chamber knows what I mean by this. This is an amazingly important topic that is exciting deep and legitimate concerns in the streets of every community in this country.

There are two good-faith bills that have been introduced dealing with police reform. I see virtues in both. I favor the Democratic bill, but that does not mean that I don’t see virtues in the Scott bill.

I have only been in the Senate 7 years. I am not an expert on procedure, as some are who are standing in the Chamber right now, but my service tells me that a bipartisan police reform bill that will do a good job and will speak to an America that wants to see leadership that is bipartisan.

It is obvious. These bills are both in the province of a Judiciary Committee that is chaired by a Republican from South Carolina, Lindsey Graham, whose ranking member, Diane Fein- stein, has been on that committee for a very long time. Why are these bills not being taken up in a committee with bipartisan diversity on that committee? They could have duty to intervene themselves, Minneapolis as well. All of these communities have been run by Democrats for decades—decades.

How about the CARES Act? There is a recent example of this. The CARES Act was an unusual one. We were under an emergency. We were socially distant from each other. We couldn’t even be in the same room as we were negotiating it, and it was in multiple committees’ jurisdiction. So it wasn’t as if one committee was taking it up. But there was good-faith, bipartisan negotiation on the different pieces of it.

The day, Leader McConnell called us all back to Washington on a Sunday to vote—not on the bipartisan negotiated bill but on a partisan version. And, again, Democrats on this side of the aisle said: We are not ready to proceed. We are not ready to proceed to the partisan bill because we are in the middle of bipartisan discussions that will have the payoff for this country, and so we voted no—not on the what, not on the who. We voted no on the how.

We are not ready to proceed to a partisan, “my way or the highway” bill when we are engaged in bipartisan discussions that can find a solution that is good for the country. Guess what happened. Three days later, after that “no” vote, we were here on the floor voting yes—voting yes to a bipartisan bill that helped individuals and families that created the Small Business Administration program for small businesses, a loan program for large businesses, aid to State and local governments, aid to hospitals and nursing homes and healthcare providers.

We voted no on the “my way or the highway” bill and then report out a bipartisan bill. We introduce it, we let the floor in a bipartisan way?

I have been introduced dealing with police reform for him, because he was serious about it. I believe the leaders of the committee wanted to do it. I believe they were told not to do it. They were told that we are not going to use the committee process on this. We are going to force this to a floor vote, a yes vote, and then, when it goes down, we will say: Democrats killed it. It is all over. Move on to the next issue.

This is only over for anyone who wants it to be over.

I think the vote today says: We are not going to do it “my way or the highway.” We ought to do it the right way—the way we do the NDAA, the way we did the FIRST STEP Act. The FIRST STEP Act, criminal justice reform. We are in the middle of bipartisan discussions working together, in committee and then negotiating with Jared Kushner and others at the White House—we did something good that all can take credit for.

How about the CARES Act? There is a recent example of this. The CARES Act was an unusual one. We were under an emergency. We were socially distant from each other. We couldn’t even be in the same room as we were negotiating it, and it was in multiple committees’ jurisdiction. So it wasn’t as if one committee was taking it up. But there was good-faith, bipartisan negotiation on the different pieces of it.
Senator KING and I, on Monday, sent a letter to the two leaders and to the Judiciary Committee chair and ranking member, and we said: For God’s sake, with a nation that is crying out for solutions that can show some unity, please vote with this bill where we know the work and what has worked.

Let the Judiciary Committee take it up promptly and let them work and report it to the floor, and we can do this bill before the August recess and do it in a way where, in committee and on the floor, we have a chance to participate and we can get a win for the American public that is critically important. It is my hope that we will still do that.

The tenor of some of the conversations is as if this is now over, in the rear-view mirror, not to be returned to until after November. I don’t accept that. Those bills are pending. We have a Judiciary Committee that can do this work.

I will be at the Judiciary Committee this morning to introduce a judicial nominee and asked members of the committee who were there: If these bills were taken up in this committee, could you find a bipartisan result? And the answer was, not necessarily to me was that.

I didn’t vote no for the what, I didn’t vote no for the who. I voted no for the how. I know how we can do this bill, and shame on us on a matter of such seriousness if we don’t engage in a process that seriousness matches the gravity of the moment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. Sasse. The Senator from Maryland was first. I have 40 seconds to comment, but thank you.

I respect the Senator from Virginia, but I would like to note for the RECORD, as somebody who spent a lot of time in the working group under Senator SCOTT’s leadership, that Senator Kaine repeatedly said it was a “my way or the highway” approach. I just think it is really important for the RECORD for us to admit that this is an open amendment process that has been proposed, and that some of the Democrats who came to some of the meetings to negotiate were frankly stumped when Mr. Scott went from 5 amendments to 20 amendments, to whatever number you want. That is the opposite of a “my way or the highway” approach. And open amendment process where dozens have been offered is not a “my way or the highway” approach.

Mr. Kaine. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. Sasse. Yes.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is a member of the Judiciary Committee, isn’t that right?

Mr. Sasse. One of the most dysfunctional committees in the Senate—I am. Mr. Kaine. When the Senator has markups in the Judiciary Committee on a bill like the FIRST STEP Act and someone, Democrat or Republican, proposes an amendment to mark, isn’t that the standard to vote on the amendment and if the majority of the committee approves, then the amendment is added to the bill?

Mr. Sasse. There are so many different situations in the Judiciary Committee. You defined yourself as a rookie who has been here for 7 years. I am a rookie to your rookie, and I am new on Judiciary. So there are a lot of ways. The way you are defining it is usually the model, but there is a whole bunch. You asked for the question that falls into that, but perhaps there is another comment that you can make.

Mr. Kaine. My experience on every committee I have been on is that we leave it to a markup in the committee with a simple majority, not allowing a simple majority amendment process in committee, but saying “no, we will give you some amendments on the floor with a 60-vote threshold” is not the majority. I respect an individual’s ability to try to persuade the majority of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, that it is a good idea or not. That is why this bill was not sent to committee but just put on the floor, so I don’t view that as fair, to respond.

I get Senator Scott, and I appreciate him saying that we should have open amendments on the floor. But depriving people the ability to offer open amendments in a simple majority—can I convince the majority of my colleagues in the committee?—that is already stacking the deck, in my view.

Mr. Sasse. I thank the Senator for his question. I told the Senator from Maryland I would get out of his way, and I thank him for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Michael). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.
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Mr. Sasse. I thank the Senator for his question. I told the Senator from Maryland I would get out of his way, and I thank him for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Michael). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Michael). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Michael). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.
fundamental relationships with our communities, in particular the African-American community and other communities of color. We can no longer wait. We must make bold changes now.

I agree with Leader SCHUMER and Senator HARRIS, whom I believe are authors of the Justice in Policing Act. My concern is that the legislation authored by Senator SCOTT, the JUSTICE Act, fails dangerously short for what we need for comprehensive, effective, and transformational police reform by the country and the American people are demanding.

I, therefore, hope that Leader MCCONNELL will negotiate with Leader SCHUMER so we can work on a bipartisan bill and establish a constructive starting point on policing reform. I listened to the debate with Senator SCOTT and Senator Kaine, and I have seen this before. When we bring a bipartisan bill to the floor where there is no pre-arranged opportunity to offer the types of amendments that simple majority votes so the rule of the Senate can prevail and when you start from a point that cannot lead to successful conclusion, you shouldn’t start. You should go back to negotiate a truly bipartisan bill.

We should use the model of the CARES Act legislation that was signed into law in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. That was a bipartisan bill that was brought to the floor. Let me just highlight a law of my concerns with the JUSTICE Act.

This legislation does not contain any mechanisms to hold law enforcement officers accountable in court for their misconduct. For example, it makes no changes in the law when it comes to qualified immunity or criminal intent standards for law enforcement. Current legal standards have allowed law enforcement officers regularly to evade criminal liability for excessive use of force. Qualified immunity shields officers from liability, even when they violate citizens’ constitutional rights.

The JUSTICE Act does not implement a public national misconduct registry necessary to hold their law enforcement officers accountable. The JUSTICE Act fails to establish a collection of all use-of-force data, data related to religious and racial profiling, and it does nothing to end harmful policing practices like racial profiling. By contrast, the Justice in Policing Act authored by Senators Booker and Harris does contain legislation I authored, the Law Enforcement Standards Act, which takes a comprehensive approach on how local police organizations can adopt performance-based standards to ensure that instances of misconduct will be minimized through training and oversight. That legislation takes steps necessary to mitigate discriminatory profiling, resources for community development and the transformation of public safety practices.

In Baltimore, we have ongoing Federal partnerships with city law enforcement and the Federal Justice Department following the tragic death of Freddie Gray, Jr. This is an example of continued efforts to rebuild trust between communities and police and encourages the establishment of more effective police models.

The legislation I described provides public safety innovation grants to help communities reimagine and develop concrete, just, and equitable public safety approaches. This is in the Booker-Harris bill. It is not in the Scott bill. The JUSTICE Act does not adequately address the issue of no-knock warrants in drug cases, nor does it adequately address the use of choke holds. Finally, the legislation does not address the issue of establishing a national use-of-force standard.

By contrast, the Justice in Policing Act changes the use-of-force standards for officers so that deadly force be used only as a last resort, while requiring officers to employ deescalation techniques. Let me bring to my colleagues’ attention a letter dated June 23, 2020, from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

In the letter, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights states: ‘We write to express our strong opposition to S. 3965, the ... (JUSTICE Act). The JUSTICE Act is an inadequate response to the decades of pain, hardship, and devastation that Black people have and continue to endure as a result of systemic racism and lax policies that fail to hold police accountable for misconduct.

The letter goes on to say: ‘Abusive policing practices, coupled with devastating state-sanctioned violence, have exacted systemic brutality and fatality upon Black people since our country. Police have shot and killed more than 1,000 people in the United States over the past year, and Black people are disproportionately more likely than white people to be killed by police. The current protests in our cities are a response not only to the unjust policing of Black people, but also calls for action to hold public officials to enact bold, comprehensive, and structural change.’

The letter concludes: ‘...Passing watered-down legislation that fails to remedy the actual harms resulting in the loss of life is a moral statement that is inconsistent with a genuine belief that black lives matter. Anything less than full support for comprehensive legislation that holds police accountable is unacceptable.

Let me close my remarks once again by sharing some words from Dr. King, from the March on Washington in 1963. In his famous speech at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall in Washington, DC, Dr. King said: ‘...we have come to our nation’s capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence, they were的梦想ing not a nation of men—yes, black men as well as white men—would be subjected to the insidious forces of poverty, the modern slavery of segregated schools, and the contempt ofWhite citizens. They would be held up to the promise of democracy... Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy... Now is the time to make justice a reality for all God’s children. It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment...’

The House of Representatives is scheduled to pass their version of the Justice in Policing Act on Thursday. Let us take up meaningful legislation in the Senate as the base bill negotiated between Democrats and Republicans. Let us rise to the occasion and make the Founders of this Nation proud.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

To the President pro tempore: The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ErNST, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, the murder of George Floyd captured the attention and the emotions of the entire world. He was wrongfully killed by four police officers in Minneapolis. Around the world, people said they had never seen such a thing before. The police officers were charged criminally, the officer who restrained Mr. Floyd was fired, and the city of Minneapolis fired its police chief. The four officers were convicted of murder and manslaughter.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I heard your comments earlier today and I couldn’t agree more—not on the importance of us dealing with the issues that were on the floor today that we failed to deal with. I heard our good friend Senator Scott’s response to the way this bill was looked at and, frankly, ignored.

When the Congress stops resembling an honest and open discussion of the issues, I think it gives us a lot to be concerned about. The solution should be the goal. When Members of Congress are more interested in a bill that they believe to be perfect rather than seriously engaging in a debate, it raises a lot of concerns about how we protect liberty and how we do our constitutional duty.

I have been in the Congress for a while, as some of my friends are more than eager to point out, and I have never voted for a perfect bill—ever. I have introduced a couple of perfect bills, but I have never voted for a perfect bill, I have been voted for a bill that couldn’t be improved.

Our good friend Tim Scott said something the other day that struck me as a truism. He said: I think most Americans are tired of Republicans and Democrats talking about Republicans and Democrats. Most Americans, as Senator Scott’s point was made, want us to solve problems. They want us to come up not with the best answer possible; they want us to come up with the best possible answer.

What is the difference between the best answer possible and the best possible answer? The difference is figuring out when you have gotten done as much as you can get done and you decide that, in this process, you want to accept that and come back at a later time and see if you can do a little better.

They don’t want us to reject a promising solution just because someone from the other party said it first. They don’t want us to reject a promising solution just because it doesn’t solve everything.

Nothing around here happens as fast as we would like it to. Debate, discussion, and compromise all take time. Remember, the Constitution was put together by people who didn’t trust government. They didn’t want to make it easy for government to do things, and they didn’t.

One of the great successes of all time was the success of making it hard for our government to do things. It is hard to explain in other countries where they have parliamentary systems where, if the leader doesn’t get what the leader wants, the government collapses. That is not the way this government is designed at all. It is designed to take some time, but you have to be willing to take the time. It is designed
Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we just finished up a vote on the Senate floor where we fell four votes short of opening debate on a bill to deal with police reform—four votes short. We were four votes short of opening debate to take it to conference.

Every single Republican voted for this—and a handful of Democrats. But the vast majority of Democrats actually said: No, we don’t want to debate this bill. We will only debate the Pelosi bill because it doesn’t have the Republicans’ amendment.

Well, that is absurd. That didn’t happen, I can assure you, when Speaker Boehner was the leader of the House, that the Senate said “I will tell you we are going to wait and see whatever Speaker Boehner sends over to Harry Reid’ and Harry Reid would say “Oh, yes, please. We will take up whatever the Boehner bill is.” That was never done, and they know that.

This is such an odd, peculiar season in our country politically and a painful season in our country culturally and practically.

Our hope was to have a real debate on that bill. I was part of the team in writing this bill. This bill was a genuine push to reform how we do police work and to increase accountability and transparency across the country.

The bill that we just needed four Democrats to join—just four Democrats to join—to be able to open it up for debate would have banned choke holds across the country.

It would have required the reporting of all serious bodily injury or death in police custody from everywhere in the country, to start tracking all of this.

It would have gathered information on no-knock warrants all around the country to start tracking this information to see if they are being abused.

It would have put more body cameras on the street. This bill that we just needed four Democrats to join us on—just four—would have put $150 million more in body-worn cameras on the streets. This bill would have required four Democrats to join—to be able to open it up for debate would have banned choke holds across the country.

It would have had the reporting of all serious bodily injury or death in police custody from everywhere in the country, to start tracking all of this.

It would have gathered information on no-knock warrants all around the country to start tracking this information to see if they are being abused.
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It would have gathered information on no-knock warrants all around the country to start tracking this information to see if they are being abused.
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It would have had the reporting of all serious bodily injury or death in police custody from everywhere in the country, to start tracking all of this.

It would have gathered information on no-knock warrants all around the country to start tracking this information to see if they are being abused.
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It would have gathered information on no-knock warrants all around the country to start tracking this information to see if they are being abused.
training, and new requirements on an officer who is watching another officer doing something they know is wrong to intervene in that process and to stop it.

It would have a national commission to put folks together to get the best ideas from around the country, to gather the best practices that have happened.

There is also a new piece that is in this—it is not in the Pelosi bill; it is only in this bill—that deals with giving a false report if you are a police officer, because at times we will have a police officer where—when there is serious bodily injury or death, their written record doesn’t match the reality of what really happened, and it is not just that they misremembered; they intentionally turned in a false report. This bill that we wanted to just debate today would have allowed us to be able to add additional penalties onto that, to make sure someone receives the due penalty if they lie on forms.

This bill would have dealt with mental health.

This bill would have dealt with desecration training. This bill was designed to help get additional training.

The discussion on it using the Museum of African American History to design a curriculum that we could put out to every department around the country on the history of race and law enforcement. It is modeled after what we did with the Holocaust Museum to deal with anti-Semitism. That is what this bill was designed to do. We just needed four Democrats to join us. Instead, they dug in, did press releases, just needed four Democrats to join us. It is what this bill was designed to do. We need to get additional training.

I would ask any American listening to me and anyone in this room: Is there anyone out there who wants this solved. All of those things I listed are all out there. Do you know what we have talked about? We talked about a police officer facing criminal penalties, as they do now, as they should. If there is a civil case, why don’t we bring it against the department that didn’t train their officer, that didn’t supervise that officer? Instead of attacking an officer’s family, why don’t we hold people accountable to actually supervise people better and push the city and the department to do the right thing: to train and to do it the way we want it to be done, not just to lie on forms. We don’t leave them out there on the street with 18 discipline records; take them off the street. If you don’t, the whole city is going to be held to account for it. That is trying to end this. This is trying to push toward more supervision, not just trying to be punitive.

Those are the two differences that I can pick up: political and civil. Other than what I mentioned that is in our bill in their bill as well.

TIM SCOTT made a very simple statement: Why don’t we put this on the floor? Why don’t we actually debate the differences that we have? Why don’t we have a vote, and then why don’t we finish this?

Leader MCCONNELL dedicated this week and next week to this bill on police reform to give 2 weeks to do all kinds of amendments, all kinds of debate, but instead, the conversation was “No, don’t want to do that; it is Speaker PELOSI’s bill or nothing” or “Let’s just slow the whole thing down and send it to committee and delay, delay, delay this.”

Why don’t we deal with this right now? There are 2 weeks that have been set aside to do it. There is plenty of time for amendments. Why not do that instead of just blocking the bill?

I don’t know a lot of people who say to me, I really don’t think we need to put more body cameras on the street. I don’t want any more oversight on law enforcement when they turn in a false report or when they turn off their body camera. I don’t run into a lot of people who say: I want to just go ahead and leave the system the way it is.

We really don’t know what is happening in a police department when there is bodily injury and harm. I meet a lot of people who say: Those things make sense to me. Why don’t we do it?

Unfortunately, that is my same question today standing on the floor of the Senate. Why don’t we?

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, for his dedication to this issue and his very substantive output.
I was privileged to serve on the minigroup that put a lot of work into this under Senator Scott's very able leadership. I am thankful for the way Senator Lankford always approaches issues, not disparaging motives but always looking at ways to improve and make this country a better place because that is what this is about.

I have been listening to a lot of the arguments, a lot of the discussions, and I am saying to myself: If somebody watching this from afar—from Oklahoma, from West Virginia or from Vermont—I am thinking to myself, what is all this talk about 60 votes and cloture and all this? They are not focused on that. All they know is that we failed—this failed.

This was an opportunity that we should have grasped. We had a chance to discuss the need for police reform and to look at the very serious issues of racial inequalities. I am exceedingly disappointed. I thought yesterday—no, actually we had a debate and we are actually going to get on this bill. We are going to have a healthy debate and amendments. We are going to be in front of the American people, giving our different opinions. We are going to vote on this, and we are actually going to have a product here that is actually going to help. But it derailed. It derailed badly. I am very disappointed by that, as I think everybody in this country should be.

Those who are protesting, those who are deeply hurt by what they have seen—they don’t care about cloture and 60 votes and who gets the political point and who is going to be able to drag this to the election. They care about getting something done on a deeply emotional issue.

We know that every American is entitled to equal protection under the law. We also know there are a lot of good police officers in this country—many officers of minority. It is clear, though, that we have a real need to improve our law enforcement so that every American can have the confidence that officers are there to serve them equally.

We should provide better resources to train police on not just deescalation but use of force and intervention, all of the issues that we saw come forward in the horrifying death of George Floyd.

We should provide more body cameras. We know there are not enough cameras. George Floyd had there not been a camera. I don’t believe there was a camera on the officer; it was a bystander's camera. But cameras can be so incredibly useful to protect the rights of the people who are confronted and to protect the rights of the police. So we need to make sure that those are not only provided and there for our law enforcement but that they are turned on.

As we saw in Louisville, they were not turned on.

We should make sure that bad police officers can’t get passed from department to department and that their disciplinary actions and employment records are there, kept either locally or—the Pelosi bill says kept at the State; the President says kept at the Federal—anyway, in any event, kept for the transparency we need.

We should eliminate the use of choke holds by officers unless the officer is in a situation where he can’t get out of it, but quite frankly, I am for banning them in any circumstance.

Those statements are really not controversial. Americans really agree with them. How do we know that? Both the bill introduced by Senator Scott and cosponsored by 47 Republican Senators and the bill introduced by Senator Booker and supported by many Democrats included these provisions in each one of their bills.

We have a nonpartisan Congressional Research Service that we rely on for nonpartisan advice. The quotes from the report in a pamphlet that both bills: Both bills seek to establish best practices for law enforcement officers and train officers in areas of the use of force and racial bias. Both bills would seek to increase the use of body cameras by State and local law enforcement—both bills. Both bills would contain provisions designed to enhance transparency concerning records of misconduct by law enforcement officers—both bills. Both bills include provisions designed to limit the use of choke holds by Federal, State, and local law enforcement—although the two statutes do differ in the breadth and approach. What happens when we differ with each other—hold conference, and we work out our differences. But we are not having that chance today.

Given these areas of common ground, it should have been easy for us to come together and begin to begin the debate on the Senate floor. That is what we are supposed to do.

There are a few major differences in the bill, and this is where I think the American people have really tuned in to the debate. We know that there is a difference on qualified immunity. Let’s have a debate. Let’s have a debate.

Had we moved forward, I think we could have ended up with a bipartisan bill that could pass both the House and the Senate and signed into law. As we are now, do you know what we have, as Senator Scott said in the speech he gave about an hour ago? Nothing. We have nothing, people on the streets of every town in America begging us to do something positive to help the situation, and today, crackers—nothing—because we couldn’t get cooperation.

It would have made significant progress. I heard Senator Scott say—and I didn’t realize this until I heard him say it on the Senate floor—20 amendments and a managers’ amendment he offered in conversations with the other side, and again, no—nothing. We don’t want that.

We don’t have the best record on showing the American people that we can work together and get things done. But, boy, we could have shown them that today. We could have shown them that the rest of the week as we debate those issues. I can guarantee you, on some of the sticky issues, we would have had great agreement. Maybe we all didn’t agree on 100%, but some of each from each part of our party and each part of the country would have agreed on those issues and formulated better, smarter, more efficient legislation. We could have demonstrated that we are committed to support of the civil rights of all Americans and in support of the men and women in law enforcement. Instead, partisanship was allowed to carry the day.

It should be clear, because I think that it should be to the American people, that this motion—the other side says, “We don’t have a seat at the table”—would have provided the world stage for their seat at the table to debate this issue.

We need 60 votes to continue, and here we are talking about technicalities of how to get it done. But there would have been an enormous amendment process that probably would have been quite lengthy and very beneficial. I am very disappointed. I am disappointed to tell people that we are listening to you, but, you know, maybe it is not in our own political benefit to cooperate to move forward, so let’s just draw it out, as Senator Lankford said.

I think it is important to point out in the process, if we had an amendment debate, if we had a debate on the Senate floor, if we cultivated and came up with a final product, it is still within the 60-vote margin for the other side to say: No. Can’t do it. It is not enough. Can’t go there.

OK. At least we tried. Now we have nothing.

As we move forward—I was on several radio interviews today, and a lot of people want to know what’s next. I don’t know what is next. We have to do better than this. We have to do better, with what we see happening in our country and listening to the cries.

When I heard Senator Scott’s speech, when he talked of the communities that are most vulnerable, that have the most difficulties in all of the struggles of their lives, we owe it to them to have this debate on the floor of the greatest deliberative body, the Senate. We could have demonstrated last week, but it didn’t work. It was denied by 44 Senators. And here we are having to go back to our constituents, go back to those folks who are very vulnerable, and say: It didn’t matter enough to try to fix it. It didn’t matter enough that we gave each other 20 amendments. It didn’t matter enough that we were going to have the debate on the Senate floor. It didn’t matter enough to have our experts come in and tell us what the best is. It didn’t matter. We are united in support of the civil rights of all Americans. We are united in support of the law enforcement. Instead, partisanship was allowed to carry the day.
committed to seeing that it doesn't go away.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this afternoon, we heard a lot of rhetoric. I would deal with the press of the rhetoric. As so often happens, the reality is different from the rhetoric.

Since I last spoke on the Senate floor in the wake of George Floyd's murder, the American people's calls for justice and accountability have not diminished. Fortunately, they have grown stronger, and rightfully so. Even since then, our Nation has had to confront yet another needless killing of an African-American man, when an Atlanta police officer shot Rayshard Brooks twice in the back when he was fleeing from officers.

Now, I know from my own experience in law enforcement that nobody can dispute that police officers have in credible jobs. No one will dispute that they are faced with difficult, split-second decisions that impact life and death, but that difficulty does not excuse the fact that something is deeply wrong in our country. It does not excuse the fact that people of color disproportionately are profiled by police, are stopped by police, are arrested by police, and are victims of excessive force at the hands of police.

Consider the killing of George Floyd, millions of Americans are demanding we do better as a nation. They recognize that longstanding societal prejudices and biases and have created a law enforcement culture and broader criminal justice system that perpetuates these prejudices and biases. They demand that we roll up our sleeves and do the hard work of ensuring that those charged with preserving the rule of law are also subject to it, that no person is above the law.

For millions of Americans, the time to act is now, but I think the Senate is acting as though it is not up to the task. On Thursday, the House is expected to pass comprehensive legislation to reform policing, and it is going to do that with Republicans and Democrats voting for it. The Senate has only advanced a patchwork of half-measures that would do little more than to place a handful of bandaids on deep, generations-old wounds.

As the Senate knows him, I don't doubt at all that the legislation drafted by Senator SCOTT is a good-faith attempt at finding consensus within the Republican Conference on how to reform policing. But by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing, but by any reasonable measure, the bill the Republicans have put forward actually fails to reform policing. The legislation introduced by Senators BOOKER and HARRIS would actually change those behaviors. They don't say: Here. Please do it. They say: Here. You have to do it. They do it by banning choke holds, and they ban no-knock warrants.

Unlike the Booker-Harris bill, the Republican bill would not address qualified immunity, which allows officers to use discretion in a court finds they have violated constitutional rights. Can you imagine anybody else in this country, when violating someone's constitutional rights, standing up and saying: “But I am in a protected group; I don't do anything about it. Bye, bye now. See ya”?

The Republican bill does nothing to address racial profiling. It does nothing to ensure that deadly force is used only as a last resort—not as a first resort and especially not against somebody who, while running away, gets shot in the back and is given the death penalty. It also does nothing to ensure there will be Federal oversight when a local law enforcement agency demonstrates a pattern of violating their citizens' civil liberties. It is well-known that the Trump administration has effectively abandoned the consent decrees, which are proven instruments for positive change within some of our troubled departments. That is why the Booker-Harris bill strengthens these investigations at both the Federal and State levels.

At every turn, where the Republican bill provides a talking point, the Booker-Harris bill provides real accountability and real transparency. Sadly and, I think, disturbingly, the fact that the majority leader will not even allow the Senate to debate the Booker-Harris bill reveals that he is interested in neither.

For a moment last week, it appeared that some Republicans were serious about police reform. During a Judiciary Committee hearing on policing reform, Chairman GRAHAM said he would like the committee to work together to find solutions, “to sit down” and see if we could “reconcile the different [policing] packages and come up with something in common.” A number of Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee even expressed an openness in reevaluating qualified immunity to ensure that there would be a sense of accountability within police departments.

I agree that these are difficult issues, but certainly, based on my experience under both Republican and Democratic majorities, I know the Judiciary Committee is capable of handling them. I know because we have done it before on tough issues. Let me give you an example.

Seven years ago, a bipartisan group of Senators—Republicans and Democrats across the political spectrum—put together a thoughtful, bipartisan bill to reform our immigration system, but the bill wasn't put here on the Senate floor. The leadership put together a bill and, I think, disturbingly, the fact that some of our troubled departments.

That is not being the conscience of the Nation. That is not why I and many others came to the Senate. That is not how the Senate gets things done, and every Senator, Republican and Democrat alike, knows that.

So I would suggest to the leader, if he is serious about tackling racial injustice and policing reform, that there is a blueprint to follow. This is not it. I urge the majority leader to reverse course. If he is unwilling to bring meaningful legislation to the floor to address these issues today, well then, allow the Judiciary Committee to put in the hard work that is necessary to build bipartisan consensus. I am sure it can be done within a couple of weeks of actual hearings and votes in our committee.

Instead, the leader is insisting on a process that is designed to fail. In doing so, the Senate fails. The Senate fails George Floyd, and it fails Breonna Taylor, and it fails countless others who have been victims of brutality or discrimination by a flawed justice system. In doing so, the Senate also fails the American people.

I hope this is not the path we take. I voted not to go forward with a flawed process, hoping we might have a real bipartisan process. I believe the Senate
should be the conscience of the Nation. Let's be so in this. Let's go to committee, and let's have Republicans and Democrats vote for or against amendments and bring a bill to the floor.

Stop these “take it or leave it” steps by the Republican leader. Let's have a perfect bill that both Republicans and Democrats have worked on, and then bring it up. Let's vote up or down on amendments. Let's give the American people something they can be proud of and something, finally, the Senate can be proud of.

I do not see another Senator who sees something, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Pride Month 2020

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, our Founders gave us a perfect nation. Even they knew that. When Thomas Jefferson, himself a slaveowner, reflected on the existence of slavery in a nation which claimed to believe that all men are created equal, he wrote: ‘‘I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever.’’

Jefferson was not alone as a slaveowner. George Washington—the namesake of our great city and another great State, the father of our Nation—and his wife owned 300 slaves. Just minutes before he died, he asked his wife to bring the two copies of his last will for him to look at for one last time and to sign.

He handed one of the copies of the wills to his wife and said: ‘‘Burn this one, and keep the other. What he burned would have released all of his slaves at the moment of his death. The one he held he said he would sign. I want him to have a chance to be his wife’s slaves for as long as she lived. He was the father of our Nation. We might not have had an independent nation without his skill and leadership; yet he was not a perfect man by any means.

The true measure of a nation’s greatness is not simply the words written by an earlier generation; it is the work of every generation to make those words not just ideals but facts. We see that work performed today.

For weeks, Americans have joined to make those words—our words—to rise up and push back against what we know is no exaggeration to describe it as a new virus, a multi-ethnic, multi-generational alliance seems to have found a collective will to confront one of humanity’s oldest viruses—the virus of racism.

It was a different protest 51 years ago this month that began one of the newest chapters of America’s struggle for equal rights. That protest is the reason that June is celebrated as Pride Month.

It started in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, at the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village of New York City. Today, the name “Stonewall” stands as a milestone on America’s journey toward equal justice, alongside such revered names as “Selma” and “Seneca Falls.” In 1969, however, the Stonewall Inn was a ramshackle refuge for outcasts—a home away from home for some of the poorest, most powerless members within one of America's most marginalized communities. Its patrons included drag queens and lesbians, transgender and gender nonconforming people, homeless LGBTQ youth who lived in nearby Christopher Street Park after being abandoned by their own families.

Police raids and arrests were regular events at the Stonewall Inn, as they were at most gay bars in America at that time, but something changed during that raid in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969. Something in this great universe shifted. That night, when the police became violent, the patrons of the Stonewall Inn fought back.

The Stonewall uprising was a 6-day protest against police mistreatment, and while the protests were contained almost entirely within Greenwich Village, they changed the world.

On the first anniversary of the Stonewall uprising, the first Gay Pride parade was held in New York and Los Angeles and in the city of Chicago. Within 2 years of that uprising, there were gay rights organizations in every major city in the United States and in Canada, Australia and Western Europe.

The month of June is now recognized throughout much of the world as Pride Month—a celebration of diversity, acceptance, and inclusion.

Last year, on the 50th anniversary of Stonewall, the grand marshal leading Chicago’s Pride Parade was our city’s first openly gay mayor, Lori Lightfoot—an incredible leader.

This year, most Pride parades and festivals in States and around the globe were canceled or transformed into virtual celebrations because of COVID–19, but those virtual gatherings still had much to celebrate.

We have witnessed profound progress in the half-century since Stonewall. Public attitudes about gay and trans rights have increased greatly. Marriage equality is now the law of the land. Openly gay men and women serve as corporate and civic leaders, as mayors, Governors, Members of Congress, and Supreme Court justices. We just ran a serious campaign for President. Gay men and lesbians serve openly in America’s Armed Forces. While this administration has regretfully reinstated a ban on transgender persons serving openly in the military, trans men, women, and children are becoming more visible members in much of the rest of our society.

June also brings a major new cause for celebration. In a landmark 6-to-3 ruling, the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity is prohibited under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is an amazing story in history, where an ultra-conservative Congressman from Virginia in 1964 thought that he would torpedo the civil rights bill by adding the word “sex” into those bases for discrimination, thus inviting protection for women. He was sure that would be the end of the conversation. His amendment was adopted and of course led to a lot of debate on gender equality and ending gender discrimination. Little did he know that so many others—that it would lead to this historic Supreme Court ruling when it came to sexual orientation. This is history happening before our eyes, and thank goodness—that goodness—we are alive to see it.

The work of equal rights and equality under the law is never finished. We were reminded of that 2 weeks ago when the Trump administration released a discriminatory rule that attempts to eliminate explicit healthcare protections for LGBTQ Americans. We are reminded that the work of equality is not finished each time we learn of another victim of alarming violence—violence against Black transgender women, including the deaths of 25-year-old Riah Milton in Ohio and 27-year-old Dominique “Rem’mie” Pells in Philadelphia.

On May 29, 4 days after George Floyd’s murder, more than 100 of the Nation’s most prominent LGBTQ civil rights groups released a joint condemnation of racial violence. Their letter said that violence against transgender and gender nonconforming people of color happens “with such regularity, it is no exaggeration to describe it as an epidemic of violence.” The groups went on to say: “We understand what it means to rise up and push back against a culture that tells us we are less than them, that our lives don’t matter. . . . Today, we join together again to say Black Lives Matter and commit ourselves to the actions those words require.”

Among the organizations signing the pledge are the American Rights Campaign, Equality Illinois, and the AIDS Foundation of Chicago.

Nearly all Americans recognize Dr. King’s “I Have a Dream” speech at the 1963 March on Washington. It was a great moment in America’s long struggle for equal rights. But how many of us know that the organizational genius behind that great gathering was a gay Black man—Bayard Rustin?

How many of us know the names of Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera—
activists and transgender women of color, members of one of the most marginalized and victimized groups in America. They were also leaders of the Stonewall uprising. They both continued to fight for gay and trans rights all of their lives—until Marsha’s death in 1992 and Sylvia’s death a decade later. Years after Stonewall, Marsha P. Johnson recalled:

History isn’t something you look back and say it was inevitable. [History happens] because people make decisions that are sometimes very impulsive and of the moment, but these moments are cumulative realities.

James Baldwin, a brilliant writer and thinker, a gay Black man, warned us that “nothing can be changed until it is faced.”

Stonewall was a tipping point. The protests today against the deaths of George Floyd, Rayshard Brooks, Breonna Taylor, Tony McDade, Ahmaud Arbery, Laquan McDonald, Tamika Rice, Sandra Bland, and so many other Black men and women and children are, in fact, a tipping point.

Let’s not look away from this historic moment of change. Let this Senate join on the right side of history. Let’s do the procedural setback on the floor of the Senate stop us from finding some common ground to move forward. Let’s acknowledge the righteousness of this month’s Supreme Court decision and pass the Equality Act to ensure that discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity is illegal and will not be tolerated, not just at your place of employment but all across America in every walk of life. Let’s act to end state-sanctioned violence and oppression against our Black and Brown brothers and sisters. Let’s do our part, in our time, to make the noble promises of our Founders real for all Americans.

DACA

Mr. President, last week, in another landmark decision, the Supreme Court rejected President Trump’s effort to repeal deportation protections for Dreamers and young immigrants who came to the United States as children. In an opinion by Chief Justice John Roberts—an opinion which I have here—the Court held that the President’s decision to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program was “arbitrary and capricious.”

It was 10 years—10 years—that I joined Republican Senator Dick Lugar of Indiana on a bipartisan basis to call on President Obama to use his legal authority to protect Dreamers from deportation. President Obama responded by creating DACA, which provided temporary—2 years at a time—protection from deportation to Dreamers if they register with the government, pay a substantial fee, and pass a criminal background check.

More than 800,000 Dreamers came forward to apply for DACA. It unleashed the full potential of these young men and women, who are contributing to America as teachers and nurses and soldiers and small business owners. More than 200,000 DACA recipients are now characterized by our government as “essential critical infrastructure workers.” I didn’t make that up; it was a definition of President Trump’s own Department of Homeland Security. The vast majority of Dreamers are workers who have come to rely on the program.

But on September 5, 2017, President Trump repealed DACA. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and being deported to countries they barely remember. Thankfully, the Supreme Court has now rejected that effort.

Unfortunately, the President, through his tweets, has responded by attacking the Court and threatening the DACA protectees again. But Chief Justice Roberts made it clear it is not going to be easy for the President to carry out his threat. The Chief Justice wrote that in order to repeal DACA, the administration must consider “accommodating particular reliance interests.” Here is what the program in order to repeal DACA, the administration must consider the interests of those who have come to rely on the program.

This includes not just DACA recipients but their American citizen children, the schools where DACA recipients study and teach, and the employers who invested time and money in training them.

Today, I am calling on President Trump to do the right thing for our Nation and not make another effort to repeal DACA. Instead, the President should direct the Department of Homeland Security to reopen DACA. Since 2017, when the President announced the end of DACA, the program has been closed to new enrollees. As a result, there are tens of thousands of Dreamers who have never been able to apply for their opportunity under DACA.

Now Congress also has a responsibility. Last week, President Trump tweeted, “I have wanted to take care of DACA recipients better than the Do Nothing Democrats, but for two years they refused to negotiate.” Here is the reality: President Trump has rejected numerous bipartisan offers to protect the Dreamers.

One example: On February 15, 2018, the Senate considered a bipartisan amendment offered by Republican Senator MIKE ROUNDS and Independent Senator ANGUS KING, which included a path to citizenship for Dreamers. A bipartisan majority of Senators supported the amendment, but it fell short of the 60 votes needed to pass the Senate because of the Trump administration’s opposition. On that same day, the Senate voted on the President’s amendment, an amendment failed by a bipartisan majority of 39 to 60. In other words, we came close to 60 in a bipartisan effort to answer the President’s challenge. His response legislation received 39 votes for and 60 against in the Senate.

On June 4, 2019, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act—legislation that would give Dreamers a path to citizenship—with a strong bipartisan vote. The Dream and Promise Act has now been pending in the Senate, on the desk of Senator McConnell, for more than 1 year.

Yesterday, I sent a letter signed by all 47 Democratic Senators calling on Senator McConnell to immediately schedule a vote on the Dream and Promise Act. The President has challenged us: Do something legislatively. Do something. Congress.

Senator McConnell, it is within your power for us to do something and to do it quickly.

Here these years, I have come to the floor of the Senate many times to tell the simple stories of these Dreamers. These stories show what is at stake when we consider the fate of DACA.

Today I want to tell you about Diana Johnson. She is one of the Dreamers whose story I have told on the Senate floor. She came to the United States from Mexico at the age of 6 and grew up in Laredo, TX. She wrote to me, and here is what she said about her childhood:

Growing up in the United States was both great and challenging. I loved the people, the culture, the language. At times it was also hard. Assimilating and learning English, a totally new language for me, came with its setbacks. Still, my neighbors, my teachers and the community around me were very welcoming. I’ll never forget that.

When Diana was 13, her mother was admitted to the hospital. Because her mother didn’t speak English, Diana had to serve as a translator. This experience inspired her to become a nurse.

Diana attended Texas A&M. She was on the dean’s list and awarded a scholarship for academic accomplishments, but she had to turn it down because she is undocumented. She went on to earn her degree in nursing and history, along with a minor in economics.

Thanks to DACA, Diana now works as an operating room nurse on the cardiovascular/cardiothoracic specialty team in a hospital in Austin, TX. She is married. She has a baby girl.

Here is what Diana says about DACA: DACA means opportunity to me. I am glad I live in a country that gives me the chance to better myself if I want to. There are doors and opportunities for the taking all around me, and DACA is the key to my success.

Now Diana is on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic in a State that is seeing a dramatic increase in infection. She is worried about infecting her little girl. Here is what she says about her experience:

I have come in contact with patients infected with COVID multiple times, and I will continue to do so as long as I am doing my work. . . . [Even though this pandemic has affected my personal and professional life, I will continue to do my job as a nurse.

I want to thank Diana Jimenez for her service. She is, in fact, a health
hero. She is a DACA health hero. She is putting herself and her family at risk to save American lives. Can we ask for anything more? She shouldn’t have to worry about whether a decision by this administration will lead to her deportation.

As long as I am a Senator, I am going to continue to come to the floor to tell the stories of people just like Diana Jimenez. It would be an American tragedy to deprive this brave and talented nurse who is saving lives in the midst of this pandemic of America’s shores.

We must ensure that Diana and hundreds of thousands of others in our essential workforce are not stopped from working when the need for their service has never been greater, and we must give them the chance that they deserve to become American citizens.

Would America be better if Diana Jimenez was returned to Mexico, if this nurse left the operating room at that hospital, if she decided that she could no longer tend to the United States and was forced, deported, to leave in the midst of this pandemic? Of course not. Every American knows that—Democrat, Republican, or Independent.

Why don’t we stand together and remind President Trump that there are values worth fighting for, and one of them is to make sure that this land of opportunity also has room for the immigrants who bring so much to our shores?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that there ought to be a legislative solution to the DACA children. In fact, we had one in 2013. We worked on it in a bipartisan way—solved a large number of immigration issues, trying to have a legal immigration system. We sent it to the House, and the House didn’t consider it. I am ready to continue to do that.

I disagree with one thing that happened today, though, about bringing bills to the floor. He talked about the importance of bringing the DACA legislation to the floor. That is important once we have an agreement either in the committee or among us informally.

The second bill that is very important to bring to the floor is the National Defense Authorization Act, which has been enacted for more than 50 years and to which members of the Armed Services Committee have a chance to offer amendments.

But Senator McConnell is the majority leader, and because he is, he has one right, really, which is to decide what to bring to the floor. He pushed aside the National Defense Authorization Act, which is important, and said: In these times, I think the important thing for me to do is to bring to the floor legislation that is police reform and racial justice and allow the Senate to have an open amendment process. He did that in what would be the logical way. Since he is the majority leader, he offered a majority bill sponsored by Senator Tim Scott and cosponsored by a number of us on the Republican side.

The vote we had a little earlier today was, shall we proceed to the issue of racial justice and police reform, starting with the Scott bill, with an open amendment process?

Now what does that mean? That means that any Democrat could offer the House bill, or any Democrat could offer any other amendment. Now we have gotten into a bad habit around here, which I know the Senator from Illinois doesn’t like either, which is if he offers an amendment and I object to his amendment, and then, if I offer an amendment, he says: Well, you objected to mine; I will object to yours. And so we don’t have any amendments. But we should be able to bring an important bill to the floor, whether it is DACA or national defense or whatever it is, criminal justice, and say that it is open for amendment, and let’s have amendments.

I think that has happened so little over the last several years that people have forgotten how to do it. If you don’t like the amendment, someone can move that takes 51 votes, and sometimes it is 60 votes. If we get to the end of the process and the minority side doesn’t like the bill the way it is, they can keep it from going off the floor by refusing to give 60 votes to the amendment when it is being put forth.

So I think it was very disappointing when the majority leader has taken a limited number of weeks and said: OK, I will give a week and a half to racial justice and police reform, starting with a majority bill and offering to the entire Senate a chance to amend it. For the other side to say: No, we will not even let you go to the bill. I think that is very disappointing. Senator Scott is disappointed, and many of us are, and I don’t believe it distinguishes the Senate when the majority leader has that opportunity.

PANDEMIC PREPARATION

Mr. President, I came to the floor today to talk briefly about a hearing we held yesterday in the HELP Committee on the next pandemic: What do we need to do to prepare for the next pandemic?

That caused at least one Senator to say: What are we doing talking about the next pandemic when we are in the middle of a big one right now and we have a lot of work to do?

We do have a lot of work to do, but I want to answer that question.

The reason we have to talk about the next pandemic is that we have short memories. Memories fade. We go on to the next issue, and we don’t do everything we need to do.

We have had public health emergencies before. Some Senators were here when anthrax drove Senators from their offices. There was SARS and the 2009 flu pandemic. There was Ebola. There was MRSA. Four Presidents—Bush, Obama, Trump, and Clinton—all reacted to those in the way you would think. They issued reports, and they made proposals. We passed nine laws and many new regulations. We tried to do some things to be ready for the next public health emergency. We built buildings to manufacture vaccines. We created a new structure for managing public health emergency. We changed the way the nation is managed. We did a number of things.

One of our witnesses yesterday was Senator Bill Frist, who was the majority leader during the mid-2000s. He said he made 20 speeches on or about 2005 when he said the only question about the pandemic is if it is coming but when it will come. He listed six things that needed to be done back then. Well, the reason we had the hearing yesterday was that we didn’t get all of those things done.

Now, some people might say: Well, weren’t we prepared for this pandemic? And most experts felt that we were pretty well prepared. I read yesterday in the hearing a front-page story from the New York Times on March 1 of this year about COVID-19. Let me just go back. March 1 was 6 weeks after we knew about the disease. At that time, we had about 100 cases in the United States and only 2 deaths. There were many cases around the world. But at that time, the New York Times reported that experts said it is “far from certain” that this disease would spread to every part of the country and “many experts believed that the United States was as well prepared as any country to deal with this pandemic.” That was on March 1. Two and one-half weeks later, we began to shut down the whole country by order of the Government.

So we were prepared, but we were surprised, too, and we underestimated this virus and how aggressive it is and how contagious it is and the fact that it can travel silently without symptoms.

So Dr. Frist was one of the witnesses yesterday. Mike Leavitt, a former Secretary of Health and Human Services, former Governor of Utah, was another. Julie Gerberding, who was former head of the Centers for Disease Control, was yet another. She is now at Merck. Dr. Khalidun, who is the chief medical officer of the State of Michigan was there.

We talked about the next pandemic. Why talk about it now? Because of the things that Dr. Frist mentioned 20 years ago and the things that really need to get done, we didn’t get that all done in between pandemics. Why? We have short memories. Four or five months ago we were in the middle of an impeachment of the President. That sounds like ancient Roman history today.

Our minds go on to the next crisis if we don’t get things done. So the time to look at the next pandemic is while people are in the middle of it, especially and say: What are we lacking? What could we do better? And let’s fix it while the iron is hot, while our eye is on it.
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For example, one of the things that they suggested that we do—all of the witnesses—is that we have a dedicated source of funding for stockpiles and for research.

Do you think that is easy to do? I don’t think it will be easy to get done. It took us years to pass the outdoor recreation bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, because of those kinds of funding issues. We are more likely to create a dedicated stream of funding for preparedness for the next pandemic if we do it in the middle of this pandemic, when we have our eye on the ball.

Another recommendation is that we should have an office in the National Security Council to provide coordination between epidemics and during the next one. That is not easy to do, either. When is the best time to do it? Now, during this pandemic, when we have our eye on the ball.

Another proposal that came up very often is that we ought to build manufacturing plants for vaccines that we don’t use between pandemics and that we ought to spend the money to keep them open. The Supreme Allied Commander with all the various agencies that we have today.

Those plus the need for dedicated funding are difficult issues. The answer to the question, “Why in the world are we having a hearing on the next pandemic when we are in the middle of this one?” is because for the last 20 years, between pandemics, we hadn’t gotten the job done on some of the things that needed to be done that Dr. Fauci, Dr. Redfield, Dr. Hahn, and Admiral Giroir, who will give us an update on going back to school and college and work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my opening statement from yesterday’s hearing printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT

COVID-19: LESSONS LEARNED TO PREPARE FOR THE NEXT PANDEMIC

[June 23, 2020]

Less than four months ago, on March 1—when the coronavirus had caused a little more than 3,000 deaths worldwide and 2 deaths in the United States—The New York Times reported: “With its top-notch scientists, modern hospitals and sprawling public health infrastructure, most experts agree, the United States is among the countries best prepared to prevent or manage such an epidemic.”

Even the experts underestimated the ease of transmission and the ability of this novel coronavirus to spread by the time the pandemic was over.

Those qualities have made the virus—in the words of infectious disease expert Dr. Anthony Fauci, “my worst nightmare.”

“In the period of four months, it has devastated the world.” Dr. Fauci said recently in remarks at a virtual convention.

This committee is holding this hearing today because, even with an event as significant as COVID-19, memories fade and attention moves quickly to the next crisis.

While the nation is in the midst of responding to COVID-19, the United States Congress should take stock now of what parts of the local, state, and federal response worked, what could work better and how, and be prepared to pass legislation this year to better prepare for the next pandemic, which will surely come.

On June 9, I released a white paper outlining 5 recommendations for Congress to prepare Americans for the next pandemic:

1. Tests, Treatments, and Vaccines—Accelerate Research and Development
2. Disease Surveillance—Expand Ability to Detect, Identify, Model, and Track Emerging Infectious Diseases
Stockpiles and Improve Medical Supply Surge Capacity and Distribution

4. Public Health Capabilities—Improve State and Local Capacity to Respond

5. What Works?—Improve Coordination of Federal Agencies During a Public Health Emergency

I have invited comments, responses, and any additional recommendations for the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions to consider. This feedback will be shared with my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans.

This is not a new subject for any of the witnesses we have today.

Fifteen years ago, then Majority Leader of the Senate, Bill Frist, said in a speech at the National Press Club that a viral pandemic was no longer a question of if, but a question of when. He spelled out what he called a "wake-up call" to point out the need for early identification of emerging infectious diseases; better manufacturing capacity; better systems to quickly identify emerging infectious diseases; more training for the health care and public health community; better distribution of medical supplies; and better systems to share information within and among states, and between states and the federal government.

Many reports also warned that while states play the lead role in a public health re-

sponse, many states did not have enough trained doctors, nurses and health care profes-
sionals; had inadequate stockpiles; and struggled with funding challenges. In some instances, inadequate or flexible federal funding contributed to these problems.

Looking at lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic, one of the challenges Congress has worked to address during the last 20 years still remain.

Additionally, COVID-19 has exposed some gaps that had not been previously identified.

These include unanticipated shortages of testing supplies and sedative drugs, which are necessary to use ventilators for COVID-19 patients.

Memories fade and attention moves quickly to the next crisis. That makes it imperative that Congress act on needed changes this year in order to better prepare for the next pandemic.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today and also appreciate the feedback we are receiving on the white paper. I have set a deadline for June 26 on that feedback so the committee has time to draft and pass legislation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to ask my colleagues to sign the bill that we voted on earlier today and the debate that has ensued prior to that vote and I am sure afterwards.

This is a moral moment for the country. I believe most would agree with that. The question is: How will our Nation respond at this moral moment?

The brutal murder of George Floyd by a police officer “shames us before the world.” I am quoting an NAACP official who says it all. His murder did shame us before the world, so did the murder of Rayshard Brooks and Breonna Taylor, and we can go on from there, with so many names that we haven’t heard before, and many that we will hear over and over.

A lot of us feel that shame. Countless millions of Americans feel that shame. They feel that sadness and they feel that anger all these weeks since that terrible act was witnessed, and so many other moments before and after that. As they feel that shame and express anger and frustration, and as they protest and proclaim, as they march and mobilize, as they use their voice and cast their votes, they demand change, but not simply change. As they feel that shame and express anger and frustration, and as they protest and proclaim, as they march and mobilize, as they use their voice and cast their votes, they demand change, but not simply change in and of itself, a certain kind of change—

the kind of change we see rarely in Washington these days and, frankly, rarely over the course of American history, but I think it might be in one of those moments now.

They demand transformative change. They demand, and appropriately so, systemic change to a criminal justice system that is infused with racism. Their right for change is, in fact, a petition for justice.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Martin Luther King said it well, among many things he said well, about where we were then and, unfortunately, where we are now. His words still ring true. He said: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” It is still true today in the context of this debate.

But you can go back even further than what Dr. King said. You can go back hundreds of years. St. Augustine said it well, about justice. He said: “Without justice, what are kingdoms but great bands of robbers?”

Kingdoms, Mr. President, are bands of robbers. There have been a lot of robbery over many, many years—even generations—when it comes to Black Americans. For hundreds of years, Black Americans have been robbed of the equal protection of the law.

The U.S. Supreme Court has emblazoned on the front door of that building, just yards from here, “Equal Justice Under Law.” So many Black Americans have been robbed of equal justice under law. They have been robbed of opportunity—the opportunity to advance in a country that would not hold the color of their skin against them. They have been robbed of that. They have been robbed of their dignity over and over, in grave ways and in other ways that people—especially—look at all the indignities, all the insults, and all the mistreatment. Not to mention, worse than that, Black Americans have been robbed of the chance to truly pursue the American dream.

They have been robbed of opportunity, something that those of us who are White should think about a lot more. I should think about more, as a White male, of the peace of mind that a parent has. A father or a mother should have the peace of mind that Black America when their son or daughter—but often it is their son—leaves the house in the morning: Will he be mistreated walking through a neighborhood by an official of our government law enforcement or otherwise? Will he be pulled over and have his rights violated because of the color of his skin? Black Americans have been robbed of that peace of mind, in addition to so many other kinds of robbery that have impacted their lives.

So what do we do? Do we simply march and protest and express outrage? All of that is important. All of that is vital. In fact, all of that is one of the reasons we are even here talking about it on the Senate floor—people in both parties talking about it. In my home State of Pennsylvania, there are many, many, very few counties—just a handful of counties—that have not had one or two or many more protests in a State with 67 counties.

Part of what we have to do as legislators, as Members of this legislative body called the U.S. Senate, is to, in fact, legislate. Let me start with the bill that was introduced about 2 weeks ago, the Justice in Policing Act, S. 392. If I had to describe the bill in one word, it would be accountability. I think there is a big difference between that bill, the Justice in Policing Act, and the bill offered by the majority. Accountability is vital. It is essential. We cannot move forward and say that we have done something substantial to bring about justice and to advance the
cause of justice unless there is accountability. The bill also has very strong transparency provisions, as well as a long menu of actions we can take to improve police practices in a meaningful way. Let me start with accountability.

When we talk about accountability, we are talking about constitutional violations—preventing those violations and holding those accountable that engage in constitutional violations. We could revise 18 U.S.C. section 242. It is, right now, as a matter of law, a violation of law for any law enforcement officer to willfully deprive a person of any right protected by the Constitution. But it is almost impossible for prosecutors to prove willfulness, and the Department of Justice doesn’t prosecute very many cases in a Nation of 18,000 law enforcement agencies.

This bill would revise the intent standard, known by the Latin “mens rea”—the intent standard—to knowingly or with reckless disregard. So the change of that standard under law would make it more likely that successful prosecutions can be brought when constitutional rights are violated in a criminal manner.

The second constitutional violation provision speaks to civil liability. Reforming our civil liability laws are often referred to by a particular doctrine, qualified immunity. In cases where there is no state action or police misconduct, this is a constitutional violation when it happens. Currently, a police officer who violates an American’s constitutional rights is often protected by a liability shield we know as qualified immunity. This doctrine has been questioned by many. There are at least two Supreme Court Justices, who don’t usually agree on much, that questioned it. Members of the U.S. Senate in both parties here have questions about it. Basically, the doctrine holds that police cannot be liable unless the conduct violates “clearly established” standards or a standard set forth in prior cases, and most courts dismiss such cases. The bill would reform that doctrine of qualified immunity to ensure that Americans can recover damages in a case where their constitutional rights are violated by the actions of law enforcement.

There are two provisions that speak to achieving that, and providing for the congressional budget so that the attorneys general to conduct these pattern-or-practice investigations at the State level. The focus here, again, is on constitutional violations that are systemic in a local jurisdiction or systemic in a State agency. The focus here, again, is on constitutional violations that are systemic in a local jurisdiction or systemic in a State agency.

What results from these kinds of investigations often are consent decrees. These consent decrees by courts are, of course, supposed to be judicially enforced. These decrees can often ensure that a police department implements reforms. Here is one of the problems. The Trump administration has virtually abandoned this practice of bringing these pattern-or-practice investigations. Administrations opened 25 such cases. But even under the Obama administration, there was a constraint because of the lack of subpoena power. That should be changed.

I will just mention two more provisions. It is a long list, but I will just mention two more. The Justice in Policing Act bans choke holds and bans carotid holds. And No. 5, it bans no-knock warrants in Federal drug cases. Now, what about the bill offered by the Republicans, the majority here in the Senate? The Republican bill does not, in my judgment, respond to this moral moment. It does not substantially advance the cause of justice because it is devoid of provisions that would impose accountability—real accountability—on law enforcement, and especially on a particular law enforcement officer who is sworn to protect Americans. He is not sworn to violate their constitutional rights. So when a law enforcement officer engages in that conduct, there must be accountability. The bill does not speak to that in a fashion that I think would bring about change.

We have a bill that doesn’t even explicitly ban choke holds and carotid holds, meaning a choke hold that cuts off your air flow, which we know can kill someone, and also the carotid hold, which cuts off your blood flow. We know that both can be dangerous. Both can be, in fact, lethal. The bill doesn’t ban them. That is the only reason, potentially, we are even here debating this, because the American people—God only knows, tens of millions, watching the officer take the life out of a human being, George Floyd. Without that video, I am not sure we would be here debating this bill or any bill. But the idea that this practice is not banned under this bill makes the bill woefully deficient, and I think that is an understatement.

The bill fails to ban no-knock warrants, even in the context—frankly, a limited context—of Federal drug cases. It doesn’t do that. That kind of a ban might be a good idea. For example, the Republican bill doesn’t prohibit racial profiling, and it provides no change—no substantial change—in the militarization of police forces.

In the end, we are here not just to debate and to focus on bills and policy in language, but we are here to talk about justice. There is a great hymn I heard in church over many years. It is rooted in the Scriptures. One of the refrains or one of the parts of the refrain of that hymn is: “We are called to act with justice.” Those are the exact words of that hymn. The first couple of lines of the hymn are: “Come! Live in the light!” And then it goes on to say: “We are called to act with justice.”

If we are going to act with justice here by way of legislation, we should listen not just to the Scriptures or to Dr. King or to St. Augustine. We will also listen to something recent Dr. King. He just testified a couple of weeks ago in our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, the committee that Senator ALEXANDER was talking about.

Former Secretary of Education King said the following regarding students returning to school this year, and I think it bears directly not just on these justice issues but also on the broader agenda that we should push forward to advance the interests of Black Americans and communities of color.

Dr. King, in this testimony just recently, said the following.

When our students return to school buildings, they will need additional supports as they grapple with the continued reality of racism in America and the legacy of over 400 years of anti-Blackness. The murders of George Floyd.

And then he lists some others—[Those murders] have once again sent the message to Black students that their lives are devalued.

He goes on in his testimony to talk about the moment we are in—the moment that Senator ALEXANDER was talking about.

As Dr. Martin Luther King and Dr. John King, the former Secretary of Education, and others have told us, we have to make sure this is a moment we can act with justice, as the hymn tells us.

All of us, no matter where we are from and no matter what party we are in—all of us—are called to act with justice. So let us not fail to act with justice in this moral moment. Let us embrace this moment. Pass the Justice in Policing Act or something very close to that, and bring the warm light of justice to millions of Americans, especially Black Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk on this floor about border security in recent years. It is amazing how much of what is said resembles what was said a quarter century ago. I am equally amazed by how the politics of border security have changed over that time period.

Earlier this week—it has been widely publicized—President Trump visited
Yuma, AZ, to highlight the continued need for border security. Now, as someone who has actually had firsthand experience with border security, I thought I would say a few words as well.

As a U.S. marine in the 1990s, I spent months in a desolate, forbidding stretch of desert—my apologies to Arizonans—that was a stone’s throw away from Yuma, AZ, the same place where these Border Patrol agents stand. Now, my marines and I were part of an unmanned aerial vehicle unit. We worked with Border Patrol agents, like these gentleman, and we were charged with patrolling the border in the Yuma Sector. They were on the ground. We flew drone missions to help them collect intelligence. It is a dangerous area with heavy narcotics and human trafficking.

While there, I saw the need for greater border security. Now, uniquely, among the military services—and I know our Presiding Officer had a distinctive and unique experience with the U.S. military, the Marines are charged, by statute, with tackling whatever mission, however daunting, the President requests of us. In fact, in 1834, Congress passed a statute right on point, indicating, under the Marines, there was a broad language. When in doubt, send in the Marines, I guess.

We carried out our mission—not glamorous, but important then and important now—was to help make the border more secure. It is a critical mission, which remained a priority under Presidents Clinton and Bush.

Later, a physical barrier was placed in the Yuma Sector. It was years after I left Active Duty. Trafficking decreased over roughly a decade’s time period by 95 percent after that physical barrier was erected. It shouldn’t be controversial. It is not ideological. This is just factual. We know walls work when properly and intelligently placed.

Now, historically, there has been a bipartisan consensus around the idea that we not only put boots on the ground to protect the border but we also must invest in technology to secure our border, including physical barriers where they are required. The President was absolutely right years ago when he stood up this issue. He was right this week in Yuma, AZ. He is right today, and he will be right tomorrow as he continues to emphasize this issue. We must address this situation that is taking place along our southern border. We mustn’t lose our resolve.

There are illegal crossings and smugglers who are trafficking drugs and people that have created a horrific humanitarian crisis and an ongoing national security threat. Don’t take it from me. According to the United Nations Missing Migrants Project, more than 2,400 migrants have died near the United States-Mexico border since 2014—2,400 migrants over a fairly short time period. This includes 497 deaths last year. That is a 26-percent increase from the year prior. This is a true humanitarian crisis today. It is also a national security threat.

In addition to migrants fleeing Central America, it is possible that foreign terrorist organizations—ISIS, for example—may want to penetrate this porous border. So border security and the safety of Americans has long been and should remain a priority of all Republicans and Democrats, especially those who serve here at the Federal level.

President Trump is not the first President—underscore “not the first President”—to understand this or to emphasize this issue. When I was serving in Arizona as a marine, President Clinton was our Nation’s Commander in Chief. During a 1993 press conference, President Bill Clinton touted increasing the number of Border Patrol agents and working to supply them with the best possible equipment and technology. He repeated this message on multiple occasions. Then, during his 1995 State of the Union address, President Clinton said: “Our administration has moved aggressively to secure our borders more by hiring a record number of new border guards.” President Clinton understood this, and he wasn’t the last Democrat to prioritize border security.

President Obama, too, understood its importance. You see, we forget this. It is amazing how quickly we forget. Under the Obama administration, a surge of additional Border Patrol agents and resources were provided to secure the southwest border and to prevent illegal crossings. In fact, this may be uncomfortable for some, but President Obama was often called the “deporter in chief” during his Presidency, with roughly 3 million people deported under the Obama administration. Again, border security should not be a partisan issue.

Historically, both sides of the aisle have agreed that the humanitarian and security issues at our southern border must be addressed, so it is time for Democrats to partner with Senate Republicans and President Trump to secure the border and to put Americans first.

If we resolve to work together on a sensible solution to this crisis—and I know it will be something to solve border towns, more jobs for American workers, fewer strains on limited government resources, and a deterrent to foreign nationals coming to America illegally and putting themselves and others at great risk.

So the Senate cannot lose its nerve when it comes to the rule of law in addressing border security. This is one area where we cannot just send in the Marines. We own this. This body owns this. Every U.S. Senator owns this issue. As U.S. Senators, we must work collectively. We must come together on this and work with our President to keep America safe and secure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Blackburn). The Senator from North Dakota.

REMEMBERING SISTER THOMAS WELDER

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I come to the floor today with, frankly, a heavy heart and a fair bit of trepidation. My goal for the minutes that is to pay tribute to somebody who is so special, so remarkable, so beloved, so important to my home State of North Dakota that I feel inadequate, frankly. But here I am to pay tribute to Sister Thomas Welder and to be with the Lord on Monday morning of this week at the age of 80. Sister Thomas was for 31 years the president of the University of Mary and in the last several served as president emerita—I am active. She was a member of the Benedictine Sisters of Annunciation Monastery at Bismarck. She was a dear personal friend—and not just to me but to everyone. When I say “everyone,” I mean everyone who must have come here, and I am uniquely, I think, to begin to really address all that she is and was and does and means to people.

Madam President, first of all, I would like to ask unanimous consent to print in the Record her obituary, as well as the press release and the obituary passing from the University of Mary.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SISTER THOMAS WELDER

(April 27, 1940–June 22, 2020)

Sister Thomas Welder, 80, a member of the Benedictine Sisters of Annunciation Monastery, Bismarck, and president of the University of Mary for 31 years, passed into eternal life June 22, 2020, at the monastery, following a recent diagnosis of kidney cancer.

Mass of Christian burial is scheduled for Monday, June 29, at 10:00 a.m. in Our Lady of the Annunciation Chapel (OLA) at the Benedictine Center for Servant Leadership at the University of Mary. Visitation will be held at OLA from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. on the funeral. Due to Covid–19 restrictions, the funeral is limited to Welder’s family and close friends. The funeral can be viewed online through our livestream.

Sister Thomas. A public vigil service with Evening Prayer will be held Sunday, June 28, at 7 p.m. in Our Lady of the Annunciation Chapel, with visitation prior from 1 p.m. to 7 p.m. Sunday’s visitation and vigil service will also be livestreamed.

Sister Thomas (baptismal name Diane Marie) was born in Linton, North Dakota, on April 27, 1940, to Mary Ann (Kuhn) and Sebastian Welder. She was the oldest of three children. When she was two, the family moved to Bismarck.

A graduate of St. Mary’s High School, she joined Annunciation Monastery after a year of college in Minnesota. Attracted by the community and prayer life of the sisters, she felt God’s call to become one of them. As a novice, she was given the name of Sister Thomas. She made her monastic profession on July 11, 1961. Sister Thomas finished Benedictine monastic life which she lived faithfully for 59 years.

She graduated from the College of St. Scholastica, Duluth with a bachelor’s degree in music and earned a master’s degree in music from Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

A dedicated servant leader, she gave her life to the University of Mary for 57 years.
She led from her heart and touched the lives of many. She was president from 1978 to 2009. Under her remarkable leadership, the school attained university status in 1986, tripled in size from 1,000 to 3,000, added the university’s first doctorate, grew on-site and online adult learning programs to 16 locations across the state, region and nation, and moved on its athletic programs.

Sister Thomas was present to students, faculty and staff. She attended student recitals and concerts, cheered at athletic events and participated in many university gatherings. She called students by name and her genuine caring attitude left a deep impression on them. She enjoyed getting to know friendly, talented, and gentle nature made others comfortable in her presence. It was a joy to be with Sister Thomas.

Sister Thomas modeled many Benedictine values, such as hospitality, respect, prayer and service, with ease and grace. Benedictine values were dear to her heart. She committed to fulfilling these values throughout the monastery’s sponsored institutions, the communities of CHI St. Alexius Health and the University of Mary.

She was an active state and national boards including CHI St. Alexius Health and MDU Resources Group, Inc. She received numerous honors during her lifetime including North Dakota’s highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Rough Rider Award. During that same TV interview, Shea commented on Thomas’s wise words to come to the belief of growing into leadership through service stands as a model for North Dakota and the nation, “reads an excerpt from the plaque bearing her portrait hang in the North Dakota Hall of Fame in the lower level of the State Capitol Building. During the later years of her presidency, Welder endured chronic kidney complications that led to a transplant in 2001. In 2005, she learned that due to a virus she would need a second kidney transplant, but had to regularly undergo dialysis until a successful second kidney transplant could be done in 2011.

At the start of Shea’s current presidency in 2009 and after her 31-year tenure as the University of Mary president and after the university’s Sister Thomas Welder continued to be involved with University of Mary as president emerita—remaining active with public speaking events, committees and fundraising in the department of Mission Advancement. In lieu of flowers, if you wish to honor the memory of Sister Thomas Welder, her love for University of Mary’s students, lifelong commitment of servant leadership, and genuine care for others, memorial donations are being accepted to Annunciation Monastery or the university’s Sister Thomas Welder Scholarship Fund at www.umary.edu/

Mr. CRAMER. I am going to read some of the facts of her life from her own words and do my best to tell in some personal thoughts while I do that. I am not going to read the entire thing.

It starts out: “Sister Thomas Welder, 80, a member of the Benedictine Sisters of Annunciation Monastery, Bismarck, and president of the University of Mary for 31 years, passed away at 7:30 p.m. on June 22, 2020, at the monastery, following a recent diagnosis of kidney cancer.

Sister Thomas lived her life for others,” said Sister Nicole Kunze, Prioress of Annunciation Monastery. “She was always giving to others, whether it was a smile, an encouraging word or a listening ear. She often said that the greatest gift you could give a person was the gift of your time, and she did that without fail. Sister Thomas modeled so many of the most important values that made others comfortable in her presence.”

Welder, a Bismarck native, attended the College of St. Benedict in St. Joseph, Minnesota, and the College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, and earned a master’s degree in music from Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. She is a member of the Benedictine Sisters of the Annunciation Monastery.

Welder began her career as a teacher at the university in 1963, when it was named Mary College. As president, Welder helped the school gain university status. Through steady growth, added numerous undergraduate and on-site graduate degree programs. Under her remarkable leadership, the school grew on-site and on-line graduate degree programs. University of Mary was confirmed as a national Catholic University in 1980 and president of the University of Mary from 1978 to 2009. Sister Thomas Welder was a rare person,” said University of Maryland President Montgomery. "She cared for the University of Mary. She was intent on maintaining a vibrant place over two days.

The public is welcome to join the following services and events through livestream at www.youtube.com/universityofmary/live. A public visitation is planned from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. on Sunday, June 28 in Our Lady of the Annunciation Chapel (OLA), located in the Benedictine Center for Servant Leadership building on campus. A vigil service with Evening Prayer will be held at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 29, a second public visitation will be held prior from 9 a.m. until 10 a.m. The funeral is open to Welder’s family.

Welder will then be immediately buried beneath Mass in the nearby Monastery Cemetery located on the west bluff next to the Benedictine Center for Servant Leadership, overlooking the Missouri River.

’Sister Thomas Welder was a rare person,’ said University of Minnesota President Monson. James Shea. ‘Under her leadership and vision, the University of Mary was confirmed in its purpose to form leaders in the service of truth in renewed and ever-growing ways, based on service to others, the struggle to help thousands of students’ lives as the university grew and expanded over her presidency. The university became known as a Benedictine Sister of Annunciation Monastery. It was those qualities, too, which touched innumerable lives over the course of her life.’

In 2019, Bismarck’s CBS affiliate, KKMB TV, honored Welder for Women’s History Month. During that interview, when reporter and anchor Lauren Kaiber asked Welder what she thinks about being regarded as one of the most influential women of our time, Welder responded, ‘What influence? And, what kind of a difference can we make, because, as I think of leadership, I am interested in the context in which leaders are accepted and in the impact they have. Without fail, Sister Thomas modeled so many of our Benedictine values with ease and with humor, profound wisdom, and genuine love and respect for others were hallmarks of her character as she lived the Benedictine value.'"


“A graduate of St. Mary’s High School, she joined Annunciation Monastery after a year of college in Minnesota. Attracted by the community and prayer life of the sisters, she felt God’s call to become one of them. As a novice, she was given the name of Sister Thomas. She made her monastic profession on July 11, 1961. Sister Thomas cherished Benedictine monastic life which she lived faithfully for 59 years.

I recall a speech—or an interview—once at an event. In fact, I think it was during her retirement. She was asked about monastic life. She was asked: What is it that grounds you? Where is it you get your inspiration?

She said: “My wellspring are the Sisters of Annunciation Monastery.”

Skipping down a little bit, her obituary reads: “A dedicated servant leader”—and we will speak to that in a little bit—“she gave her life to the University of Mary for 57 years. She led from within and taught the value of being present all the time. The six that they highlight there were the Benedictine values of hospitality, respect for persons, prayer, moderation, service—really important, as she called them, gospel values. But she didn’t just call them gospel values. She didn’t just teach them, although she does a lot.

By the way, the internet and YouTube are full of her speeches on Benedictine values and other values and leadership, especially servant leadership.

“She committed herself to instilling these values throughout the monastery’s sponsored institutions,” which included, of course, the University of Mary and CHI St. Alexius Health.

“Sister Thomas modeled many Benedictine values at the University of Mary. We learned them all, all the time. The six that they highlight there are the Benedictine values of hospitality, respect for persons, prayer, moderation, service—really important, as she called them, gospel values. But she didn’t just call them gospel values. She didn’t just teach them, although she does a lot.

By the way, the internet and YouTube are full of her speeches on Benedictine values and other values and leadership, especially servant leadership.

“She committed herself to instilling these values throughout the monastery’s sponsored institutions,” which included, of course, the University of Mary and CHI St. Alexius Health.

Sister Thomas served in the university’s Mission Advisory Board and online adult learning programs to 16 locations across the state, regional site and served in the university’s first doctorate, grew on her—” and we will speak to that in a little bit—“she gave her life to the University of Mary for 57 years. She led from within and taught the value of being present all the time. The six that they highlight there were the Benedictine values of hospitality, respect for persons, prayer, moderation, service—really important, as she called them, gospel values. But she didn’t just call them gospel values. She didn’t just teach them, although she does a lot.

By the way, the internet and YouTube are full of her speeches on Benedictine values and other values and leadership, especially servant leadership.

“She committed herself to instilling these values throughout the monastery’s sponsored institutions,” which included, of course, the University of Mary and CHI St. Alexius Health.

She served on many state and national boards including CHI St. Alexius Health and MDU Resources Group,” a Fortune 400 corporation.

“She received numerous honors during her lifetime including North Dako-ta’s highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Rough Rider Award.”

She delivered these all. She earned them all. In fact, whenever she was complimented—which was often, as you might imagine, when you know as many people as she knows and have accomplished as much as she accomplished—she always, as I said earlier, deflected her accomplishments and gave someone else credit.

She said this in an interview once when confronted with her many accomplishments: “I have always been blessed with the sense that I can do only what I do with the guidance and the help of the Spirit.” Think of that. All that she accomplished—she takes no credit but credits the fact that she was blessed with the sense that at least she was aware that the Spirit was the one who was guiding her.

Her obituary also states: “Sister Thomas was grateful for many blessings in her life. She was particularly thankful to two kidney donors who gave her the gift of life through two successful transplants. She prayed for and stayed connected”—“to these special people.”

In that TEDx speech that I talked about from about 3 years ago, she was talking about connectivity, as I said. She was challenging them. She said: “A disconnect from our cellphone or iPad makes possible a reconnect with those around us.””

“A disconnect from our cellphone or iPad makes possible a reconnect with those around us.”

I could share lots of personal stories. I am tempted to, but I don’t think that would be the tribute she would want.

She and I made a lot of calls together. We went on a lot of road trips together. We spoke at a lot of the same events. I was always grateful when I could go first. It was impossible to follow her—an incredible speaker.

One time we were at an event—I think it was the emcee, actually—a local event in Bismarck. She gave one of her phenomenal speeches. They all are. They all were. In the audience, unbeknownst to me, was the president of the National Automobile Dealers Association. He came up to me afterwards, and he said: “Do you realize that every year we pay about $50,000 for a speaker at our national annual meeting, and we have never had one this good?”

I said: “Well, I could get her to do it for less.”

He said: “It is unbelievable. I have never been this inspired in my life.”

I would just challenge everybody who has a minute and wants to be inspired to just do a quick Google search of Sister Thomas Welder, and you will find a video that will inspire you. Everyone person I know, who ever met her is better because they did, everybody I know whom she encountered, I once brought John Wooden, the great
wizard of Westwood, the winningest coach in NCAA history, to the University of Mary to give a speech on servant leadership. It was a remarkable time. I sat there, and as I watched Coach Wooden—he was 96 years old at the time—and the stage after Sister Thomas introduced him, I stood between them and I thought, wow, I am between saints, two of the best servant leaders, who both taught and lived that incredible value.

As I said, my heart is heavy. It is hard not to be offended. Yet Sister Thomas and I, of all of the things we talked about over the many years that I worked with her and for her, talked mostly about matters of faith.

I am not Catholic. I do have a degree from the University of Mary. I am on their board of trustees. I love the place. I love the Sisters of Annunciation Monastery and Sister Thomas especially because she embodies all that is good about them. But we always talked about matters of faith.

I will never forget one trip to Fargo. I will never forget, in fact, where we were—sitting in my car, waiting to go in to call on somebody about a gift to the school. And we talked about Heaven. And we both said that we were going to be surprised at who we will see there. And I thought, yeah, you are probably right.

She gets the blessing of being there first now and seeing who all is there, but the lot of people there who know her, and they are looking forward to welcoming her and thanking her for the incredible gift she was in their life. I look forward to the day when I can go and be welcomed by her.

I am grateful for her life.

I love you, Sister Thomas.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

THE JUSTICE ACT

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I hope today’s events in the Senate will not soon be forgotten by the American people. Over the last few months, it is an ugly truth to say that our country has experienced unprecedented physical, financial, and social turbulence. From the pandemic, to the economic challenges that came on its heels, to the widespread protests against racial injustice—the needs of our country should have transcended politics. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case today.

We had been on a pretty good run, Republicans and Democrats, and put aside our differences to pass bold and transformative legislation to support our Nation’s fight against COVID-19, as well as ease the ensuing financial fallout. I had hoped that trend would continue as we work together to address the injustices that still persist in our society, beginning with police reforms.

As we all know by now, thanks to our friend Senator Tim Scott and others who worked with him, we introduced the JUSTICE Act on a strongly bipartisan, lasting reform so we can begin to restore the broken trust between minority communities and our law enforcement agencies. This package of bills addresses some of the most pressing changes we’ve been calling for—ending choke holds, better training for our police officers, accountability for body cameras, more diverse police forces, and the list goes on and on.

We knew it wasn’t the only bill that has been introduced in this Senate. Our Democratic colleagues introduced a bill of their own, which would address many of the same issues. While there are areas that overlap, and many of the same issues. While there are still a lot of things that we believe in, we are working to bring about a police reform bill to the floor to be debated and voted on before July Fourth. When Senator McConnell did exactly that, what did they do? As soon as they were told they would actually have a chance to vote on a police reform bill, they changed their tune—a 180-degree change.

It kind of reminds me a little bit of last year’s debacle over the Green New Deal. After this real deal was introduced, a number of Senate Democrats rushed to endorse it, but when given the opportunity to vote on the resolution they were praising, what happened? Not a single one of those individuals that were told the bill would be voted for it—not one. What kind of games are they playing here? Senator Mark Warner, who introduced that resolution in the Senate, even accused the majority leader, who scheduled a vote on a bill he was the lead sponsor for—called it sabotage.

History seems to be repeating itself and not—not—in a good way. Our friends across the aisle, who have been asking to debate and vote on a police reform bill, this morning had that opportunity, but once again, they pulled a 180.

Let me be clear on what we were voting on this morning. This was not a vote on a JUSTICE Act as is, without any changes or amendments; this was simply a vote to begin debating the bill. You can’t finish a bill, you can’t actually vote on legislation if you are unwilling to start. And that is exactly what happened this morning.

Knowing that Republicans and Democrats did have some differences, even though there is a lot in common, Leader McConnell provided the opportunity to have that debate right here on the Senate floor. We could have had that debate in front of the American people. I think it might have helped, No. 1, as Senator Scott likes to say, send a signal that we actually are listening, we hear you, we see you, and we are responding to you—no backroom negotiations like apparently what our Democratic colleagues want; rather, an open and honest debate right here in full view of the American people.

Our Democratic colleagues refused to participate in the process and have blocked us from even considering police reform legislation. This ‘my way or the highway’ legislative strategy we have come to expect from our colleagues is absolutely shameful, and it is counterproductive.

I remember talking to Rodney Floyd—George Floyd’s brother—shortly before his funeral and he said: Senator, we are from Texas. What we want for George is Texas-sized justice.

I said: Rodney, I am going to do my best to deliver on every one of these things without even a 180.

The JUSTICE Act would have ended the choke holds and prevented this dangerous and outdated tactic from being used in police departments across the country. The bill introduced by Senator Scott would have done as proposed. Subject to amendments and votes, there would have been multiple opportunities to stop the bill if it wasn’t heading in the right direction the whole time.

First of all, this would have made lynching a Federal crime. That provision in the bill was actually authored by Senators Harris and Booker, but believe it or not, they filibustered and blocked it.

The JUSTICE Act would have ended the 827-page and 13,000-word document that our Democratic colleagues do? They blocked it.

This legislation would have helped local police departments improve minority hiring so that the departments would look more like the communities they served. Our Democratic colleagues blocked that too.

This bill would have strengthened the use and accountability for body cameras, improved access to deescalation and duty to intervene training, and established new requirements to give us a better understanding of the challenges that need to be addressed in the long run. What did our Democratic colleagues do? They blocked it.

Frankly, it is insulting to the memory of people like Mr. Floyd and others for whom so much empathy and sympathy and concern was expressed that when the time comes to actually do something, they come to this empty-handed.

For weeks, we have watched people of all races and cultures and backgrounds
marching and demanding action. They want to see greater transparency and accountability. They want better training and education for our police officers. They want to know that at the end of the day, the color of your skin will not determine the nature and outcome of an encounter with a police officer. I agree with each of those points, and until this morning, I believed every Member of the Senate did as well. But the actions we have seen this morning blocking this legislation, stopping even debating the bill, offering amendments, trying to make it better—I guess I was giving our colleagues credit, which they clearly do not deserve.

The problems that led to the death of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and other Black Americans have not gone away, but our Democratic colleagues have proven they are more interested in politics than solutions.

Let the record reflect that this morning, we have the opportunity to take the first step toward passing reforms that would begin to heal the divisions and distrust between law enforcement and the communities they served, and our Democratic colleagues unequivocally and shamelessly stood in the way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss Republicans’ historic record on confirming judges and why it matters to our country. It is because the rulings of these judges affect all Americans.

The Republican-led Senate has seated President Trump’s highly qualified judicial nominees at lightning speed. These judges respect and uphold the rule of law. This week, the Senate marks a major milestone by confirming the 200th—200th—Trump judicial nominee.

The appeals court nominations and confirmations are especially critical. These are the circuit courts, and they rank right below the Supreme Court. Their decisions have a major impact on our Nation. With the confirmation of Cory Wilson to the Fifth Circuit, we have now filled all 53 appeals court vacancies that existed in the United States. There is not a single vacancy at that court level in America.

When I served as Mayor, the makeup of powerful appeals courts like the Second, the Third, the Ninth, and the Eleventh circuits. Seven of the 12 U.S. circuit courts are now at a point where they have a majority of Republican-appointed judges.

The 250 judges we have seated represent a sea change—a generational change in the Federal bench. I remind you that these are lifetime appointments, so they will decide cases for decades.

Let me assure people who are tuning in today: These judges will apply the law as written. They will not legislate from the bench. We have had enough of that. Republicans are stemming this liberal judicial tide that we have lived with in the past. We are delivering on our promise to promote an independent judiciary.

This concept is key to upholding our Constitution’s separation of powers and our system of checks and balances. Simply put, it is the glue holding our democracy together.

The Constitution limits the power of the judiciary. Only Congress makes law, not the courts. This is not the way some courts like to operate. The courts interpret the law as a separate, coequal, and independent branch of government. That is what the Constitution tells us. And the judges’ job is to follow the law, period. Yet, for decades, Democrats have hijacked the courts. They have sought to make their preferred policies through something known as judicial activism.

Activist judges have used the bench to make liberal laws in a very liberal way. Rather than decide cases impartially, liberal judges have a habit of favoring the left. The result has been a slew of radical reforms. These include promoting overregulation that hurt farmers and blocking the President’s efforts to secure the border.

Republicans are replacing these liberal activist judges with Trump-appointed constitutional conservatives. These judges will uphold the law, not their own ideology. They will rule right now as they did throughout the entire country. If you ask “How are they making a difference?” they are doing it by protecting our constitutional rights, by safeguarding our individual freedoms, and by checking unbridled government power.

These judges are blocking Federal overreach. They are preventing Washington bureaucrats from inventing endless rules. They are upholding pro-life precedent and recognizing the right to life at the smallest possible point. They are defending the Second Amendment, securing the border, and protecting our First Amendment rights, including free speech and religious liberty.

Above all, Republican-appointed judges are applying the law as written; they are not making law from the bench. This has Democrats worried. You have seen it. You heard the comments on the floor and around the Nation. Democrats are worried they are losing control of the courts. If the next President is a Democrat, the minority leader, is so worried, in fact, that he even threatened harm to Supreme Court Justices who don’t rule his way. He recently stood outside the Supreme Court, and he yelled at the court building and the Justices inside. He mentioned Justices by name and said: “You have released a whirlwind, and you will pay the price!” “You will pay the price!” This is how the left tends to operate: intimidation. Do what we say, give us control, and then the intimidation will stop.

They are threatening the independence of the judiciary in other ways as well. Democrats have announced their plans to pack the Supreme Court. They have announced they will pack the Court with Justices friendlier to their causes.

The standard we all know for the Supreme Court is nine Justices. In fact, it has been nine Justices since 1869—for over 150 years. Yet they want to change this longstanding precedent by actually increasing the number of Supreme Court Justices, taking it from 9 to 11. Some are proposing going to 13 if a Democrat is elected President and they have control of the Senate. Let us be clear: Court-packing amounts to deck-stacking by the far left.

Democrats want to regain power, tip the scales of justice, and deliver their leftwing agenda any way they can. If Democrats win the election, as they have threatened, they will pack and stack the Court with impunity.

The stakes in this election could not be higher. The next President will appoint maybe more than 60 circuit court judges and possibly another Supreme Court Justice.

This is about ensuring justice. It is about ensuring fairness. It is about ensuring freedom for all Americans. Republicans, through today confirming our 200th judge to the courts, are stemming this liberal judicial tide. We have delivered generational change on the bench. We must continue confirming well-qualified judges who will secure our freedoms and our future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 4049

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, on Tuesday night, Senator REED and I had the honor of filing S. 4049, the 60th annual National Defense Authorization Act. Think about that—60 years. This is something we are always pretty confident we will eventually get passed. To me, it is the most significant bill of the year, and we have been doing it now successfully for 60 years. It is what we consider every year, and we know it is going to pass because it has always passed, but it is also about taking care of our troops and defending our country.

There is a document no one reads anymore. It is called the Constitution. It talks about what our primary responsibility is, which is to defend America. We are in a much more dangerous position today than we have ever been before, so I think it is fitting that we are doing this ahead of the Fourth of July, which is my birthday. We wouldn’t have our freedoms without our men and women in uniform from the past and present, and that is
who we are dedicating this to. They are the beneficiaries of what we are doing as we are the beneficiaries of what they are doing.

It is why we can all come together and finish this bill by next Thursday. I would say, even if we can come together there is opposition to this. I say that because it would be the last day before the recess that is coming up, the Fourth of July, and I think it would be good if we could do it that way. There is a lot for that, but we are also realistic, and we are not sure that we are going to be able to do it, but we are going to make every effort to do it.

One thing about working with my partner over here, Senator REED, is that we have always operated in a very cooperative manner, and we have supported each other. He answers to his Democratic friends, and we bring them together because of the relationship that we have on this committee. So I think there is always a possibility we can get this done.

Both Senator REED and I would like to use an open amendment process. This is a process that would allow for all of our Members to come in and do what they have to do and do what they want to do to this bill. What we want to have in the bill. We were not able to do that over the last couple of years because we had objections.

One thing about the Senate is that everything operates on the basis of unanimous consent, so if we have someone who objects, we are unable to do it. Hopefully, that will not happen again this year, and we will be able to use the open amendment process.

In having said that, it is not going to be nearly as significant this year because what we did in this year’s bill is to have actually made an appeal way back in February to our Democrats and Republicans, not just to those on the Armed Services Committee but to those in the entire Senate. Here in February, we said: Start getting your amendments ready. We will warn at that time that we didn’t want to wait until the last minute. Get them out there so we can talk about them and prepare them for ultimate votes. So people actually started. They were warned at that time that we didn’t want to wait until the last minute to do this. This is the first time we have been able to successfully do this.

Of all of the items that are in this bill—Senator REED and I consider to be the most significant of the year—40 percent of the input came from our Members of the Senate, and 40 percent of it came from the administration and the Pentagon, so that all of those things have already been treated once. Now, I have been around here long enough to remember when that 40 percent wasn’t 40 percent—it was about 6 percent. We didn’t get the input of the Members like we do today. We just operated differently at that time. This is the third year we have been in a position where we have been able to get a higher percentage of input from the Members. I think that is something that is working well, and it has already given the Members time to participate.

I will put this a different way. The bill includes nearly 600 requests for amendments from the members of the Armed Services Committee and almost that it will not be necessary to have more amendments since that is what we have already done.

If we want to finish this bill by the end of next week, we will need to reach a unanimous consent agreement before this Friday. I understand there may be an objection to that which could happen, or there could be a change of mind. It is still my hope that this will take place. There is a reason for that, too, in that the House will be working on its bill right after we come back from the recess. We have nearly run out of time, so we need to get this started.

We are putting in the managers’ package a bipartisan set of amendments that we can all agree on. I ask all of our Members to get those in by this time on Tuesday. I think it is going to be necessary for the staff to work all the way through the weekend to put it in position. We know we want to complete the first managers’ package, so the amendments will have to be filed and reviewed, and I have that as a deadline for getting those amendments in.

In recent years, we have been able to consider many amendments on the floor. As I said earlier, I hope we will be able to do that again, and it may or may not happen. If a Member has an amendment and wants to debate it on the floor, we also need to know that the Member desires to have a debate so that we can work that in. Last year, the Members were working through their amendments, please be thoughtful that we shouldn’t get bogged down with a lot of amendments that have nothing to do with national defense. This is the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. We should be talking about military. Yet one of the things that is characteristic about this is that, for as many years as we have been here and since this is the one bill that is going to be a must-pass bill this year, the people who were not able to get their bills in or amendments in on other bills wait until this comes along and try to do this with amendments. I am discouraging that from happening, and I hope that it doesn’t happen. What is most important here is that we take care of our men and women in uniform. That is what it is all about. They are all volunteers, and they are deserving of our support.

Again, my message to Members is to get their amendments filed as soon as possible. As I noted, this is the 60th annual NDAA. For the last 59 years, Congress has always passed an NDAA on a bipartisan basis. That is a big deal, and it is not a legacy we take lightly. I have been privileged to participate in this process as a member of the big four. I will tell you how that works.

We do our bill, and the House does its bill, and everyone is supposed to come together, and we are still not able to get together, so they take the big four, which constitutes the ranking Democrat and Republican in the House and the ranking Democrat and Republican in the Senate, and the four of us sit down and get it done. We have failed in that several times in the past. It is the stopgap. It is the one last thing that we have to do if we are not able to do it any other way.

Every year, we are told there are things we can’t accomplish. Every year, we are told there is no way we can find common ground. All of this happens, but, always, we do it, and our grand, bipartisan tradition continues just, as it will this year. The reason is simple: Failure and, worse, failure on our part is not an option.

While we are doing this, what I will remind everyone is that our military was hurt pretty badly under the previous administration. I always admired President Obama. He had a different agenda, and consequently we had some problems. I would say this: In the last 5 years of his 8-year administration—that would be from 2010 to 2015—our defense spending dropped by 25 percent. That has never happened before, and our military has been working to rebuild since then. We are not quite there yet, but we have made great headway. It is easy to cut our military, to reduce readiness, to slow down production, and all of that, but it is harder, not to mention slower and more costly, to rebuild it. That is what we are in the middle of right now.

So that is what this is all about. It is a significant bill, and it is something we need to get done. Then it comes time for it to come to the floor, which is where we are now.

I have to say this: I can’t think of anyone I would rather have as a partner than Senator REED. Senator REED and I have worked together for many years, and we have a way of getting along with each other and of coming to conclusions and the right decisions. It has been an honor for me over the years to have worked, as we are this year, with Senator REED. We are going to get a good bill done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to join my colleague and chairman, Senator INHOFE, to discuss the fiscal year 2021 national defense authorization bill.

I begin by thanking Senator INHOFE for his leadership in ensuring that we had a bill to consider this year. This was an extraordinary year. Social distancing just began as the Armed Services Committee was finishing our hearings and getting ready to go into
the markup for the national defense authorization bill. Despite the uncertainty, the unusual challenges—the logistical challenges particularly—Senator INHOFE ensured that the bill was written and that the markup was held on schedule. He could be commended for this accomplishment. It is a tribute to his leadership, to his wisdom, to his common sense, and to his common decency.

So thank you for that, Mr. Chairman. I also want to take a moment to thank the staff. Both the chairman and I operate under the same rubric: They do the work, and we get the credit. It works for us—their work for us. They do a superb job. They found ways to draft the legislation. Yet they, too, were disrupted. Their work spaces were separated, and many had to work from home. So this has been an extraordinary achievement, and it is a tribute to their commitment, to their professionalism, to their skill, and to their collaborative bipartisan effort. I thank them for that.

As the Senator, the chairman, has said and emphasized several times “bipartisanship.” This has been the hallmark of this legislation for many, many years. We recall colleagues, going back to John Warner and Sam Nunn and others, who had the attitude that “we have to work together.” Again, let me give the chairman credit for preserving that attitude, for insisting on it, and for really getting, I think, the best out of the committee because of his example and of his setting a tone.

We have differences in the bill, but we are strongly behind this effort. One of the things that I think we have been able to do is to figure out what might be a point of difference and that, if it comes to down to it, we take a vote, and we move on, and we get the bill done. That is what we did this time. We look forward to working on the floor and to doing the same thing—taking amendment proposals from our colleagues and trying to deal with them. If we can include them in the bill unanimously, that will be great. If we need a vote, I hope we can have debate and get a vote.

We all understand that the bill provides the Defense Department with the resources it needs, particularly to ensure that the men and women who defend our nation have the resources they need not only to fight the fight but, when they return, to have a quality of life with their families themselves that is in keeping with their sacrifice and their service. This bill does that. It also funds at the caps set under the recently enacted Budget Control Act of about 2 years ago, so we are providing the much needed stability the Department needs. It will include many items that benefit the families and military members, and I will go into those details later in our discussion.

Now, 2 weeks ago, the committee took up the bill in the markup. Again, under the leadership of the chairman, we had a very good day of discussion and debate, and the bill was adopted by the committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 25 to 2. This legislation is coming to the floor with overwhelming bipartisan support, and as the chairman indicated, the reason is that he solicited the input of all of the members. We and our staff tried very vigorously to incorporate those proposals and ideas of all members, and at the end of the day, it was a strong, overwhelming vote.

But even though we did consider, as the chairman said, hundreds of different proposals by members of the committee and Members of the Senate, there are still issues that will come before us. That is why, on the floor, I hope we will have, as the chairman indicated, an open debate, that we will consider amendments—hopefully do so under reasonable time constraints so that we can get a lot done—and then, if the time allows, be able to vote for a bill that will advance the welfare of the men and women who serve and advance the common defense, which is our constitutional responsibility.

Again, I thank Senator INHOFE and look forward to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me just make one other comment. Senator Reed talked about the staff and what the staff has done. When I talk to people back in Oklahoma about how hard a lot of these people work, they think of people in government as not caring to really spend the time and make the effort.

I mentioned a minute ago that our staff is going to be working all this next weekend, and they have been working every weekend, that I can remember, to get this thing done.

There are two people in particular—John Bonsell and Liz King. Liz King is the top adviser and manages things for Senator REED, and John Bonsell has done the same thing for me. He actually worked for me many years ago. When you see how hard they work and their long hours—early in the morning until late at night and then on weekends—I just really want to say, not just of those two individuals but of the people they have working for them, that I have never seen a harder working group. Their job, I guess—I say to my friend Senator REED—is to make us look good, but they are the ones who do the work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll of Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING SISTER THOMAS WELDER

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an influential and beloved North Dakotan, Sister Thomas Welder. I know the Presiding Officer knew her very well and just a little bit ago spoke about her here on the Senate floor, and that is so appropriate. She was a wonderful woman, and we both are so very fortunate to have known her and to have had time with her, to have learned much from her. She is truly somebody who I think epitomizes the term “servant leader.”

Sister Thomas Welder was somebody who for me was a friend and a mentor in so many different ways, it is hard to recount, and also for my wife Mikey. Sister Thomas Welder dedicated her life to the University of Mary and the students, and my wife Mikey is on the board of trustees at the University of Mary, so Mikey and Sister Thomas worked together for many, many years and share an unbelievable bond as well. I am not even sure how long Mikey and I have known Sister Thomas; it has been many years. We have seen her in so many different capacities and so many different ways, but without fail, she was an inspiration—an inspiration for both of us and an inspiration for anybody who ever met her. She truly was one of the most exceptional, amazing, wonderful people I have ever met. She was certainly a person of incredible faith, and she lived her faith, and she provided that to others, certainly in her words but in her deeds and in her spirituality, in the way that she handled herself, in her spirit and compassion, and it affected everyone she met. Everyone she met felt that radiant glow and reflected it back because it was so powerful within her.

She was a member of the Benedict Sisters of Annunciation Monastery and faithfully lived the monastic life for 59 years.

From 1978 to 2009, she served as the president of the University of Mary and was, as I say, beloved by students and faculty. Under her leadership, the university did amazing things. She is my former teacher. The Presiding Officer worked there at the University of Mary during her tenure as president of the school. She grew the enrollment—I think tripled the enrollment.

She was a gifted leader, an inspiring leader. She led by example. I think one of the most amazing things about her—a story you hear about over and over again; people marvel about it. When she originally came back after her school year at the University of Mary, she taught music, but she eventually became president of the university. Even after she was president of the university and Msgr. Shea became president of the university, she stayed around and continued to work with the university and the students.

One of the amazing stories that people would talk about and marvel at is how she would go on campus and she would meet all the students. So she got to know them all, thousands of students. She knew all the faculty and administrators and that kind of thing because they were there all the time. But
she would get to know all the students, and without fail, she would remember those students’ names. She went around the campus, and it wasn’t just “Hi, how are you?” She knew the students. She knew their names. She knew who they were. This people not only that she was able to do that, but she never seemed to forget a name. You have to remember, there are thousands of students, and they are there for a while, and they move on and more come in.

It is one thing to know the faculty and administrators and those kinds of things and people who are there year in and year out, but think about the flow of students coming through, and you know them and know them by name. I think it is not only a testament to her but a testament to the University of Mary, where they really make those students feel special and feel that they are an individual. That is what she did, and what a difference she made in the lives of so many.

As I say, I don’t know that I ever met anyone who didn’t immediately like her, but it was more than that. I mean, there are a lot of people who are likeable, affable, and amiable. She was all of that. She was very, very likeable. She had a great smile, good wit, and good humor. She was a really good speaker. She was always very prepared, always had a good message, and was well-spoken, with a great smile and a ready laugh, and she immediately made people feel comfortable. You could see how she would lean in and gaze in on them and just start to talk: Tell me about you. Give me some of what you do. Little bit of what is your spirit, what moves you, what makes you. What are you interested in? What do you like? How are you feeling?

She just did it naturally. I just, again, can’t think of anybody who ever met her and didn’t come away saying: You know, I like her, but she is special. She made me feel good. She made me feel good. She seemed interested in me. She is genuine. She cares. She made an impact on me.

They remember her, and it was positive, and it was strong. Mikey and I extend our deepest condolences to her loved ones, and when I say her family, she had a huge family because everybody she met was basically her family, all those kids and all those students. We want to express our sincere appreciation for her lifetime of service and her commitment to our community and her commitment to God. Sister Thomas was wonderful, Sister Thomas was beloved, and Sister Thomas will be missed very, very much. God bless her.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to block consideration of the JUSTICE bill. This happened to be the first major piece of police reform legislation in years.

To be clear, this vote wasn’t a vote to pass the bill in the Senate. It wasn’t even a vote to limit debate on police reform. It was a vote on whether we could simply begin debate on police reform.

We are standing now on the floor of what is called the world’s greatest deliberative body, the U.S. Senate. Yet my colleagues on the other side wouldn’t even entertain a debate on an issue that has stirred our Nation and shaken it to its core.

We know why we are here. There was a murder of a citizen at the hands of police—George Floyd. There have been peaceful demonstrations all over the country since then, and Congress’s time to respond probably—probably should have responded years ago, but this has brought to a head that we need police reform.

Yes, we are in the world’s greatest deliberative body, we are told. The Senate’s legacy and prestige are built on our ability to debate and discuss legislation, to address the most pressing issues before our country. My colleagues on the other side have robbed the American people of the opportunity to pass meaningful police reform.

On the other side, the argument that the JUSTICE Act doesn’t go far enough and that their version of police reform is the only bill worth considering. All the brains in the U.S. Senate are on the other side of the aisle, is more or less what they are saying. I want to remind them that we live in a country with diverse ideas and varying opinions. Debating those differences is the only way to make meaningful reform.

Democrats complain that their views weren’t represented in this bill. Well, the JUSTICE Act contains a number of proposals that actually have bipartisan support. Even if that wasn’t enough for them, every Democrat would still have an opportunity to make additional changes.

On our side, Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina led this effort for all of us. Forty-six of us are joining him. I hope the other seven will join in as well. But that is just Republicans, and the other side isn’t nearly bipartisan enough to satisfy the other side but still bipartisan—and they wouldn’t let us move ahead.

Senator SCOTT made clear when the bill was introduced last week that he was interested and willing to discuss changes. Leader MCCONNELL pledged an open amendment process. Even Speaker PELOSI noted that she welcomed the opportunity to conference the Democratic House police reform bill with Senator SCOTT’s JUSTICE Act.

Instead of letting our time-honored legislative process work, my colleagues sent a letter calling the JUSTICE Act “unsalvageable.” Let’s remember—this is the same Senators who insisted that the Senate consider a police reform bill before the July recess, which starts next week. Now that they are getting what they asked for, they say they don’t want it anymore—at least that is what their vote tells me today.

My question is, What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of losing control of
the process if it goes to a vote? Well, then, they are afraid of democracy. They are afraid of the American people who elected each Senator in this body and trusts each Senator to represent them by voting on legislation.

Are they really afraid of the American people? I have heard that their ideas won’t be adopted? The JUSTICE Act has many similarities to the Justice in Policing Act. We want to find a way forward on a bipartisan basis. If ideas have merit, they will have to be voted on and be included.

Are they somehow afraid that if we make progress, it will be perceived as giving the President and his party a win? I have been around here long enough to know that in an election year, it gets harder and harder to get things done because neither party wants the other to get any credit for anything or have an advantage. But on an issue as important as this, it is the height of cynicism and hypocrisy to prevent progress to gain political advantage.

I am reminded of a Scripture: “For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world but lose his soul?”

The American people expect better. I know that my fellow Iowans expect better. Frankly, I expect better as well. I hope my colleagues reconsider their obstruction and let us get on with crafting a bipartisan police reform bill. I know my colleagues on the other side share our desire to do what is best for our constituents. I don’t doubt their sincerity about wanting to address inequities in the communities or unfairness in policing. I don’t doubt they would have had legitimate ideas on how to improve this legislation if it had come before the Senate. But at the very least, we can’t accomplish any of those things unless we start debate.

We have done it before on other issues. Only 18 months ago, this Chamber passed the FIRST STEP Act, the most significant criminal justice reform bill in a generation. That was a strong bipartisan bill. It wasn’t easy, but Senator Durbin and I and Democrats and other Republicans in addition to the two of us found a path forward and are giving thousands of Americans a chance to improve their lives when they leave prison.

I am frustrated that the Senate can’t consider this JUSTICE Act, but I promise the American people that this partisan exercise doesn’t represent my last hope for meaningful change. I stand ready to work with any Democrat or any Republican on the issue of police reform, and, for sure, I am not alone in the willingness to do that.

In fact, at the Judiciary Committee, just last week, the issue was police use of force and community relations. At that meeting, Chairman Graham indicated that he wants to hold more hearings on this issue.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to let today’s vote be the end of the story. There is and has been an evergreen issue. George Floyd’s murder was the spark that ignited a national outcry. We must rise to the occasion. We cannot let election-year politics and differences of opinion prevent us from even discussing how to improve justice and safety in our communities.

FLYNN INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, I will speak just a short period of time on another issue that was resolved today by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. Finally, justice has been served on a person who has been very unjustly treated, a person by the name of Lieutenant General Flynn, who served this country 33 years in the military.

Today, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordered the district court to grant the government’s motion to dismiss the Flynn case. Remember, this has been going on for almost 4 years.

I am pleased the appeals court upheld what it called “clearly established legal principles.” The appeals court said that the first “troubling indication” of the district judge’s “misunderstanding” of his role was to appoint a former judge, and now a private attorney, to argue against the government’s proposal to District Judge Sullivan to dismiss the Flynn case. Remember, the reason for that was that he was mistreated in the first place.

As the majority opinion said: “The court has appointed one private citizen to argue that another citizen should be deprived of his liberty regardless of whether the Executive Branch is willing to pursue those charges.”

The DC Circuit is ordering an end to this charade, and let Lieutenant General Flynn get back to his life and his family. Remember, this is a case where we set up—and you saw the emails from people that were going to prosecute General Flynn. At that point, we all know the FBI had fired Flynn. Is it or is it to get Flynn fired? Or is it to get him prosecuted? That is how open it was, but we didn’t know about that until a few months ago.

So, today, Flynn’s legal team released Strzok’s notes regarding a meeting between Obama, Biden, Comey, Sally Yates, and Susan Rice. These notes appear to show several important things. The first one is, Comey said the Flynn calls with the Russian Ambassador had not been investigated. President Obama ordered Comey to “look at things.” Three, President Obama directed that “the right people” investigate Flynn. Four, Vice President Biden appeared to raise the Logan Act. The Logan Act appears to give this to you as an example. We have done it before, and if you let people run wild over the freedoms and liberties of the American people, if it can happen to a lieutenant general, it can happen to anybody else, and we saw it happen to General Flynn, murdered because of justice and the constitutional rights of people not being followed.
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So then we have the incoming Trump administration and all this going on, having no idea that Obama, Biden, Comey, and Strzok were busy setting the stage for what would become a multiyear struggle to show that Trump didn’t collude with the Russians. What a mess. The stage was set for a peaceful transition of power from one President to another and from one political party to another. It was something that for 240 years we prided ourselves in, but not in this mess. By the time the election, November of 2016, think of all the things that have been done to get Trump out of office, and it started even before he was sworn in.

Well, thankfully, the DC Circuit stepped in to restore a bit of justice after the government’s multiyear campaign to destroy Flynn’s reputation. The FBI and the Department of Justice’s actions to frame an American citizen, drag that citizen into court, settle the case, and then do everything they can to cover up their transgressions should never happen and should never have happened either. Let’s all hope it never happens again. I yield the floor.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am here to talk about a complicated but really important issue, and it is one that Congress and the administration needs to address before it results in a devastating financial impact on millions of retirees, raises costs to thousands of businesses, some of which are going to go insolvent—bankrupt—unless the government steps in, and an issue that can harm the overall economy if it is not dealt with.

The Presiding Officer has been very involved in this issue, and I hope others will bear with me as we talk about it, because it is complicated, but it is really important. I am talking about multiemployer pension reform, and as anyone who is working on this problem can tell you, it is something that we cannot ignore.

Briefly, a multiemployer pension plan consists of multiple different companies. Usually, employees in a single union pool their assets together, and they provide a defined benefit pension—the old-style pensions, a guarantee paid by the company to cover workers and retirees. These plans are jointly administered, then, between the unions and the employers as trustees, who determine the benefits and the employer contributions based on the collective bargaining process and subject to whatever statutory funding requirements there are that we provide here in the U.S. Congress and through law.

It is a system of a lot of different employers coming together and providing a pension under one union typically. This system now comprises over 1,400 plans covering 10.8 million participants and their families. Unfortunately, it is on the verge of collapse. The system is underfunded by more than $638 billion, and that figure has probably increased significantly due to the coronavirus epidemic and the resulting impact on the economy.

On top of that, there is the Federal entity that ensures these pensions. Pensions are sort of a guaranteed benefit, so-called, but they are guaranteed in a sense because they are insured by a Federal entity called the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. That PBGC for the multiemployer plan is projected to become insolvent in less than 5 years. Over 1.4 million workers and retirees are in plans already in what is called “critical and declining status,” meaning they are facing benefit cuts of over 90 percent. So that is the problem.

This chart can sort of show it to you here. These are the assets at the start of the year—2019, 2020, 2021—and this is what happens. The assets go down, the liabilities go up. This is the financial assistance provided to the various plans. So, as you can see, the green is only going to last until 2025. And, again, with the new economic numbers, that will be exhausted even before that, which creates a real problem for those plan participants or retirees, for the companies that are going to have huge new liabilities—and some of them will not be able to handle it and will not be able to stay in business—and for our economy, because that will then have a contagion impact on the entire economy.

So those workers who are expecting to have the benefit because they are still working and those retirees who are facing those cuts are looking to us to do something to fix the problem, to protect pensions for the plan participants or retirees, for the companies that are going to have huge new liabilities—and some of them will not be able to handle it and will not be able to stay in business—and for our economy, because that will then have a contagion impact on the entire economy.

Some are already insolvent, like the Teamsters Local 116 of Cleveland Pension Fund, for some, unfortunately, this insolvency has already happened.

The Central States Pension Fund, which is the single largest plan that is in this critical and declining status, is projected to become insolvent in 2025—the same time the PBGC is because when it goes under, PBGC goes under; it is that big. They have 44,000 participants in that plan that go—if, in Ohio—again, more than any other State. The majority of Central States’ retirees are veterans, by the way, according to the National United Committee to Protect Pensions. They receive about $360 million in annual benefits from their pensions. By the way, that money goes right back into the economy. That is the single largest plan.

Unfortunately, years of bad Federal policy with respect to funding and withdrawal liability rules, losses on risky investments, and failure to take proactive action have brought many of these pension plans to the brink of insolvency. The result is that these hard-working Ohioans in Central States face pension cuts of over 90 percent if no action is taken. That is unacceptable. We can’t let that happen.

By the way, it is not just a retirement security issue, as I said earlier; it is a jobs issue. The multiemployer pension system consists primarily of smaller businesses that face uncertainty and a higher cost of doing business due to the liability they will face called withdrawal liability.

More than 200 small businesses are in Central States alone in my home State of Ohio—200 businesses that face huge withdrawal liability costs which are much bigger than the book value of the company, meaning, of course, that they are not going to make it.
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The Presiding Officer has been very involved in this issue, and I hope others will bear with me as we talk about it, because it is complicated, but it is really important. I am talking about multiemployer pension reform, and as anyone who is working on this problem can tell you, it is something that we cannot ignore.

Briefly, a multiemployer pension plan consists of multiple different companies. Usually, employees in a single union pool their assets together, and they provide a defined benefit pension—the old-style pensions, a guarantee paid by the company to cover workers and retirees. These plans are jointly administered, then, between the unions and the employers as trustees, who determine the benefits and the employer contributions based on the collective bargaining process and subject to whatever statutory funding requirements there are that we provide here in the U.S. Congress and through law.

It is a system of a lot of different employers coming together and providing a pension under one union typically. This system now comprises over 1,400 plans covering 10.8 million participants and their families. Unfortunately, it is on the verge of collapse. The system is underfunded by more than $638 billion, and that figure has probably increased significantly due to the coronavirus epidemic and the resulting impact on the economy.

On top of that, there is the Federal entity that ensures these pensions. Pensions are sort of a guaranteed benefit, so-called, but they are guaranteed in a sense because they are insured by a Federal entity called the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. That PBGC for the multiemployer plan is projected to become insolvent in less than 5 years. Over 1.4 million workers and retirees are in plans already in what is called “critical and declining status,” meaning they are facing benefit cuts of over 90 percent. So that is the problem.

This chart can sort of show it to you here. These are the assets at the start of the year—2019, 2020, 2021—and this is what happens. The assets go down, the liabilities go up. This is the financial assistance provided to the various plans. So, as you can see, the green is only going to last until 2025. And, again, with the new economic numbers, that will be exhausted even before that, which creates a real problem for those plan participants or retirees, for the companies that are going to have huge new liabilities—and some of them will not be able to handle it and will not be able to stay in business—and for our economy, because that will then have a contagion impact on the entire economy.

So those workers who are expecting to have the benefit because they are still working and those retirees who are facing those cuts are looking to us to do something to fix the problem, to protect pensions for the plan participants or retirees, for the companies that are going to have huge new liabilities—and some of them will not be able to handle it and will not be able to stay in business—and for our economy, because that will then have a contagion impact on the entire economy.

Some are already insolvent, like the Teamsters Local 116 of Cleveland Pension Fund, for some, unfortunately, this insolvency has already happened.

The Central States Pension Fund, which is the single largest plan that is in this critical and declining status, is projected to become insolvent in 2025—the same time the PBGC is because when it goes under, PBGC goes under; it is that big. They have 44,000 participants in that plan that go—if, in Ohio—again, more than any other State. The majority of Central States’ retirees are veterans, by the way, according to the National United Committee to Protect Pensions. They receive about $360 million in annual benefits from their pensions. By the way, that money goes right back into the economy. That is the single largest plan.

Unfortunately, years of bad Federal policy with respect to funding and withdrawal liability rules, losses on risky investments, and failure to take proactive action have brought many of these pension plans to the brink of insolvency. The result is that these hard-working Ohioans in Central States face pension cuts of over 90 percent if no action is taken. That is unacceptable. We can’t let that happen.

By the way, it is not just a retirement security issue, as I said earlier; it is a jobs issue. The multiemployer pension system consists primarily of smaller businesses that face uncertainty and a higher cost of doing business due to the liability they will face called withdrawal liability.

More than 200 small businesses are in Central States alone in my home State of Ohio—200 businesses that face huge withdrawal liability costs which are much bigger than the book value of the company, meaning, of course, that they are not going to make it.
In fact, if a systemically important plan like Central States were to become insolvent, contributing employers face the risk of being assessed unplanned withdrawal liabilities that will result in a wave of bankruptcies and a contagion effect across the economy as pension obligations spike. A number of contributing bases also fail. It will not just be that plan; it will be other plans as well because the companies pay into different plans.

Even if they are not assessed withdrawing liability, employers will be forced then to make contributions into an insolvent plan, making those companies not competitive in the labor market. They will not be able to pay their employees as much because they are making the payments into the insolvent plan.

These jobs are essential to our economy—right now, more than ever. Many of the current workers in the Central States Pension Fund, as an example, are women and these are the very truckdrivers who are keeping our grocery stores stocked. They are the supply lines running through this coronavirus crisis. They have put their health on the line for all of us, and we need to do everything best to ensure that the pensions they have earned—rightly earned—will be there for them.

While these problems were well known before the current economic downturn, this slowdown is only going to accelerate the crisis. As CBO projected in late April—that is, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—the second quarter of this fiscal year is projected to mark the largest percentage drop in economic output in recorded history, with the GDP projected to fall 40 percent on an annualized basis. That has a real impact on these pensions.

As chair of the Senate Finance subcommittee with jurisdiction over these multiemployer pension plans, I have been working on this issue with Democrats and Republicans alike, and I believe a balanced, pro-growth solution to the problem is possible. I also know that it is needed.

As bad as the pension crisis is for these retirees we talked about and for their individual plans, it also has a broader impact on our economy, so all of us should be interested in solving this problem.

It will not be easy, especially given the unprecedented health crisis we now face, but putting off this difficult work today means greater costs tomorrow. The costs compound, so it gets worse.

The multiemployer program deficit is projected to rise significantly as we wait until this period—around 2024 or 2025. Even if we didn’t have this pandemic, this is an issue we owe to our constituents to take proactive action on.

We have come some way on this project, and we have made some progress over time. In 2018, Senator Sherrod Brown and his co-chair Senator Orrin Hatch and I put together a framework for reform while serving on this Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans. I think that framework can effectively address the crisis.

We called it the bipartisan framework. It would have provided PBGC enough resources to prevent the plan put in place structural reforms to the funding rules and the way plans are governed to ensure a long-term solution going forward.

Unfortunately, the joint committee was not able to reach final agreement on these reforms, and therefore we weren’t able to stabilize the PBGC and put it on a stronger financial footing. But I strongly believe that the mechanism to address the immediate crisis that is in this bipartisan framework still offers the right way forward for us to get this done. In fact, I am pleased there is a renewed interest in addressing this crisis using this framework right now.

The House-passed HEROES Act—that is, the legislation the House passed to deal with the COVID–19 crisis—includes a proposal to try to fix this problem. Again, it is a step in the right direction in that they have chosen to adopt the approach used by PBGC and other small plans to help address the immediate crisis. That is the approach we took.

This is a step away from their previous plan in the House and among a lot of Democrats in the Senate, which was to essentially kick the can down the road for all inactive liabilities and, based on CBO analysis, would not have prevented PBGC from becoming insolvent. So this new structure makes more sense, and it is closer to the Senate bipartisan framework. The new House plan, therefore, costs a little less, and retirees also get more certainty from it.

There are some flaws in the House Democrats’ approach that still make it a nonstarter over here in the Senate. First, the House plan lacks responsibility when it comes to strengthening the financial condition of the PBGC. It entirely relies on taxpayers—so $59 billion of taxpayer funds over the next 10 years. Some on our side of the aisle, of course, find that to be a bailout by the taxpayers when, in fact, there ought to be more shared responsibility. This is particularly important now as there is more and more concern about the public money that is being spent.

Second, the participation in the plan includes no structural reforms whatsoever to the rules governing how multiemployer pension plans operate, how employer contributions are determined, and corrective actions that trustees can take to improve plan solvency and protect the participating plans.

What we don’t want to do is solve the problem with a bandaid and then have the problem come right back again. We want to get this right. The reforms that we are discussing are underpinning flaws in the system, and ensuring that PBGC can function as a self-sustaining entity rather than a new line item in the Federal budget funded by permanent entitlement spending. This has to be something that solves the problem long term. We can’t put in place a partial solution that will require Congress to come back again and again in the future. Unfortunately, the House Democrats’ plan fails to achieve this.

The bipartisan approach to reform the multiemployer pension system has to adhere to three main principles:

- No. 1, we do need shared responsibility to address the immediate crisis. We should not pass a legislative solution where the bill is entirely footed by taxpayers. Employers and participants must share the responsibility of fixing this problem—not taxpayers alone since 99 percent of taxpayers aren’t participating in this system.

A recent poll by McLaughlin & Associates of 2,700 likely voters in Midwestern States found that 76 percent of voters support a shared solution based on a combination of financial contributions from employers, retirees, and taxpayers.

A Congressional Budget Office 2017 working group paper found that both various exemptions from government employer contributions and accounting rules used by multiemployer plans played significant roles in allowing PBGC to become insolvent. So both exemptions from the employers putting money in and the accounting standards are the reason, they say, that PBGC became insolvent. So greater employer contributions are part of getting these plans back on track.

Second, I believe any solution must ensure sustainable solvency for the PBGC. Again, this is important to be sure that we are solving this problem. Overall, I believe premiums should be a significant contributor to the health of PBGC, covering at least half of the cost of recapitalization.

We also need our plan participants to participate, in the form of solvency fees paid directly to PBGC. With a significant variable-rate premium, by the way, we can make these solvency fees as low as 10 percent or maybe even lower. We need to think long and hard about the levels of shared responsibility that could include premiums imposed on workers, on unions, and increased flat-rate premiums as well. These would be small contributions but significant in the sense that everybody in the multiemployer plans everybody would do a little bit, and the taxpayers would be asked to do a lot too. But the only way we can get the taxpayers to make a substantial contribution is to ensure that there is this shared responsibility.

Third, any solution must ensure there is sustainable solvency for the multiemployer plans in the future. Any bipartisan solution should include structural reform to the funding rules governing employer contributions to multiemployer plans so that Congress and the Treasury will not be regularly called upon to bail out a large number of underfunded plans.
Retirees need to know these plans are secure. This includes gradually phasing down the rate at which plans may value existing pension liabilities, which are promises to retirees that should be kept but are being budgeted for through investments that the Congressional Budget Office says are high risk. Without any rules on how these pension liabilities are valued, there is high risk. Here is what the risk is now. Here is the average multiemployer plan target rate of return. Here is a conservative way to look at it: would be the interest rate on 10-year Treasuries.

By the way, the 10-year Treasury is now down to just about 1 percent, so it has gone down even further. This gap is that high risk the Congressional Budget Office is talking about. So there needs to be some solution here.

I understand that this needs to be phased in. It needs to be gradual. It needs to be reasonable. But we have to, again, as retirees know that, when they get into a plan and make contributions to a plan, it is going to be there for them.

The Senate Finance Committee published its own proposal in November which is set at the twin goals of addressing the immediate crisis through shared responsibility and preventing a future crisis through reformed multiemployer pension system. This was a Republican plan put forward by Senator Cassidy and was also put forward by the President. That proposal was called the Multiemployer Pension Recapitalization Reform Plan. It is not perfect, but it is worth emphasizing that the Trump administration supports this proposal and put out a Statement of Administration Policy endorsing it, saying: "We believe it has the potential to serve as the base for a long-term solution to the multiemployer pension crisis." I have talked to several people within the administration, and I think they are committed to a bipartisan agreement in this Congress to try to solve this problem.

Again, the plan put out by Senator Grassley and also Senator Alexander may not be perfect, but now you have two plans out there, both of which use the same basic structure, and I think there is an opportunity here for us to come together.

Right now, I know some of my counterparts in the House who have worked on the multiemployer pension proposal in the HEROES Act want to know whom they should be negotiating with because they are not negotiating right now on how to find that compromise. I would suggest talking to the Finance Committee. That is where the jurisdiction is. That is what the administration has indicated as well.

We have been working all year with the PBGC on a reasonable proposal that both sides can get support from the National United Committee to Protect Pensions, many of the Teamsters local unions, and many employers who are trying to stay afloat right now.

The Senate Finance Committee will continue to reach out to have a serious conversation with Democrats on both sides of the Capitol to help address this immediate crisis and ensure sustainable solvency for the multiemployer pension system. We must reach an agreement on this issue, shared responsibility will be necessary to make it work, in my view.

To reiterate, we are willing to put serious Federal funds—and we are willing to negotiate, but it has to be a balanced approach.

The time to act is now. The Senate Finance Committee has this commonsense proposal on the Republican side—again, vetted by PBGC—that, while not perfect, is an interesting starting point for us to come together. The House has its own proposal that has many similarities in terms of its structure. So don’t build upon those, as Republicans and Democrats, to ensure that we can get our multiemployer pension system back in working order. We owe it to the retirees. We owe it to the workers, to the participants in these plans, to the taxpayers, and to the treasuries. Let’s get serious about this and ensure we can protect the retirements of hard-working Americans we represent. Taxpayers deserve proactive action now, and so do workers and so do retirees.

Let’s get it done.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, nearly a month has passed since George Floyd died. In a show of unity, which bridged divides Americans—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—demanded that something be done to prevent such deaths from happening in the future. Republicans are trying to do something.

Thanks to the leadership of Senator Tim Scott, the Senate is trying to consider the JUSTICE Act, a major bill to reform policing in a meaningful, practical ways; yet today, Democrats blocked consideration of the bill. I hope Democrats allow the Senate to at least debate the JUSTICE Act. If Democrats don’t like the bill, offer an amendment. Make the case. Reforming police departments, making justice fair, and equal for all is a bipartisan issue.

I smiled when I was sitting in the Chair where you are right now, Mr. President, when a Senate colleague, who is a Democrat, spoke yesterday and described the Senate as the world’s greatest deliberative body. I thought she must be sarcastic. I say that because when I am a member watching who heard this dialogue yesterday or these speeches yesterday from our colleagues on the Democratic side. Let me just remind people, if we approve a bill, it still goes to conference committee.

The legislation passed by the House of Representatives is considered; those two bills are merged; and then it comes back for another vote. They have a chance to amend. They have a chance to vote against it if they don’t like the final product, and then it goes to a conference committee with Speaker Pelosi’s version, and then they get to vote against that if they don’t like that.

If all they do is allow deliberation of the bill—in what one said sarcastically was the “world’s greatest deliberative body”—they would have this, that, and that opportunity to either change, disapprove, or to vote on something which they finally approve. That is how it is supposed to work.

By the way, my young aide was bringing us into the Chamber and saw somebody in the hallway, and the young person said: Hmm, it doesn’t work that way. He remembered seeing this cartoon, this YouTube, when he was a kid. As he could say was: It doesn’t work that way.

It should. It is how our Founding Fathers set it up. But the other side decided it doesn’t work that way, and that is too bad. That is why we are in the business we are in. If we don’t deliberate, if we continue to have status quo over the change and the reform that all the American people are
demanding, then we will not be answering the pleas of those peaceful protesters who are asking for that change. The cynic might believe the Democrats blocked deliberation of the JUSTICE Act because they don’t want the President to win, to have a win in an election year. If that is the case, if this is purely political, they have let down the American people, especially those who demand justice. They let down the American people just to score political points.

Maybe they blocked it because it doesn’t include the Democratic Party’s new wish list: defunding and abolishing police forces. Perhaps they knew that, if somebody offered an amendment to the JUSTICE Act to defund police, then Members would be forced to vote on the measure rather than just pay lip service to an idea that is going nowhere.

Let me say, defunding and abolishing police forces is not the direction Republicans should take. For obvious reasons. Mobs are destroying and defacing property and destroying and defacing monuments of national heroes—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses Grant, World War II memorials defaced with swastikas, torn down by a mob that hates the United States of America.

When you establish a so-called police-free zone—an absurd promise for a utopian society that is, in fact, full of crime—the people in Seattle have had, I think, four shootings—at this point, the mob’s goal is not justice for George Floyd; the mob’s goal is about displaying their hatred for the United States of America.

If Senate Democrats reject that behavior of the mob, let the country hear you. Reject it. But that would require debate. That would require deliberation. That is what is being denied the JUSTICE Act. That is what Senate Democrats have blocked.

Here is what Senate Democrats blocked when they decided against allowing deliberation of the JUSTICE Act, if you will, addressing the demands of the people who are calling for reforms of policing. They denied stronger accountability measures for the police departments. The JUSTICE Act requires reporting of use of force and no-knock warrants. It increased penalty for false police reports. It institutes penalties for failing to properly preserve evidence. It requires sharing of disciplinary records so that departments will know whether an applicant has the history of bad behavior in another law enforcement department.

By the way, some of the Senate Democrats have said they want to outlaw these things. Offer an amendment. That is why you deliberate. You don’t come up with a deal in a back room and bring it—and, oh, my gosh, we have to vote on it. You offer an amendment. Allow the votes.

Why will they not respond to the pleas of the American people to deliberate, to consider, to come up with some form of fairness and policing for those who feel like it has been denied? Let me continue. The JUSTICE Act requires the Department of Justice to develop and provide training and deescalation and intervention techniques when police feel they are getting out of hand. That training works. The New Orleans Police Department has implemented it.

One of the images I saw when the riots were occurring in Minneapolis was this: On the police Department taking a knee with protesters in Jackson Square—literally on common ground—to say that we are with you to work towards a solution. That is because of this sort of training being instituted there. I am so proud that my State has example of that which works. This bill would take that which works and make it common across the country.

The JUSTICE Act also requires training and education about the African-American circumstances so officers can gain a better perspective in these communities. It promotes understanding of how African-American males are impacted by experience, including education, health, and financial status in the criminal justice system. It helps departments know the best practices for police tactics, employment processes, community transparency, and how law enforcement can best engage on issues related to race, health, homelessness, and addiction.

Senator Scott, drawing from his own experiences, crafted a bill with reforms that will lead to more accountability, fewer uses of force, and a better understanding of disenfranchised and minority communities that police should also serve and protect. Criminal justice reform advocates have long called for the very same reforms the JUSTICE Act institutes. In fact, there is a lot of agreement between Republicans and Democrats on many of the reforms in this bill.

I will ask once more: Why are Democrats blocking even a consideration on this floor of this bill? If you don’t like it, work to change it. If it passes, it only passes with your votes. If it does pass, it then goes to the House of Representatives for reconciliation with their bill, and then it comes back. But we should at least debate—at least pretend to hear the cries of the American people who are asking for justice for those who perceive that they have been denied.

We know that the JUSTICE Act brings about the changes to policing that Americans are calling for: more accountability, deescalation training, education, and other things. Yet again, Senate Democrats have blocked even a discussion of those reforms.

I ask myself—it doesn’t make sense, good people—why would they block the consideration, any response whatsoever to the cries of the people on the street that the Congress do something? Why would they even do that? Then I return to this. I think they are afraid that someone on their side of the aisle will offer an amendment to defund the police, and they would have to go on the record as to whether or not they are going to appose a radical left base or not. They don’t want to be made to look out of step or not they are going to support the men and women in uniform that protect us all. They don’t want that.

It is not just a political calculation that they don’t want President Trump to win. I suggest it is a political calculation that they don’t want a loss. They don’t want to be forced to declare their support for the police or their support to defund the police.

They are ignoring the cries of protesters demanding that George Floyd never occur again in order to cover political tracks. I think it is important to recognize that defunding the police, which I think is a radical concept, is sickied upon the side of the building.

I am always struck that my colleagues of both parties always thank Capitol Police for the service they do.

Don’t the people who live in our community thank the police officers to know their businesses stolen and robbed or burned? I think they do. But on the other hand, if you think police should be defunded, allow that amendment to come up, and then vote on it. The American people didn’t send us here to duck tough votes. They sent us here to declare that which we believe in but also to represent their interest.

A word about the mob that is not peaceful protesters advocating for justice for all but those who hate the United States of America, who wish to erase our history, and who wish to replace our national heroes with toppled statues and swastikas and hammer and sickle. The irony is that most of the mob relies upon constitutional protections of free speech and freedom of assembly. We cherish those rights. We cherish them and thank those who are peacefully protesting for exercising those constitutional rights.

I also hear from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that, somehow, these actions of anarchists are just violent. There is a sentiment that says we try to enact change peacefully, but nothing is happening. I, unfortunately, have to agree with them.

The Republicans have brought forward a bill that peacefully will begin to make changes in how policing is understood and practiced and, in peacefully doing so, bring about change for which they are advocating. But again, nothing has happened because Senate Democrats have blocked it. They don’t even want to debate a bill, offer amendments, vote against the final product, or allow it to go to a conference committee with the House of Representatives to be changed once more so that perhaps come more to their liking.

Again, my Senate Democratic colleagues are not just blocking reform;
they will not even allow discussion of reform. They don't want to talk to Republicans about it. They don't want to take a stand on defunding and abolishing police departments. Rather than have a debate, we go into hiding, leaving the issues regarding the reform of policing hanging. I hope my Democratic colleagues allow the debate to occur. I hope they recognize the importance of this issue to all Americans, especially to those in communities of color, but really to us all.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Come back to the table. Let's hear your amendments. Let's have debate. Let's enact the change we need by building a consensus on the best path forward. Let's live up to the statement that the Senate is the world's greatest deliberative body.

Together, the Senate—Republicans and Democrats—can deliver change for the American people. We can bring about the unity that we as a country desperately need in order to heal as a society, but this will only happen if my Senate Democratic colleagues stop hiding behind procedural votes.

Come to the floor. Let's deliberate. Let's do what the Founding Fathers imagined that we would. I know that it is politically difficult, but sometimes, we have to rise above political difficulty with a challenge of time, and that challenge is now. I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ROUSH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, over the school's two centuries, some of Kentucky's brightest students have walked Centre College's campus. Our Commonwealth's first Governor, Isaac Shelby, chaired the inaugural board. Prominent Kentucky surgeon Dr. Ephraim McDowell, whose accolades include a statue here in the U.S. Capitol, also served as a trustee. To date, Centre's alumni include two U.S. Vice Presidents, one Chief Justice and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, as well as more than a dozen Senate, 43 43 Members of Congress, and 11 Governors.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to another leading member of Centre's community: its 20th president and my good friend Dr. John Roush. At the end of this month, John will complete his service to the school, closing out 22 years of achievement that have brought well-deserved praise and growth to Centre.

Since coming to Danville, John has led a transformation of the school. He championed major investments into campus infrastructure, the addition of new endowed professorships, and the completion of a $120 million capital campaign. Along the way, a national publication named Centre the top school in the South.

Of course, Centre College is no stranger to making national headlines. In 2000, Centre hosted a Vice Presidential debate between Dick Cheney and our former colleague Joe Lieberman. When Centre was selected for this prestigious honor, it was the smallest higher educational institution in history to host a Presidential or Vice Presidential debate. By any objective standard, the event was a total success, and it came as a clear result of John's creativity and ingenuity. Afterward, a Washington Post writer praised the debate as "one of the best ever. The vice presidential debate today felt like a hole day was Norman Rockwell meets Alexis de Tocqueville."

That writer wasn't the only one impressed by Centre's performance. The Commission on Presidential Debates went back to John, asking Centre to host another Vice Presidential debate. Once again, the Centre community planned and executed an extraordinary event with the eyes of the country on them.

Last year, John led Centre in the celebration of its bicentennial anniversary with a full year of events. While the school honored its distinguished history, John seemed to consider his own place in it. He announced his retirement from Centre, making him one of the three longest serving presidents in the school's history.

Perhaps John's greatest legacy at Centre will be his fierce devotion to students. Every single graduate was invited into his home at least twice during their undergraduate years. With his beloved wife Susie, who is an institution herself, John brought compassion and leadership to his work. His colleagues called John the institution's "beating heart." As he leaves campus at the end of this month, 1 day before his 70th birthday, he should take pride in a job very well done.

I am sure Centre College planned several opportunities for its students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends to express their sincere appreciation to John. Unfortunately, the coronavirus pandemic changed many of these plans. But there is nothing that can change our heartfelt gratitude to John and Susie for all they have done for Centre College and the Commonwealth of Kentucky. As they embark on their next adventure together, we wish them the very best.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to proceeding on S. 3985, the JUSTICE Act, and want to briefly explain why.

On May 25, a Minneapolis police officer kneed on the neck of George Floyd for almost 9 minutes. Mr. Floyd repeatedly said he could not breathe and pleaded for officers to stop. The officers ignored his pleas and continued to kneel on his neck until his body went limp. George Floyd's alleged crime? Using a counterfeit $20 bill to buy groceries during a global pandemic.

As a nation, we have seen far too many unarmed Black men and women killed by police. Rayshard Brooks was shot twice in the back while running away from Atlanta police. The police had been called because he had fallen asleep in his car and was blocking a fast-food drive-thru. Breonna Taylor, an emergency medical worker, was shot eight times by Louisville police while asleep in her home. Eric Garner was choked to death by an NYPD officer for selling cigarettes. Freddie Gray was killed after being taken into custody by Baltimore police for possessing a knife. Walter Scott was shot in the back by North Charleston police after being stopped for a traffic light. Stephon Clark was killed by Sacramento police in his grandmother's backyard for breaking windows. And Michael Brown was shot six times by Ferguson police while his hands were raised in the air.

Over the past month, millions of people—of all races, ages, and backgrounds—have taken to the streets throughout the Nation to protest these killings and to demand real police reform. We need to pass legislation that truly meets this moment, a bill that actually holds law enforcement agencies and offices accountable under the law.

The Republican JUSTICE Act is no where near enough. It simply does not impose accountability on law enforcement. Specifically, it does not create a national use of force standard. For example, in California, lethal force may only be used to prevent an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person. It does not end racial profiling; in other words, it does not stop police from using race to target individuals, a practice I would hope that everyone agrees must cease. It does not prohibit no-knock warrants in drug cases, the very type of warrant that led to the death of Breonna Taylor. It does not reform qualified immunity, a legal defense that allows police to avoid being held accountable even when they have broken the law. Instead of fixing these problems, the JUSTICE Act collects more information and data on problems we already know exist. We do not need more information. We need to address the underlying issues of systemic racism and police use of force. That is where the Justice in Policing Act comes in. Senator Booker and Senator HARRIS introduced this bill earlier this month. It should be our starting point. The bill makes meaningful reforms. For example, it requires that police departments ban
choke holds and carotid holds in order to receive Federal funds. It prohibits the use of racial profiling by police officers. It creates a national police misconduct registry that would collect disciplinary or termination history of officers so police departments can more easily identify and compare misconduct and see if officers are generally prone to misconduct. It gives subpoena authority to the Justice Department to conduct “pattern or practice” investigations. It eliminates the defense of “qualified immunity” so that police officers can be held civilly liable under the law for misconduct. And it amends Federal criminal law so officers can more effectively be charged for violating people’s constitutional and legal rights.

Meaningful reform is long overdue, and rather than rushing a weak bill to the floor, the Senate Judiciary Committee should take up the Justice in Policing Act as soon as possible. This is how the Senate is supposed to work. We should not be trying to address this important issue by rushing an insufficient bill to the floor. Now is the time for leadership, courage, and real police reform.

Thank you.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the committee is closely monitoring upgrades to the software and other capabilities under the continuous capability development and delivery C2DD2 strategic modernization framework. The principal purpose for C2DD2 is the development of Block 4 software and weapons system upgrades, which also includes other elements like Technical Refresh-3 and dual weapons capability, to ensure the F-35 maintains it operational advantage. However, the committee is concerned the planned F-35 air vehicle capability growth, associated weapons systems enhancements, will exceed the established thrust, power, and thermal management capabilities of the current F135 propulsion system beginning with the delivery of Lot 18 aircraft. Such a capability gap between the current F135 performance and future requirements could significantly constrain the operational capabilities of the F-35 weapons system.

The committee is aware of a recent agreement to conduct a 6-month propulsion study and operational assessment to determine the specific F135 propulsion growth requirement that would address this capability gap. The study to determine the future propulsion requirement is expected to conclude in the first quarter of fiscal year 2021. The committee strongly endorses this approach and encourages the Department of Defense to submit recommendations to Congress following completion of the study. Further, the committee is concerned that a long-term focus on propulsion improvements over fiscal years 2021-2025 necessary to support engineering and manufacturing development for upgraded engine production supporting the planned delivery of Lot 18 aircraft.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense and Joint Program Office to establish an F135 Propulsion Growth Program that ensures propulsion growth requirements are aligned with and support weapons systems upgrade requirements. Finally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include funding in the fiscal year 2022 defense budget to support the F135 Propulsion Growth Program across the Future Years Defense Plan.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but had I been present would have voted no on rollcall Vote 112, motion to invoke cloture on confirmation of Michael Pack to be Chief Executive Officer of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

I was necessarily absent but had I been present would have voted no on rollcall Vote 113, confirmation of Michael Pack, of Maryland, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for the term of three years.

I was necessarily absent but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall Vote 117, motion to invoke cloture on Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

I was necessarily absent but had I been present would have voted no on rollcall Vote 124, motion to invoke cloture on Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

RECOGNIZING THE 555TH FIGHTER SQUADRON

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the “World Famous Highly Respected” 555th Fighter Squadron, commonly known as the Triple Nickel, recently completed the Department of Defense’s first real-world combat Dynamic Force Employment DFE to United States Central Command. In plain English, the Triple Nickel executed an unplanned deployment to the Middle East last fall to counter Iranian aggression against the United States and our allies in the region.

During its historic deployment, the squadron flew more than 7,000 hours supporting operations in the Arabian Gulf, Qatar, Iraq, and Syria. Demonstrating the rapid, agile, and lethai characteristics of airpower, the Nickel executed defensive counter-air missions in Syria—routinely intercepting and monitoring Russian, Syrian, and Iranian aircraft operating near U.S. and partnered ground forces. It also provided close air support to troops battling the Taliban in Afghanistan, as well as ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

The Nickel returned home in December as Iran’s aggression began to wane but deployed a second time only days later when tensions rapidly escalated following the U.S. strike against Qasem Soleimani. The squadron subse- quently executed dozens of missions in Iraq during and after Iran’s missile attacks against U.S. forces. The Triple Nickel then deployed to a second expeditionary operating location. U.S. F-16s had not conducted combat missions from this location since 2003. From there, the squadron was able to immediately respond to the rocket attacks on Camp Taji, Iraq, by Iranian-backed Shia militia groups and execute retaliatory strikes.

The squadron returned to Aviano Air Base, Italy, in late April as the Air Force’s first major combat unit to redeploy during the China virus pandemic. Throughout their deployment, the 555th Fighter Squadron and Maintenance Unit performed exceptionally under tense combat pressures executing a new and highly mobile deployment construct during a pandemic. The Triple Nickel represents the best America has to offer, and I congratulate them on a job well done. “Once Green!”

TRIBUTE TO KIM CAWLEY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career and retirement of Kim Cawley after 34 years of service at the Congressional Budget Office. Kim has been Chief of the Natural and Physical Resources Cost Estimates Unit for more than 20 of those years, also spent over a decade as one of CBO’s energy analysts. He is one of that agency’s experts on the Nuclear Waste Fund, the treatment of Federal loans and loan guarantees, and the budgetary effects of Federal insurance programs.

It is hard to overstate Kim’s role in analyzing the budgetary impacts of an incredibly broad spectrum of legislation over the past three decades. He has been instrumental in providing objective, carefully researched estimates of thousands of pieces of legislation that the Congress has considered, debated, and enacted since the mid-1980s, including bills dealing with flood insurance, compensation for victims of asbestos and oilspills, Federal property sales, and infrastructure financing, to name just a few.

Kim has worked tirelessly with Members of Congress and our staff on both sides of the aisle throughout those years. During many hours of discussion and patient explanation, he could be counted on to be forthright and fair. He embodied CBO’s commitment to nonpartisan analysis and helped the Congress understand the intricacies of such complex laws as the Federal Credit Reform Act, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, and the 9-11 Victims Compensation Act.

Kim has been a mentor and guide to dozens of CBO analysts. Thanks to his
guidance and training, a generation of CBO analysts think harder, dig deeper, and ask more probing questions when analyzing the estimated costs of legislation. Kim set high standards for himself and for the Natural Resources Unit, and we are confident that they will continue to provide timely and thorough analyses for the Congress thanks to what they have learned under Kim’s leadership.

I, along with House Budget Committee Chairman John Yarmuth, wish to thank the people of Nome, Richard Beneville, and his family for the privilege of serving under Kim’s leadership. His passing is a true loss for my State. I will miss his boundless enthusiasm and his trademark greeting to all he ran into, “Hello Central!”

REMEMBERING RICHARD BENEVILLE

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the legacy of a friend and one of Alaska’s truly unique individuals, the mayor of Nome, Richard Beneville. We lost the mayor last month when he succumbed to pneumonia. Protesters had been camping in Nome when he called home for more than 32 years. Richard’s life story was colorful. He left New York City as a young man struggling with alcoholism and searching for a new life. Alaska was as far away as he could go, and he often said Alaska saved him. He spent a few years in Barrow before moving to Nome in 1988, and I think it is fair to say that the town has never been the same since. His career began on Broadway, and Richard channeled his creative energy to inspire youth and adults in Nome through the Nome Arts Council. He directed more than three dozen plays, including “The Sound of Music,” “Music Man,” and “Fiddler on the Roof,” and inspired generations in the community to appreciate the stage.

Ever the showman, Richard was a tireless ambassador for Nome and Arctic tourism. He founded Nome Discovery Tours in 1994, and he never missed an opportunity to promote Nome and the surrounding region and its rich history. Watching him entertain a tour group with tales of Nome’s early gold mining days, while he demonstrated how to pan for gold, audience captivated, was a real treasure. For the past 4½ years, he served as mayor of Nome, and there was no better cheerleader for this remote community. Some of my colleagues may recall running into him in the halls of the Hart and Dirksen Buildings, wearing his signature black hat that he referred to as “the hat, a Port of Nome, vest and always sporting his I love Nome! button. Never shy, Richard would greet Senators, staff, and visitors alike, quickly asking them how their day was and what they were up to as he worked the halls and made new friends during the day and genuine interest in people was refreshing in an environment all too often filled with hustle and tension.

For those of you who have never had the fortune to visit Nome, there are only three ways to get there from Anchorage—airplane, boat, and dog sled. Nome is 2000 miles closer to the North Pole than to New York City, and in 2016 when they released the Crystal Serenity on their Pole to Nome voyage, the mayor was there to greet these intrepid Arctic adventurers. I had the privilege to travel with Richard to many Arctic conferences, and it was a joy to be his ambassador for Arctic tourism and a positive future for this fascinating and challenging part of the world.

The mayor was a passionate champion of the Iditarod and I last saw him on Saturday, March 7, in Anchorage at the ceremonial start of the race. He had just been released from the hospital, having persuaded his doctors and nurses that the “show must go on” to be there for the festivities.

He loved Nome, the arts, flowers, and above all, Nome to the end. His passing is a true loss for my State. I will miss his boundless enthusiasm and his trademark greeting to all he ran into, “Hello Central!”

RECOGNIZING MERCEDES SCIENTIFIC

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a woman-owned small business that provides critical medical supplies to hospitals and laboratories nationwide. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Mercedes Scientific of Lakewood Ranch, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1993, Noelle Haft and Hank Traynor founded Mercedes Scientific in New Hyde Park, NY. The two were veterans of the medical supply industry, combining their scientific expertise and knowledge of laboratory distribution to start their own small business. At the time, it was known as Mercedes Medical. Drawn by the weather and welcoming business regulations, Mercedes Medical relocated to Florida in 1993. When Hank retired, Noelle and her husband, Rob, continued running the company along with their daughter, Alex Miller.

Over the next few decades, Mercedes Medical remained a family-owned company as it grew into a notable medical supplier. The company moved into their Lakewood Ranch facility in 2018 and expanded to provide laboratory equipment and personal protective equipment, PPE. They rebranded as Mercedes Scientific in 2019 due to their growing focus on serving the research, laboratory, and scientific communities.

Mercedes Scientific is active in the community. They donate medical supplies to local organizations and businesses, as well as educational institutions nationwide. The company supports international nonprofit missions, such as helping medical facilities recover from natural disasters. Closer to home, Mercedes Scientific is a team build partner with Habitat for Humanity in Sarasota, FL. They also work with the Lakewood Ranch Business Alliance to promote local economic development.

Like many small businesses in Florida, Mercedes Scientific experienced supply chain disruptions due to the coronavirus pandemic. As a medical supply company, they play a critical role in securing laboratory supplies, PPE, and COVID-19 test kits. Mercedes Scientific works tirelessly with laboratories and hospitals in Florida and throughout the Nation to ensure they receive the resources needed to combat the pandemic.

When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, PPP, Mercedes Scientific applied for funding. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID–19 pandemic. Thanks to a PPP loan, Mercedes Scientific was able to keep their 67 employees paid and remain focused on its mission sourcing medical supplies.

Mercedes Scientific is a notable example of the key role small businesses play in America’s medical supply chains. I commend their continued work to provide essential hospital and laboratory supplies as the United States confronts the coronavirus pandemic. Congratulations to Noelle, Rob, and the whole team. I look forward to your continued success, growth, and success in the Lakewood Ranch area.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with copies of papers and documents, and were referred as indicated: EC–487. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the
Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of Defense (DoD) Guideline Documents" (RIN0790–AK97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4872. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program Reforms" (RIN0790–AB75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4873. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TRICARE Coverage and Payment for Certain Services in Response to the COVID–19 Pandemic (Interim Final Rule)" (RIN0790–AB81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4874. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes." (Rept. 116–29).

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment.

EC–4875. A communication from the Chief of Congressional Affairs, Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4876. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure: COVID–19 Relief Under 770(b)" (Rev. Proc. 2020–20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4877. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure: COVID–19 Relief Under 770(b)" (Rev. Proc. 2020–20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4878. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure: COVID–19 Relief Under 770(b)" (Rev. Proc. 2020–20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Report to accompany S. 4049. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. (Rept. 116–29).

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Joyce Louise Connelly, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 22, 2023.

*Thomas A. Summers, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 22, 2023.

Air Force nomination of Col. Kathleen M. Flarity, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nominations of Capt. Terry W. Eddington, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Patrick S. Hayden, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Eric L. Peterson, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Donald Y. Sze, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Stephen D. Donald and ending with Capt. Gregory K. Emery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2020.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (ih) Grafton D. Chase, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (ih) Eugene A. Burcher and ending with Rear Adm. (ih) William G. Mager, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. William L. Angermann and ending with Capt. Jeffrey S. Spivey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2020.


PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–208. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, urging the United States Congress to pass Emergency Economic Recovery Tax Credit; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–209. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, urging the United States Congress to pass H.R. 40 (Commission to Study and Develop Reparations Proposals for African-Americans Act) and implement a federal commission to study and develop reparations proposals for the African American Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.


Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John B. Mustin, to be Vice Admiral.


Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John B. Mustin, to be Vice Admiral.


Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Alex B. Fink, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Edward A. Skidmore and ending with Col. Anthony L. McQueen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.


Navy nomination of Vice Adm. James J. Malloy, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michelle C. Siskubo, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of printing, to make a part of the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Cory L. Baker and ending with Stephen D. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Katherina B. Donovan, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Kirk W. Greene, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Patterson G. Aldeueva, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of William R. Martin II, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael F. Cooper, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Syed I. Ahmad and ending with D01577, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Bradley Aebi and ending with Kevyn Wetzel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with John L. Ament and ending with Wendy G. Woodall, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Fely O. Andrade and ending with D01577, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher A. Flaugh and ending with Zack T. Solomon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Michael Berezik and ending with James W. Pratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Rohul Amim and ending with D014798, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Thomas E. Allen and ending with Michael T. Zell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Chad M. Alt and ending with Roger R. Ziegler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Daniel P. Allen and ending with Gary C. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Brian E. Bart and ending with Mitchell J. Wisniewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2020.

Army nomination of Nathaniel A. Stone, to be Major.

Army nomination of Margaret C. Brainardbland, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael B. McGuire, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Ralph Pean, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher M. Hartley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Mauro Quevedo, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Shinah Nassirikhan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Joshua W. Krupa, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Peter C. Renals, to be Major.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert L. Betts and ending with James G. Thurston II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew L. Abelson and ending with David P. Ziegler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul Annas and ending with Peter M. Zubof, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Benjamin E. Baran and ending with Joseph F. Rheeke III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron A. Asimakopoulos and ending with Kimberly A. Pizer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Derek L. Buzasi and ending with Tracy A. Sicks, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Francis P. Brown and ending with McKinney J. Wallace, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Stuart R. Blair and ending with Jeffery T. King, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with John F. Bauer and ending with Kurt A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven G. Beall and ending with Almond Smith III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with David S. Barnes and ending with Joel A. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Kathryn M. Burmeister and ending with Dwight E. Smith, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Christa D. Almonte and ending with Scott D. Wethington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Brown and ending with Joseph B. Ruff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Brian S. Cooper and ending with John F. Ryan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Jereal E. Dorsey and ending with Kyle A. Raines, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Darrell C. Hawes and ending with Charles Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Lionel C. Vigue and ending with Charles Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Darren C. Bessett and ending with Gary D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Shane J. Eisenbraun and ending with Michael W. Murphee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert A. Scinicariello, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Drell M. Griffith, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Lionel C. Vigue and ending with Charles Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with John P. Fournier and ending with Kevin L. West, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Mark A. Dunaway and ending with Amir M. Tavakoliriz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with David S. Barnes and ending with Joel A. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven G. Beall and ending with Almond Smith III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Kathryn M. Burmeister and ending with Dwight E. Smith, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Christa D. Almonte and ending with Scott D. Wethington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.
Navy nominations beginning with Hyun S. Chun and ending with Scott C. McKinney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael T. Curry and ending with Rodney H. Moss, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Cory M. Groom and ending with Michael L. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Cassius A. Farrell and ending with Kenneth J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Allan M. Baker and ending with Richard M. Yeatman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Ian A. Brown and ending with Kenya D. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Navy nomination of Suzette Inzerillo, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Thomas G. Chekouras, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Ryan P. Anderson and ending with Glenn A. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael D. Amedick and ending with Dennis M. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeremy P. Adams and ending with Allen E. Willey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Marco A. Ayala and ending with David M. You, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nomination beginning with William M. Anderson and ending with David S. Weldon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerry J. Bailey and ending with Erin R. Willfong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Phillip A. Chockley and ending with Daniel Werner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nominations beginning with Kenneth R. Basford and ending with Susan M. Tillimon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2020.

Navy nomination of Robert C. Birch, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Tori J. Moffitt, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Matteau B. Wilkey, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.*

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

- **By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. SHUMER, and Mr. COONS):**
  - S. 4052. A bill to improve the Department of Energy's ability to support online training of residential contractors and rebates for energy efficiency upgrades of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

- **By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. SMITH):**
  - S. 4053. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to modernize the EPSCoR program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

- **By Mr. ROBERTS:**
  - S. 4054. An original bill to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; placed on the calendar.

- **By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):**
  - S. 4055. A bill to address health workforce shortages and disparities highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic through additional funding for the National Health Service Corps and the Nurse Corps, and to establish a National Health Service Corps Emergency Service demonstration project; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

- **By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. LORFLEER):**
  - S. 4056. A bill to prohibit certain individuals from being appointed to positions if the individual worked for an individual's employment with the United States, on behalf of a special counsel investigation that investigated or prosecuted a President or a candidate for election to the office of President; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

- **By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. CRAMER):**
  - S. 4057. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are not required to reinstate an environmental impact analysis or land use plan under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

- **By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):**
  - S. 4058. A bill to authorize grants to address substance use during COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

- **By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):**
  - S. 4059. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations, community-based entities, and primary care and behavioral health organizations to address behavioral health needs caused by the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

- **By Ms. SMITH:**
  - S. 4060. A bill to provide additional funds for Federal and State facility energy resiliency programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

- **By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):**
  - S. 4061. A bill to provide emergency nutrition assistance to States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

- **By Mrs. LORFLEER:**
  - S. 4062. A bill to amend section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that providers and users of an interactive computer service meet certain standards to qualify for liability protections; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

- **By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. SMITH):**
  - S. 4063. A bill to provide that, due to the disruptions caused by COVID-19, applications for impact aid for fiscal year 2022 may use certain data submitted in the fiscal year 2021 application; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

- **By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):**
  - S. 4064. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and behavioral health crisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

- **By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. KINN):**
  - S. 4065. A bill to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

- **By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):**
  - S. 4066. A bill to require transparency, accountability, and protections for consumers online; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

- **By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):**
  - S. 4067. A bill to prohibit certain assistance for inverted domestic corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 360. At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of financial statements to the Committee on Finance.

S. 373. At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 578. At the request of Mrs. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to place certain restrictions on the sale, purchase, or reorganization of cable television systems.

S. 1125. At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DANIELS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.
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At the request of Mr. Durbin, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3182, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Hirono, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and retiree pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and to treat related disability, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Hirono, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3624, a bill to amend the national service laws to prioritize national service programs and projects that are directly related to the response to and recovery from the COVID–19 public health emergency, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Udall, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3727, a bill to provide for cash refunds for canceled airline flights and tickets during the COVID–19 emergency.

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3727, supra.

At the request of Ms. Smith, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3737, a bill to improve the public health workforce loan repayment program.

At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3775, a bill to establish a United States-Israel Operations-Technology Working Group, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3781, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Sinema, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. Sinema) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3182, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the Women’s Health Transition Training pilot program through at least fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Hirono, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and retiree pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and to treat related disability, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) were added as cosponsors of S. 3393, supra.

At the request of Ms. Hirono, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3395, a bill to require consultations on reuniting Korean Americans with family members in North Korea.

At the request of Mr. Coons, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3624, a bill to amend the national service laws to prioritize national service programs and projects that are directly related to the response to and recovery from the COVID–19 public health emergency, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Udall, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3727, a bill to provide for cash refunds for canceled airline flights and tickets during the COVID–19 emergency.

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3727, supra.

At the request of Ms. Smith, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3737, a bill to improve the public health workforce loan repayment program.

At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3775, a bill to establish a United States-Israel Operations-Technology Working Group, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Peters, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3781, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to provide for supplemental loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

At the request of Mr. Hoeven, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner) were added as cosponsors of S. 4017, a bill to extend the period for obligations or expenditures for amounts obligated for the National Disaster Resilience competition.

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4019, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Sullivan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4041, a bill to assist the American energy sector in retaining jobs during challenging economic times.

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4046, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to award grants to eligible entities to purchase and install, zero emissions port equipment and technology, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Harris, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4048, a bill to modify the deadlines for completing the 2020 decennial census of population and related tabulations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Reed (for himself, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Moran, Mr. Jones, and Mrs. Hyde-Smith):

S. 4663. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to modernize the EPSCoR program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. Reed. Mr. President, today I introduce, along with Senator Inhofe, Senator Jones, Senator Moran, and Senator Hyde-Smith, the DOE EPSCoR Modernization Act of 2020. As many of our colleagues are aware, the Department of Energy Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DOE EPSCoR) was established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–486). This critical initiative seeks to improve the capacity of eligible states to conduct nationally competitive energy research and connect eligible states with the National Laboratory System.

The purpose of the bill we are introducing is to broaden the scope of the...
research funded by the DOE EPSCoR program beyond basic science, to encompass the full range of research supported by DOE. This includes cutting-edge research in applied energy technologies, energy efficiency, energy storage, and environmental management to address the key areas of the program’s narrow focus on basic science. EPSCoR States are only able to support a small fraction of DOE’s research mission.

Our bill would continue to support investments in research infrastructure and expand opportunities for EPSCoR institutions to partner with National Laboratories to conduct their research. Our bill would also increase support for graduate students and early career faculty.

When the National Academy of Sciences evaluated EPSCoR programs, it concluded that EPSCoR programs are critical to the nation’s scientific and technology leadership, because EPSCoR guarantees that talented researchers and scientists from all 50 states are partners in science and technology research. This is even truer in the context of energy issues, where each state and region faces different energy opportunities and infrastructure challenges.

By modernizing the program and bringing it into alignment with EPSCoR programs operated by other agencies, DOE EPSCoR will be better positioned to meet today’s energy challenges, with the interests and strengths of EPSCoR states. I am pleased to have the support of the Coalition of EPSCoR/IDeA States in this effort, and I urge our colleagues to join us in pressing for passage of this bill.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RUROH): S. 4055. A bill to address health workforce shortages and disparities highlighted by the COVID–19 pandemic through additional funding for the National Health Service Corps and the Nurse Corps, and to establish a National Health Service Corps Emergency Service demonstration project; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: S. 4055

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening America’s Health Care Readiness Act”.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

(a) Additional Funding.—Section 10509(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(F), by striking “and” at the end of clause (v) and inserting “, and”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(H), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) to be transferred to the Secretary of Health and Human Services $5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, to provide additional funding to carry out the National Health Service Corps Scholarship Program under section 338A of the Public Health Service Act, the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program under section 338B of such Act, and the National Health Service Corps Emergency Service under section 2812A of such Act.”.

(b) Criteria for Use of Additional Funding.—The Secretary may grant increased award amounts to certain participating individuals if the Secretary determines that an individual participating under this section may practice a health profession in an area of national need when not obligated to fulfill the requirements described in subsection (c).

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” and inserting “, or”;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(5) in paragraph (5), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(6) in paragraph (6), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(7) in subparagraph (A), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(8) in subparagraph (B), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”;

(9) in subparagraph (C), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”; and

(10) in subparagraph (D), by striking “under section (c)” and inserting “under this section”.

(c) Special Provisions.—In general.—The Secretary may coordinate with entities receiving funding under section 2812A of such Act to provide increased award amounts to certain participating individuals under this section if the Secretary determines that an individual participating under this section may practice a health profession in an area of national need when not obligated to fulfill the requirements described in subsection (c).

(d) Emergency Service Plan.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, shall establish an action plan for the service commitments, deployment protocols, coordination efforts, training requirements, and other requirements to ensure the effective development, and such other considerations as the Secretary determines appropriate. Such action plan shall be subject to the approval of both the National Health Service Corps and National Disaster Medical System.

“(II) secondly, to qualified individuals who continue to practice in any site approved for obligated service under the Scholarship Program or Loan Repayment Program other than the site at which the individual served.

“(II) increased funding amounts.—The Secretary may grant increased award amounts to certain participating individuals under this section if the Secretary determines that an individual participating under this section may practice a health profession in an area of national need when not obligated to fulfill the requirements described in subsection (c).

(2) Current NHSC Members.—In general.—An individual who is participating in the Scholarship Program under section 338A or the Loan Repayment Program under section 338B may apply to participate in the program under this section while fulfilling the individual’s obligated services under such program.

(3) clarifications.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, with respect to service requirements under the Scholarship Program or Loan Repayment Program, an individual fulfilling service requirements described in subsection (c) shall not be considered in breach of such contract under such Scholarship Program or Loan Repayment Program, provided that the individual notifies the Secretary that the individual is fulfilling his or her obligated service requirements under such contract.

(4) No Credit toward Obligated Service.—No period of service under the National Disaster Medical System described in subsection (c) shall be counted toward satisfying a period of obligated service under the Scholarship Program or Loan Repayment Program.

(5) Participants as Members of the National Disaster Medical System.—

(1) Service Requirements.—An individual participating in the program under this section shall participate in the activities of the National Disaster Medical System under section 2812 in the same manner and to the same extent as other participants in such system.

(2) Rights and Requirements.—An individual participating in the program under this section shall be considered participating in the National Disaster Medical System and shall be subject to the requirements of subsections (c) and (d) of section 2812.

(3) Emergency Service Plan.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, shall establish an action plan for the service commitments, deployment protocols, coordination efforts, training requirements, and other requirements to ensure the effective development, and such other considerations as the Secretary determines appropriate. Such action plan shall be subject to the approval of both the National Health Service Corps and National Disaster Medical System.

(4) Ensure an adequate health care workforce during a public health emergency declared by the Secretary under section 319 of such Act, a major disaster declared by the President under section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, or a national emergency declared by the President under the National Emergencies Act; and

(5) ensure adherence to the missions of both the National Health Service Corps and National Disaster Medical System;
“(3) describe how the program established under this section will be implemented in a manner consistent with, and in furtherance of, the assessments and goals for workforce and training described in the report submitted by the Secretary under section 2813(b)(2).

(e) CONTRACTS FOR CERTAIN PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS—An individual who is participating in the emergency service program under this section shall receive loan repayments in an amount equal to 50 percent of the bill later referred to as the Champlain North Education Loan Program pursuant to a contract entered into at the same time under subsection (b)(2) pursuant to the Scholarship Program under section 338A or the Loan Repayment Program under section 338B, as applicable.

(f) BREACH OF CONTRACT.—If an individual breaches the written contract of the individual under subsection (e) by failing either to begin such individual’s service obligation in accordance with such contract or to complete such service obligation, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the individual an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) the total of the amounts paid by the United States under such contract on behalf of the individual for any period of such service not served;

(2) an amount equal to the product of the number of months of service that were not served by the individual, multiplied by $3,750; and

(3) the interest on the amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2), at the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States, from the date of the breach.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions an annual report that evaluates the demonstration project established under this section, including—

(1) the effects of such program on health care access in underserved areas and on public health emergency response capacity;

(2) the effects of such program on the health provider workforce pipeline, including the demographic presentation among, and the fields or specialties pursued by, students in approved graduate training programs in medicine, osteopathic medicine, dentistry, behavioral and mental health, or other health profession;

(3) the impact of such program on the enrollment, participation, and completion of requirements in the underlying scholarship, loan repayment programs of the National Health Service Corps;

(4) the effects of such program on the National Health Service Corps’ capacity, readiness, and workforce strength; and

(5) recommendations for improving the demonstration program described in this section, and any other considerations as the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 2. FUNDING FOR THE NURSE CORPS SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—There are hereby appropriated, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, for purposes of carrying out section 4112 of the Federal Service Loan Repayment Program (42 U.S.C. 2976), to remain available until expended, except that—

(1) of the amount appropriated under this heading and made available for scholarships and loan repayment, not less than 40 percent shall be allocated for eligible applicants who are members of groups that are historically underserved in health care professions, including racial and ethnic minorities and individuals from low-income urban and rural communities; and

(2) to carry out the requirements of paragraph (1), the Secretary may coordinate with entities receiving funding under section 821 to identify, recruit, and select individuals to receive such funding.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts provided by this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) DESIGNATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, this section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 4063. A bill to provide that, due to the disruptions caused by COVID–19, applications for impact aid funding for fiscal year 2022 shall use certain data submitted in the fiscal year 2021 application; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4063.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Impact Aid Coronavirus Relief Act.”

SEC. 2. USE OF IMPACT AID APPLICATION STUDENT COUNT DATA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 IMPACT AID APPLICATIONS.

Due to the public health emergency relating to COVID–19 and notwithstanding sections 7002(j) and 7003(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702(j), 7703(c)), a local educational agency may use the student count data relating to COVID–19 and notwithstanding section 7002 or 7003 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7702, 7703) for fiscal year 2022 that also submitted an application for such payment for fiscal year 2021 may, in the application submitted under section 7005 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7705) for fiscal year 2022—

(1) with respect to a requested payment under section 7002 of such Act, use the Federal property valuation data relating to calculating such payment that was submitted by the local educational agency in the application for fiscal year 2021, provided that for purposes of the calculation of payments for fiscal year 2022 under section 7002(b)(1) of such Act, such payments shall be based on utilizing fiscal year 2020 data (from academic year 2018–2019) to include total current expenditure, local contribution rates, and per pupil expenditures; or

(3) with respect to a requested payment under section 7002 or 7003(c) of such Act, use the student count or Federal property valuation data relating to calculating such payment for the fiscal year required under section 7002(j) or 7003(c) of such Act, as applicable.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4067. A bill to prohibit certain assistance for inverted domestic corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4067.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Assistance for American Companies Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON APPLICATION OF CERTAIN ASSISTANCE TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN TAX INCENTIVES.—

(1) NOT OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACKS.—By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. HARRIS OF ALASKA, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. GILLIS) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to any foreign corporation for any taxable year in which such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation (as defined in section 7701(p)(2)), or to any member of the expanded affiliated group (as defined in section 7874(c)(1)) of such a foreign corporation, unless such foreign corporation has made an election under section 7874(f)(1).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 2303(b) of the CARES Act.

(2) EARNED LIMITATION ON BUSINESS INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 163(j)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply to any foreign corporation for any taxable year in which such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation (as defined in section 7701(p)(2)), or to any member of the expanded affiliated group (as defined in section 7874(c)(1)) of such a foreign corporation, unless such foreign corporation has made an election under section 7874(f)(1).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 2303(b) of the CARES Act.

(3) FEDERAL RESERVE EMERGENCY LENDING FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No inverted domestic corporation, as defined in section 7701(p)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any member of the expanded affiliated group (as defined in section 7874(c)(1) of such Code) of such inverted domestic corporation, may be a beneficiary of any assistance for inverted domestic corporations established by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the authority of...
section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 343) and with funding authorized under section 4003 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-139), including the Primary Market Corporate Credit Facility and the Secondary Market Corporate Credit Facility.

(2) ELECTION TO TREAT INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

(i) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

subsection (o) the following new subsection:

(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'inverted domestic corporation' means any foreign corporation which, pursuant to a plan of reorganization or arrangement approved by a court, is organized or reorganized primarily for the purpose of holding stock in a domestic corporation or in a series of related transactions—

(A) substantially all of the properties held by the group are located in the United States,

(B) the income of the group is derived in whole or in part from sources within the United States,

(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

(D) the group is a member of a significant domestic business activities or group of significant domestic business activities or group of significant domestic business activities.

3 Exception for Corporations With Substantial Business Activities in Foreign Country of Organization.—Such term shall not include a corporation described in paragraph (2) if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the corporation has substantial business activities in a foreign country in which the corporation is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'substantial business activities' shall have the meaning given such term in section 18, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

4 Management and Control.—For purposes of paragraphs (3) and (4), 'management and control' shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence.

SA 1677. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1679. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3985, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1689. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1692. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1699. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1702. Ms. SULLIVAN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1708. Ms. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1710. Mr. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, super; which was ordered to lie on the table.
to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1695. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1696. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1697. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1698. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1699. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1700. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1701. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1702. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1703. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1704. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1705. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1706. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1707. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1708. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1709. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1710. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1711. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1712. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1713. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1714. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1715. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1716. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1717. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1718. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1719. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1720. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1721. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1722. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1723. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1724. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1725. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1726. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1727. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1728. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1729. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1730. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1731. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1732. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1733. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1734. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1735. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1736. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1737. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1738. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1739. Mr. DURBAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, supра; which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 1767. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3985, to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 707(c), strike “section 107(a)(9)(C)(i)” and insert “section 107(a)(9)(C)(ii)”.

SA 1677. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 707(c), strike “section 107(a)(9)(C)(i)” and insert “section 107(a)(9)(C)(ii)”.

**TITLE XII—FAIR ACT**

**SECTION 1201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Fifth Amendment Integrity Restoration Act of 2019” or the “FAIR Act”.

**SECTION 1202. CIVIL FORFEITURE PROCEEDINGS.**

Section 903 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—

(A) by striking “;”;

(B) and the property subject to forfeiture is real property that is being used by the person as a primary residence,”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”;

and

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) if the Government’s theory of forfeiture is that the property was used to commit or facilitate the commission of a criminal offense, or was involved in the commission of a criminal offense, the Government shall establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that—

“(A) there was a substantial connection between the property and the offense; and

“(B) the owner of any interest in the seized property—

“(i) used the property with intent to facilitate the offense; or

“(ii) knowingly consented or was willfully blind to the use of the property by another in connection with the offense.”;

(3) in subsection (d)(2)(A), by striking “an owner who” and inserting “an owner who, upon learning”;

and

(C) in subsection (f)(6), in the matter preceding paragraph (7), by inserting “shall award to the claimant an amount equal to 3 times the value of the property seized and a reasonable attorney’s fee” before the period at the end; and

(4) in subsection (i)(6), in the matter preceding paragraph (7), by inserting “shall award to the claimant an amount equal to 3 times the value of the property seized and a reasonable attorney’s fee” before the period at the end; and

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (A) and (B); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (C) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively.

**SECTION 1203. DISPOSITION OF FORFEITED PROPERTY.**

(a) REVISIONS TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT—Section 511(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 881(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “civilly or”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (2)—
(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “ac- cordance with section 524(c) of title 28,” and inserting “the General Fund of the Treasury of the United States”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4);

(D) in paragraph (3), by inserting “Any payment”; and

(E) in paragraph (4), by redesigning paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(F) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “para- graph (1)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)(B) that is civilly or criminally seized or restrained after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1205. STRUCTURING TRANSACTIONS TO EVADE REPORTING REQUIREMENT PROHIBITED.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 3524 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “knowingly” after “Public Law 91–508”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “of funds not derived from a legitimate source” after “any transaction”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “knowingly” after “such section”; and

(3) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “knowingly” after “section 5316”;

(b) PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING IN CONNECTION WITH PROPERTY SEIZURES RELATING TO CERTAIN MONETARY INSTRUMENTS TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 5317 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING IN CONNECTION WITH PROPERTY SEIZURES RELATING TO CERTAIN MONETARY INSTRUMENTS TRANSACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which notice is provided under paragraph (2),

“A court of competent jurisdiction shall conduct a hearing on any property seized or restrained under subparagraph (c)(2) with respect to an alleged violation of section 5324;

“(B) any property described in subparagraph (A) shall be returned unless the court finds that there is probable cause to believe that there is a violation of section 5324 involving the property.

“(2) NOTICE.—Each person from whom property is seized or restrained under subparagraph (c)(2) with respect to an alleged violation of section 5324 shall be notified of the right of the person to a hearing under paragraph (1).

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to property seized or restrained after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) TARIFF ACT OF 1930.—The Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 532(a)(19) (19 U.S.C. 1613(b)(19))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (4), and inserting paragraph (3), and

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking “grossly”;

(b) in paragraph (4), by striking “grossly”;

(c) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (c)”; and

(d) in paragraph (6), by striking “subsection (c)”; and

(e) in paragraph (7), by striking “subsection (c)”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “the court shall consider such factors as—

(A) the seriousness of the offense;

(B) the extent of the nexus of the property to the offense;

(C) in paragraph (2), by inserting under paragraph (1)”—

(A) a court of competent jurisdiction

(B) any proceeding described in subparagraph (A) shall be returned unless the court finds that there is probable cause to believe that there is a violation of section 5324 involving the property.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to property seized or restrained after the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) financially unable to obtain representation by counsel; or

(ii) the cost of obtaining representation would exceed the value of the seized property.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The court may authorize or appoint counsel to represent that person with respect to the claim.”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “or appoint” after “authorize”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “under paragraph (1)” after “counsel”;

(3) in subsection (d)(1), by striking the second sentence;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “nonjudicial”; and

(ii) by striking “a declaration” and inserting “an order”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “dec- laration” and inserting “order”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) if a person has not been served with notice of the hearing or has been served with notice but is determined before a declar- ation of law—

“(B) notwithstanding any other provi- sion of law—

(i) financially unable to obtain representation by counsel; or

(ii) the cost of obtaining representation would exceed the value of the seized property.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The court may authorize or appoint counsel to represent that person with respect to the claim.”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “or appoint” after “authorize”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “under paragraph (1)” after “counsel”;

(3) in subsection (d)(1), by striking the second sentence;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “nonjudicial”; and

(ii) by striking “a declaration” and inserting “an order”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “de- claration” and inserting “order”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) Any proceeding described in subparagraph (A) shall be commenced within 6 months of the entry of the order granting the motion.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (5);

(d) Section 983(g)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘nonjudicial forfeiture’ means an action through which the Government seeks to obtain title to property seized or retained but is determined before a declaration of law.”;

(E) in section 984(d)(2), as added by section 984(b)(2), of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ‘Claim’;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(aa) by striking “clauses (ii) through (v), in any nonjudicial” and inserting “clause (ii), in any”; and

(bb) by striking “60” and inserting “7”;
SEC. 1209. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to—

(1) any civil forfeiture proceeding pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any amounts received from the forfeiture of property on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1678. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3985, to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: Strike section 102 and insert the following:

SEC. 102. JUSTICE FOR BREONNA TAYLOR.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Justice for Breonna Taylor Act.”

(b) PROHIBITION ON NO-KNOCK WARRANTS.—

(1) FEDERAL PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115 of title 18, United States Code) may not execute a warrant until after the of- federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115 of title 18, United States Code) may not execute a warrant until after the of-

section 115 of title 18, United States Code Act”.

(2) STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter, a State or local law enforcement agency that receive funds from the Department of Justice during the fiscal year may not execute a warrant that does not require the law enforcement officer serving the warrant to provide notice of his or her authority and purpose before forcibly entering a premises, except in the case of an imminent risk of death or serious bodily injury.

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), an officer serving the warrant with a warrant that—

(A) is of a type that requires notice to the property owner within a specified time period; or

(B) is of a type that requires notice to the property owner in person; or

(C) is a warrant to seize property under section 3621 of title 18, United States Code, that requires notice to the property owner before entering a premises.

(4) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF NO-KNOCK WARRANTS.—

(A) In general.—A warrant to execute a no-knock warrant under subsection (b) requires the property owner to be notified of the warrant, in writing, before it is executed.

(B) Exception.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a warrant to execute a no-knock warrant under subsection (b) does not require notice to the property owner if the property owner has been notified of the warrant in writing before it is executed.

(5)追い討ちの処分

(C) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(D) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(E) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(F) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(G) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(H) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(I) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(J) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(K) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(L) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(M) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(N) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(O) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(P) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(Q) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(R) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(S) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(T) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(U) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(V) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(W) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(X) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(Y) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(Z) The recipient certifies to the Secretary of Defense that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient agency and is not needed for the purpose of the operation.

(h) W EBSITE.—The Defense Logistics Agency应当作成

(A) the agency has complied with all requirements under this section; or

(B) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(C) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(D) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(E) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(F) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(G) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(H) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(I) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(J) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(K) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(L) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(M) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(N) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(O) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(P) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(Q) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(R) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(S) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(T) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(U) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(V) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(W) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(X) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(Y) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated; and

(Z) the eligibility of any agency that has received property transferred under this section has been suspended or terminated.

(b) WEBSITE.—The Defense Logistics Agency shall maintain a web page on a quarterly basis, an Internet website on which the following information shall be made publicly available in a searchable form:

(1) A description of each transfer made under this section, including transfers made before the date of the enactment of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act, set forth by State, county, and recipient agency, and including item name, item type, item model, and quantity.
SEC. 12.


(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act,
the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the humanitarian effects on the people of Yemen of—
(1) the air, land, and sea blockade of Yemen;
(2) the activities of the Ansar Allah, or the Houthis, to illicitly profit from critical commercial and humanitarian imports; and
(3) the activities of the Government of the Republic of Yemen and the Southern Transitional Council.
(b) Contents.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:
(1) Any credible information known about the estimated number of civilian deaths in Yemen that are attributable, in whole or in part, to—
(A) the air, land, and sea blockade of Yemen imposed by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Government of the United Arab Emirates, or the Saudi-led coalition since March 1, 2015; and
(B) the activities of the Houthis, the Government of the Republic of Yemen, and the Southern Transitional Council.
(2) Any credible information known about the humanitarian effects of such blockade and activities on the people of Yemen, including the effects on—
(A) food security, water, sanitation, hygiene, and public health; and
(B) the extent to which the Government of Yemen to halt or reduce the transmission of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Yemen.
(3) Any credible information known about the effects of such blockade and activities on the economy of Yemen.
(4) Any credible information known about such activities that have exacerbated the adverse effects of such blockade.
(5) Any credible information known about whether the military support of the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Government of the United Arab Emirates, or the Saudi-led coalition since March 1, 2015, has contributed in any manner to such blockade, including—
(A) the transfer of logistics support, supplies, and services under sections 2341 and 2342 of title 10, United States Code, or any other applicable law and
(B) the total amount of such support.
(6) A description of the Department of Defense’s activities, the Department of State’s activities, and the Department of Treasury’s activities in place to ensure that the provision of military support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Government of the United Arab Emirates, or the Saudi-led coalition for military operations in Yemen is in compliance with Federal and international law of armed conflict, and a determination of whether the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State have made an assessment of such compliance in accordance with such processes.
(c) Form.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.
(d) Appropriate Committees of Congress.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—
(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and
(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SA 1682. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appro-
with section 522a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Privacy Act of 1974").

(b) basic facts about the case;

(c) summary of the information that such individual may be detained unlawfully or wrongfully;

(d) a description of specific efforts, legal and diplomatic, that have been or are being made on behalf of United States nationals detained abroad and the Family Engagement Coordinator established pursuant to section 4(c)(2), the Secretary of State shall provide resource guidance in writing to government officials and families of unjustly or wrongfully detained individuals.

(2) CONTENT.—The resource guidance required under paragraph (1) should include—

(A) information to help families understand United States policy concerning the release of United States nationals unlawfully or wrongfully held abroad;

(B) contact information for officials in the Department of State or other government agencies that advocate on behalf of families;

(C) relevant information about options available to help families obtain the release of unjustly or wrongfully detained individuals, including guidance on how families may engage with United States diplomatic and consular channels to ensure prompt and regular access for the detained individual to legal counsel, medical care, humane treatment, and other services;

(D) guidance on submitting public or private letters from members of Congress or other individuals who may be influential in securing the release of an individual; and

(E) appropriate points of contacts, such as legal resources and counseling services, who have a record of assisting victims’ families.

SEC. 4. HOSTAGE RECOVERY FUSION CELL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish an interagency Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell.

(b) PARTICIPATION.—The President shall direct the heads of each of the following executive departments, agencies, and offices to make available personnel to participate in the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell: (1) the Department of State; (2) the Department of the Treasury; (3) the Department of Defense; (4) the Department of Justice; (5) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; (6) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; (7) the Central Intelligence Agency.

(c) PERSONNEL.—The Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell shall include—

(1) a Director, who shall be a full-time senior officer or employee of the United States Government;

(2) a Family Engagement Coordinator who shall—

(A) work to ensure that all interactions by executive branch officials with a hostage’s family occur in a coordinated fashion and that the family receives consistent and accurate information from the United States Government; and

(B) if directed, perform the same function as set out in subparagraph (A) with respect to the family of any United States national who is unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad; and

(3) other officers and employees as deemed appropriate by the President.

(d) DUTIES.—The Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell shall—

(1) coordinate efforts by participating agencies to ensure that all relevant information, expertise, and resources are brought to bear to secure the safe recovery of United States nationals held hostage abroad;

(2) if directed, coordinate the United States Government’s response to other hostage-takings occurring abroad in which the United States has a national interest;

(3) if directed, coordinate or assist the United States Government’s response to help secure the release of United States nationals unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad; and

(4) pursuant to policy guidance coordinated through the National Security Council, (A) identify hostage recovery options and strategies to the President through the National Security Council or the Deputies Committee of the National Security Council; (B) coordinate efforts by participating agencies to ensure that information regarding hostage events, including potential recovery options with families and external actors (including foreign governments), is appropriately shared within the United States Government to facilitate a coordinated response-taking; (C) assess and track all hostage-takings of United States nationals abroad and provide regular reports to the President and Congress on the status of such cases and any measures being taken toward the hostages’ safe recovery;

(5) provide a forum for intelligence sharing among the Director of National Intelligence, coordinate the declas-sification of relevant information;

(6) coordinate efforts by participating agencies to provide support and assistance to hostages and their families in a coordinated and consistent manner and to provide families with timely information regarding those cases;

(7) make recommendations to agencies in order to reduce the likelihood of United States nationals being taken hostage abroad and enhance United States Government preparation to maximize the probability of a favorable outcome following a hostage-taking; and

(G) coordinate with agencies regarding congressional, media, and other public inquiries pertaining to hostage events.

(d) DUTIES.—The Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell shall be located within the Federal Bureau of Investigation for administrative purposes.

SEC. 5. HOSTAGE RESPONSE GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish a Hostage Response Group, chaired by the designated member of the National Security Council or the Deputies Committee of the National Security Council, to be convened on a regular basis, to further the safe recovery of United States nationals held hostage abroad or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and to be tasked with coordinating the United States Government response to other hostage-takings occurring abroad in which the United States has a national interest.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The regular members of the Hostage Response Group shall include the Director of the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell, the Hostage Recovery Cell’s Family Engagement Coordinator, the Special Envoy appointed under section 3, and representatives from the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other agencies as the President, from time to time, may designate.

(c) DUTIES.—The Hostage Recovery Group shall—

(1) identify and recommend hostage recovery options and strategies to the President through the National Security Council;

(2) coordinate the development and implementation of United States hostage recovery policies, strategies, and procedures;

(3) receive regular updates from the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell and the Special Envoy for Hostage Affairs on the status of United States nationals being held hostage or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad and measures being taken to effect safe recoveries;

(4) coordinate the provision of policy guidance to the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell, including reviewing recovery options proposed by the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell and working to resolve disputes within the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell;

(5) as appropriate, direct the use of resources at the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell to coordinate or assist in the safe recovery of United States nationals unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad; and

(6) as appropriate, direct the use of resources at the Hostage Recovery Fusion Cell to coordinate the United States Government response to other hostage-takings occurring abroad in which the United States has a national interest.

(d) MEETINGS.—The Hostage Response Group shall meet regularly.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—The Hostage Response Group shall regularly provide recommendations on hostage recovery options and strategies to the National Security Council.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person the President determines, based on credible evidence, (1) is responsible for or is complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the hostage-taking of a
United States national abroad or the unlawful or wrongful detention of a United States national abroad;

(2) knowingly provides financial, material, or technological support for, or the importation of goods, services, or technology in violation of subsection (a), for the importation of goods, or services in support of, an activity described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a) may be—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien described in subsection (a) may be subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) takes effect immediately; and

(II) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien’s possession.

(2) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a person described in subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) INAPPLICIBILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of section 302 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this section.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) RESERVATION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERAGENCY COMMITTEES AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under subsection (b)(1) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, New York, on June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or any applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under subsection (b)(2) shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured article, including technology and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(d) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(2) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out such section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(e) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—If the President terminates sanctions pursuant to subsection (d), the President shall report to the appropriate congressional committees written justification for such termination within 15 days.

(g) IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) any citizen or national of a foreign country (including any such individual who is also a citizen or national of the United States); or

(B) any entity not organized solely under the laws of the United States or existing solely in the United States.

(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) an individual who is a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence who is physically present in the United States;

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity;

(C) any person in the United States.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) UNITED STATES NATIONAL.—The term “United States national” means—

(A) a United States national as defined in section 101(a)(22), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22), and

(B) a lawful permanent resident alien with significant ties to the United States.

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to authorize a private right of action.
SA 1685. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. MICROLOAN PROGRAM.
(a) In General.—Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended—
(1) in paragraph (4)(C)(ii)(I)—
(A) by striking “has—” and inserting “shall have—”;
(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” and inserting “or”;
(C) by adding at the end the following:
“(bb) a portfolio of loans made under this subsection of which not less than 25 percent is serving rural areas during the period of the intermediaries participation in the program;”;
(2) in paragraph (6), by adding at the end the following:
“(F) loan duration.—
“(i) In general.—With respect to a loan made by an eligible intermediary under this paragraph or on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the duration of the loan shall be not more than 8 years.
“(ii) Existing Borrowers.—With respect to a loan made by an eligible intermediary under this paragraph or on or after the date of enactment of this Act, the duration of the loan shall be not more than 8 years.
“(iii) Effective Date.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.”;
(b) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:
“(7) Program funding for microloans.—Under the program authorized by this subsection, the Administration may fund, on a competitive basis, not more than 300 intermediaries.”;

SA 1686. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. Office of Small Business and disadvantaged Business Utilization.
(a) In General.—Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “If the Government Accountability Office has determined that a Federal agency is not in compliance with all of the requirements under this subsection, the Federal agency shall, not later than 120 days after that determination or 120 days after the date of this sentence, whichever is later, submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report that includes the reasons why the Federal agency is not in compliance and the specific actions that the Federal agency will take to comply with the requirements under this subsection.”;
(2) by striking “The management of each such office” and inserting “The management of each Office of Small Business and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.”;

SA 1687. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 120. Restriction on Procurement by Defense Logistics Agency of Certain Items Containing Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances.
(a) Prohibition.—The Director of the Defense Logistics Agency may not procure any covered item containing a perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance.
(b) Definitions.—In this section—
(1) COVERED ITEM.—The term “covered item” means—
(A) non-stick cookware or food service ware for use in galleys or dining facilities;
(B) food packaging materials;
(C) furniture or floor waxes;
(D) carpeting, rugs, or upholstered furniture;
(E) personal care items;
(F) dental floss; and
(G) sunscreen.
(2) Perfluoroalkyl substance.—The term “perfluoroalkyl substance” means a man-made chemical containing a mix of fully fluorinated carbon atoms.
(3) Polyfluoroalkyl substance.—The term “polyfluoroalkyl substance” means a man-made chemical containing a mix of fully fluorinated carbon atoms, partially fluorinated carbon atoms, and nonfluorinated carbon atoms.
(c) Effective Date.—This section shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1690. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(b) Repeal of Requirement in Public Law 112–74.—Section 538 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2012 (6 U.S.C. 190 note; division D of Public Law 112–74) is repealed.
(a) Certification to Congress.—Chapter 13 of title 10 of the United States Code, as amended by section 252 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking: (1) the words "as so redesignated, by striking"; (2) the words "section 251 of title 10, United States Code"; (3) in section 251—

(1) the words "as subparagraph (A)"; and (2) the words "whenever" and inserting the following:

"(a) Certification to Congress.—When the President invokes the authority under this section, not later than 48 hours after such invocation of authority, the President shall certify to Congress that the State concerned is unable or unwilling to suppress, an unlawful obstruction, combination, or conspiracy, and a legal justification for resorting to the authority under this section to so suppress.

(b) Certification to Congress.—The President, in every possible instance, shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.

(c) Certification to Congress.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"256. Certification with Congress.

"The President, in every possible instance, shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.""

SA 1691. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"(b) Certification to Congress.—When the President invokes the authority under this section, not later than 48 hours after such invocation of authority, the President shall certify to Congress that the State concerned is unable or unwilling to suppress, an unlawful obstruction, combination, or conspiracy, and a legal justification for resorting to the authority under this section to so suppress.

(b) Certification to Congress.—The President, in every possible instance, shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.

(c) Certification to Congress.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"256. Certification with Congress.

The President, in every possible instance, shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.""

SEC. 3. MODIFICATIONS TO THE INSURRECTION ACT OF 1807.

(a) Authority.—Whenever there is an insurrection in any State against its government, the President may, upon the request of the governor of the State concerned, call into Federal service such of the militia of the other States, in the number requested by the governor of the State concerned, and use such of the armed forces of the United States, as are necessary to suppress the insurrection.

(b) Use of Militia and Armed Forces to Enforce Federal Authority.

(a) Authority.—Whenever there is an unlawful obstruction, combination, or conspiracy, and a legal justification for resorting to the authority under this section to so suppress.

(b) Certification to Congress.—When the President invokes the authority under this section, not later than 48 hours after such invocation of authority, the President shall certify to Congress that the State concerned is unable or unwilling to suppress, an unlawful obstruction, combination, or conspiracy, and a legal justification for resorting to the authority under this section to so suppress.

(c) Certification to Congress.—The President may not invoke the authority under this section unless the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General certify to Congress that the State concerned is unable or unwilling to suppress, an unlawful obstruction, combination, or conspiracy, and a legal justification for resorting to the authority under this section to so suppress.

(d) Certification With Congress.—The President shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.

(e) Technical and Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"256. Consultation.

The President, in every possible instance, shall consult with Congress before invoking the authority under section 251, 252, or 253.""
after the date of such commencement.

(1) 14-DAY PERIOD.—With respect to an

inclusion of authority on a date on which Congress is in session, the period beginning on the date on which the President invokes such authority and ending on the date that is 14 calendar days after the date of such invocation; or

(2) in the case of an invocation of authority on a date on which Congress is adjourned, the period beginning on the date on which the next session of Congress commences and ending on the date that is 14 calendar days after the date of such commencement.

(2) JOINT RESOLUTION.—The term ‘joint resolution’ means a joint resolution.

(A) In general.—Chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, the blank space being filled in with whether the extension relates to the provision of Federal aid for State governments, the use of militia and armed forces to enforce Federal authority, or the suppression of interference with State and Federal law under section 253, and

(B) the title of which is as follows: ‘Joint resolution relating to the extension of authority for purposes of which is as follows: “That Congress extends the authority to which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—If the House of Rep- resentatives proceeds to consideration of a joint resolution—

(A) the joint resolution shall be considered as read;

(B) all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived;

(C) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 10 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(D) an amendment to the joint resolution shall not be in order; and

(E) a motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(4) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN SENATE.—

(A) RECONVENING.—Upon invocation by the President of the authority under section 251, 252, or 253, if the Senate has adjourned or reduced for more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(B) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, after passage of a joint resolution in the House, the Senate receives the companion measure from the House of Representa- tives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(C) CONSIDERATION AFTER PASSAGE.—

(A) PERIOD PENDING WITH PRESIDENT.—If Congress passes a joint resolution—

(i) the period beginning on the date on which the President is presented with the joint resolution and ending on the date on which the President signs, allows to become law without signature, or vetoes and returns the joint resolution (but excluding days when either House is not in session) shall be disregarded in determining whether the joint resolution was enacted before the last day of the 14-day period, and

(ii) the date that is the number of days in the period described in clause (i) after the 14-day period shall be substituted for the 14-day period for purposes of paragraphs (b) and (c).

(B) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint resolution, consideration of a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House.

(C) CONSIDERATION AND DISCHARGE.—Any com- mittee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution is referred shall report it to the House of Representatives not later than 14 calendar days after the last day of the 14-day period, there is enacted into law a joint resolution. If a committee fails to report the joint resolution within that pe- riod, the joint resolution shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee.

(3) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—

(A) In general.—After each committee authorized to consider a joint resolution re- ported by the House of Representatives to the Senate, there shall be referred to the Senate and the Senate shall convene not later than 3 calendar days after the date of such consideration.

(B) PROCEDURE.—For a motion to proceed to consider a joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the motion are waived;

(ii) such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint res- olution;

(iii) the previous question shall be consid- ered as ordered on the joint resolution after the motion to consider the joint resolution is discharged from consideration, it shall be in order, not later than 7 calendar days after the last day of the 14-day period, to move to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution in the House of Representatives.

(C) VETOES.—If the President vetoes the joint resolution, consideration of a joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(D) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(A) In general.—If the Senate proceeds to consider a joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived;

(ii) consideration of the joint resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

(iii) a motion further to limit debate is in order, and

(iv) an amendment, to a motion to postpone, or a motion to commit the joint reso- lution is not in order; and

(v) a motion to proceed to the considera- tion of other business is not in order.

(B) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on pas- sage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of a joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in ac- cordance with the rules of the Senate.

(C) SPECIAL RULES OF THE CHAMBER.—

(A) JOINT RESOLUTION.—The term ‘joint reso- lution’ means a joint resolution.

(A) In general.—Chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, the blank space being filled in with whether the extension relates to the provision of Federal aid for State gov- ernments under section 251, the use of militia and armed forces to enforce Federal au-

thority under section 252, or the suppression of interference with State and Federal law under section 253, and

(B) the title of which is as follows: ‘Joint resolution relating to the extension of au-

thority for purposes of which is as follows: ‘That Congress extends the authority to
“(g) Rules of House of Representatives and Senate.—Subsections (d) and (e) and paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4)(B) of subsection (f) are enacted by Congress.—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedures to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.”.

(2) Technical and conforming amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(257. Termination of authority and expedited procedures for extension by joint resolution of Congress.—)

(3) Judicial review.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 257. Termination of authority and expedited procedures for extension by joint resolution of Congress.—

“(a) In general.—Notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any other provision of law, any individual or entity (including a State or local government) that is injured by, or has a credible fear of injury from, the use of members of the armed forces under this chapter may bring a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief. In any action under this section, the district court shall have jurisdiction to decide any question of law or fact arising under this chapter, including challenges to the legal basis for members of the armed forces to be acting under this chapter.

“(b) Expedited consideration.—It shall be the duty of the applicable district court of the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance theocket and try the case with the greatest possible expeditiousness, and to the disposition of any matter brought under this section.

“(c) Appeals.—

“(1) In general.—The Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States in a civil action brought under this section.

“(2) Filing deadline.—A party shall file an appeal under paragraph (1) not later than 30 days after the court issues a final decision under subsection (b).

(2) Technical and conforming amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 258. Judicial review.

“(g) Restricted on direct participation by military personnel.—

“(a) In general.—No activity (including the provision of any equipment or facility or the assignment or detail of any personnel) under this title shall include or permit direct participation by a member of the Reserve, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in a search, seizure, arrest, or other similar activity unless participation in such activity by such member is otherwise expressly authorized by law.

“(b) Regulations.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations as may be necessary to ensure compliance with subsection (a).”.

SA 1692. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

“SEC. 275. Restriction on direct participation by military personnel.

“(a) In general.—No activity (including the provision of any equipment or facility or the assignment or detail of any personnel) under this title shall include or permit direct participation by a member of the Reserve, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in a search, seizure, arrest, or other similar activity unless participation in such activity by such member is otherwise expressly authorized by law.

“(b) Regulations.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations as may be necessary to ensure compliance with subsection (a).”.

SA 1694. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

“SEC. 275. Restriction on direct participation by military personnel.

“(a) In general.—No activity (including the provision of any equipment or facility or the assignment or detail of any personnel) under this title shall include or permit direct participation by a member of the Reserve, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps in a search, seizure, arrest, or other similar activity unless participation in such activity by such member is otherwise expressly authorized by law.

“(b) Regulations.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations as may be necessary to ensure compliance with subsection (a).”.

(2) Technical and conforming amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 13 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 257. Termination of authority and expedited procedures for extension by joint resolution of Congress.—

“(a) In general.—Notwithstanding, and without prejudice to, any other provision of law, any individual or entity (including a State or local government) that is injured by, or has a credible fear of injury from, the use of members of the armed forces under this chapter may bring a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief. In any action under this section, the district court shall have jurisdiction to decide any question of law or fact arising under this chapter, including challenges to the legal basis for members of the armed forces to be acting under this chapter.

“(b) Expedited consideration.—It shall be the duty of the applicable district court of the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance theocket and try the case with the greatest possible expeditiousness, and to the disposition of any matter brought under this section.

“(c) Appeals.—

“(1) In general.—The Supreme Court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States in a civil action brought under this section.

“(2) Filing deadline.—A party shall file an appeal under paragraph (1) not later than 30 days after the court issues a final decision under subsection (b).
training program of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Labor after such separation.

(E) Industries that have employed such veterans;

(F) Military occupational specialties available to such veterans.

(G) Barriers to employment of such veterans.

(H) Causes to fluctuations in employment of such veterans.

(I) Current employment training programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Labor that are available to such veterans.

(J) Economic indicators that impact unemployment of such veterans.

(K) Health conditions of such veterans that could impact employment.

(L) Whether there are differences in the analyses conducted under subparagraphs (A) through (K) based on the race of such veteran who served on active duty in the United States Armed Forces, in a campaign for which a Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal was awarded, or (K) based on the race of such veterans.

(3) DECLASSIFICATION.—The term “declassification” means the authorized change in the status of information from classified information to unclassified information.

(b) REPORT.—(1) The President shall conduct the study under subsection (a).

(2) In coordination with the Information Security Oversight Office in the National Archives and Records Administration, the President shall:

(A) The analyses conducted under subsection (a); and

(B) The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report on such study.

(c) CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION.—The term “classified national security information” means information that is determined pursuant to Executive Order 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to classified national security information), or any predecessor or successor order, to require that classified national security information be kept secret in any manner and under any condition specified in the order or any predecessor or successor order.

(d) DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—In coordination with the Information Security Oversight Office in the National Archives and Records Administration, the Director of National Intelligence shall serve as the Executive Agent for Declassification.

(e) DUTIES.—The duties of the Executive Agent for Declassification are as follows:

(1) To promote programs, processes, and systems within the Federal Government in order to ensure that declassification activities keep pace with classification activities and that classified information is declassified at such time as it no longer meets the standard for classification.

(2) To promote technological and automated solutions for automating declassification review and directing resources for such purposes in the Federal Government.

(3) To provide guidance on resources to develop, coordinate, and implement a federated declassification system that includes technologies that automate declassification review and promote consistency in declassification determinations across the executive branch of the Federal Government.

(4) To work with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in developing a line item for declassification in each budget of the President that is submitted for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(5) To identify and support the development of:

(A) best practices for declassification among Executive agencies; and

(B) goal oriented declassification pilot programs.

(6) To promote technological and automated solutions relating to declassification, with human input as necessary for key policy decisions.

(7) To promote feasible, sustainable, and interoperable programs, processes, and systems to facilitate a federated declassification system.

(8) To coordinate the implementation across Executive agencies of the most effective programs and approaches relating to declassification.

(9) In coordination with the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, develop acquisition and contracting policies relating to declassification and review agency contracts.

(10) In coordination with the Information Security Oversight Office in the National Archives and Records Administration—

(A) to issue directives to the heads of Executive agencies relating to directing resources and making technological investments in declassification that include support for a federated declassification system;

(B) to ensure implementation of the policies and directives issued under subparagraph (A); and

(C) to collect information on declassification practices and policies across Executive agencies, including challenges to effective declassification, the costs associated with classification and declassification;
SEC. 6. REPORTING.
(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than the end of the first full fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each fiscal year, the Executive Agent for Declassification shall submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on the implementation of declassification programs and processes in the most recently completed fiscal year.
(b) COORDINATION.—The report shall be coordinated with the Annual Report of the Information Security Oversight Office in the National Archives and Records Administration pursuant to Section 5.2(b)(6) of Executive Order 13526.
(c) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted and made available under subsection (a) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:
(1) The costs incurred by the Federal Government for classification and declassification.
(2) A description of information systems of the Federal Government and technology programs, processes, and systems of Executive agencies for classification.
(3) A description of the policies and directives issued by the Executive Agent for declassification and other activities of the Executive for declassification.
(4) A description of the challenges posed to Executive agencies in implementing the policies and directives of the Executive Agent for declassification relating to declassification as well as the policies of the Executive agencies.
(5) A description of pilot programs and new investments in programs, processes, and systems relating to declassification and metrics of effectiveness for such programs, processes, and systems.
(6) A description of progress and challenges in achieving the goal described in section 4(c)(1).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.

SA 1695. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII, add the following:
SEC. 28. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RELOCATION OF JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER.
It is the Sense of Congress that Congress strongly recommends that the Director of the Defense Information Systems Agency begin the process for the relocation of the Joint Spectrum Center of the Department of Defense to the building at Fort Meade that is allocated for such center.

SA 1688. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:
SEC. 1710. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the appropriate place in title XII, insert the following:
Subtitle 7—Enhancing Human Rights Protection in Arms Sales
SEC. SHORT TITLE
This subtitle may be cited as the "Enhancing Human Rights Protection in Arms Sales Act of 2020.

SEC. 3. STRATEGY ON ENHANCING HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS IN UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to enhance United States efforts to ensure human rights protections for United States military assistance and arms transfers. The strategy shall include processes and procedures to—
(1) determine when United States military assistance and arms transfers are used to commit gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;
(2) determine when United States military assistance and arms transfers are used to contribute to gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including acts of grossly increased human casualty and economic damage and acts that undermine international peace and security or contribute to gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including acts of grossly increased human casualty and economic damage and acts that undermine international peace and security or contribute to gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

SA 1700. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following:
SEC. CONTRACT FINANCE RATES.
Section 2307(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense may not establish a contract finance rate that is lower than any other government agency.
(B)(i) The Secretary of Defense may not institute a regulatory change to a contract finance rate until the Secretary provides the congressional defense committees with a notice of determination or need to adjust the customary rates. At a minimum, this notice shall include—
"(i) a justification for the rate change, together with the data and analysis relied upon to inform the determination; and
"(ii) an assessment of how the rate change will lead to a more effective acquisition program and a healthier industrial base.
"(ii) The Secretary shall ensure the notice of determination of need required under clause (i) is published in the Federal Register not later than 5 business days after the notice is provided to the congressional defense committees."
transfers, including the diversion of such assistance or the use of such assistance by security forces or police units credibly implicated in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and
(4) train partner militaries, security, and police forces on methods for preventing civilian causalities; and
(5) determine whether individuals or units that have received United States military, security, or police training or have participated or are scheduled to participate in joint exercises with United States forces have later been credibly implicated in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1702. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Subtitle I. Promotion of Democracy and Human Rights in Burma

SEC. 1291. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Burma Human Rights and Freedom Act of 2020”.

SEC. 1292. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:
(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—
(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.
(2) CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.—The term “crimes against humanity” includes, when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack—
(A) murder;
(B) deportation or forcible transfer of population;
(C) torture;
(D) rape, sexual slavery, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable severity;
(E) use of public or private acts of violence directed against any group or community or on the occasion of any act of violence against the community;
(F) enforced disappearances of persons.
(3) GENOCIDE.—The term “genocide” means any offense described in section 1091(a) of title 18, United States Code.
(4) TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE.—The term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, non-judicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes for the purposes of atrocities and to promote long-term, sustainable peace.

SEC. 1293. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that—
(1) the pursuit of a robust engagement strategy is essential to support the establishment of a peaceful, prosperous, and democratic Burma that includes respect for the human rights of all its people regardless of ethnicity and religion; and
(2) the guiding principles of such a strategy include—
(A) support for meaningful legal and constitutional reforms that remove remaining restrictions on civil and political rights and institute civilian control of the military, civilian control over the government, and the constitutional provision reserving 25 percent of parliamentary seats for the military, which provides the military with veto power over constitutional amendments; and
(B) the establishment of a fully democratic, pluralistic, civilian controlled, and representative political system that includes regularized free and fair elections in which all people of Burma, including the Rohingya, can vote;
(C) the promotion of genuine national reconciliation and conclusion of a credible and sustainable nationwide ceasefire agreement, political accommodation of the needs of ethnic Shan, Kachin, Chin, Karen, and other ethnic groups, voluntary return of displaced persons to villages of origins, and constitutional change allowing inclusive permanent peace;
(D) independent and international investigations into credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence and genocide, perpetrated against ethnic minorities like the Rohingya by the government, military, and security forces of Burma, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict;
(E) accountability for determinations of war crimes, crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence and genocide perpetrated against ethnic minorities like the Rohingya by the Government, military, and security forces of Burma, violent extremist groups, and other combatants involved in the conflict;
(F) strengthening the government’s civilian institutions, including support for greater transparency; and
(G) the establishment of professional and nonpartisan military, security, and police forces that operate under civilian control; and

SEC. 1294. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated not less than $220,500,000 for fiscal year 2021 for humanitarian assistance and reconciliation activities for ethnic groups and civil society organizations in Burma, Bangladesh, Thailand, and the region. The assistance may include—
(1) assistance for the victims of the Burmese military’s crimes against humanity targeting Rohingya and other ethnic minorities in Rakhine State, Kachin, and Shan States, including those displaced in Burma, Bangladesh, Thailand, and the region;
(2) support for voluntary resettlement or repatriation in Burma, pending a genuine reparation agreement that is developed and negotiated with Rohingya involvement and consultation; and
(3) assistance to promote ethnic and religious tolerance, to combat gender-based violence, and to support victims of violence and perpetrators of violence and extremist groups, including sexual and gender-based violence and genocide committed in Burma;
(4) assistance to ethnic groups and civil society in Burma to help sustain ceasefire agreements and further prospects for reconciliation and sustainable peace; and
(5) promotion of ethnic minority inclusion and participation in Burma’s political processes.

SEC. 1295. MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive director of each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to support projects in Burma that—
(1) provide for accountability and transparency, including the collection, verification and publication of beneficial ownership information related to extractive industries and on-site monitoring during the life of the project;
(2) will be developed and carried out in accordance with best practices regarding environmental conservation, cultural protection, and empowerment of local populations, including free, prior, and informed consent of affected indigenous communities;
(3) do not provide incentives for, or facilitate, forced displacement; and
(4) do not partner with or otherwise involve enterprises owned or controlled by the armed forces.

SEC. 1296. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RIGHT OF RETURN AND FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT.

(a) RIGHT OF RETURN.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Burma, in collaboration with the regional and international community, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, should—
(1) ensure the dignified, safe, sustainable, and voluntary return of all those displaced from their homes, especially from Rakhine State, without an undue high burden of proof, and the opportunity for appropriate compensation to restart their lives in Burma;
(2) ensure that those returning are granted or restored full citizenship, as well as the rights that adhere to citizenship in Burma;
(3) offer to those who do not want to return meaningful opportunity to obtain appropriate compensation or restitution; and
(4) not place returning Rohingya in internally displaced persons camps or “model villages”, but instead make efforts to reconstitute Rohingya villages as and where they were;
(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RIGHT OF RETURN.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Burma, in collaboration with the regional and international community, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, should—
(1) support for the return of any funds collected by the Government by harvesting the resources owned and tended by Rohingya farmers for them upon their return;
(6) fully implement all of the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State; and

(7) ensure there is proper consultation, buy-in, and support from the building from the Rohingya refugee community on decisions being made on their behalf.

(b) Freedom of Movement of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons—Congress recognizes that the Government of Bangladesh has provided long-standing support and hospitality to people fleeing violence in Burma, and calls on the Government of Bangladesh—

(1) to ensure all refugees, including Rohingya persons living in camps in Bangladesh, are able to freely choose their place of residence and access the services they need; and,

(2) to ensure that internally displaced persons in camps in Burma, have freedom of movement, including outside of the camps, and under no circumstance are subject to unsafe, involuntary, or enforced repatriation;

(3) to ensure the rights of refugees are protected, including through allowing them to build durable shelters, and ensuring equal access to healthcare, basic services, education, and work.

SEC. 1297. MILITARY COOPERATION

(a) Prohibition.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the President may not furnish any security assistance or engage in any military-to-military programs with the armed forces of Burma, including training or observation or participation in regional exercises, until the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, certifies to both Houses of Congress that the Burmese military has demonstrated significant progress in abiding by international human rights standards and is undergoing fundamental and significant security sector reform, including transparency and accountability to prevent future abuses, as determined by applying the following criteria:

(1) The military adheres to international human rights standards and institutes meaningful internal reforms to stop future human rights violations.

(2) The military supports efforts to carry out meaningful and comprehensive independent and international investigations of credible allegations of human rights violations and accountability those in the Burmese military responsible for human rights violations.

(3) The military supports efforts to carry out the military’s own comprehensive, independent and international investigations of reports of conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence and is holding accountable those in the Burmese military who failed to prevent, respond to, and investigate and prosecute cases of human rights violations.

(4) The Government of Burma, including the military, allows immediate and unfettered humanitarian access to communities in areas affected by conflict, including Rohingya and other minority communities in Rakhine, Kachin, and Shan States, specifically to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relevant United Nations agencies.

(5) The Government of Burma, including the military, cooperates with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relevant United Nations agencies to ensure the protection of displaced persons and the safe and voluntary return of Rohingya and other minority refugees and internally displaced persons.

(6) The Government of Burma, including the military, takes steps toward the implementation of the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State.

(b) Exceptions.—


(2) Hospitality.—The United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State may provide assistance authorized by part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to support rebuilding and the Burmese military for the purpose of supporting research, dialogues, meetings, and other activities related to the Union Peace Conference.

(c) Military Reform.—The certification requirements of the Burma Freedom and Human Rights Act of 2020 (Public Law 116–148; 22 U.S.C. 2511 note) are amended by—

(i) striking "2008" and inserting "2018"; and

(ii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

(d) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this Act affects any law, treaty, or other provision of United States law implementing any security assistance or engagement with Burma.

(e) Report.—

(1) In General.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the strategy and plans for military-to-military engagements between the United States Armed Forces and the military of Burma.

(2) Elements.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description and assessment of the Government of Burma’s strategy for—

(i) security sector reform, including as it relates to an end to involvement in the illicit trade in jade, rubies, and other natural resources;

(ii) reforms to end corruption and illicit drug trafficking; and

(iii) constitutional reforms to ensure civilian control of the armed forces;

(B) A list of ongoing military activities conducted by the United States Government with the Government of Burma, and a description of the strategy for future military-to-military engagements between the United States and Burma’s military forces, including the military of Burma, the Burma Police Force, and armed ethnic groups.

(C) An assessment of the progress of the military of Burma towards developing a framework to implement human rights reforms, including—

(i) cooperation with civilian authorities to investigate and prosecute cases of human rights violations;

(ii) steps taken to demonstrate respect for internationally-recognized human rights standards and implementation of and adherence to the United Nations’ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

(iii) a description of the elements of the military-to-military engagement between the United States and Burma that promote such improvements;

(iv) the Secretary’s efforts to implement reforms, end impunity for human rights violations, and increase transparency and accountability.

(f) Report Required Under Section 217 of the Act.—(1) The military strategy and plans described in section 217(c) of the Act (22 U.S.C. 2511 note) are amended by—

(i) striking "2008" and inserting "2018"; and

(ii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

(g) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this Act affects any law, treaty, or other provision of United States law implementing any security assistance or engagement with Burma.

(h) Reinstatement of Import Restric- tions on Jadeite and Rubies from Burma.—

(1) In General.—Section 3A of the Burma Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by—

(i) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

(ii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018"; and

(iii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

SEC. 1298. TRADE RESTRICTIONS.

(a) Reinstatement of Import Restrictions on Jadeite and Rubies from Burma.—

(1) In General.—Section 3A of the Burma Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by—

(i) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

(ii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018"; and

(iii) striking "2008" and inserting "2018";

(2) Conforming Amendments.—

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking "until such time" and all that follows through "2008" and inserting "2018";

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking "the date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting "the date of the enactment of the Burma Freedom and Democracy Act of 2020";

SEC. 1299. REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY FOR GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) In General.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and—

(B) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.
SEC. 1299. VISA BAN AND ECONOMIC SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO MILITARY OFFICIALS RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) List Required.—In general.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of all military officials who are responsible for gross violations of human rights, war crimes, or crimes against humanity (including sexual or gender-based violence), in Burma, including against the Rohingya minority population; and

(b) Entities owned or controlled by officials described in subparagraph (a) (1).

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The list required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) each senior official of the military and security forces of Burma;

(B) any person directly responsible for or involved in the commission of gross violations of human rights, war crimes, or crimes against humanity (including sexual or gender-based violence), in Burma, including against the Rohingya minority population; and

(C) any entity owned or controlled by officials described in subparagraph (A).

(3) UPDATES.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a updated version of the list required by paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS.—

(1) VISA BAN.—The Secretary of State shall deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall exclude from the United States, any individual included in the most recent list required by subsection (a).

(2) EMBARGO.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall impose an embargo on the importation of goods of Burma.

(B) GOO DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘‘good’’ means all property and interests in property of a person included in the most recent list required by subsection (a).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 208 and 209 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (2) or (3) of this section, and any order issued to carry out such a paragraph, shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act as described in subsection (a) of that section.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on diplomatic efforts to impose sanctions with respect to persons sanctioned under—

(1) section 1299; or

(2) section 1296 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for activities described in subsection (a) of that section in or with respect to Burma.

(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) humanitarian assistance.—A requirement to impose sanctions under this section shall not apply with respect to the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other humanitarian assistance to Burma in response to a humanitarian crisis.

(2) UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to the admission of an individual to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with an agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed on March 19, 1967, or other international obligations of the United States.

(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on diplomatic efforts to impose sanctions with respect to persons sanctioned under—

(1) section 1299; or

(2) section 1296 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) for activities described in subsection (a) of that section in or with respect to Burma.

(3) SDN LIST.—The term ‘‘SDN list’’ means the list of specially designated nationals under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) that was established by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘‘United States person’’ has the meaning given that term in section 595.315 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on
the day before the date of the enactment of this Act."

SEC. 1299A. STRATEGY FOR PROMOTING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) In General.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to support inclusive, and market-based economic development, in accordance with the priorities of disadvantaged communities in Burma and in consultation with relevant local stakeholders, and to improve economic conditions and government transparency.

(b) Elements.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include a roadmap—

(1) to assess and recommend measures to diversify control over and access to participation in key industries and sectors, including efforts to remove barriers and increase competition, access, and opportunity in sectors dominated by officials of the Burmese military, former military officials, and their families, and businesses connected to the military of Burma, with the goal of eliminating the role of the military in the economy of Burma;

(2) to increase transparency disclosure requirements in key sectors of the economy of Burma to promote responsible investment, including through efforts—

(A) to provide technical support to develop and implement policy reforms related to public disclosure of the beneficial owners of entities in key sectors identified by the Government of Burma, specifically by—

(i) working with the Government of Burma to require—

(I) the disclosure of the ultimate beneficial ownership of entities in the ruby industry; and

(II) the publication of project revenues, payments, and contract terms relating to that industry; and

(ii) ensuring that reforms complement disclosures due to be put in place in Burma as a result of its participation in the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative; and

(B) to identify the persons seeking or securing access to the most valuable resources of Burma; and

(3) to promote universal access to reliable, affordable, efficient, and sustainable power, including leveraging United States assistance to support reforms in the power sector and electrification projects that increase energy access, in partnership with multilateral organizations and the private sector.

SEC. 1299B. REPORT ON CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN BURMA.

(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the credible reports of crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence, and genocide perpetrated against the Rohingya and other ethnic minorities in Burma, including credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against peace committed by persons described in subsection (a)(2) of section 1299(b); and

(b) Elements.—The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence, and genocide perpetrated against the Rohingya and other ethnic minorities in Burma, including credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against peace committed by persons described in subsection (a)(2) of section 1299(b);

(2) identify suspected perpetrators of such crimes;

(3) collect, document, and preserve evidence of crimes committed and to improve economic conditions and relevant civil society and local stakeholders, with the priorities of disadvantaged communities in Burma and in consultation with relevant local stakeholders, and to enhance economic conditions and government transparency.

SEC. 1299B. STRATEGY FOR PROMOTING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) In General.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy to support inclusive, and market-based economic development, in accordance with the priorities of disadvantaged communities in Burma and in consultation with relevant local stakeholders, and to improve economic conditions and government transparency.

(b) Elements.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include a roadmap—

(1) to assess and recommend measures to diversify control over and access to participation in key industries and sectors, including efforts to remove barriers and increase competition, access, and opportunity in sectors dominated by officials of the Burmese military, former military officials, and their families, and businesses connected to the military of Burma, with the goal of eliminating the role of the military in the economy of Burma;

(2) to increase transparency disclosure requirements in key sectors of the economy of Burma to promote responsible investment, including through efforts—

(A) to provide technical support to develop and implement policy reforms related to public disclosure of the beneficial owners of entities in key sectors identified by the Government of Burma, specifically by—

(i) working with the Government of Burma to require—

(I) the disclosure of the ultimate beneficial ownership of entities in the ruby industry; and

(II) the publication of project revenues, payments, and contract terms relating to that industry; and

(ii) ensuring that reforms complement disclosures due to be put in place in Burma as a result of its participation in the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative; and

(B) to identify the persons seeking or securing access to the most valuable resources of Burma; and

(3) to promote universal access to reliable, affordable, efficient, and sustainable power, including leveraging United States assistance to support reforms in the power sector and electrification projects that increase energy access, in partnership with multilateral organizations and the private sector.

SEC. 1299B. REPORT ON CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN BURMA.

(a) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the credible reports of crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence, and genocide perpetrated against the Rohingya and other ethnic minorities in Burma, including credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against peace committed by persons described in subsection (a)(2) of section 1299(b); and

(b) Elements.—The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of credible reports of war crimes, crimes against humanity, including sexual and gender-based violence, and genocide committed by violent extremist groups or anti-government forces; and

(2) any incidents that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, if possible, identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or organized such incidents; and

(3) a detailed study of the feasibility and desirability of potential transitional justice mechanisms for Burma, including a hybrid or ad hoc tribunal as well as other international justice and accountability options.

The report should be produced in consultation with Rohingya representatives and other entities; and

(c) Restriction on Foreign Assistance.—The President may terminate or reduce the provision of United States foreign assistance to Burma if the President determines that the Government of Burma does not verifiably and irreversibly eliminate all purchases or other acquisitions of defense articles from the Government of North Korea or an individual or entity acting on behalf of that Government.

(d) Defense Article Defined.—In this section, the term ‘‘defense article’’ has the meaning given that term in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

SEC. 1299E. MEASURES RELATING TO MILITARY COOPERATION BETWEEN BURMA AND NORTH KOREA.

(a) Imposition of Sanctions.—

(1) In General.—The President may, with respect to any person described in paragraph (2)—

(A) impose the sanctions described in paragraph (1) or (3) of section 1299(a)(b) or (c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (126 Stat. 2859); or

(B) include that person on the SDN list (as defined in section 1299(f));

(2) Persons Described.—A person described in this paragraph is any person that is an official of the Government of Burma or an individual or entity acting on behalf of the Government of Burma that the President determines purchases or otherwise acquires defense articles from the Government of North Korea or an individual or entity acting on behalf of that Government.

(b) Defense Article Defined.—In this section, the term ‘‘defense article’’ has the meaning given that term in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

SEC. 1299F. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force.

SA 1703. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle H—United States National Security Interests in Europe

SEC. 1299H. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ‘‘Maintaining United States National Security Interests in Europe Act.’’

SEC. 1299G. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) Findings.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The 2017 National Security Strategy stated that ‘‘The United States will deepen collaboration with our European allies and partners to confront forces threatening to
undermine our common values, security interests, and shared vision. The United States and Europe will work together to counter Russian subversion and aggression, and the threats posed by North Korea and Iran. We will continue to advance our shared principles and interests in international forums.

(2) After the end of World War II, the presence of foreign military forces in Germany was governed by a law signed in April 1949 that allowed France, the United Kingdom, and the United States to retain forces in Germany.

(3) The initial law was succeeded by the Convention on the Presence of Foreign Forces in the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, allowing eight North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members, specifically Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, to maintain a long-term presence of military forces in the Federal Republic of Germany.

(4) The Federal Republic of Germany has made significant contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance, and by hosting the largest United States Armed Forces in Europe, the Federal Republic of Germany has borne a significant burden in the interest of collective security.

(5) As of June 2020, the United States presence in Europe includes United States personnel in various locations in the Federal Republic of Germany, including in Stuttgart at the United States European Command and the United States Africa Command, consists of—

(A) approximately—
(i) 35,000 members of the Armed Forces;
(ii) 10,000 Department of Defense civilian employees;
(iii) 2,000 defense contractors;
(B) personnel of the Department of State and other United States Government agencies; and
(C) the dependents of individuals described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(6) The United States presence in Europe, including in the Federal Republic of Germany—
(A) protects and defends the United States and United States allies and partners by deterring aggression from the Russian Federation and other adversaries;
(B) strengthens and supports the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance and critical partnerships in Europe; and
(C) provides a potential support platform for carrying out vital national security engagements in Afghanistan, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe.

(7) The deep bilateral ties between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany have led to decades of economic prosperity for both countries and their allies and has strengthened human rights and democracy around the world.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—
(1) the United States should continue to maintain the bilateral relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany and the relationships with other European allies;
(2) the United States should maintain a robust military presence in the Federal Republic of Germany so as to deter further aggression from the Russian Federation or aggression from other adversaries against the United States and its allies and partners; and
(3) the United States should remain committed to strong collaboration with European allies as outlined in the 2017 National Security Strategy.
(b) OVERSIGHT OF PEACE PROCESS AND OTHER AGREEMENTS.—

(1) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF MATERIALS RELevANT TO THE FEBRUARY 29 AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall continue to submit to the appropriate congressional committees materials relevant to the February 29 Agreement.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF ANY FUTURE DEALS INVOLVING THE TALIBAN.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 5 days of conclusion and on an ongoing basis thereafter, any future agreement or arrangement involving the Taliban in any manner, as well as materials relevant to any future agreement or arrangement involving the Taliban in any manner.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY.—If this subsection is not followed, the terms “materials relevant to the February 29 Agreement” and “materials relevant to any future agreement or arrangement” include all relevant reports, and instruments for implementation of the February 29 Agreement or a future agreement or arrangement, as well as any understandings or expectations related to the February 29 Agreement or a future agreement or arrangement.

(c) REPORT AND BRIEFING ON VERIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 120 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report verifying whether the key tenets of the February 29 Agreement, or future agreements, and accompanying implementing frameworks are being preserved and honored.

(B) BRIEFING.—At the time of each report submitted under paragraph (A), the Secretary of State shall direct a Senate-confirmed Department of State official and other appropriate officials to brief the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the contents of the report. The Director of National Intelligence shall also direct an appropriate official to participate in the briefing.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report and briefing required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment—

(i) of the Taliban’s compliance with counterterrorism guarantees, including guarantees to cease violence against civilians, the Taliban’s compliance with the safe passage and evacuation guarantees, and any other movement of personnel from any group to the region;

(ii) of the Taliban’s cooperation with the United States, including any agreement to facilitate the conveyance and evacuation of personnel and assets in the region; and

(iii) of the Taliban’s cooperation with the international community and the United States, including any agreement to facilitate the conveyance and evacuation of personnel and assets in the region;

(B) an assessment of the extent of Taliban involvement with any other terrorist groups, including any agreements with such groups, and any other agreements with such groups;

(C) an assessment of the extent of Taliban participation in the Afghan peace process, including any agreements to participate in the Afghan peace process; and

(D) an assessment of the extent of Taliban cooperation with any other groups, including any agreements to participate in the Afghan peace process.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following terms shall have the meanings given them—

(A) the Global Health Security Strategy (GHSS); and

(B) the Afghanistan National Defense and Security Forces.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall preclude whether a future deal involving the Taliban in any manner constitutes a treaty for purposes of Article II of the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 1085. AUTHORIZATION FOR UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE COALITION FOR EPIDEMIC PREPAREDNESS INNOVATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States is authorized to participate in the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations.

(b) INVESTORS COUNCIL OF CEPI.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to serve on the Investors Council of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness as a representative of the United States, to be effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the following:

(1) The United States’ planned contributions to the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations.

(2) The manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the governance of the Coalition.

(3) The role of the Coalition in and anticipated benefits of United States participation in the Coalition on—

(A) The Global Health Security Strategy required by section 7058(c)(3) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2018 (division K of Public Law 115–141); and

(B) The applicable revision of the National Defense Strategy required by section 1086 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (6 U.S.C. 104); and

(4) Any other relevant policy and planning documents described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(d) UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, to carry out global health security initiatives as well as to carry out global health security initiatives that are not part of the United States’ contribution to the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations.
(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1706. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 601. BASIC NEEDS ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) In General.—Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 402a the following new section:

‘‘§ 402b. Basic needs allowance for low-income members.’’

‘‘(a) ALLOWANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned shall pay to each member of the armed forces described in subsection (b), whether with or without dependents, a monthly basic needs allowance in the amount determined for such member under subsection (c).

‘‘(b) MEMBERS ENTITLED TO ALLOWANCE.—

‘‘(1) a member of the armed forces is entitled to receive the allowance described in subsection (a) for a year if—

‘‘(A) the gross household income of the member during the year preceding such year did not exceed an amount equal to 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines of the Department of Health and Human Services for the location and number of persons in the member’s household for such year; and

‘‘(B) the member does not elect not to receive the allowance for such year.

‘‘(2) EXCLUSION OF BAH FROM GROSS HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—In determining the gross household income for purposes of paragraph (1)(B) there shall be excluded any basic allowance for housing (BAH) received by the member (and any dependents of the member in the member’s household) during such year under section 402a of this title.

‘‘(3) HOUSEHOLD WITH MORE THAN ONE ELIGIBLE MEMBER.—In the event a household contains two or more members entitled to receive the allowance under subsection (a) for a year, only one allowance shall be paid under subsection (a) for such year to such member among such members as such members shall jointly elect.

‘‘(c) AMOUNT OF ALLOWANCE; MONTHS CONSTITUTING YEAR OF PAYMENT.

‘‘(1) AMOUNT.—The amount of the monthly allowance payable to a member under subsection (a) for a year shall be—

‘‘(A) the aggregate amount equal to—

‘‘(i) 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines of the Department of Health and Human Services for the location and number of members of the member’s household for such year; minus

‘‘(ii) the gross household income of the member during the preceding year; and

‘‘(B) expressed in paragraph (2) of section 402a of this title.

‘‘(2) MONTHS CONSTITUTING YEAR OF PAYMENT.—The monthly allowance payable to a member for a year shall be payable for each of the 12 months following March of such year.

‘‘(d) NOTICE OF ELIGIBILITY.—

‘‘(1) PRELIMINARY NOTICE OF ELIGIBILITY.—Not later than December 31 each year, the Director of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service shall notify, in writing, each member aggregated amount of basic pay and compensation for service in the armed forces during such year is estimated to not exceed the amount equal to 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines of the Department of Health and Human Services for the location and number of persons in the member’s household for a year’s potential entitlement to the allowance described in subsection (a) for the following year.

‘‘(2) INFORMATION TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY.—Not later than January 31 each year, each member seeking to receive the allowance for such year (whether or not subject to a notice for such year under paragraph (1)) shall submit to the Director such information as the Director shall require for purposes of this section in order to determine whether or not such member is entitled to receive the allowance for such year.

‘‘(3) NOTICE OF ELIGIBILITY.—Not later than February 28 each year, the Director shall notify, in writing, each member determined by the Director to be entitled to receive the allowance for such year.

‘‘(e) ELECTION NOT TO RECEIVE ALLOWANCE.—

‘‘(1) IN GENERAL.—A member otherwise entitled to receive the allowance described in subsection (a) for a year may elect, in writing, not to receive the allowance for such year. Any election under this subsection shall be effective only for the year for which made. Any election made for a year under this subsection is irrevocable.

‘‘(2) DEEMED ELECTION.—A member who does not submit information described in subsection (d)(2) for a year as otherwise required by that subsection shall be deemed to have elected not to receive the allowance for such year.

‘‘(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section. Such regulations shall specify the income to be included in, and excluded from, gross household income of members for purposes of this section.

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 402a the following new item:

‘‘402b. Basic needs allowance for low-income members.’’

SA 1707. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 582. PROHIBITION ON HOUSING OF ANIMALS AT ALAMOGORDO PRIMATE FACILITY AT HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not after September 1, 2020, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later, the Secretary of the Air Force may not grant any permit to an individual or entity to house a non-human primate or other animal at the Alamogordo Primate Facility at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the amount paid by the Department of the Air Force for electricity, gas, water, and disposal of wastewater at Alamogordo Primate Facility during the period beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on September 30, 2020;

(2) any additional costs related to the operations of Alamogordo Primate Facility paid by the Department of the Air Force; and

(3) any additional contractors or grantees that are using facilities on Holloman Air Force Base under an agreement with the Secretary of the Air Force, or other agreement, including—

(A) details of the rent or additional fees paid by any such contractor or grantee under the agreement; and

(B) any request to the Air Force under the agreement.

SA 1708. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 583. MARITIME SECURITY AND DOMAIN AWARENESS.

(a) PROGRESS REPORT ON MARITIME SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, including the Secretaries of the Departments of the Treasury and Homeland Security, and, in coordination with the congresional defense committees, shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of any security cooperation efforts, including—

(A) Inclusion of counter-IUU fishing in existing shipper agreements to which the United States is a party.

(B) Entry into shipper agreements that include counter-IUU fishing with priority flag states and countries in priority regions with which the United States does not already have such agreements.

(C) Inclusion of counter-IUU fishing in the mission of the Combined Maritime Forces.

(D) Inclusion of counter-IUU fishing exercises in the annual at-sea exercises conducted by the Department of Defense, in coordination with the United States Coast Guard.

(E) Development of partnerships similar to the Oceania Maritime Security Initiative and the Africa Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership in other priority regions.

(b) ELEMENT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of specific steps taken by the Secretary of the Navy with respect to each mechanism described in paragraph (1).
by such mechanisms and resulting coordination between the Department of the Navy and the Coast Guard.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF SERVICE COORDINATION ON MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to assess the available commercial solutions for collecting, sharing, and disseminating among United States maritime services and partner countries maritime domain awareness information relating to illegal maritime activities, including IUU fishing.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment carried out pursuant to an agreement under paragraph (1) shall:

(A) build on the ongoing Coast Guard assessment related to autonomous vehicles;

(B) consider appropriate commercially and academically available technological solutions; and

(C) consider any limitation related to affordability, exportability, maintenance, and sustainment that may constrain the suitability of such solutions for use in a joint and combined environment, including the potential provision of such solutions to one or more partner countries.

(3) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after entering into an agreement under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives the assessment prepared in accordance with the agreement.

(c) REPORT ON USE OF FISHING Fleets by FOREIGN governments.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Office of Naval Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on the use by governments of foreign countries of distant-water fishing fleets as extensions of the official maritime security forces of such countries.

(2) ELEMENT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) the Commission of the manner in which fishing fleets are leveraged in support of the naval operations and policies of foreign countries more generally.

(B) A consideration of—

(i) threats posed, on a country-by-country basis, to the fishing vessels and other vessels of the United States and partner countries;

(ii) risks to Navy and Coast Guard operations of the United States, and the naval and coast guard operations of partner countries; and

(iii) the broader challenge to the interests of the United States and partner countries.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be in unclassified form, but may include classified annexes.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, any term that is also used in the Maritime SAFE Act (Public Law 116–92) shall have the meaning given such term in that Act.

SA 1709. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe the military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 377 and insert the following:

SEC. 377. COMMISSION ON THE NAMING OF ASSETS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE THAT COMMEMORATE THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA OR ANY PERSON WHO SERVED VOLUNTARILY WITH THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a commission relating to the assigning, modifying, keeping, or removing of names, symbols, displays, monuments, or paraphernalia that commemorate the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America in (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Commission’’).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of eight members, of whom—

(A) two shall be appointed by the President;

(B) two shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense;

(C) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission shall hold its initial meeting on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DUTIES.—The Commission shall do the following:

(1) Assess the cost of renaming or removing names, symbols, displays, monuments, or paraphernalia on assets of the Department of Defense that commemorate the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America.

(2) Develop criteria to assess whether an existing name, symbol, display, monument, or paraphernalia commemorates or valorizes the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America.

(3) Develop criteria to assess whether the predominant meaning now given by the local community to an existing name, symbol, display, monument, or paraphernalia that commemorates the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America has changed since the name, symbol, monument, display, or paraphernalia first became associated with an asset of the Department of Defense.

(4) Nominate names, symbols, displays, monuments, or paraphernalia to be potentially renamed or removed from assets of the Department of Defense based on the criteria developed under paragraphs (2) and (3).

(5) Develop proposed procedures for renaming or removing names, symbols, displays, monuments, or paraphernalia that commemorate the Confederate States of America or any person who served voluntarily with the Confederate States of America that the Commission nominates as suitable candidates for renaming or removal, as the case may be, if such procedures do not already exist or have not been developed under subsections (a) and (b), nominations made under paragraph (4), and procedures developed under paragraph (5), including by—

(A) conducting public hearings on such criteria, nominations, and procedures in the States that would be affected by any renaming or removal; and

(B) consulting on such criteria, nominations, and procedures from the State entities, local government entities, military families, veterans service organizations, military service organizations, community to an existing name, symbol, display, monument, or paraphernalia of assets of the Department of Defense prepared in accordance with the agreement.

(6) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 14 days before a hearing to be conducted under subsection (d)(6)(A), the Commission shall publish on a website of the Department of Defense—

(A) an announcement of such hearing; and

(B) an agenda for the hearing and a list of materials relevant to the topics to be discussed at the hearing.

(7) SOLICITATION OF INPUT.—Not later than 60 days before soliciting input under subsection (d)(6)(B) with respect to a renaming or removal, the Commission shall provide notice to State entities, local government entities, military families, veterans service organizations, military service organizations, community organizations, and other non-government entities that would be affected by the renaming or removal to provide those individuals and entities time to consider and comment on the criteria, nominations, and procedures developed under subsection (d).

(f) EXEMPTION FOR GRAVE MARKERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any renaming or removal pursuant to this section shall not apply to any grave marker that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) BRIEFINGS AND REPORTS.—

(1) BRIEFING.—Not later than October 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing the progress of the Commission in carrying out the requirements of the Commission under subsection (d).

(2) BRIEFING AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2022, the Commission shall brief and provide a written report to the Secretary of Defense and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing the results of requirements of the Commission under subsection (d), including the following:

(A) A list of assets of the Department of Defense to be renamed or removed; and

(B) The costs associated with the renaming or removal of such assets.
(C) A description of the criteria used to
nominate such assets for renaming or re-
moval.
(D) A description of the feedback received
and incorporated from State and local stake-
holders pursuant to subsection (d)(6), includ-
ing a detailed explanation of any decision by
the Commission to override concerns raised
by State and local stakeholders when devel-
oping and issuing recommendations on the
criteria, nominations, and proposed proce-
dures described in paragraphs (2) through (5)
of subsection (d).

(h) FUNDING.—
(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—
There is authorized to be appropriated
$2,000,000 for this section.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be
appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021
for Operation and Maintenance, Army, sub-
activity group 431, other personnel support
is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

(i) ASSETS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘‘assets
of the Department of Defense’’ includes any
base, installation, street, building, facility,
aircraft, ship, plane, weapon, equipment,
or any other property owned or controlled by
the Department of Defense.

SA 1710. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr.
SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations
for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel
for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel

SEC. 3. CYBERSECURITY REPORTING RE-
QUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICLY TRAD-
CED COMPANIES.
(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2(a) of the Sar-
banes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7210) is
amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(18) CRITICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The
term ‘critical information system’ means a
set of activities—
(A) involving people, processes, data, or
technology; and
(B) that enable an issuer to obtain, gen-
erate, use, and communicate transactions
and information in pursuit of the core busi-
ness objectives of the issuer.

‘‘(19) INFORMATION SECURITY CONTROL.—
The term ‘information security control’ means
a safeguard or countermeasure that is—
(A) prescribed for an information system
or an organization; and
(B) designed to—
(i) protect the confidentiality, integrity,
and availability of information; and
(ii) meet a set of defined security require-
ments.

‘‘(20) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term ‘cy-
bersecurity risk’ means a significant vulner-
bility to, or significant deficiency in, the
security and defense activities of an infor-
mation system.’’

(b) CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINAN-
CIAL REPORTING AND CRITICAL INFORMA-
TION SYSTEMS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Sar-
banes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7211) is
amended—
(A) in the section heading, by inserting
‘‘AND CRITICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS’’ after
‘‘REPORTS’’; and
(B) in subsection (a)—
(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1),
by striking ‘‘and’’ and inserting ‘‘; and’’;
(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘‘the
principal financial officer or officers,’’ and
the principal security, risk, or informa-
tion security officer or officers’’;
(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking ‘‘and
security controls,’’ after ‘‘internal controls’’;
and
(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘and
security controls; and’’; and

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of
contents for the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002
(15 U.S.C. 7201 note) is amended by striking
‘‘Subsection (b)’’ and inserting ‘‘Subsections (b)
and (c)’’; and
(3) MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENTS OF INTER-
TERNAL CONTROLS AND CRITICAL INFORMA-
TION SYSTEMS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Sar-
banes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is
amended—
(A) in the section heading, by inserting
‘‘AND CRITICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS’’ after
‘‘CONTROLS’’;

(c) MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENTS OF IN-
TERNAL CONTROLS AND CRITICAL INFORMA-
TION SYSTEMS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 of the Sar-
banes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7262) is
amended—
(A) in the section heading, by inserting
‘‘AND CRITICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS’’ after
‘‘CONTROLS’’;

(b) in subsection (a)—
(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘and’’ at
the end;
(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘of the
issuer for financial reporting,’’ and inserting
‘‘or the issuer for financial reporting and
for maintaining internal information
security controls and’’; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(d) shall state the responsibilities of the
Commission for establishing and maintaining ade-
quate internal information security controls,
which shall include penetration testing, as
appropriate:’’;

(C) by redesignating subsection (c) as sub-
section (d); and
(D) by inserting after subsection (b) the fol-
lowing:

‘‘(c) INFORMATION SECURITY CONTROL
EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—With respect to
the internal information security control assess-
ment required by subsection (a), any third-
party information security firm that pre-
pares or issues a cyber or information security
risk assessment for the issuer, other than an
issuer that is an emerging growth company
(as defined in section 3 of the Secu-
shall provide to the issuer, and an assessment
made by the management of the issuer.
An attestation made under this subsection shall
be made in accordance with standards for at-
testation engagements issued or adopted by
the Board. Any such attestation shall not
be the subject of a separate engagement.’’;

(E) in subsection (d), as so redesignated,
by striking ‘‘Subsection (b)’’ and inserting
‘‘Subsections (b) and (c)’’; and
(F) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(e) GUIDANCE REGARDING HOW TO DESCRIB
INFORMATION SECURITY ISSUES UNDER THIS
SECTION.—The Commission shall issue guid-
ance regarding how to describe informa-
tion security issues under this section in a
manner that does not compromise the secu-

(c) MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENTS OF IN-
ternal controls and critical infor-
mation systems.’’

SA 1712. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr.
SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended
to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations
for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel
for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel

SA 1711. Mr. KING submitted an amend-
mint intended to be proposed by him to
the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropri-
ations for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel
for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for
military construction, and for defense
activities of the Department of Energy,
to prescribe military personnel

SEC. 4. JOINT COLLABORATIVE ENVIRON-
MENT.
(a) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the
Cyber Threat Data Standards and Interoper-
ability Council established pursuant to sub-
section (e), the Director of the Cybersecurity
and Infrastructure Security Agency and the
Director of the National Security Agency
shall establish a joint, cloud-based, informa-
tion sharing environment to—
(1) integrate the unclassified and classified
cyber threat intelligence, malware forensics,
and data from network sensor programs of
the Federal Government;
(2) enable cross-correlation of threat data at the speed and scale necessary for rapid detection and identification of cyber threats; (3) enable query and analysis by appropriate threat indicators across the Federal Government; and (4) facilitate a whole-of-government, comprehensive understanding of the cyber threat environment facing the Federal Government and critical infrastructure networks in the United States.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—(1) EVALUATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the Director of the National Security Agency shall design the structure of a common platform for sharing and fusing existing government information, insights, and threat indicators shared with Federal agencies.

(2) POST-DEPLOYMENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal agencies and in consultation with the National Security Agency, to set data standards and requirements for participation under this section.

(3) C ONTENT.—The Attorney General shall in consultation with the Federal agencies and in consultation with the National Security Agency, to set data standards and requirements for participation under this section.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish an interagency council in this subsection referred to as the “Council”), which shall consist of the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Director of the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Council is to provide a comprehensive understanding of the cyber threat environment facing the Federal Government and critical infrastructure networks in the United States.

(c) OPERATIONS.—The information sharing environment established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be jointly managed by— (1) the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, who shall have responsibility for all classified information and data streams; and (2) the Director of the National Security Agency, who shall have responsibility for all unclassified information and data streams.

(d) POST-DEPLOYMENT ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the deployment of the information sharing environment required by subsection (a), the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the Director of the National Security Agency shall jointly assess the information sharing environment and, to the maximum extent practicable, begin the process of expanding the information sharing environment to include critical infrastructure information sharing organizations and, to the maximum extent practicable, begin the process of expanding the information sharing environment to include critical infrastructure information sharing organizations.

(e) CYBER THREAT DATA STANDARDS AND INTEROPERABILITY COUNCIL.—
SA 1713. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

"Subtitle C—Cyber State of Distress"

"SEC. 2231. CYBER STATE OF DISTRESS."

"(a) Definitions.—In this section:"

"(1) ASSET RESPONSE.—The term 'asset response' means activities including—"

"(A) furnishing technical and advisory assistance to entities affected by a cyber incident; (B) identifying other entities that may be at risk and assessing their risk to the same or similar vulnerabilities; (C) assessing potential risks to the sector or region, including potential cascading effects, and developing courses of action to mitigate these risks; (D) facilitating information sharing and operational coordination with threat response; and (E) providing guidance on how best to utilize Federal resources and capabilities in a timely, effective manner to accelerate recovery."

"(2) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Cyber Response and Recovery Fund established under subsection (c)."

"(3) INCIDENT.—The term ‘incident’ has the meaning given in the term in section 2290."

"(4) SIGNIFICANT CYBER INCIDENT.—The term ‘significant cyber incident’ means an incident that is, or group of related cyber incidents that together are, reasonably likely to result in significant harm to the national security, foreign policy, or economic health or financial stability of the United States."

"(b) DECLARATION.—"

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may declare a significant cyber incident in accordance with this section if the Secretary determines that—"

"(A) a significant cyber incident has occurred; or (B) there is a near-term risk of a significant cyber incident."

"(2) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—Upon declaration of a cyber state of distress under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—"

"(A) coordinate all asset response activities by Federal entities in response to a cyber state of distress; (B) harmonize the activities described in subparagraph (A) with the appropriate Federal agencies in response to a cyber state of distress; and (C) harmonize the activities described in subparagraph (B) within the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense, through the Director, to mitigate these risks; and (D) minimizing these risks; (E) providing guidance on how best to utilize Federal resources and capabilities in a timely, effective manner to accelerate recovery."

"(3) DURATION.—A declaration made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be for a period designated by the Secretary or 60 days, whichever is shorter."

"(4) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a declaration made pursuant to paragraph (1) as necessary to respond to or prepare for a significant cyber incident."

"(5) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 72 hours after the Secretary makes the declaration pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish the declaration in the Federal Register."

"(6) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the authority to declare a cyber state of distress under paragraph (1)."

"(7) SUPERSeding DECLARATIONS.—A declaration made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have no effect if the President declares a major disaster pursuant to section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) in the same area covered by the declaration made pursuant to paragraph (1)."

"(B) CYBER RESPONSE AND RECOVERY FUND.—"

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the Cyber Response and Recovery Fund."

"(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to carry out—"

"(A) activities related to a cyber state of distress declared by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and (B) advance activities undertaken by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c)."

"(3) EXPENDITURES FROM THE FUND.—The cost of any assistance provided pursuant to this section shall be reimbursed out of funds appropriated to the Fund and made available to carry out this section."

"(4) NATIONAL CRITICAL FUNCTION.—The term ‘national critical function’ means the Department of Homeland Security."

"(B) SECTOR RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—The term ‘Sector Risk Management Agency’ means an agency designated under subsection (a)."

"(C) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish procedures for process developed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register."

"(D) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 4 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the President a report on the risks identified by the process established pursuant to subparagraph (A)."

"(2) NATIONAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE STRATEGY.—"

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 4 years thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report required under paragraph (1), the President shall submit to majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and the majority leader of the House of Representatives a National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy designed to address the risks identified by the Secretary."

"(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by adding at the end the following:
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(iii) Identify and outline current and proposed national-level actions, programs, and efforts to be taken to address the risks identified;
(iv) Identify the Federal departments or agencies responsible for leading each national-level action, program, or effort and the relevant critical infrastructure sectors for each;
(v) Outline the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of activities proposed or described in the National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy;
(vi) Request any additional authorities or resources necessary to successfully execute the National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy.

(C) Form.—The strategy required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the President submits a National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy under this subsection, and once every year thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with Sector Risk Management Agencies, shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on the national risk management cycle activities undertaken pursuant to this section.

(d) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR DESIGNATION

(1) INITIAL REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—
(A) review the current list of critical infrastructure sectors and the assignment of Sector Risk Management Agencies, as set forth in Presidential Policy Directive-21; and
(B) submit a report to the President containing recommendations for—
(i) any additions or deletions to the list of critical infrastructure sectors set forth in Presidential Policy Directive-21; and
(ii) any new assignment or alternative assignment of a Federal department or agency to serve as the Sector Risk Management Agency for a sector.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year before the submission of each strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall—
(A) review the current list of critical infrastructure sectors and the assignment of Sector Risk Management Agencies, as set forth in Presidential Policy Directive-21, or any successor document; and
(B) recommend to the President—
(i) any additions or deletions to the list of critical infrastructure sectors; and
(ii) any new assignment or alternative assignment of a Federal agency to serve as the Sector Risk Management Agency for each sector.

(3) UPDATE.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a recommendation under paragraph (2), the President shall—
(i) review the recommendation and update, as appropriate, the designation of critical infrastructure sectors and each sector's corresponding Sector Risk Management Agency;
(ii) submit a report to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives explaining the basis for rejecting the recommendations of the Secretary.

(B) LIMITATION.—The President—
(i) may not designate more than 1 department or agency as the Sector Risk Management Agency for each critical infrastructure sector; and
(ii) may only designate an agency under this subsection if the agency is referenced in section 205 of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 901).

(4) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTORS.—The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a publicly available designation of critical infrastructure sectors.

(e) SECTOR RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any reference to a Sector Risk Management Agency in law, regulation, memo, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Sector Risk Management Agency of the relevant critical infrastructure sector.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the head of each Sector Risk Management Agency—
(A) coordinate with the Secretary and the head of other relevant Federal departments and agencies;
(B) collaborate with critical infrastructure owners and operators; and
(C) as appropriate, coordinate with independent regulatory agencies, and State, local, Tribal, and territorial entities.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The head of each Sector Risk Management Agency shall utilize the specialized expertise of the agency about the infrastructure sector and authorities of the agency under applicable law to support and carry out activities for which the agency is responsible related to—
(A) sector risk management, including—
(i) establishing and carrying out programs to assist critical infrastructure owners and operators within their assigned sector in identifying, understanding, and mitigating threats, vulnerabilities, and risks to their region, sector, systems or assets; and
(ii) recommending resilience measures to mitigate the consequences of destruction, compromise, and disruption of their systems and assets;
(B) sector risk identification and assessment, including—
(i) identifying, assessing, and prioritizing risks to critical infrastructure within their sector, considering physical and cyber threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences; and
(ii) supporting national risk assessment efforts for the sector, including identifying, understanding, and prioritizing cross-sector and national-level risks;
(C) sector coordination, including—
(i) serving as a day-to-day Federal interagency forum for the dynamic prioritization and coordination of sector-specific activities and their responsibilities under this section;
(ii) serving as the sector coordinating council chair for their assigned sector; and
(iii) participating in cross-sector coordinating councils, as appropriate;
(D) threat and vulnerability information sharing, including—
(i) facilitating access to, and exchange of, information and intelligence necessary to strengthen the security of critical infrastructure, including through the sector's information sharing and analysis center;
(ii) facilitating the identification of intelligence priorities and threats to critical infrastructure in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate;
(iii) providing the Director ongoing, and where practicable, real-time awareness of identified threats, vulnerabilities, mitigations, assessments, and actions to the security of critical infrastructure; and
(iv) supporting the reporting requirements of the Department under applicable law by providing sector-specific critical infrastructure information; and
(E) incident management, including—
(i) supporting incident management and restoration efforts during or following a security incident;
(ii) supporting the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, as requested, in conducting vulnerability assessments and asset response activities for critical infrastructure; and
(iii) supporting the Attorney General and law enforcement agencies with efforts to detect and prosecute threats to and attacks against critical infrastructure;

(F) emergency preparedness, including—
(i) coordinating with critical infrastructure owners and operators in the development of planning documents for coordinated response in response to an incident or emergency;
(ii) conducting exercises and simulations of potential incidents in emergencies; and
(iii) supporting the Department and other Federal departments or agencies in developing planning documents or conducting exercises or simulations relevant to their assigned sector;

(G) participation in national risk management efforts, including—
(i) briefing the Secretary in the risk identification and assessment activities carried out pursuant to subsection (c);
(ii) supporting the President in the development of the National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy pursuant to subsection (c); and
(iii) implementing the National Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy pursuant to subsection (c).


(f) REPORTING AND AUDITING.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and once every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to appropriate Committees of Congress on the effectiveness of Sector Risk Management Agencies in carrying out their responsibilities under subsection (e).

SA 1715. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 7. BUREAU OF CYBER STATISTICS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
(1) the term ‘‘Bureau’’ means the Bureau of Cyber Statistics of the Department of Commerce established under subsection (b); and
(2) the term ‘‘Director’’ means the Director of the Bureau;

(b) the term ‘‘statistical purpose’’—
(A) means the description, estimation, or analysis of the characteristics of groups without identifying the individuals or organizations that comprise those groups; and
(B) includes the development, implementation, or maintenance of methods, techniques, or administrative procedures, or information resources that support the duties and functions of the Director under subsection (d).

(c) The amendment made to section 463, title 5, United States Code, by subsection (a) is amended by eliminating within the Department of Commerce the Bureau of Cyber Statistics.
(c) DIRECTOR.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau shall be head-
ed by a Director, who shall—
(A) report to the Secretary of Commerce; and
(B) be appointed by the President.
(2) AUTHORITY.—The Director shall—
(A) have final authority for all cooperative agreements and contracts entered into by the Bureau;
(b) be responsible for the integrity of data and statistics collected and retained by the Bureau;
(c) protect against improper or illegal use or disclosure of data and statistics collected and retained by the Bureau, consistent with the procedures developed under subsection (g);
(d) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director—
(A) shall have experience in statistical pro-
grams; and
(B) may not—
(i) engage in any other employment while serving as the Director; or
(ii) hold any office, or act in any capac-
ity for, any organization, agency, or institu-
tion with which the Bureau enters into any con-
tract or other arrangement under this section.
(3) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS.—The Director shall—
(A) collect and analyze—
(i) information concerning cybersecurity, including data relating to cyber incidents, cyber crime, and any other area the Director determines appropriate; and
(ii) hold any office in, or act in any capac-
ity for, any government, agency, or institu-
tion with which the Bureau enters into any contract or other arrangement under this section;
(B) compile, collate, analyze, publish, and disseminate uniform national cyber statistics concerning cybersecurity, including data relating to cyber incidents, cyber crime, and any other area the Director determines appropriate;
(C) provide information to the President, Congress, Federal agencies, the private sector, and the general public on methods of gathering or analyzing cyber statistics and for ensuring the reliability and validity of statistics collected under this section;
(D) conduct or support research relating to methods of gathering or analyzing cyber statistics;
(E) enter into cooperative agreements or contracts with public agencies, institutions of higher education, and private organiza-
tions concerning cyber statistics; and
(F) represent the Bureau in support of national policy and decision making;
(4) IMMUNITY FROM LEGAL PROCESS.—Any submission (including any data derived from a submission) that is collected and retained by the Bureau, or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of the Bureau, or a submission (including any data derived from a submission) that is in the possession of, or produced by, another person or entity other than the Bureau, an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of the Bureau, or a submission that is independently collected, retained, or produced for purposes other than the pur-
poses of this section shall be immune from legal process for a submission (including any data derived from a submission) if the submission is in the possession of any person, agency, or entity other than the Bureau or an officer, employee, agent, or contractor of the Bureau.
(5) PRIVATE SECTOR SUBMISSION.—After the development of the criteria and standards required under paragraph (1), the Director shall release guidance for submission procedures with respect to private entities sub-
mitting to the Bureau data relating to cyber incidents.
(6) PRIVATE SECTOR SUBMISSION.—After the development of the criteria and standards required under paragraph (1), the Director shall publish the processes for the submissions described in paragraph (2) and shall begin accepting those submissions.
(7) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director begins ac-
cepting submissions under paragraph (2), the Director shall submit to Congress a report detailing—
(A) the rate of submissions by private enti-
ties;
(B) an assessment of the procedures for the submissions described in subparagraph (A); and
(C) an overview of mechanisms for ensur-
ing the collection of data relating to cyber incidents from private entities that collect and retain that type of data as part of their core business activity.
(8) STATUS OF DIRECTOR POSITION.—Section 3515 of title 5, United States Code, is amend-
ed by inserting after the item relating to the Director the following:
‘‘Director, Bureau of Cyber Statistics, De-
partment of Commerce.’’. SA 1716. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SANSONE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S 3049, to make appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activi-
ties of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:
SEC. 1. BUREAU OF CYBERSPACE SECURITY AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES. Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—
(1) in subsection (c)(1) by striking ‘‘24’’ and inserting ‘‘25’’;
(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as sub-
section (h); and
(3) by inserting after subsection (f) the fol-
lowing:
‘‘(g) BUREAU OF CYBERSPACE SECURITY AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established, within the Department of State, the Bureau of Cyberspace Security and Emerging Tech-
ologies (referred to in this subsection as the ‘‘Bureau’’). The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Sen-
ate, an Assistant Secretary (referred to in this subsection as the ‘‘Assistant Secretary’’), who shall head the Bureau.
(2) DUTIES.—
‘‘(A) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall—
(i) carry out the responsibilities described in subparagraph (B); and
(ii) perform such other duties and exer-
cise such powers as the Secretary shall pre-
scribe.
‘‘(B) PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The As-
sistant Secretary shall—
(i) serve as the principal cyber policy of-
icial within the Department of State and as the adviser to the Secretary for cyberspace issues;
(ii) lead the Department of State’s diplo-
matic cyber efforts, which may include—
(I) the promotion of human rights, de-
mocracy, and the rule of law (including free-
dom of expression, innovation, communica-
tion, and economic prosperity); ‘‘(II) respecting privacy; and
(iii) guarding against deception, fraud, and theft;
(iv) advocate for norms of responsible be-
havior in cyberspace and confidence building measures, deterrence, international re-
sponsibility to cyber threats, Internet freedom, digital economy, cybercrime, and capacity building;
(v) promote an open, interoperable, reli-
able, and secure information and commu-
nications technology infrastructure globally;
(vi) represent the Secretary in interagency efforts to develop and advance the policy pri-
orities of the United States relating to cyberspace and emerging technologies; and
(vii) consult, as appropriate, with other executive branch agencies with related func-
tions.
‘‘(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Assistant Sec-
retary shall be an individual of demonstrated competence in the fields of—
(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyber issues; and
(B) international diplomacy.
‘‘(4) ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.—
(A) INITIAL PLACEMENT.—Subject to the 4-
year period beginning on the date of the en-
tact of the National Defense Authoriza-
tion Act for Fiscal Year 2021, the Assistant Secretary shall report—
(i) the Under Secretary for Political Af-
fairs; and
(ii) an official of the Department of State having the higher rank of an Assistant Secretary for Political Affairs, if so directed by the Secretary.
"(B) PERMANENT PLACEMENT.—After the conclusion of the period described in subparagraph (A), the Assistant Secretary shall report to:

(i) the appropriate Under Secretary of the Department of State; or

(ii) an official of the Department of State holding a higher position than Under Secretary.

SA 1717. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. Sasse) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strength for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. STRATEGY TO SECURE FOUNDATIONAL INTERNET PROTOCOLS AND E-MAIL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BORDER GATEWAY PROTOCOL.—The term "border gateway protocol" means a protocol designed to optimize routing of information exchanged through the internet.

(2) DOMAIN NAME SYSTEM.—The term "domain name system" means a system that stores information associated with domain names in a distributed database on networks.

(3) DOMAIN-BASED MESSAGE AUTHENTICATION, REPORTING, AND CONFORMANCE (DMARC).—The terms "domain-based message authentication, reporting, and conformance" and "DMARC" mean an e-mail authentication, policy, and reporting protocol that verifies the authenticity of the sender of an e-mail and blocks and reports fraudulent accounts.

(b) STRATEGY TO SECURE FOUNDATIONAL INTERNET PROTOCOLS AND E-MAIL.—

(A) PROTOCOL SECURITY STRATEGY.—

(i) an initial estimate of the total cost to government and implementing entities of implementing the border gateway protocol and domain name system security at scale, including the burdens of implementation and the entities on whom those burdens will most likely fall;

(ii) the level of security for critical information and communications technology that is in use in critical infrastructure sectors and that underpins national critical functions as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security;

(iii) identify any barriers to implementing the domain-based message authentication, reporting, and conformance standard at scale across all United States-based e-mail providers; and

(iv) recommendations for defraying the cost described in clause (i), if applicable.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategy pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall:

(i) articulate the security and privacy benefits of implementing domain-based message authentication, reporting, and conformance standard at scale, where feasible; and

(ii) propose a strategy to implement the domain-based message authentication, reporting, and conformance standard at scale across all United States-based e-mail providers; and

(C) COST ESTIMATE.—The strategy required by under subparagraph (A) shall include:

(i) an initial estimate of the total cost to the Federal Government and private sector implementing entities of implementing the domain-based message authentication, reporting, and conformance standard at scale across all United States-based e-mail providers; and

(ii) recommendations for defraying the cost described in clause (i), if applicable.

SEC. 5. 2020 NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY CERTIFICATION AND LABELING AUTHORITY AND PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Cybersecurity Certification and Labeling Authority as a certifying agent, that results from passage of an information and communications technology that establishes the extent to which a particular design and implementation meets a set of specified security standards.

(b) ACCREDITATION OF CERTIFYING AGENTS.—As part of the program established and administered under subsection (a), the Authority shall define and publish a process whereby nongovernmental entities may become a certifying agent for the certification of specific critical information and communications technologies.

(c) IDENTIFICATION OF STANDARDS, FRAMEWORKS, AND BENCHMARKS.—As part of the program established and administered under subsection (a), the Authority shall work in close coordination with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and subject matter experts from the Federal Government, academia, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to develop and harmonize security standards, frameworks, and benchmarks against which the security of critical information and communications technologies may be measured.

(d) PRODUCT CERTIFICATION.—As part of the program established and administered under subsection (a), the Authority shall:

(i) develop, and disseminate to accredited certifying agents, guidelines to standardize the presentation of certifications to communicates identified under subsection (c);

(ii) develop criteria for the certification of critical information and communications technologies based on identified security standards, frameworks, and benchmarks, through the work conducted pursuant to subsection (c); and

(iii) issue, or permit agents accredited under subsection (b) to issue, certificates for the certification of services and products designed and administered under subsection (a), that meet and comply with security standards, frameworks, and benchmarks [endorsed by the Authority through the work conducted under title (d)].
(4) permit a manufacturer or distributor of a [covered product] [critical information and communication technology] to display a certificate reflecting the extent to which the covered product [established and identified cybersecurity and data security benchmarks] [the standards, frameworks, and benchmarks identified under subsection (c)]

(5) indication of a certified [covered product] [critical information and communication technology] as a [covered product] [critical information and communication technology] included in the program if the manufacturer of the certified [covered product] [critical information and communication technology] is identified in the [benchmarks established under paragraph (e)(2) for the covered product] [the standards, frameworks, and benchmarks identified under subsection (a)]

(6) work to enhance public awareness of the Authority's certificates and labeling, including through public outreach, education, research and development, and other means; and

(7) publicly display a list of certified [products] [critical information and communication technologies], including with their respective certification information.

(c) CERTIFICATIONS.—

(1) in general.—Certifications issued under the program established and administered under subsection (a) shall remain valid for one year from the date of issuance.

(2) classes of certification.—[developing Note: Subsection (c) says "identified and harmonized not "developed" the the "guidelines and criteria —Note: Subsection (c) uses "standards, frameworks, and benchmarks" under subsection (c), the Authority shall designate at least three classes of certifications, including—

(A) for products and services that product manufacturers and service providers of critical information and communications attest meet the criteria for certification under the program established and administered under subsection (a), attestation-based certification;

(B) for products that have undergone a security evaluation and testing process by a qualifying third party, accreditation-based certification; and

(C) for products that have undergone a security evaluation and testing process by a qualifying third party, test-based certification.

(f) PRODUCT LABELING.—The Authority, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and other experts from the Federal Government, academia, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector, shall—

(1) collaborate with the private sector to standardize language and define a labeling schema to provide transparent information on the security characteristics and constituent components of a software or hardware product that includes critical information and communication technology; and

(2) establish a mechanism by which product developers can provide this information for both product labeling and public posting.

(1) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a person—

(A) to falsely attest to, or falsify an audit or test for, a security standard, framework, or benchmark for certification;

(B) to intentionally mislabel a product; or

(C) to fail to maintain a security standard, framework, or benchmark to which the person has attested [for a security standard, framework, or benchmark for certification].

(2) ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of paragraph (1) shall be treated as an unfair and deceptive act or practice in violation of a regulation under section 16a(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act [15 U.S.C. 57a(1)(B)] regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

(b) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act [15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.] were incorporated into and made a part of this subsection.

(2) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person who violates this subsection shall be subject to the penalties and privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act [15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.].

SEC. 03. SELECTION OF THE AUTHORITY.

(a) SELECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall issue a notice of funding opportunity and select, on a competitive basis, a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization to serve as the National Cybersecurity Certification and Labeling Authority (in this section referred to as the "Authority") for each class.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce may only select an organization to serve as the Authority if such organization—

(1) is a nongovernmental, not-for-profit that is—

(A) exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) described in sections 501(c)(3) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi) of that Code;

(2) has a demonstrable track record of work on cybersecurity and information security standards, frameworks, and benchmarks; and

(3) possesses requisite staffing and expertise, with demonstrable prior experience in technology security or safety standards, frameworks, and benchmarks, as well as certification.

(c) APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall establish a process by which a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization may be selected as the Authority may apply for consideration.

(d) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every four years thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall—

(1) assess the effectiveness of the labels and certificates produced by the Authority, including—

(A) assessing the costs to businesses that manufacture [covered product] [critical information and communication technologies] participating in the Authority's program;

(B) assessing the information in the Authority's program by businesses that manufacture [covered products] [critical information and communication technologies]; and

(C) assessing the level of public awareness and consumer awareness of the labels under the Authority's program;

(2) audit the security and fairness of the activities of the Authority;

(3) issue a public report on the assessment most recently carried out under paragraph (1) and the audit most recently carried out under paragraph (2); and

(4) brief Congress on the findings of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the reports required under paragraph (1) and the most recent audit under paragraph (2).

(e) RENEWAL.—After the initial selection pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall, every four years thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall—

(1) accept applications from nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations seeking selection as the Authority; and

(2) select another applicant organization to serve as the Authority.

SEC. 04. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

SA 1719. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. Sasse) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049. to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction and国防 activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 06. STRENGTHENING PROCESSES FOR IDENTIFYING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE CYBERSECURITY INTELLIGENCE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES.

(a) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE CYBERSECURITY INTELLIGENCE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the heads of appropriate Sector-Specific Agencies (as defined in section 2201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651)), shall establish a formal process to solicit and compile critical infrastructure input to inform national intelligence collection and analysis priorities.

(2) RECURRENT INPUT.—Not later than 30 days following the establishment of the process described in paragraph (1), and biennially thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, shall solicit information from critical infrastructure utilizing the process established pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) INTELLIGENCE NEEDS EVALUATION AND PLANNING.—Utilizing the information received through the process established pursuant to subsection (a), as well as existing intelligence information, the National Counterintelligence and Security Center and the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, shall—

(1) identify common technologies or dependencies that are likely to be targeted by nation-state adversaries;

(2) identify intelligence gaps across critical infrastructure cybersecurity efforts;

(3) identify and execute methods of empowering sector-specific agencies to identify specific critical lines of businesses, technologies, and processes within their respective sectors; and

(4) coordinate closely with the intelligence community to convey specific information relevant to the operation of each sector; and
(4) refocus information collection and analysis activities, as necessary to address identified gaps and mitigate threats to the cybersecurity of critical infrastructure of the United States;

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the identification and refocusing required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(1) assesses how the information obtained from critical infrastructure is shaping intelligence collection activities;

(2) evaluates the success of the intelligence community in sharing relevant, actionable intelligence with critical infrastructure; and

(3) addresses any legislative or policy changes necessary to enable the intelligence community to increase sharing of actionable intelligence with critical infrastructure.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) the term "critical infrastructure" has the meaning given that term in the Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 5195c).

(3) the term "intelligence community" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SA 1720. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CISA DIRECTOR TERM APPOINTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2203(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 652(b)(1)), is amended by adding at the end the following: "Each Director shall serve for a term of 5 years."

(b) TRANSITION RULES.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the confirmation of a Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency by the Senate; or

(2) January 1, 2021.

(c) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS.—Subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5313, by inserting after the item "Director, Transportation Security Administration" the following: "Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency";

(2) in section 5314, by striking the item relating to "Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency"; and

(3) in section 5315, by striking the item relating to "Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency".

SEC. ___. REQUIREMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—In order to strengthen the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct a comprehensive review of the ability of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to fulfill—

(1) the missions of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency; and

(2) the recommendations detailed in the report issued by the Cyberspace Solarium Commission under section 1652(k) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–222).

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) an assessment of how additional budget resources could be used by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency for projects and programs that—

(A) support the national risk management mission;

(B) support public and private-sector cybersecurity;

(C) promote public-private integration; and

(D) provide situational awareness of cybersecurity threats.

(2) A comprehensive force structure assessment of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency including—

(A) a determination of the appropriate size and composition of personnel to accomplish the mission of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, as well as the recommendations detailed in the report issued by the Cyberspace Solarium Commission under section 1652(k) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–222);

(B) an assessment of whether existing personnel are appropriately matched to the prioritization of threats in the cyber domain and risks in critical infrastructure;

(C) an assessment of whether the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has the appropriate personnel and resources to—

(i) perform risk assessments, threat hunting, incident response to support both private and public cybersecurity;

(ii) carry out the responsibilities of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, as determined by the Department of Homeland Security, to protect the Federal information and Federal information systems; and

(iii) carry out the critical infrastructure responsibilities of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, including national risk management; and

(D) an assessment of whether current structures and resources of regional field offices are sufficient in fulfilling agency responsibilities and mission requirements.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the President and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall conduct an exercise to test the resilience, response, and recovery of the United States in the case of a significant cyber incident impacting critical infrastructure.

(b) PLANNING AND PREPARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each exercise required under subsection (a) shall be prepared by expert operational planners described in paragraph (1) in the preparation of each exercise required under subsection (a).

(i) Federal government participants.—(A) The Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) The Department of Defense;

(C) The Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(D) appropriate elements of the intelligence community, as specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) identified by the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) Assistance.—The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security shall provide assistance to the expert operational planners described in paragraph (1) in the preparation of each exercise required under subsection (a).

(c) PARTICIPANTS.—

(1) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPANTS.—(A) Relevant interagency partners, as determined by the Secretary, shall participate in the exercise required under subsection (a), including relevant interagency partners from—

(i) law enforcement agencies; and

(ii) the intelligence community, as specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)); and

(2) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary shall invite representatives from
State, local, and Tribal governments to participate in the exercise required under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines the participation of those representatives to be appropriate.

(3) **PRIVATE SECTOR.**—Depending on the nature of an exercise being conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation with representatives from the appropriate subnational, private, or sector-specific agencies participating in the exercise under paragraph (1)(B), shall invite the following individuals to participate:

(A) Representatives from private entities.

(B) Other individuals that the Secretary determines will best assist the United States in preparing for, and defending against, a cyber attack.

(4) **INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS.**—Depending on the nature of an exercise being conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall invite allies and partners of the United States to participate in the exercise.

(d) **OBSERVERS.**—The Secretary may invite representatives from the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government to observe the exercise required under subsection (a).

(e) **ELEMENTS.**—The exercise required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) Exercising of the orchestration of cyber security response and the provision of cyber support to Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments and private entities, including coordination of the command and control, and deconfliction of operational responses of—

(A) the National Security Council;

(B) interagency coordinating and response groups; and

(C) each Federal Government participant described in subsection (c)(1).

(2) Testing of the relevant policy, guidance, and doctrine, including the National Cyber Incident Response Plan of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) A test of the interoperability of Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments and private entities.

(4) Exercising of the integration of operational capabilities of the Department of Homeland Security, the Cyber Mission Force, Federal law enforcement agencies, and elements of the intelligence community, as specified under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(5) Exercising of integrated operational, mutual support, and shared situational awareness of the cybersecurity operations centers of the Federal Government, including—

(A) the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) the Cyber Threat Operations Center of the National Security Agency;

(C) the Joint Operations Center of Cyber Command;

(D) the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

(E) the National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(F) the Defense Cyber Crime Center of the Department of Defense; and

(G) the Intelligence Community Security Coordination Center of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(f) **BRIEFING.**

(1) **GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which each exercise required under subsection (a) is conducted, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the participation of the Federal Government participants described in subsection (c)(1) in the exercise.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The briefing required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the decision and response gaps observed in the national level response exercise described in paragraph (1);

(B) proposed recommendations to improve the resilience, response, and recovery of the United States in the case of a significant cyber attack against critical infrastructure;

(C) plans to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (1); and

(D) specific timelines for the implementation of the plans described in subparagraph (C).

(g) **REPEAL.**—Subsection (b) of section 1648 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1129) is repealed.

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(2) **PRIVATE ENTITY.**—The term "private entity" has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(4) **SECTOR-SPECIFIC AGENCY.**—The term 'sector-specific agency' has the meaning given the term 'Sector-Specific Agency' in section 2301 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 651).

(5) **STATE.**—The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

**SA 1722. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. Sasse) submitted an amendment** intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

```
SEC. 1002. ASSESSING PRIVATE-PUBLIC COLLABORATION IN CYBERSECURITY.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of National Intelligence, shall—

(1) conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of any ongoing public-private collaborative initiatives involving the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and the private sector relating to cybersecurity and defense of critical infrastructure, including reviews and assessments of—

(A) the Pathfinder initiative of the United States Cyber Command and any derivative initiative;

(B) the Department of Defense’s support to an integration with existing Federal cybersecurity centers and organizations; and

(C) comparable initiatives led by other Federal departments or agencies that support collaboration with the public-private cybersecurity collaboration; and

(2) develop recommendations for improvements and the requirements and resources necessary to institutionalize and strengthen the programs assessed under paragraph (1).

(b) CERTAIN MATTERS EXCLUDED.—The review and assessment under subsection (a) shall not include a review or assessment of any intelligence, intelligence organization, or information derived from intelligence collection, except for declassification and downgrading procedures for the purpose of sharing cyber threat information.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the reviews and assessments conducted under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the recommendations developed under paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) may be submitted in unclassified form or classified form as necessary.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—
```
SA 1724. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. 6. REPORT ON THE INTEGRATION OF UNITED STATES CYBER CENTERS.**

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Federal cyber and cybersecurity centers in operation on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) elements of review.—The review required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) with respect to each Federal cyber center:

(A) assess where the missions and operations, or portions of the mission, of the Federal cyber center are unique, overlap, are inefficient, or are in conflict in some way with the mission of the authorizing agency of the Federal cyber center;

(B) assess aspects of the operations of the Federal cyber center that would benefit from greater integration, collaboration, or colocation to support a unified cybersecurity strategy within the Federal government;

(C) assess shortcomings in the capacity, structure, and funding of the Federal cyber center and in the integration of the work of the Federal cyber center with sector-specific agencies; and

(D) assess whether the Federal cyber center has distinct statutory authorities best kept within the authorizing agency of the Federal cyber center;

(2) with respect to each Federal cyber center that makes significant contributions to the National Cybersecurity Center of the United Kingdom:

(A) assess aspects of the operations of the Federal cyber center that would benefit from greater integration, such as, for example, integrating the Federal cyber center's cyber threat intelligence capability with the National Cybersecurity Center; and

(B) assess other Federal cyber centers that provide similar services and assess whether the Federal cyber center should be integrated with another Federal cyber center to maximize the capacity and capabilities of the Federal cyber centers; and

(3) assess whether an integrated national cybersecurity model, such as the National Cybersecurity Center of the United Kingdom, is an effective model for the United States;

(4) recommend procedures and criteria for expanding the integration of public- and private-sector personnel into Federal Government cyber defense and security efforts, including any limitations posed by the security clearance program for private sector expertise; and

(5) recommend a cyber center structure that integrates, to the maximum extent, Federal cyber centers in a way that optimizes efficiency, minimizes redundancy, and increases information and expertise sharing between the public and private sectors.

(c) Federal cyber centers described.—The review required to be conducted under subsection (a) shall include in the review, at a minimum, the following Federal cyber centers:


(2) The Cyber Threat Operations Center of the National Security Agency.

(3) The Joint Operations Center of Cyber Command.

(4) The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.


(7) The Intelligence Community Security Coordination Center of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(d) report.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the review required under subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) form of report.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall—

(1) the status of Federal cyber center integration efforts;

(2) whether any findings of the review conducted under subsection (a) should be updated;

(3) whether additional resources or authorities required to support Federal cyber centers; and

(4) the progress of Federal agencies in addressing the areas identified through the review conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1725. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following:

**SEC. 7. NATIONAL INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIAL BASE STRATEGY.**

(a) strategy.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and once every 4 years thereafter, the President shall coordinate with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy, and the Director of National Intelligence, and consult with private sector entities, to develop a comprehensive national ICT industrial strategy consistent with—

(i) the most recent national security strategy pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043); and

(ii) the strategic plans of other relevant departments and agencies of the United States; and

(iii) other relevant national-level strategic plans.

(b) assess the ICT industrial base, to include identifying—

(i) critical technologies, trusted components, products, and materials that comprise or support the ICT industrial base;

(ii) industrial capacity of the United States, as well as its allied and partner nations, necessary for the construction and development of ICT deemed critical to the United States national and economic security; and

(iii) areas of supply risk to ICT critical technologies, trusted components, products, and materials that comprise or support the ICT industrial base;

(c) identify national ICT strategic priorities and estimate Federal monetary and human resources necessary to fulfill such priorities and areas where strategic financial investment in ICT research and development is necessary for national and economic security; and

(d) assess the Federal government’s structure, resources, and authorities for evaluating critical components, products, and materials and promoting availability and integrity of trusted technologies.

(b) report.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after developing the strategy under subsection (a), the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees with the strategy.

(2) Form.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) definitions.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘‘information and communications technology’’ means information technology and other equipment, systems, technologies, or processes, for which the principal function is the transformation, manipulation, storage, display, receipt, protection, or transmission of electronic data and information, as well as any associated content.

SA 1726. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:
SA 1727. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SASSIE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 2215. JOINT CYBER PLANNING OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Agency an office for joint cyber planning (referred to in this section as the ‘‘Office’’) to carry out certain responsibilities of the Secretary. The Office shall be headed by a Director of Joint Cyber Planning.

(b) MISSION.—The Office shall lead Government-wide and public-private planning for cyber defense campaigns, including the development of a set of coordinated actions to respond to and recover from significant cyber incidents or limit, mitigate, or defend against coordinated, malicious cyber campaigns that pose a potential risk to critical infrastructure of the United States and broader national interests.

(c) PLANNING AND EXECUTION.—In leading the development of Government-wide and public-private plans for cyber defense campaigns pursuant to subsection (b), the Director of Joint Cyber Planning shall—

(1) establish and deliberate processes and procedures across relevant Federal departments and agencies, accounting for all participating Federal agency cyber defense campaign authorities and capabilities;

(2) ensure that plans are, to the greatest extent practicable, developed in collaboration with relevant public- and private-sector entities, and recognize that such entities have comparative advantages in limiting, mitigating, or defending against a significant cyber incident or coordinated, malicious cyber campaign;

(3) ensure that plans are responsive to potential adversary activity conducted in response to U.S. offensive cyber operations;

(4) in order to inform and facilitate exercises of such plans, develop and model scenarios based on an understanding of adversary threats, critical infrastructure vulnerability, and potential consequences of disruption or compromise;

(5) coordinate with, and, as necessary, support relevant efforts in this establishment of procedures, development of additional plans, including for offensive and intelligence activities in support of cyber defense campaigns, and procurement of authorizations necessary for the rapid execution of plans once a significant cyber incident or malicious cyber campaign has been identified; and

(6) support the Department and other Federal agencies, as appropriate, in coordination and execution of plans developed pursuant to this section.

(d) COMPOSITION.—The Office shall be composed of—

(1) a central planning staff;

(2) appropriate representatives of Federal agencies, including—

(A) the United States Cyber Command;

(B) the National Security Agency;

(C) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(D) the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(E) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;

(3) appropriate representatives of non-Federal entities, such as—

(A) State, local, and tribal governments;

(B) information sharing and analysis organizations, including information sharing and analysis centers;

(C) owners and operators of critical information systems; and

(D) private entities; and

(4) other appropriate representatives or entities, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary and the head of a Federal agency described in subsection (d) may enter into agreements for the sharing of personnel on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis.

SEC. 2215A. INFORMATION PROTECTION.

Information provided to the Office by a private entity shall be considered to have been shared pursuant to section 103(c) of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1503(c)) and shall be protected from disclosure pursuant to section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

Mr. DURBIN, Mr. B LUMENTHAL, and Mr. S HAEFFER submitted

SA 1728. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 2 EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF THE AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

Section 602(b)(3)(F) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ‘‘2020’’ and inserting ‘‘2021’’;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ‘‘December 31, 2020’’ and inserting ‘‘December 31, 2021’’; and

(3) in clause (i), by striking ‘‘December 31, 2021’’ and inserting ‘‘December 31, 2022’’.

SEC. 2A. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF THE AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

Section 602(b)(3)(F) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ‘‘2020’’ and inserting ‘‘2021’’;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ‘‘22,500’’ and inserting ‘‘26,500’’;

(3) in clause (i), by striking ‘‘December 31, 2021’’ and inserting ‘‘December 31, 2022’’; and

(4) in clause (ii), by striking ‘‘December 31, 2021’’ and inserting ‘‘December 31, 2022’’.
fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR STUDY BY CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION RELATING TO PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES CONTAMINATION IN DRINKING WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCREASE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense Wide for SAG IGTN for the study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under section 316(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91; 131 Stat. 1350) is hereby increased by $5,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021 for Operation and Maintenance, Army for SAG Wide Transportation is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

(b) INCREASE IN TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Section 316(a)(3)(B)(ii) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91; 131 Stat. 1350), as amended by section 316(a) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 116–93; 133 Stat. 1713), is amended by striking “$10,000,000” and inserting “$15,000,000”.

SA 1730. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 3. SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MONTHLY WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PAYMENTS AND OTHER PAYMENTS FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL UNDER CHIEF OF MISSION AUTHORITY.

Section 961 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–94) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “or other designated heads of Federal agencies” after “the Secretary of State”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “Department of State” and inserting “Federal Government”.

SA 1731. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title IX, add the following:

SEC. 3. COMPANY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON VULNERABILITIES OF THE DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FEDERAL ACTIVITIES RESULTING FROM OFFSHORE TECHNICAL SUPPORT CALL CENTERS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on vulnerabilities in connection with the provision of services by offshore technical support call centers to the Department of Defense.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description and assessment of the location of all offshore technical support call centers.

(2) A description and assessment of the types of information, including health information, to which foreign nationals at offshore technical support call centers have access.

(3) An assessment of the extent to which access to such information by foreign nationals creates vulnerabilities to the information technology network of the Department.

(c) OFFSHORE TECHNICAL SUPPORT CALL CENTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “offshore technical support call center” means a call center that—

(1) is physically located outside the United States;

(2) employs individuals who are foreign nationals; and

(3) may be contacted by personnel of the Department to provide technical support relating to technology used by the Department.

SA 1732. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7. REGISTRY OF INDIVIDUALS EXPOSED TO PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) establish and maintain a registry for eligible individuals who may have been exposed to perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (in this section referred to as “PFAS”) due to the accidental release of aqueous film-forming foam (in this section referred to as “AFFF”) on military installations to meet the requirements of military specification MIL-P-23695P;

(B) include any information in such registry that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines necessary to ascertain and monitor the health effects of the exposure of members of the Armed Forces to PFAS associated with AFFF;

(C) develop a public information campaign to inform eligible individuals about the registry, including how to register and the benefits of registering; and

(D) periodically notify eligible individuals of significant developments in the study and treatment of conditions associated with exposure to PFAS.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in carrying out paragraph (1).

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date on which the registry under subsection (a) is established, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress an initial report containing the following:

(A) An assessment of the effectiveness of actions taken by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to collect and maintain information on the health effects of exposure to PFAS.

(B) Recommendations to improve the collection and maintenance of such information.

(C) Using established and previously published epidemiological studies, recommendations regarding the most effective and prudent means of addressing the medical needs of eligible individuals with respect to exposure to PFAS.

(2) FOLLOW-UP REPORT.—Not later than five years after submitting the initial report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a follow-up report containing the following:

(A) An update to the initial report submitted under paragraph (1).

(B) An assessment of whether and to what degree the content of the registry established under subsection (a) is current and scientifically up-to-date.

(3) INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into an agreement with an independent scientific organization to prepare the reports under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL EXPOSURES TO BE INCLUDED.—Not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every five years thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall submit to Congress recommendations for additional chemicals with respect to which individuals exposed to such chemicals should be included in the registry established under subsection (a).

(d) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALDefined.—In this section, the term “eligible individual” means any individual who, on or after a date specified by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs through regulations, served or is serving in the Armed Forces at a military installation where AFFF was used or at another location of the Department of Defense where AFFF was used.

SA 1733. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. RESPONSE TO RELEASE OF PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES TASK FORCE.—

(a) PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES TASK FORCE.
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a task force to address the effects of the release of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances from activities of the Department of Defense (in this subsection referred to as the “PFAS Task Force”).

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the PFAS Task Force are the following:

(A) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainability.
(B) The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy, and Environment.
(C) The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment.
(D) The Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy.
(E) A liaison from the Department of Veterans Affairs to be determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(3) CHAIRMAN.—The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainability shall be the chairman of the PFAS Task Force.

(4) SUPPORT.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and such other individuals as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate shall support the activities of the PFAS Task Force.

(5) DUTIES.—The duties of the PFAS Task Force are the following:

(A) Analysis of the health aspects of exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances.
(B) Establishment of clean-up standards and performance requirements relating to mitigating the effects of the release of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances.
(C) Finding and funding the procurement of an effective substitute firefighting foam without perfluoroalkyl substances or polyfluoroalkyl substances.
(D) Establishment of standards that are supported by determining exposure to and ensuring clean up of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances.
(E) Establishment of interagency coordination with respect to mitigating the effects of the release of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and semiannually thereafter, the Chairman of the PFAS Task Force shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the task force.

(b) BLOOD TESTING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—Determine exposure to perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on October 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall make available, on an annual basis, to each member of the Armed Forces and their dependents blood testing to determine and document exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances (commonly known as “PFAS”).

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “dependent” has the meaning given that term in section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1734. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for conclusive actions of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 1735. ANNUAL REPORTS ON MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS AND EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 28 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth a description and assessment of the interaction between members of the Armed Forces and extremist ideologues during the previous fiscal year.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, for the year covered by such report, the following:

(1) An assessment of the current policies of the Department of Defense, and each Armed Force, on affiliations between members of the Armed Forces and recruits to the Armed Forces and white supremacists, neo-Nazi, terrorist, gang, and other extremist ideologues.

(2) A description and assessment of the current procedures used by the Department, and each Armed Force, to identify and mitigate the affiliations described in paragraph (1).

(3) An assessment of the recruitment tactics and practices used by organizations that propose ideologues referred to in paragraph (1) toward members and potential members of the Armed Forces, including a description of the evolution of such tactics and practices.

(4) A listing of the installations currently subject to orders banning hate speech, and tactics and symbols, among installation personnel.

(5) The number of violations of policies against the affiliations described in paragraphs (1) and (2) by each Armed Force, and each Armed Force notwithstanding a substantiated finding of such a violation.

(6) If the disciplinary action authorized for violations described in paragraph (2) includes administrative separation from the Armed Forces—

(A) the number of individuals administratively separated from the Armed Forces in connection with such violations; and

(B) the number of individuals retained in the Armed Forces notwithstanding a substantiated finding of such a violation.

(7) An identification and assessment of the extent to which the number of such violations is on the increase, and a description and assessment of any trends in the number of such violations.

(8) A description and assessment of the training provided to members of the Armed Forces—

(A) the extent to which the training results in increasing diversity in the Armed Forces and among the grades of the Armed Forces.

(B) The causes of the increase.

(9) Recommendations for measures to address the increase.
(d) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS ON TRENDS IN VIOLATIONS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall also include the following:  
(1) A description and assessment of the trend described in subsection (b);  
(b) between the year covered by such report and the year preceding the year covered by such report;  
(2) description and assessment of the work undertaken by the Department of Defense with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to identify the extent and nature of such trend.  
(e) FORM.—Each report under this section shall be unclassified, but may include information in a classified annex only to the extent that submittal of such information in classified form is the sole basis on which such information is submittable to Congress.

SA 1736. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:  
At the appropriate place, insert the following:  
_SEC. 850. BRIEFING ON ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON ACTIVE DUTY TO THE JOINT ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE._  

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to Congress a report describing the effects of COVID-19 mobilization on the behavioral and physical health of the National Guard.  
(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report described in subsection (a) shall—  
(1) include results of a thorough analysis of COVID-19 surveillance efforts, psychological health, and prevention programming data to describe the impact of COVID-19 on National Guard members’ mental health, including any changes in reported anxiety, depression, mood disorders, or risky behaviors;  
(2) include an analysis of National Guard members who contracted COVID-19 and what accommodations or access to care they received;  
(3) take into account the degree to which employment and economic stressors, reductions in pay, and workplace-induced precarity increased stress on National Guard members during COVID-19;  
(4) describe an evidence-based leadership response model for the National Guard that includes a summary of resources available to National Guard members during deployment to the COVID-19 pandemic;  
(5) examine potential increases in substance use and risky behaviors that may increase under COVID-19 mobilization;  
(6) identify barriers to access to healthcare, including physical and behavioral health care, during a member’s COVID-19 deployment such as—  
(A) lack of TRICARE providers near a service member’s or eligible dependent’s location;  
(B) lack of appointments available with TRICARE providers in the service member’s or eligible dependent’s location;  
(C) long delays in receiving healthcare, including appointments for behavioral health, for service members and their eligible dependents, in an area served by a military medical treatment facility; and  
(D) lack of availability of telehealth and other technology enabled options; and  
(7) identify increases to access to healthcare and use of healthcare, including physical and behavioral health, for service members and their eligible family members, such as—  
(A) the number of service members and eligible dependents who, as a result of orders in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, became TRICARE beneficiaries;  
(B) the rate of utilization of TRICARE benefits to obtain healthcare during their time of eligibility;  
(C) receiving healthcare, to include physical and behavioral health, at a military medical treatment facility during their time as eligible beneficiaries; and  
(D) the rate of utilization of telehealth and other technologies to receive healthcare, to include physical and behavioral health, during their time of eligibility.
of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 30010. BRIEFING ON EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON HEALTH OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on the effect of climate change on the health of members of the Armed Forces in the contiguous United States and outside the contiguous United States.

(b) ELEMENTS OF BRIEFING.—The briefing under subsection (a) shall specifically address possible increased incidents of—

(1) heat-related illness;

(2) water scarcity;

(3) vector borne disease; and

(4) extreme weather.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropri-ate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 1741. Mr. BENVET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE XXX—COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY

SEC. 300101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act".

SEC. 300201. DEFINITION OF STATE.

In this title, the term "State" means the State of Colorado.

SEC. 300301. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the most recent statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, permitted by such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Subtitle A—Continental Divide

SEC. 30101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) COVERED AREA.—The term "covered area" means any area designated as wilderness by the amendments to section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) by section 30102(a).

(2) HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.—The term "Historic Landscape" means the Continental Historic Landscape designated by section 30107(a).

(3) RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term "Recreation Management Area" means the Tennille Recreation Management Area designated by section 30104(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.—The term "Wildlife Conservation Area" means, as applicable—

(A) the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 30105(a); and

(B) the Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 30106(a).

SEC. 30102. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking "1993," and inserting "1993, and certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 6,896 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019,’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(23) HOLLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 3,866 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Megan Dickie Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Wilderness Addition Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by the map entitled 102a(5) of Public Law 96–560 (94 Stat. 3236).

"(24) HOOSIER RIDGE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 5,235 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’.

"(25) TENMILE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Tenmile Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Tenmile Wilderness’.

"(26) EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 9,670 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Freeman Creek Wilderness Addition’ and ‘Proposed Spradley Creek Wilderness Addition’ designated by the map entitled ‘Eagles Nest Wilderness Additions Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94–352 (90 Stat. 870)."

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of the Wilderness Act of 1964 as amended shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering a covered area.

(c) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may carry out any activity in a covered area on that date that is necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) GRIZZLIES.—The grazing of livestock on a covered area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

SEC. 30103. WILLIAMS FORKS MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, comprising approximately 8,036 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Williams Forks Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Williams Forks Wilderness Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, is designated as a potential wilderness area.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided in sub-paragraph (c), the Secretary shall manage the area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) this section.

(c) LIVESTOCK USE OF VACANT ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall establish a determination regarding whether to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the ‘Big Hole Allotment’; and

(B) the ‘Blue Ridge Allotment’.

(2) MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may combine the vacant allotments referred to in that paragraph.

(d) PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a determination of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock is published under paragraph (1), if applicable, the Secretary shall grant a permit or other authorization for that livestock grazing or other use in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) RANG E IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary permits livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the potential wilderness area under subsection (c), the Secretary, or a third party authorized by the Secretary, may use any motorized or mechanized transport or equipment for purposes of administering the covered area, including habitat and watershed restoration.

(2) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The author-ity provided by this subsection terminates 10 years after the date on which the Secretary publishes a positive determination under subsection (c)(3).

(e) DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.—That wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be designated as wilderness, to be known as the "Williams Forks Mountains Wilderness".
(B) on the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that the construction or rehabilitation of range improvements under subsection (d) is complete;

(ii) the date described in subsection (d)(2); and

(iii) the effective date of a determination of the Secretary not to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock under subsection (c)(1).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77); and

(B) this subtitle.

SEC. 30104. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 17,122 acres of Federal land located in the Tenmile Range in the State, as generally depicted as "Proposed Tenmile Recreation Management Area" on the map entitled "Tenmile Proposed Recreation Management Area" and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the "Tenmile Recreation Management Area".

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Recreation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, water quality, and cultural resources of the Wilderness Area described in subsection (b); and

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, hunting, and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area.

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area for the purpose of harvesting forest resources.

(2) APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section applies to the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area.

(d) WATER.—

(1) EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area.

(2) APPLICATION.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Recreation Management Area.

(3) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—

Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Recreation Management Area—

(A) for a regional transportation project, including—

(i) highway widening or realignment; and

(ii) construction of multimodal transport systems; or

(B) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(4) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area.

SEC. 30105. PORCUPINE GULCH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,287 acres of Federal land located in the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area of—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77); and

(B) this subtitle.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor; and

(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b);

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); and

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(b) PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only authorize the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(2) VEHICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall authorize the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area.

(ii) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(B) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—Nothing in this section applies to the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77); and

(B) this subtitle.

(d) WATER.—

(1) EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area.

(2) APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section applies to the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area.

(e) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wilderness Area. The Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(f) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wilderness Area.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(g) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Recreation Management Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(h) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wilderness Area.

(i) REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—

Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wilderness Area.

(j) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wilderness Area.
land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—
(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or
(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.
(3) WATER.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1508) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.
SEC. 30106. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.
(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 3,528 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated October 27, 2016, shall be designated as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”)
(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, recreational, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.
(c) MANAGEMENT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—
(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and
(B) in accordance with—
(i) the forest and rangeland renewable resources planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);
(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and
(iii) this section.
(2) USFS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b); and
(B) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—
(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.
(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (i), the construction of any new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.
(3) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—
(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;
(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or
(III) responding to an emergency.
(4) BIKES.—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.
(b) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.
(i) USE.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.
(ii) USAGE.—Subject to clause (i), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.
(2) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.
(i) USE.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.
(ii) USAGE.—Subject to clause (i), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.
(3) WATER.—Nothing in subsection (a) of section 138 of title 23, United States Code, prevents the Secretary from making a determination under that section.
(4) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area.
(5) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall continue to apply with respect to the land in the Wildlife Conservation Area any of the terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.
(e) ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 30106(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the continued leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—
(1) a regional transportation project, including—
(A) highway widening or realignment; and
(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or
(2) any other activity, structure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).
(f) WATER.—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1508) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.
SEC. 30107. CAMP HALE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.
(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 28,676 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Camp Hale National Historic Landscape” on the map entitled “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated the “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape”.
(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—
(1) to provide for—
(A) the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;
(B) the historic preservation of the Historic Landscape, consistent with—
(i) the designation of the Historic Landscape as a national historic site; and
(ii) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape;
(C) recreational opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic significance of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road- and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and
(D) the continued environmental remediation and removal of unexploded ordnance at the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site and the Camp Hale historic cantonment area; and
(2) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.
(c) MANAGEMENT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—
(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and
(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).
(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.
(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—
(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with re-
Defense Site, or the Historic Landscape, including such an obligation under—

(b) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement—

(1) to specify—

(A) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscapes of the covered area.

(B) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to environmental remediation and the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) to require the Secretary to provide to the Secretary of the Army, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, a management plan for the Historic Landscapes of the covered area.

SEC. 30105. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior relating to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) C OVERED LAND .—The term “covered area” means the area described in subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundary of the White River National Forest, as modified by subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest, as established by section 30103(a)(2), as expanded by section 30103(a)(3), and as modified by this title.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES .—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside the boundary of a covered area can be seen or heard from nonwilderness activity or use on land outside the covered area.

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(i) D ESIGNATION OF OVERLOOK.—The Secretary shall—

(A) a covered area;

(B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area;

(C) the Recreation Management Area;

(D) a Wildlife Conservation Area;

(E) the Historic Landscape;

(2) OFTSEIDE.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside the covered area can be seen or heard from within the covered area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered area.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(d) Acquiring or Transferring Land.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of an area described in subsection (b)(1) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness area, Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or the Historic Landscape, as applicable, the area of which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(f) MILITARY OVERFLIGHT.—Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle restricts or precludes—

(1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the covered area.

(2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(3) the use or establishment of—

(A) any new unit of airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area.

(i) D ESIGNATION OF OVERLOOK.—The Sense of Congress that military aviation training on Federal public land in the State, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle J—San Juan Mountains

SEC. 30201. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED LAND.—The term “covered land” means—

(2) a land designated as wilderness under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 30202); and

(2) a Special Management Area.

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(g) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Special Management Area” means each of—

(1) the program for environmental restoration and storage of water,

(2) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) ACTING SECRETARY.—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 3,141 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—

(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Preserv—
Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness.

(a) Designation.—
(1) SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 21,663 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Whitehouse Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness’’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

(b) Purpose.—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the geological, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, and scenic resources of the Special Management Areas.

(c) Management.—
(1) In General.—The Secretary shall manage the Special Management Areas in a manner that—
(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources and values of the Special Management Areas;

(2) prohitions. —The following shall be prohibited in the Special Management Areas:
(A) Permanent roads.
(B) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the Federal land, to provide access for abandoned mine cleanup, and to protect public health and safety:
(i) Any other activities (including helicopter access for recreation and maintenance and the competitive running event permitted since 1992) that have been authorized by permit or license as of the date of enactment of this Act to continue within the Special Management Areas, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.
(B) Permitting.—The designation of the Special Management Area pursuant to paragraph (a) shall not affect the issuance of permits relating to the activities covered under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of this Act.
(C) Bicycles.—The Secretary may permit the use of bicycles in—
(i) the portion of the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area identified as ‘‘Ophir and Valley Area’’ on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area’’ and dated September 19, 2018; and
(ii) the portion of the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area identified as ‘‘Liberty Bell Corridor’’ on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’’ and dated September 6, 2018.

(d) Applicable Law.—Water and water rights in the Special Management Areas shall be administered in accordance with section 8 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this subtitle, the maps and legal descriptions referred to in section 8 of this Act, or the Bowen Gulch Protection Area or the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area identified in sections 5 and 6 of this Act, or the area covered by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of this Act, shall be considered to be a reference to—
(A) the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economic Development Act; or

SEC. 30204. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111–11 is amended by—
(1) by redesignating section 2408 (16 U.S.C. 496zz–2) as section 2409; and
(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 496zz–6) the following:

"SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1722(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1722(c)) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable laws.

(c) McKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1722(c)), the portions of the McKenna Peak Wilderness Area in San Miguel County in the State of Colorado not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1722(c)) have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in paragraph (1) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1722(c)) shall be managed in accordance with any other applicable laws.

SEC. 30205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) Fish and Wildlife.—Nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction of the Interagency Committee on Fish and Wildlife in the State.

(b) Grazing.—Nothing in this subtitle establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around covered land.

(2) Activities Outside Wilderness.—The fact that a management activity or use on land outside of the covered land can be seen or heard from within covered land shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered land.

(c) Maps and Legal Descriptions.—
(1) In General.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States, as appropriate, shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1732 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 30202) and the Special Management Areas with—
(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and
(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) Force of Law.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title and shall be considered to be a reference to—
(a) the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economic Development Act; or
(b) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1732 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 30202) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(3) Public Availability.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

(d) Acquisition of Land.—
(1) In General.—The Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a Special Management Area or the wilderness designated under this title, or contained within covered land, by exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) Management.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated, into, and administered as a part of the wilderness or Special Management Area in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) Grazing.—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary of the Interior with jurisdiction over the covered land, in accordance with—

(f) Applicable Guidelines.—If established before the date of enactment of this Act, and if applicable, guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96–617).
(f) FINE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary, with jurisdiction over a wilderness area designated pursuant to section 77 of the Wilderness Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), may carry out any activity in the wilderness area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the covered land and the approximately 6,590 acres generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Natura Canyon Mineral Withdrawal Area,” and dated September 6, 2018, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws;
(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

Subtitle C—Thompson Divide

SEC. 30301. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) subject to valid existing rights, to withdraw certain Federal land in the Thompson Divide area from mineral and other disposal laws; and
(2) to promote the capture of fugitive methane emissions that would otherwise be emitted into the atmosphere—

(A) to reduce methane gas emissions; and
(B) to provide—

(i) new renewable electricity supplies and other beneficial uses of fugitive methane emissions; and
(ii) increased royalties for taxpayers.

SEC. 30302. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS.—The term “fugitive methane emissions” means methane gas from the Federal land in Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State, as generally depicted on the pilot program map as “Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area,” that would leak or be vented into the atmosphere from an active, inactive, or abandoned underground coal mine.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program established by section 30305(a)(1).  

(3) PILOT PROGRAM MAP.—The term “pilot program map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” and dated June 17, 2019.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” means any oil or gas lease that—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or
(ii) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” does not include any oil or gas lease that—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or
(ii) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(6) THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.—The term “Thompson Divide map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Area Map” and dated June 13, 2019.

(7) THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.—The term “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area” means the Federal land and minerals generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.”

(8) WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” means a development right for any of the Federal mineral leases numbered COC 007496, COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 015645, and COC 015646, as generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as “Wolf Creek Storage Agreement”.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” does not include any storage right or related activity within the area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 30303. THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area is withdrawn from—

(1) all Federal entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and
(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) SURVEYS.—The exact acreage and legal description of the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area shall be determined by surveys approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) CROSSING.—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land.

SEC. 30304. THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In exchange for the relinquishment by a lesseeholder of all Thompson Divide leases of the lesseeholder, the Secretary may issue to the lesseeholder credits for any bid, royalty, or rental payment due under any oil or gas lease on Federal land in the State, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) EXCHANGE OF CREDITS.—

(1) AMOUNT OF CREDITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of credits issued to a lesseeholder of a Thompson Divide lease relinquishment under this section (a) shall be equal to the amount of any expenses incurred by the lesseeholder of the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of the date on which the lesseeholder submits to the Secretary a notice of the decision to relinquish the applicable Thompson Divide leases; and

(B) to improve public safety.

(c) CANCELLATION.—Effective on relinquishment under the terms of this section, and without any additional action by the Secretary, a Thompson Divide lease—

(1) shall be permanently cancelled; and
(2) shall not be reissued.

(d) CONDITIONS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each exchange under this section shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) this title; and
(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS.—The Secretary shall accept credits issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as cash for the payments described in that subsection.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(4) TREATMENT OF CREDITS.—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) accepted by the Secretary shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(A) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 197); and

(e) WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.

(1) CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Thompson Divide lease, any lesseeholder with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right shall permanently relinquish, transfer, and otherwise convey to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, all Wolf Creek Storage Field development rights of the lesseeholder.

(2) LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.—An interest acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be held in perpetuity; and

(B) not be—

(i) transferred;
(ii) reissued; or
(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 30305. GREATER THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.—

(B) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management a pilot program, to be known as the “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program”.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the pilot program is to promote the capture, beneficial use, mitigation, and sequestration of fugitive methane emissions—

(A) to reduce methane emissions;
(B) to promote economic development;
(C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;
(D) to improve air quality; and
(E) to improve public safety.

(C) PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan—

(B) COORDINATION.—In developing the plan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(i) the State;
(ii) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State;
(iii) lessees of Federal coal within the counties referred to in clause (ii);
(iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and
(v) interested members of the public.
(b) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an inventory of fugitive methane emissions.
(2) CONDUCT.—The Secretary may conduct the inventory under paragraph (1) through, or in collaboration with—
(A) the Bureau of Land Management;
(B) the United States Geological Survey;
(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;
(D) the United States Forest Service;
(E) State departments or agencies;
(F) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State;
(G) the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District;
(H) institutions of higher education in the State;
(I) lessees of Federal coal within a county referred to in subparagraph (F);
(J) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;
(K) the National Center for Atmospheric Research; or
(L) other interested entities, including members of the public.
(3) CONTENTS.—The inventory under paragraph (1) shall include—
(A) the general location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions;
(B) an estimate of the volume and concentration of fugitive methane emissions from each source of significant fugitive methane emissions, including details of measurements taken and the basis for that estimate;
(C) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year;
(D) relevant data and other information available from—
(i) the Environmental Protection Agency;
(ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration;
(iii) the department of natural resources of the State;
(iv) the Colorado Public Utility Commission;
(v) the department of health and environment of the State; and
(vi) the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; and
(E) other information as may be useful in advancing the purposes of the pilot program.
(4) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: DISCLOSURE.—
(A) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall provide opportunities for public participation in the inventory under this subsection.
(B) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the inventory under this subsection publicly available.
(c) DISCLOSURE.—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary to publicly release information that—
(i) poses a threat to public safety;
(ii) is confidential business information; or
(iii) is otherwise protected from public disclosure.
5. USE.—The Secretary shall use the inventory—
(A) by leasing under subsection (b); and
(B) by capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions under subsection (d).
(c) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION LEASING PROGRAM.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and in accordance with this section, not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the inventory required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall carry out a program to encourage the use and destruction of fugitive methane emissions.
(2) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINES SUBJECT TO LEASE.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall authorize the holder of a valid existing Federal coal lease for a mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions to capture for use, or destroy by flaring, the fugitive methane emissions.
(B) CONDITIONS.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall apply to—
(i) valid existing rights; and
(ii) such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.
(C) LIMITATION.—The program carried out under subparagraph (A) shall only include fugitive methane emissions that can be captured for use, or destroyed by flaring, in a manner that does not—
(I) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker; or
(II) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.
(D) COOPERATION.—
(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the holders of valid existing Federal coal leases for mines that produce fugitive methane emissions to encourage—
(I) the capture of fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, or transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material; and
(II) the beneficial use of the fugitive methane emissions is not feasible, the destruction of the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.
(ii) GUIDANCE.—In furtherance of the purposes of this paragraph, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of Federal authorities and programs to encourage the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions, while minimizing impacts on natural resources or other public interest values.
(E) ROYALTIES.—The Secretary shall determine whether any fugitive methane emissions used or destroyed pursuant to this paragraph are subject to the payment of a royalty under applicable law.
(F) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, notwithstanding section 3002 of the Coal Mine and Surface Mining Control Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1271), the Secretary shall—
(i) authorize the use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land and; or
(ii) make available for leasing such fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land.
(B) DUE DILIGENCE.—The lease form developed under clause (i) shall include terms and conditions requiring the leased fugitive methane emissions to be put to beneficial use or flared by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the lease.
(C) ROYALTY RATE.—The Secretary shall develop a minimum bid and royalty rate for leases under this paragraph to advance the purposes of this section, to the maximum extent practicable.
(d) SEQUESTRATION.—If, by not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any significant fugitive methane emission from abandoned coal mines on Federal land are not leased under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—
(1) to cap those fugitive methane emissions at the source in any case in which the cap will result in the long-term sequestration of all or a significant portion of the fugitive methane emissions; or
(2) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.
(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report from the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report detailing—
(1) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and
(2) any recommendations of the Secretary regarding whether the pilot program could be expanded geographically to include other significant sources of fugitive methane emissions from coal mines.
SEC. 30206. EFFECT.
Except as expressly provided in this subtitle, nothing in this subtitle—
(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing mineral leasing or mineral interest, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations); or
(2) prevents the capture of methane from any valid existing, inactive, or abandoned coal mine covered by this subtitle, in accordance with applicable law; or
(3) prevents access to, or the development of, any new or existing coal mine or lease in Delta or Gunnison County in the State.

Subtitle D—Curecanti National Recreation Area

SEC. 30401. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(a) MAP.—The term ‘‘map’’ means the map entitled ‘‘Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary’’, numbered 618-100,485C, and dated August 11, 2016.

(b) NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—The term ‘‘National Recreation Area’’ means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 30402(a).

(c) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 30402. CURECATI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Effective beginning on the earlier of the date on which the Secretary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I) and the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Curecanti National Recreation System, in accordance with this title, consisting of approximately 50,667 acres of land in the State, as generally depicted on the map as ‘‘Curecanti National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary’’.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Recreation Area in accordance with—

(A) this subtitle; and

(B) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) DAM, POWER PLANT, AND RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle affects or interferes with the authority of the Secretary to—

(i) operate the Uncompahgre Valley Reclamation Project under the reclamation laws;

(ii) operate the Wayne N. Aspinall Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the ‘‘Colorado River Storage Project Act’’) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); or

(iii) under the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 460l–12 et seq.).

(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

(i) SUBMISSION OF REQUEST TO RETAIN ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Secretary a request for the Commissioner of Reclamation to retain administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land within the land identified on the map as ‘‘Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects’’ that the Commissioner of Reclamation identifies as necessary for the effective operation of Bureau of Reclamation water facilities, the Secretary may—

(A) approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the request; and

(B) if the request is approved under subclause (I), make any modifications to the map that are necessary to reflect that the Commissioner of Reclamation retains administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land required to fulfill the reclamation mission.

(2) TRANSFER OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as ‘‘Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects’’, as modified pursuant to clause (i)(II), if applicable, shall be transferred from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Secretary of the Interior for the National Park Service not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) ACCESS TO TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the terms of the Cooperative Management Agreement, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary’s designee, shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior the National Recreation Area as a unit of the National Park Service, including for the operation, maintenance, and expansion or replacement of facilities.

(ii) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be determined by a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the National Park Service not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements, or modify management agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, relating to the boundary of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Secretary of the Interior to manage federal land within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(B) STATE LAND.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements for any land administered by the State that is within or adjacent to the National Recreation Area, in accordance with the cooperative management authority under section 101075 of title 54, United States Code.

(C) ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SERVICES.—The Secretary shall transfer to the National Park Service all engineering and technical services, authorizations, and responsibilities relating to the National Recreation Area.

(D) MINERAL LEASING.—The Secretary shall carry out the terms of any valid existing Federal mineral leases, authorizations, or permits, including any modifications to the terms of such leases, authorizations, or permits, made after the date of enactment of this Act.

(E) TERMINATION OF LEASES.—Within the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may—

(i) accept the voluntary termination of a lease or permit for grazing; or

(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated by the lessee, terminate the lease or permit.

(F) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subtitle—

(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of any water, water right, or interest in water; or

(B) affects any vested, absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States; or

(C) affects any water right held by another public entity in existence before the date of enactment of this Act;
(D) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right;

(E) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water right reserved by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(F) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water right with respect to the National Recreation Area.

(9) FISHING EASEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinwall Unit developed under section 30402 of title 33, United States Code (commonly known as the "Colorado River Storage Project Act") (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (including any successor in interest to that division) that provides for the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinwall Unit (referred to in this paragraph as the "program").

(B) ACQUISITION OF FISHING EASEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, is authorized to acquire by exchange or purchase any successor in interest to that division who holds a water right with respect to the National Recreation Area that is acquired by the United States for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(10) CONSOLIDATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force, for the purpose of providing efficient management of the lands and water resources of the National Recreation Area, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall develop a plan for fulfilling the obligation of the Secretary under the program to acquire 24 miles of class 1 public fishing easements to provide to sportmen access to the land within the Upper Gunning Basin upstream of the Aspinwall Unit, subject to the condition that no existing fishing access downstream of the Aspinwall Unit shall be controlled or to diminish or alter the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(B) ACQUISITION OF TECHNICAL SURVEY.—The Secretary of the Air Force, upon the request of the State, may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State to conduct a boundary survey and legal description of the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2042. ACQUISITION OF LAND; BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT.

(a) ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(2) MANNER OF ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), land described in paragraph (1) may be acquired under this subsection by—

(i) donation;

(ii) purchase from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds;

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) exchange.

(B) STATE LAND.—Land or interests in land owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may only be acquired by purchase, donation, or exchange.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 2,560 acres of land identified on the map as "Bureau of Land Management proposed transfer to National Park Service" is transferred from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service, subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(B) E XCHANGE; INCLUSION IN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—On transfer of the land described in paragraph (1), the transferred land—

(i) may be exchanged by the Secretary for private land described in section 30402(c)(5);

(ii) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(C) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(b) ADDITION TO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may add to, and manage as a part of, the National Recreation Area any land—

(A) that would otherwise be eligible for payment under that agreement were those costs paid using amounts appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency; or

(B) that is acquired by the United States for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into such agreements with a local water authority or State for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(2) E XCHANGE OF LAND.—Any land exchanged pursuant to this subsection (a) shall be managed as a part of the National Recreation Area.

(d) LIMITATION.—Any payment made under subsection (a) may not exceed the actual cost of treatment of perfluorooctane sulfonylic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid resulting from the activities of the Environmental Protection Agency, paid for by the Department of the Air Force.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—The amount paid under subsection (a) shall be available to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2043. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may establish a general management plan for the National Recreation Area, in consultation with the National Park Service, in accordance with the laws (including regulations) and policies governing National Park Service land, and may establish any other general management plan or policies governing the National Recreation Area.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The Secretary may use amounts available under this Act for the purpose of preparing or implementing a general management plan.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Park Service, shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(d) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on the status of the implementation of the general management plan.

SEC. 2044. MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The amounts available under this Act to provide funding for the implementation of this Act shall be available to enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2045. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(b) USE OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Payment made under this section may be made under agreement (A) that would otherwise be eligible for payment under that agreement were those costs paid using amounts appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency; or (B) that is acquired by the United States for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(d) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(e) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2046. PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE TREATMENT OF PERFLUOROOCTANE SULFONIC ACID AND PERFLUOROOCTANOIC ACID IN DRINKING WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The amounts available under this Act to provide funding for the implementation of this Act shall be available to enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(c) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(d) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2047. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(b) USE OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Payment made under this section may be made under agreement (A) that would otherwise be eligible for payment under that agreement were those costs paid using amounts appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency; or (B) that is acquired by the United States for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(d) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(e) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2048. PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE TREATMENT OF PERFLUOROOCTANE SULFONIC ACID AND PERFLUOROOCTANOIC ACID IN DRINKING WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The amounts available under this Act to provide funding for the implementation of this Act shall be available to enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(c) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(d) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 2049. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(b) USE OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Payment made under this section may be made under agreement (A) that would otherwise be eligible for payment under that agreement were those costs paid using amounts appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency; or (B) that is acquired by the United States for the purpose of providing fishing access to the public.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.

(d) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements with States, local water authorities, or the Department of the Interior for the purpose of implementing the provisions of this Act.

(e) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—The Secretary shall prepare a boundary description of the National Recreation Area.
year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. \( \text{REPORT ON USE OF ENCRYPTION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS} \). Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report detailing the mission need and efficacy of full disk encryption across Non-classified Internet Protocol Router Network (NIPRNet) and Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet) endpoint computer systems. Such report shall cover matters relating to cost, mission impact, and implementation timeline.

SA 1744. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 724. \( \text{REQUIREMENT TO USE HUMAN-BASED METHODS FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL TRAINING} \).

(a) In General.—Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

\( \text{“}2017. \text{Use of human-based methods for certain medical training.”} \)

(b) Injuries.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2025, the Secretary of Defense shall develop, test, and validate human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries with the goal of replacing live animal-based training methods.

(2) Not later than October 1, 2025, the Secretary—

"(A) shall only use human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries; and"

"(B) may not use animals for such purpose.

(3) The term ‘partial task trainers’ means training aids that allow individuals to learn or practice specific medical procedures."

(SA 1745. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. \( \text{REPUTTABLE PRESUMPTION AGAINST LAWFULNESS OF ORDERS TO DEPLOY OR USE REGULAR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO SUPPRESS INDIVIDUALS PEACEABLY ASSEMBLED TO PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES} \).

(a) In General.—There shall be a rebuttable presumption that an order to deploy or use regular members of the Armed Forces to suppress individuals peaceably assembled to petition for a redress of grievances is not a lawful order for purposes in law.

(b) Strict Scrutiny.—In evaluating arguments to rebut the presumption in subsection (a) with respect to a particular order described in that subsection, a court shall require the arguments to advance compelling governmental interests and be the least restrictive means of doing so.

SA 1748. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title V, add the following:
SEC. 1749. MR. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XXXVII, add the following:

SEC. 2703. CONTINUITY OF CERTAIN REMEDIATION ACTIVITIES.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of the Army may not suspend remediation activities conducted at a location under a settlement agreement pursuant to a base closure law notwithstanding that—

(1) the Secretary determines that the quantity and depth of contamination at the location has exceeded original estimates; and

(2) such agreement expires in 2020.

(b) Base Closure Law Defined.—In this section the term “base closure law” has the meaning given that term in section 10(a)(17) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 1750. MR. PETERS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KING, and Mr. Sasse) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to add sections for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. CONTINUITY OF THE ECONOMY PLAN.

(a) Requirement.—

(1) In General.—The President shall develop and maintain a plan to maintain and restore the economy of the United States in response to a significant event.

(2) Principles.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be consistent with—

(i) a free market economy; and

(ii) the rule of law; and

(B) respect private property rights.

(3) Contents.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) examine the distribution of goods and services across the United States necessary for the reliable functioning of the United States during a significant event;

(B) identify the economic functions of relevant actors, the disruption, corruption, or dysfunction of which would have a debilitating effect in the United States on—

(i) security;

(ii) economic security;

(iii) defense;

(iv) public health or safety;

(C) identify the critical distribution mechanisms for each economic sector that should be prioritized for operation during a significant event, including—

(i) bulk power and electric transmission systems;

(ii) national and international financial systems, including wholesale payments, stocks, and currency exchanges;

(iii) national and international communications networks, data-hosting services, and cloud services;

(iv) interstate oil and natural gas pipelines; and

(D) identify economic functions of relevant actors, the disruption, corruption, or dysfunction of which would cause—

(i) catastrophic economic loss;

(ii) the loss of public confidence; or

(iii) the widespread imperilment of human life;

(E) identify the economic functions of relevant actors that are so vital to the economy of the United States that the disruption, corruption, or dysfunction of those economic functions would undermine our ability to respond to a disaster, recovery, or mobilization efforts during a significant event;

(F) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, the principles and practices contained within Federal plans for the continuity of Government and continuity of operations;

(G) identify—

(i) industrial control networks on which the interests of national security outweigh the benefits of dependence on Internet connectivity, including networks that are required to maintain defense readiness; and

(ii) for each industrial control network described in clause (i), the most feasible and optimal locations for the installation of—

(I) parallel services; and

(II) stand-alone analog services; and

(III) services that are otherwise hardened against failure;

(H) identify critical economic sectors for which the data in protected, verified, and uncorrupted status would be required for the quick recovery of the economy of the United States in the face of a significant disruption following a significant event;

(I) include a list of raw materials, industrial goods, and other items, the absence of which would significantly undermine the ability of the United States to sustain the functions described in subparagraphs (B), (D), and (E); and

(J) provide an analysis of supply chain diversification for the items described in subparagraph (I) in the event of a disruption caused by a significant event;

(K) identify—

(i) a recommendation as to whether the United States should maintain a strategic reserve of 1 or more of the items described in subparagraph (I) and

(ii) for each item described in subparagraph (I) for which the President recommends maintaining a strategic reserve an identification of mechanisms for tracking inventory and availability of the item in the strategic reserve;

(L) identify mechanisms in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and mechanisms that can be developed to ensure that the swift transport and delivery of the items described in subparagraph (I) is feasible in the event of a distribution network disturbance or degradation, including a distribution network disturbance or degradation caused by a significant event;

(M) include guidance for determining the prioritization for the distribution of the items described in subparagraph (I), including consultation with States and other Federal entities; and

(N) consider the advisability and feasibility of mechanisms for extending the credit of the United States or providing other financial support—

(i) is necessary to avoid severe economic degradation; or

(ii) allows for the recovery from a significant event;

and

(O) include guidance for determining categories of employees that should be prioritized to continue to work in order to sustain the functions described in subparagraphs (B), (D), and (E) in the event that there are limitations on the ability of individuals to travel to workplaces or to work remotely, including considerations for defense readiness;

(P) identify critical economic sectors necessary to provide material and operational support to the defense of the United States; and

(Q) the Secretary of Homeland Security, the National Guard, and the Secretary of Defense have adequate authority to assist the United States in a recovery from a severe economic degradation caused by a significant event;

(R) review and assess the authority and capability of heads of other agencies that the President determines necessary to assist the United States in a recovery from a severe economic degradation caused by a significant event; and

(S) consider any other matter that would aid in protecting and increasing the resilience of the economy of the United States from a significant event.

(b) Coordination.—In developing the plan required under subsection (a)(1), the President shall—

(1) receive advice from—

(A) the Secretary of Homeland Security;

(B) the Secretary of Defense; and

(C) the head of any other Federal agency that the President determines necessary to complete the plan;

(2) consult with relevant State, Tribal, and local governments and organizations that represent those governments; and

(3) consult with any other non-Federal entity that the President determines necessary to complete the plan.

(c) Submission to Congress.—The President shall submit the plan to the following:

(1) the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Senate;

(3) the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the majority and minority leaders of the Senate;

(5) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(6) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(7) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(8) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(9) any other committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over the subject of the plan.
(2) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The information described in this paragraph is—
(A) any change to Federal law that would be necessary to carry out the plan required under subsection (a); and
(B) any proposed changes to the funding levels provided in appropriation Acts for the most recent fiscal year that can be implemented through appropriation Acts or additional resources necessary to—
(i) implement the plan required under subsection (a)(1); or
(ii) maintain any program offices and personnel necessary to—
(I) implement the plan required under subsection (a)(1) and (i); and
(II) conduct exercises, assessments, and updates to the plans described in subclause (I) over time.
(3) BUDGET OF THE PRESIDENT.—The President may include the information described in paragraph (2)(B) in the budget required to be submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.
(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
(1) The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.
(2) The term “economic sector” means a sector of the economy of the United States.
(3) The term “Secretary” means—
(A) the Federal government;
(B) a State, local, Tribal government; or
(C) the private sector.
(4) The term “significant event” means an event that causes severe degradation to economic activity in the United States due to—
(A) a cyber attack; or
(B) another significant event that is natural or human-caused.
(5) The term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any possession of the United States.

SA 1751. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriate Federal fiscal year funding for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and to prescribe purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the end of subtitle B of title XVI, add the following:
SEC. 1643. PILOT PROGRAMS ON REMOTE PROVISION BY NATIONAL GUARD TO STATE GOVERNMENTS AND NATIONAL GUARDS OF OTHER STATES OF CYBERSECURITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN TRAINING, PREPARATION, AND RESPONSE TO CYBER INCIDENTS.
(a) PILOT PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may each, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, conduct a pilot program to use existing capabilities and the feasibility and vulnerability of the development of a capability within the National Guard through which a National Guard of a State remotely provides State and National Guards of other States (whether or not in the same Armed Force as the providing National Guard) with cybersecurity technical assistance in training, preparation, and response to cyber incidents. If such Secretary elects to conduct such a pilot program, such Secretary shall be known as an “administering Secretary” for purposes of this section, and any reference in this section to “the pilot program” shall be treated as a reference to the pilot program conducted by such Secretary.
(b) ASSESSMENT PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT.—For purposes of evaluating existing platforms, technologies, and capabilities under subsection (c), and for establishing eligibility and participation requirements under subsection (d), for purposes of the pilot program, an administering Secretary, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, shall, prior to commencing the pilot program—
(1) conduct an assessment of—
(A) existing cyber response capacities of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard, as applicable, in each State; and
(B) any existing platform, technology, or capability of a National Guard that provides the capability described in subsection (a); and
(2) determine whether a platform, technology, or capability described in paragraph (1)(B) is suitable for expansion for purposes of the pilot program.
(c) ELEMENTS.—A pilot program under subsection (a) shall include the following:
(1) A technical capability that enables the National Guard to remotely provide cybersecurity technical assistance to State governments and National Guards of other States, without the need to deploy outside its home State.
(2) Policies, processes, procedures, and authorities for use of such a capability, including with respect to the following:
(A) The roles and responsibilities of both requesting and deploying State governments and National Guards with respect to such technical assistance, taking into account the matters specified in paragraph (b);
(B) The conduct, in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, other Federal agencies, and appropriate non-Federal entities, of at least one exercise to demonstrate the capability, which exercise shall include the following:
(i) Participation of not fewer than two State governments and their National Guards.
(ii) Circumstances designed to test and validate the policies, processes, procedures, and authorities developed pursuant to paragraph (2); and
(iii) An after action review of the exercise.
(d) USE OF EXISTING TECHNOLOGY.—An administering Secretary may use an existing platform, technology, or capability to provide the capability described in subsection (a) under the pilot program.
(e) ELIGIBILITY AND PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS.—An administering Secretary shall, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, establish requirements with respect to eligibility and participation of State governments and their National Guards in the pilot program.
(f) CONSTRUCTION WITH CERTAIN CURRENT AUTHORITY.—Nothing in a pilot program under subsection (a) may be construed as affecting or altering the command authorities otherwise applicable to any unit of the National Guard unit participating in the pilot program.
(g) EVALUATION METRICS.—An administering Secretary shall consult with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Secretary of Homeland Security, establish requirements to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot program.
(h) TERM.—A pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the commencement of the pilot program.
(i) REPORTS.—
(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the commencement of the pilot program, the administering Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a description of the pilot program and such other matters in connection with the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.
(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the termination of the pilot program, the administering Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program.
(j) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—
(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SA 1752. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by
him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 520. NONDISCRIMINATION WITH RESPECT TO SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—Chapter 37 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 651 the following new section:

"561a. Members: nondiscrimination standards for eligibility for service.

Any personnel policy developed or implemented by the Department of Defense with respect to members of the armed forces shall ensure equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed forces, without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, or sex (including gender identity or sexual orientation) of an individual."

SEC. 3. MORATORIUM ON INCINERATION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES, POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES, AND AQUEOUS FILM FORMING FOAM.

(a) In General.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall not authorize the incineration of materials containing perfluorooalkyl substances, polyfluorooalkyl substances, or aqueous film forming foam at the Department of Defense, or any component thereof, for 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Department of Defense from implementing any other United States Code, without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, or sex (including gender identity or sexual orientation) of an individual.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to alter the treatment of individuals, regardless of the individual's designated sex at birth.
SA 1756. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. 6. EXPANSION OF OPEN BURN PIT REGISTRY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE OPEN BURN PITS USED IN SYRIA AND EGYPT.

Section 201(c)(2) of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans’ Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or Iraq” and inserting “, Iraq, Syria, or Egypt”.

SA 1757. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 7. CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PAY AND VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

(a) Voluntary Separation Pay for Transfer to the Reserves.—Section 1175c(e)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “, but there shall be deducted” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting a period.

(b) Voluntary Separation Pay.—Section 1175c(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND DISABILITY COMPENSATION”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), a member” and inserting “A member”;

(B) by striking “, but there shall be” and all that follows through “Internal Revenue Code of 1986”; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(c) Coordination With Concurrent Receipt Limitation.—Section 5300a(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply to an award of voluntary separation incentive pay under section 1175f of title 10 or voluntary separation pay under section 1175a of this title.”

SA 1758. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1. OPEN TECHNOLOGY FUND.

(a) Subject Matter.—This section may be cited as the “Open Technology Fund Authorization Act.”

(b) Findings.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The political, economic, and social benefits of the internet are important to advancing democracy and freedom throughout the world.

(2) Authoritarian governments are investing billions of dollars each year to create, maintain, and operate internet censorship and surveillance systems to limit free association, control access to information, and prevent citizens from exercising their rights to free speech.

(3) Over 5% of the world’s population lives in countries in which the internet is restricted. Governments shut down the internet more than 200 times every year.

(4) Internet censorship and surveillance technology is rapidly being exported around the world, particularly by the Government of the People’s Republic of China, enabling widespread abuses by authoritarian governments.

(c) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the interest of the United States—

(1) to promote global internet freedom by countering internet censorship and repressive surveillance;

(2) to protect the internet as a platform for—

(A) the free exchange of ideas;

(B) the promotion of human rights and democracy; and

(C) the advancement of a free press; and

(3) to support efforts that prevent the deleterious misuse of the internet to repress individuals from exercising their rights to free speech and association, including countering the use of such technologies by authoritarian regimes.

(d) Establishment of the Open Technology Fund.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established—

(A) the free exchange of ideas;

(B) the promotion of human rights and democracy; and

(C) the advancement of a free press; and

(3) to support efforts that prevent the deleterious misuse of the internet to repress individuals from exercising their rights to free speech and association, including countering the use of such technologies by authoritarian regimes.

(e) Methodology.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Open Technology Fund shall—

(1) establish an Advisory Council, which shall conduct an open, transparent, and competitive process to plan and prioritize projects supported by the Open Technology Fund, and to make grants to nonprofit organizations, to carry out the purposes of the Open Technology Fund.

(f) Authorization.—This Act shall be carried out in accordance with section 1504 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(g) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(h) Certification.—The Administrator shall certify that the Open Technology Fund has carried out the purposes of this Act.
“(7) implement an independent review process, through which proposals are reviewed by such experts to ensure the highest degree of technical review and due diligence; 

(8) in coordination with the public and private sectors, foreign allies, and partner countries to maximize efficiencies and eliminate duplication of efforts; and 

(9) any other methodology approved by the United States Agency for Global Media and in furtherance of the mission of the Open Technology Fund. 

(d) GRANT AGREEMENT.—Any grant agreement with, or grants made to, the Open Technology Fund under this section shall be subject to the following limitations and restrictions:

(1) The headquarters of the Open Technology Fund and its senior administrative and managerial staff shall be located in a location which ensures economy, operational effectiveness, and accountability to the United States Agency for Global Media. 

(2) Grants awarded under this section shall be made pursuant to a grant agreement requiring that:

(A) grant funds are only used only activities consistent with this section; and 

(B) failure to comply with such requirement shall result in termination of the grant without further fiscal obligation to the United States. 

(3) Each grant agreement under this section shall require that each contract entered into by the Open Technology Fund specify that 

(A) should be kept to a minimum; and 

(B) to the maximum extent feasible, should not exceed the costs that would have been incurred if the Open Technology Fund had been operated as a Federal entity rather than as a grantee. 

(4) Grants may not be used for any activity whose purpose is influencing the passage or defeat of legislation considered by Congress. 

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.— 

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Open Technology Fund shall be consistent with the reporting and accountability by the United States Agency for Global Media in accordance with section 305. 

(2) ASSISTANCE.—The United States Agency for Global Media, its broadcast entities, and the Open Technology Fund shall render such assistance to each other as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section consistent with the Open Technology Fund. 

(3) NOT A FEDERAL AGENCY OR INSTRUMENTALITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to make the Open Technology Fund an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

(4) DETAILS.—Employees of a grantee of the United States Agency for Global Media may be detailed to the Open Technology Fund in accordance with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.) and Federal employees may be detailed to a grantee of the United States Agency for Global Media, in accordance with such Act. 

(f) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT-FUNDED INTERNET FREEDOM PROGRAMS.—The United States Agency for Global Media shall ensure that internet freedom research and development projects of the Open Technology Fund are deconflicted with internet freedom programs of the Department of State and other relevant United States Government departments. Agencies shall still share information and best practices relating to the implementation of subsections (b) and (c).

(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Open Technology Fund shall highlight, in its annual report, 

(i) trends in censorship and surveillance technologies and their effects; 

(ii) the threats such pose to journalists, citizens, and human rights and civil society organizations; and 

(iii) a description of the technology projects supported by the Open Technology Fund and the associated impact of such projects in the most recently completed year. 

(2) ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE OPEN TECHNOLOGY FUND.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that indicates:

(A) whether the Open Technology Fund is—

(i) technically sound; 

(ii) cost effective; and 

(iii) satisfying the requirements under this section; and 

(B) the extent to which the interests of the United States are being served by maintaining the work of the Open Technology Fund. 

(b) AUDIT ORTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Financial transactions of the Open Technology Fund that relate to functions carried out under this section may be audited by the Government Accountability Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Open Technology Fund are normally kept. 

(2) ACCESS BY GAO.—The Government Accountability Office shall have access to all books, accounts, reports, files, papers, and property belonging to or in use by the Open Technology Fund pertaining to financial transactions as may be necessary to facilitate an audit. The Government Accountability Office shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians of funds, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of the Open Technology Fund shall remain in the possession and custody of the Open Technology Fund. 

(3) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Department of State and the Foreign Service is authorized to exercise the authorities of the Inspector General Act of 1978 with respect to the Open Technology Fund. 

(2) COMPILATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 is amended—

(A) in section 304(d) (22 U.S.C. 6204(d)), by inserting “the Open Technology Fund,” before “or the Middle East Broadcasting Networks” each place that term appears. 

(B) in section 310 (22 U.S.C. 6209(c), by inserting “the Open Technology Fund,” before “and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks” each place that term appears. 

(C) in section 310 (22 U.S.C. 6209(c), by inserting “the Open Technology Fund,” before “and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks” each place that term appears. 

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Open Technology Fund, which shall be used to carry out section 309A of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994, as added by paragraph (1)—

(A) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2021; and 

(B) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2022. 

(e) UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.—Section 134 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1999 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is amended by striking “October 1, 2020” and inserting “October 1, 2025”. 

SA 1759. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: 

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS. 

The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 21(a) (15 U.S.C. 631(a)), by inserting “American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “American Samoa,” and 

(B) in paragraph (4)(C)(ix), by striking “American Samoa” and inserting “American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands”.

SA 1760. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: 

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1. MODIFICATION TO FIRST DIVISION MONUMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Society of the First Infantry Division may make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in President’s Park in the District of Columbia to honor the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, in-
(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—
(1) the term ‘‘Department of Defense law enforcement officer’’ means an officer in a position in the Department of Defense who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function;
(2) the term ‘‘Department of Defense law enforcement function’’ means the prevention, detection, or investigation, or the prosecution or incarceration of any person, for any violation of law; and
(3) the term ‘‘memorial function’’ means a member of any of the armed forces, as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, or a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(3) of title 32, United States Code.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—On and after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each Department of Defense law enforcement officer, Department of Defense law enforcement function, or member of an armed force who is engaged in any form of crowd control, riot control, or arrest or detention of individuals engaged in an act of civil disturbance, demonstration, protest, or riot in the United States shall at all times display identifying information in a clearly visible fashion, which shall include—
(1) the last name, badge number, and component of the Department of Defense of a Department of Defense law enforcement officer;
(2) the last name and contractor or subcontractor employee of the Department of Defense contract employee; and
(3) the last name, rank, and armed force of a member of an armed force.

SA 1765. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 110a. MEMORIAL FUNCTION; COMMISSION ON THE CEREMONY OF RITUALISTIC ARMED PERSONNEL.

SEC. 110b. MEMORIAL FUNCTION; COMMISSION ON THE CEREMONY OF RITUALISTIC ARMED PERSONNEL.
chapter for pursuit of such education or training as if the individual were not also eligible to receive or in receipt of educational assistance under section 2007 for pursuit of such education or training.

“(2) In the case of an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter, the Secretary concerned shall, at the election of the individual, pay to the individual an educational assistance allowance to meet all or a portion of the charges of the educational institution or for the education or training that are not paid by the Federal Government, the military department concerned or the Bureau of Veterans Affairs, unless the individual is in receipt of a similar allowance to pay all or a portion of the charges of an educational institution or for the education or training that are not paid by the Federal Government, the military department concerned or the Bureau of Veterans Affairs.

“(2)(A) The amount of the educational assistance allowance paid to an individual under this paragraph for a month shall be equal to the amount of the educational assistance allowance paid under paragraph (2)(A) of section 16131(k) of title 38, for the month included in the period of the Ready Reserve of the reserve components of former members of the Selected Reserve of Veterans Affairs, shall review the records of the selected reserve component to determine whether an individual is eligible to receive educational assistance under this title, and such individuals shall be entitled to receive educational assistance under this title on the same basis as permanent members of the reserve components of former members of the Selected Reserve of Veterans Affairs.

“SA 1767. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle C of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1003. REPORT ON FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET REQUEST REQUIREMENTS IN CONNEC- TION WITH AIR FORCE OPERATIONS IN THE ARCTIC.

The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 30 days after submission of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the President for fiscal year 2022 (as submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code), a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of the manner in which amounts requested for the Air Force in the budget for fiscal year 2022 support Air Force operations in the Arctic.

(2) A list of the procurement initiatives and research, development, test, and evaluation initiatives funded by that budget that are primarily intended to enhance the ability of the Air Force to deploy to or operate in the Arctic region, or to defend the northern approaches to the United States homeland.

(3) An assessment of the adequacy of the infrastructure of Air Force installations in Alaska and in the States along the northern border of the continental United States to support deployments to and operations in the Arctic, including assessment of runways, fuel lines, and aircraft maintenance capacity for purposes of such support.

“SA 1768. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

Subtitle. —Industries of the Future

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This subtitle may be cited as the "Industries of the Future Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT IN INDUSTRIES OF THE FUTURE. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) The United States must drive technological breakthroughs through research and development investments across the Federal Government, academia, and industry in order to promote scientific discovery, economic competitiveness, and national security;

(2) The United States must identify key research infrastructure investments that enable these technological breakthroughs and establish the domestic capabilities necessary for the United States to lead in the industries of the future;

(3) The United States must encourage opportunities for collaboration between the Federal Government and the private sector so that through such partnerships, all can benefit from each other’s investment and expertise, ensuring United States leadership in the industries of the future;

(4) The United States must encourage opportunities for collaboration between the Federal Government and the private sector so that through such partnerships, all can benefit from each other’s investment and expertise, ensuring United States leadership in the industries of the future;

(5) In order for the United States to maintain its global economic edge, Federal investments must be made in research and development efforts focused on industries of the future, such as artificial intelligence, quantum information science, bioinformatics, and wireless networks and infrastructure, advanced manufacturing, and synthetic biology.
SEC. 1. VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION SUPPORT TO TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—Not later than 270 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall establish a process by which a representative of a veterans service organization may be present at any portion of the program carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, for the purposes of supporting pretransition counseling and transition assistance carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the submission of claims to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for compensation under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) Purpose.—The process established in subsection (a) shall ensure that a representative of a veteran service organization can support the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide pretransition counseling and transition assistance carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the submission of claims to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for compensation under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) Access to Be Authorized.—In accordance with the process established in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall review and modify as necessary the memorandum of the Secretary entitled “Installation Access and Support Services for Non-Profit Non-Federal Entities” and dated December 23, 2014, to permit a representative of a veterans service organization access to a military installation to be present at any portion of the program carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, to members of the Armed Forces stationed at such installations.

(d) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of Defense to offer—

(1) a recommendation or endorsement of a particular veterans service organization over another veterans service organization for the purposes of supporting pretransition counseling and transition assistance program;

(2) the encouragement, support, or other suggestion that a member of the Armed Forces seek membership in a veterans service organization.

(e) Report.—(1) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on participation of veterans service organizations in the program carried out under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Contents.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the Department of Defense with the directives providing a representative of a veterans service organization access to a military installation, including—

(i) the memorandum of the Secretary entitled “Installation Access and Support Services for Non-Profit Non-Federal Entities” and dated December 23, 2014, or

(ii) a memorandum of the Secretary superseding the memorandum described in clause (i);

(B) The number of military bases that have complied with such directives.

(C) How many veterans service organizations have been present at a portion of a program as described in paragraph (a).

(f) VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “veterans service organization” means any organization recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. RESTORING HONOR TO SERVICE.

(a) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the mission of the Department of Defense is to deter war and to protect the security of the United States;

(2) expanding outreach to veterans impacted by Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell or a similar policy prior to the enactment of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell is important to closing a period of history harmful to the creed of integrity, respect, and honor of the military;

(3) the Department is responsible for providing for the review of a veteran’s military personnel file before the discharge review board or, when more than 15 years has passed, board of correction for military or naval records; and

(b) TIGER TEAM FOR OUTREACH TO FORMER MEMBERS.—

(1) In General.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a team (commonly known as a “tiger team”) and referred to in this section as the “Tiger Team”) responsible for conducting outreach to build awareness among former members of the Armed Forces of the process established pursuant to section 527 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92) for the review of discharge characterizations.

(2) Tiger Team Leader.—One of the persons assigned to the Tiger Team under paragraph (1) shall be a senior-level officer or employee who shall serve as the lead official of the Tiger Team (in this section referred to as the “Tiger Team Leader”) and who shall be accountable for the activities of the Tiger Team under this section.

(3) Report on Composition.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the names of the personnel of the Department assigned to the Tiger Team pursuant to this subsection, including the positions to which assigned. The report shall specify that each individual assigned as Tiger Team Leader.

(b) Duties.—

(1) In General.—The Tiger Team shall conduct outreach to build awareness among veterans of the process established pursuant to section 527 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 for the review of discharge characterizations by appropriate discharge boards.

(2) Collaboration.—In conducting activities under this subsection, the Tiger Team shall work to carry out such activities. Such stakeholders shall include the following:

(A) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(B) The Archivist of the United States.

(C) Representatives of veterans service organizations.

(3) Such other stakeholders as the Tiger Team considers appropriate.

(c) Initial Report.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress the following:

(A) A plan setting forth the following:

(i) A description of the manner in which the Secretary, working through the Tiger Team, will identify and prioritize stakeholders described in paragraph (2), shall identify individuals who meet the criteria in...
(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the consistency and uniformity of the reviews conducted pursuant to section 527 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter for a four-year period, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the reviews under paragraph (1). Such reports shall include any comments or recommendations for continued actions.

(a) Description of the manner in which the Secretary shall terminate the Tiger Team and the external stakeholders.

(b) A description of the manner in which the work described in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (a) shall be carried out, including an allocation of the work among the Tiger Team and the external stakeholders.

(c) A schedule for the implementation, carrying out, and completion of the plan required under subparagraph (A).

(d) A description of the additional funding, personnel, or other resources of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT OF RISKS TO DEFENSE COMMUNITIES.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program that ensures that the Secretary of each military department is able to—

(1) conduct exercises to assess and to the degree feasible quantitatively the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience resulting from vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure inside and outside of the military installation, including community infrastructure, not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(2) improve collaboration and information sharing among critical infrastructure vulnerabilities with stakeholders in the civilian community that are necessary to reduce the risks to military installation resilience.

(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State or local government, and for environmental, pre-disaster mitigation measures and projects that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, will contribute to maintaining or improving military installation resilience.

(1) In the case of funds provided under clause (1) for projects involving the preservation or restoration of natural features for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing military installation resilience—

(II) any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal. Such interest or income shall be used only if a reasonable amount is not made available for assistance under this sub-paragraph shall remain available until expended.

(iv) A disaster mitigation or risk reduction project.

SA 1772. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 2816. Defense community vulnerability assessments and exercises

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program that ensures that the Secretary of each military department is able to—

(1) conduct exercises to assess and to the degree feasible quantitatively the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience resulting from vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure inside and outside of the military installation, including community infrastructure, not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(2) improve collaboration and information sharing among critical infrastructure vulnerabilities with stakeholders in the civilian community that are necessary to reduce the risks to military installation resilience.

(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State or local government, and for environmental, pre-disaster mitigation measures and projects that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, will contribute to maintaining or improving military installation resilience.

(1) In the case of funds provided under clause (1) for projects involving the preservation or restoration of natural features for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing military installation resilience—

(II) any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal. Such interest or income shall be used only if a reasonable amount is not made available for assistance under this sub-paragraph shall remain available until expended.

(iv) A disaster mitigation or risk reduction project.

SA 1772. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 2816. Defense community vulnerability assessments and exercises

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program that ensures that the Secretary of each military department is able to—

(1) conduct exercises to assess and to the degree feasible quantitatively the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience resulting from vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure inside and outside of the military installation, including community infrastructure, not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(2) improve collaboration and information sharing among critical infrastructure vulnerabilities with stakeholders in the civilian community that are necessary to reduce the risks to military installation resilience.

(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State or local government, and for environmental, pre-disaster mitigation measures and projects that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, will contribute to maintaining or improving military installation resilience.

(1) In the case of funds provided under clause (1) for projects involving the preservation or restoration of natural features for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing military installation resilience—

(II) any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal. Such interest or income shall be used only if a reasonable amount is not made available for assistance under this sub-paragraph shall remain available until expended.

(iv) A disaster mitigation or risk reduction project.

SA 1772. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT OF RISKS TO DEFENSE COMMUNITIES.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program that ensures that the Secretary of each military department is able to—

(1) conduct exercises to assess and to the degree feasible quantitatively the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience resulting from vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure inside and outside of the military installation, including community infrastructure, not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(2) improve collaboration and information sharing among critical infrastructure vulnerabilities with stakeholders in the civilian community that are necessary to reduce the risks to military installation resilience.

(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State or local government, and for environmental, pre-disaster mitigation measures and projects that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, will contribute to maintaining or improving military installation resilience.

(1) In the case of funds provided under clause (1) for projects involving the preservation or restoration of natural features for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing military installation resilience—

(II) any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal. Such interest or income shall be used only if a reasonable amount is not made available for assistance under this sub-paragraph shall remain available until expended.

(iv) A disaster mitigation or risk reduction project.

SA 1772. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT OF RISKS TO DEFENSE COMMUNITIES.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program that ensures that the Secretary of each military department is able to—

(1) conduct exercises to assess and to the degree feasible quantitatively the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience resulting from vulnerabilities to critical infrastructure inside and outside of the military installation, including community infrastructure, not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(2) improve collaboration and information sharing among critical infrastructure vulnerabilities with stakeholders in the civilian community that are necessary to reduce the risks to military installation resilience.

(b) VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist a State or local government, and for environmental, pre-disaster mitigation measures and projects that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, will contribute to maintaining or improving military installation resilience.

(1) In the case of funds provided under clause (1) for projects involving the preservation or restoration of natural features for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing military installation resilience—

(II) any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal. Such interest or income shall be used only if a reasonable amount is not made available for assistance under this sub-paragraph shall remain available until expended.
‘(1) Energy generation, distribution, and transmission systems.

‘(2) Water and wastewater treatment facilities.

‘(3) Telecommunications and information technology systems.

‘(4) Intermodal transportation nodes, including access roads, railways and railheads, bridges, and harbor and port infrastructure.

‘(5) Emergency services.

‘(6) Such other critical infrastructure sectors as the Secretary concerned determines are essential to ensure military installation resilience.

‘(c) VULNERABILITY EXERCISES.—(1) In carrying out the program under subsection (b), each year, the Secretary of each military department shall conduct a vulnerability exercise to assess and to the degree feasible quantify the potential impact of current and projected risks to military installation resilience at no fewer than five military installations and identify information gaps necessary to improve military installation resilience planning under section 2864(c) of this title.

‘(2) The Secretary of each military department shall conduct and conduct exercises under paragraph (1) in coordination with the following:

‘(A) The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.

‘(B) The Secretary of Energy, acting through the director of the Resilience Optimization Center of the Idaho National Laboratory.

‘(C) The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, acting through the Chief of Engineers.

‘(D) Representatives of State, tribal, and local emergency management agencies, including the heads of such agencies, as appropriate.

‘(E) Representatives of State, tribal, and local areas with expertise, oversight, or responsibility for the critical infrastructure sectors described in subsection (b).

‘(F) Representatives of private service providers serving critical infrastructure sectors described in subsection (b).

‘(G) Representatives of non-governmental organizations and local colleges and universities with access to the planning tools to provide local-level vulnerability analysis to assess current and projected critical infrastructure vulnerabilities inside and outside of the military installation.

‘(H) The heads of such other Federal or State departments or agencies as the Secretary of Energy determines appropriate for conducting the exercise under paragraph (1).

‘(3) Each exercise under paragraph (1) shall model and analyze interdependency vulnerabilities related to military installation infrastructure and community infrastructure using a uniform method that seeks to compare, to the extent appropriate and applicable, the following:

‘(A) All hazards analysis that models military installation infrastructure and community infrastructure in a regionally linked system to assess the current and projected risks and consequences of manmade and natural disasters on those systems inside and outside of the military installation.

‘(B) Science-based analysis that provides for enhanced modeling of current and projected infrastructure risks to military infrastructure resilience within the boundaries of the military installation.

‘(4) The Secretary of each military department shall conduct an exercise under paragraph (1) in a manner described in paragraph (2) any information, in an appropriate form, that is used to develop the exercises described in paragraph (1), including—

‘(A) projections from reliable and authorized sources used for the military installation resilience component of the installation master plans of the Department of Defense under section 2864 of this title;

‘(B) modeling and analytical products described in paragraph (1), and

‘(C) any additional material used to conduct the exercises under paragraph (1).

‘(d) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of each military department shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the conducted under this section, including the assessments conducted under subsection (b) and the exercises conducted under subsection (c), during the year preceding the report.

‘(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

‘(A) The name and location of each military installation where an assessment and exercise was conducted under this section in the year covered by the report, including a list of stakeholders engaged as part of each exercise under subsection (c).

‘(B) The name and location of where each military department plans to conduct assessments and exercises under this section in the following year.

‘(C) An analysis of what current and future risks the assessments and exercises addressed, quantified for each military installation and what information gaps, if any, persist following the assessment and exercise.

‘(D) An explanation of how the Secretary concerned will address any persistent information gaps identified under subparagraph (C).

‘(E) An explanation of how the assessments and exercises under subsection (b) informed or will inform military installation resilience projects under section 2815 of this title.

‘(F) A plan by applicable authorities to mitigate vulnerabilities to military installation infrastructure and community infrastructure, including under section 2391(d) of this title.

‘(G) Representatives of non-governmental organizations and local colleges and universities with access to the planning tools to provide local-level vulnerability analysis to assess current and projected critical infrastructure vulnerabilities inside and outside of the military installation.

‘(H) The heads of such other Federal or State departments or agencies as the Secretary of Energy determines appropriate for conducting the exercise under paragraph (1).

‘(3) Each exercise under paragraph (1) shall model and analyze interdependency vulnerabilities related to military installation infrastructure and community infrastructure using a uniform method that seeks to compare, to the extent appropriate and applicable, the following:

‘(A) All hazards analysis that models military installation infrastructure and community infrastructure in a regionally linked system to assess the current and projected risks and consequences of manmade and natural disasters on those systems inside and outside of the military installation.

‘(B) Science-based analysis that provides for enhanced modeling of current and projected infrastructure risks to military infrastructure resilience within the boundaries of the military installation.

‘(4) The Secretary of each military department shall conduct an exercise under paragraph (1) in a manner described in paragraph (2) any information, in an appropriate form, that is used to develop the exercises described in paragraph (1), including—

‘(A) projections from reliable and authorized sources used for the military installation resilience component of the installation master plans of the Department of Defense under section 2864 of this title;

‘(B) modeling and analytical products described in paragraph (1), and

‘(C) any additional material used to conduct the exercises under paragraph (1).

SA 1773. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Subtitle ___READI Act

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE. This subtitle may be cited as the “Reliable Emergency Alert Distribution Improvement Act of 2020” or “READI Act.”

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS. In this subtitle—

(a) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(b) the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission;

(c) the term “Emergency Alert System” means the national public warning system, the rules for which are set forth in title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and


SEC. 03. WIRELESS EMERGENCY ALERT SYSTEM OVERRIDES. (a) AMENDMENT.—Section 602(b)(2)(E) of the Warning, Alert, and Response Network Act (47 U.S.C. 1201(b)(2)(E)) is amended—

(1) by striking the second and third sentences; and

(2) by striking “other than an alert issued by the President.” and inserting the following: “other than an alert issued by—

(i) the President; or

(ii) the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, in consultation with the Administrator, shall adopt regulations to implement the amendment made by subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 04. STATE EMERGENCY ALERT SYSTEM PLANS AND EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEES. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “SECC” means a State Emergency Communications Committee;

(2) the term “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any possession of the United States; and

(3) the term “State EAS Plan” means a State Emergency Alert System Plan.

(b) STATE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall adopt regulations that—

(1) encourage the chief executive of each State to establish a SECC if the State does not have an SECC; or

(2) require the States to have an SECC.

(A) To establish an SECC if the State does not have an SECC; or

(B) If the State has an SECC, to review the composition and governance of the SECC.

(c) Provide that—

(1) each SECC, not less frequently than annually, shall—

(i) meet to review and update its State EAS Plan;

(ii) certify to the Commission that the SECC has met as required under clause (i); and

(iii) submit to the Commission an updated State EAS Plan;

(B) Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Commission receives an updated State EAS Plan under subparagraph (A)(iii), the Commission shall—

(i) approve or disapprove the updated State EAS Plan; and

(ii) notify the Chief of the State of the Commission’s findings; and

(3) establish a State EAS Plan content checklist for SECCs to use when reviewing a State EAS Plan for submission to the Commission under paragraph (2)(A).
SEC. 05. INTEGRATED PUBLIC ALERT AND WARNING SYSTEM GUIDANCE.

(a) In General.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall develop and issue guidance on how State, Tribal, and local governments can participate in the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States described in section 526 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 321) (referred to in this section as the "public alert and warning system") while maintaining the integrity of the public alert and warning system, including—

(1) guidance on the categories of public emergencies and appropriate circumstances that warrant an alert and warning from State, Tribal, and local governments using the public alert and warning system;

(2) procedures for State, Tribal, and local government officials to authenticate civil emergencies and initiate, modify, and cancel alerts transmitted through the public alert and warning system, including protocols and technology capabilities for—

(A) the initiation, or prohibition on the initiation, of alerts by a single authorized or unauthorized individual;

(B) testing a State, Tribal, or local government incident management and warning tool without accidentally initiating an alert through the public alert and warning system; and

(C) steps a State, Tribal, or local government official should take to mitigate the possibility of a false alert through the public alert and warning system;

(3) the standardization, functionality, and interoperability of incident management and warning tools used by State, Tribal, and local governments to notify the public of an emergency through the public alert and warning system;

(4) the annual training and recertification of emergency management personnel on requirements for originating and transmitting an alert through the public alert and warning system;

(5) the procedures, protocols, and guidance concerning the protective action plans that State, Tribal, and local governments should issue to the public following an alert issued under the public alert and warning system; and

(6) the procedures, protocols, and guidance concerning the communications that State, Tribal, and local governments should issue to the public following a false alert issued under the public alert and warning system;

(7) a plan by which State, Tribal, and local government officials may, during an emergency, contact each other as well as Federal officials and participants in the Emergency Alert System and the Wireless Emergency Alert System, when appropriate and necessary, by telephone, text message, or other means of communication; and

(8) any other procedure the Administrator determines appropriate for maintaining the integrity of the public alert and warning system.

(b) Coordination With National Advisory Council on Radiation.—The Administrator shall ensure that the guidance developed under subsection (a) do not conflict with recommendations made for improving the public alert and warning system provided in the report submitted by the National Advisory Council on Radiation under section 2(b)(7)(B) of the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System Modernization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–143; 130 Stat. 332).

(c) Public Consultation.—In developing the guidance under subsection (a), the Administrator shall ensure appropriate public consultation and, to the extent practicable, coordinate the development of the guidance with stakeholders of the public alert and warning system, including—

(1) appropriate personnel from Federal agencies, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Commission;

(2) representatives of State and local governments and emergency services personnel, who shall be selected from among individuals nominated by national organizations representing those governments and personnel;

(3) representatives of federally recognized Indian Tribes and national Indian organizations;

(4) communications service providers;

(5) vendors, developers, and manufacturers of systems, facilities, equipment, and capabilities for the provision of communications services;

(6) third-party service bureaus;

(7) the national organization representing the licensees and permittees of noncommercial broadcast television stations;

(8) technical experts from the broadcasting industry;

(9) educators from the Emergency Management Institute; and

(10) other individuals with technical expertise as the Administrator determines appropriate.

(d) Inapplicability of FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the public consultation with stakeholders under subsection (c).

(e) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to amend, supplement, or abridge the authority of the Commission under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or in any other manner give the Administrator authority to require other commercial service providers participating in the Emergency Alert System or the Wireless Emergency Alert System.

SEC. 06. FALSE ALERT REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, in consultation with the Administrator, shall complete a rulemaking proceeding to establish a system to receive from the Administrator or State, Tribal, or local governments reports of false alerts under the Emergency Alert System or the Wireless Emergency Alert System, and for other purposes described in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, as follows:

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 1774. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 382. PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTING WALLS, FENCES, OR ASSOCIATED ROADS ON SOUTHERN BORDER OF UNITED STATES.

The Secretary of Defense may not use any of the amounts authorized in this Act to—

(1) provide support under section 284 of the United States Code, or in any other manner, with the construction of a wall or fence on the southern border of the United States or a road associated with such a wall or fence; or

(2) undertake a construction project under section 2808 of such title in connection with the construction of such a wall, fence, or road; or

(3) otherwise construct or provide support for the construction of such a wall, fence, or road.

SA 1775. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 384. MODIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFER OF UN-USED ENTITLEMENT TO POST-911 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) Modification of Eligibility Requirements.—

(1) In General.—Subsection (b) of section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Eligible Individuals.—An individual referred to in subsection (a) is an individual who, at the time of the approval of the individual's request to transfer entitlement to educational assistance under this section—"

(1) has completed at least 10 years of service in the unified services, not fewer than six of which were in service in the Armed Forces;

(2) is a member of the unified services who—

(A) is not an individual described in paragraph (1); or

(B) has served at least six years in the Armed Forces;

(3) enters into an agreement to serve as a member of the unified services for a period that is no less than the difference between—

"(A) the number of years of service that the individual transferred, and

"(B) the number of years of service that the individual would have served in the Armed Forces under this Act and any previous Act relating to transfers of entitlement to Educational Assistance for Members of the Unified Services, if the individual had not transferred such entitlement into the program established by this Act.

"(c) Repeal.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.
CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF SERVICE-MEMBER AND VETERAN DISPUTES

Sec. 401. Definitions.

402 No validity or enforceability.

**401. Definitions.**—In this chapter—

(1) the term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means an agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement; and

(2) the term ‘predispute joint-action waiver’ means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one or more parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

402 No validity or enforceability

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to a dispute relating to disputes arising under chapter 43 of title 38 or the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.).

(b) Applicability.—

(1) In General.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the parties resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

(2) Collective Bargaining Agreements.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an employer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.

(c) Technical and Conforming Amendments—

(1) In General.—Title 9, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1 by striking ‘‘of seamen,’’

(B) in section 208—

(i) in the section heading, by striking ‘‘under subsection (b)(1);’’

(ii) replacing ‘‘under subsection (b)(1)’’ with ‘‘under subsection (b)(1)’’; and

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(b) Modification of time to transfer.—

(1) In General.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of such section is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) Time for transfer.—Subject to the time limitation for use of entitlement under section 3232 of this title, and except as provided in subsection (k), an individual approved to transfer entitlement to educational assistance under this section may transfer such entitlement at any time.’’;

(c) Section 202—

(1) In General.—Subsection (c)(1)(B) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(B) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m) and redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (l).’’;

(d) Modification of section 203—

(1) In General.—Subsection (c)(4) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(4) In the section heading, by striking ‘‘predispute arbitration agreement’’ and inserting ‘‘predispute joint-action waiver’’; and

(2) by omitting the period at the end and adding a comma after the word ‘‘predispute joint-action waiver’’.

(e) Section 203A—

(1) In General.—Subsection (g)(2)(B) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(B) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g) and redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h).’’;

(f) Modification of section 204—

(1) In General.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(d) by redesigning paragraph (B) as paragraph (C).’’;

(g) Modification of section 205—

(1) In General.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(c) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).’’;

(h) Modification of section 205A—

(1) In General.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(c) by redesigning paragraph (B) as paragraph (C) and redesigning paragraph (C) as paragraph (B).’’;

(i) Modification of section 206—

(1) In General.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended to read—

‘‘(2) by redesigning paragraph (B) as paragraph (C) and redesigning paragraph (C) as paragraph (B).’’

SEC. 644. LIMITATION ON WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND WAIVER OF PROTECTION AGAINST DELIBERATE DECEIT.

(a) Amendments.—Section 107(a)(1) of chapter 2 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following—

‘‘(208. Application).’’;

(b) Chapter 2.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following—

‘‘(208. Application).’’;

(c) Table of Chapters.—The table of chapters of title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

| 4. Arbitration of servicemember and veteran disputes | 401 |

SEC. 645. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle, and the amendments made by this subtitle, shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1777. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title VI, add the following:

Subtitle E—Arbitration Rights of Members of the Armed Forces and Veterans

SEC. 641. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ‘‘Justice for Servicemembers Act’’.

SEC. 642. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) to ensure predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of disputes arising from claims brought under chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.), and

(2) to prohibit agreements and practices that interfere with the right of persons to participate in a joint, class, or collective action related to disputes arising from claims brought under the provisions of the laws described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 643. ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES INVOLVING THE RIGHTS OF SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

(a) In General.—Title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(c) if it is made after a specific dispute has arisen or after February 1, 2010.

(b) Section 1725(f) of title 38, United States Code.

(c) Section 1725(f) means the meaning given those terms in section 1725(f) of title 38, United States Code.

(d) Section 1725(f) and the definitions of title 38, United States Code, in section 1725(f) mean the meanings given those terms in section 1725(f) of title 38, United States Code.

(2) Reimbursement Request.—The term ‘‘reimbursement request claim by a veteran for reimbursement of a copayment’’ means the following:

A claim by a veteran for reimbursement of a copayment, deductible, coinsurance, or similar

SEC. 645. APPLICABILITY.

This subtitle, and the amendments made by this subtitle, shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1777. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
payment for emergency treatment furnished to the veteran in a non-Department of Veterans Affairs facility and made by a veteran who had coverage under a health-plan contract. In such cases, the value of emergency treatment that was rejected or denied by the Department of Veterans Affairs, whether the rejection or denial was final or not.

SA 1778. Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 355. REPORT ON HAZARDOUS WASTE INCINERATORS USED TO DISPOSE OF PERFLUOROALKYL AND PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES AND PERFLUOROOROCANIC ACID.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that identifies each hazardous waste incinerator used by the Department of Defense to dispose of perfluoroalkyl substances, polyfluoroalkyl substances, and perfluoroocanic acid.

SA 1779. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE CYBER COOPERATION WITH SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may carry out a pilot program—

(1) to enhance the cyber security, resiliency, and readiness of United States partners in Southeast Asia; and

(2) to increase regional cooperation between the United States and Southeast Asian countries on cyber issues.

(b) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall identify no fewer than three pilot countries in Southeast Asia, including Vietnam, in which the pilot program under subsection (a) may be carried out.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The activities of the pilot program under subsection (a) may include the following:

(1) Provision of training to cybersecurity and computer science professionals in the pilot countries identified under subsection (a);

(2) An expansion of the capacity of organizations involved in the training of such cybersecurity and computer science professionals;

(3) The facilitation of regular policy dialogues between and among the United States Government and the governments of such pilot countries with respect to the development of infrastructure to protect against cyber attacks.

(4) An evaluation of legal and other barriers to reforms relevant to cybersecurity and technology in such pilot countries.

(5) A feasibility study on establishing a public-private partnership to develop cloud-computing capacity in such pilot countries and in Southeast Asia more broadly.

(6) The development of cooperative exercises, to be carried out in future years, to enhance collaboration between the United States Government and the governments of such pilot countries.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 to carry out this section.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) DESIGN OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than June 1, 2021, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the design of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(2) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program under subsection (a) that includes—

(A) a description of the activities conducted and the results of such activities; and

(B) an assessment of legal and other barriers to reforms relevant to cybersecurity and technology in the pilot countries identified under subsection (a).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 to carry out this section.

(g) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance, Navy, and available for SAG ICCS for military information support operations, is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

(h) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1780. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows: At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. PILOT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE CYBER COOPERATION WITH SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish a pilot program—

(1) to enhance the cyber security, resiliency, and readiness of United States partners in Southeast Asia; and

(2) to increase regional cooperation between the United States and Southeast Asian countries on cyber issues.

(b) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall identify not fewer than three pilot countries in Southeast Asia, including Vietnam, in which the pilot program under subsection (a) may be carried out.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The activities of the pilot program under subsection (a) may include the following:

(1) Provision of training to cybersecurity and computer science professionals in the pilot countries identified under subsection (a);

(2) An expansion of the capacity of organizations involved in the training of such cybersecurity and computer science professionals.

(3) The facilitation of regular policy dialogues between and among the United States Government and the governments of such pilot countries.

(4) An evaluation of legal and other barriers to reforms relevant to cybersecurity and technology in such pilot countries.

(5) A feasibility study on establishing a public-private partnership to develop cloud-computing capacity in such pilot countries and in Southeast Asia more broadly.

(6) The development of cooperative exercises, to be carried out in future years, to enhance collaboration between the United States Government and the governments of such pilot countries.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) DESIGN OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than June 1, 2021, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the design of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(2) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the pilot program under subsection (a) that includes—

(A) a description of the activities conducted and the results of such activities; and

(B) an assessment of legal and other barriers to reforms relevant to cybersecurity and technology in the pilot countries identified under subsection (a).

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 to carry out this section.

(g) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for operation and maintenance, Navy, and available for SAG ICCS for military information support operations, is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

(h) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1781. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to
the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

SEC. 79B. LIMITATION ON ALTERATION OF AN/SPY-6 RADAR.

(a) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States shipbuilding and supporting industrial base constitute a national security imperative that is unique and must be protected;

(2) a healthy and efficient industrial base continues to be a fundamental driver for achieving and sustaining a successful shipbuilding procurement strategy;

(3) without consistent and continuous commitment to steady and predictable acquisition profiles, the industrial base will struggle and some elements may not survive; and

(4) proposed reductions in the future-years defense program for DDG–51 Destroyer procurement profile without a clear transition to procurement of the next Large Surface Combatant would adversely affect the shipbuilding base and long-term strategic objectives of the Navy.

(b) Limitation.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may not deplete from the 2016 Navy Force Structure Assessment to implement the results of a new force structure assessment or new annual long-range plan for construction of new Destroyer vessels that base reduce the requirement for Large Surface Combatants to fewer than 104 such vessels until the date on which the Secretary of the Navy submits to the congressional defense committees the certification under paragraph (1) and the report under subsection (c).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The certification referred to in paragraph (1) is a certification, in writing, that each of the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) the large surface combatant shipbuilding industrial base and supporting vendor base would not significantly deteriorate due to a reduced procurement profile.

(B) the shipbuilders of large surface combatants will remain viable, in terms of sufficient new construction ship procurement, to construct the next class of Large Surface Combatants.

(C) The Navy can mitigate the reduction in anti-air and ballistic missile defense capabilities due to a reduced number of DDG–51 Destroyers with the advanced AN/SPY–6 radar in the next three decades.

(c) Report.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) a description of likely detrimental impacts large surface combatant shipbuilding industrial base and the Navy’s plan to mitigate any such impacts if the fiscal year 2021 future-years defense program were implemented;

(2) a review of the benefits to the Navy fleet of the new AN/SPY–6 radar to be deployed aboard Flight III variant DDG–51 Destroyers currently under construction, as well as an analysis of impacts to the fleet’s warfighting capabilities, should the number of such destroyers be reduced; and

(3) a plan to fully implement section 131 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116–92), including subsystem prototyping efforts and funding by fiscal year.

SA 1782. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 80B. STUDY AND REPORT ON SURGE CAPACITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO ESTABLISH NEGATIVE AIR ROOM CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS IN MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES.

(a) Study.—The Director of the Defense Health Agency shall conduct a study on the use, operation, and performance for commercial off the shelf negative air pressure room containment systems in order to improve pandemic preparedness at military medical treatment facilities worldwide, to include an assessment of whether such systems would improve the readiness of the Department of Defense to expand capability and capacity to treat patients at such facilities during a pandemic.

(b) Report.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1785. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 901. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON HANDLING BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF DISABILITY-RELATED BENEFITS CLAIMS BY VETERANS WITH TYPE 1 DIABETES WHO WERE EXPOSED TO A HERBICIDE AGENT.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on how the Department of Veterans Affairs has handled claims for disability-related benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with type 1 diabetes who have been exposed to a herbicide agent (as defined in section 1116(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code).

SA 1786. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 101. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HOSPITAL CARE, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND NURSING HOME CARE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO INCLUDE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.

Section 1710(a)(2)(E) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “of the Mexican border period or of World War I” and inserting “of—

(i) the Mexican border period;

(ii) World War I; or

(iii) World War II.”.

SA 1784. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle P of title V, add the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT ON REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS ON AWARD OF MEDALS OR COMMISSIONS TO HANDLERS OF MILITARY WORKING DOGS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the regulations and other procedures prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments in order to implement and carry out the programs of the military departments on the award of medals or other honors to handlers of military working dogs required by section 582 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (10 U.S.C. 232; 132 Stat. 1787).
of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BY THIS ACT; ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INVEST IN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.

(a) In General.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act is—

(i) the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act (other than for military personnel and the Defense Health Program); minus

(ii) the amount equal to 14 percent of the aggregate amount described in paragraph (a); or

(b) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(i) be applied on a pro rata basis against each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned; and

(ii) be applied on a pro rata basis by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Treasury a grant program through which the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, provide grants to eligible entities in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) PURPOSES.—

(A) PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds for any of the following:

(i) To construct, renovate, retrofit, or perform maintenance with respect to an affordable housing unit, a public school, a childcare facility, a community health center, a public hospital, a library, or a clean drinking water facility if any such building or facility is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ii) To remove contaminants, including lead, from infrastructure with respect to the jurisdiction of the eligible entity if that infrastructure is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iii) To replace, remove, or renovate a vacant or blighted property that is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iv) To hire public school teachers to reduce class size at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(v) To increase the pay of teachers at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vi) To provide nutritious meals to children and parents who live within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vii) To provide free tuition to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity to attend public institutions of higher education, including vocational and trade schools.

(viii) To provide rental assistance to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ix) To reduce or eliminate homelessness within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(B) IMPERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may not use grant funds—

(i) to construct a law enforcement facility, including a prison or a jail; or

(ii) to purchase a vehicle for a law enforcement agency.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term ''eligible entity'' means—

(i) a county government with respect to a high-poverty county; or

(ii) a local or municipal government within the jurisdiction of which there are fewer than 5 high-poverty neighborhoods; and

(B) the term ''high-poverty county'' means a county that contains high-poverty neighborhoods.

(d) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use grant funds to carry out projects that—

(i) are consistent with the purposes and goals stated in this section;

(ii) address the needs of communities in the jurisdiction of the eligible entity; and

(iii) have a project budget of not less than $5 million.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional committees an initial report on the activities of the Department of the Treasury to carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).

(f) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BY THIS ACT; ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INVEST IN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.

(a) In General.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act is—

(i) the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act (other than for military personnel and the Defense Health Program); minus

(ii) the amount equal to 14 percent of the aggregate amount described in paragraph (a); or

(iii) the amount described in subparagraph (a); or

(iv) the amount available to such department, agency, or element for the fiscal year in which such determination is made shall be equal to—

(A) the amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for such department, agency, or element for the fiscal year; minus

(B) the lesser of—

(i) an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) $100,000,000; or

(v) the amount unavailable to such department, agency, or element for that fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be applied on a pro rata basis against each program, project, and activity of such department, agency, or element in that fiscal year; and

(B) the amount described in subparagraph (a); or

(ii) $100,000,000; or

(v) the amount unavailable to such department, agency, or element for that fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be applied on a pro rata basis against each program, project, and activity of such department, agency, or element in that fiscal year; and

(C) the term ''high-poverty neighborhood'' means a neighborhood that contains high-poverty neighborhoods, an Indian Tribe that exercises jurisdiction over land under the Indian Reorganization Act, and the Department of the Treasury shall provide grants to eligible entities in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(i) be applied on a pro rata basis among each account and fund for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act (other than for military personnel and the Defense Health Program); and

(ii) be applied on a pro rata basis by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).
among the accounts and funds for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act (other than military personnel and the Defense Health Program), and shall be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned.

SA 1791. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 6. ASSISTANCE FOR DEPLOYMENT-RELATED SUPPORT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING DEPLOYMENT AND THEIR FAMILIES BEYOND THE YELLOW RIBBON RE-INTEGRATION PROGRAM.

Section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2572) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsection (k):

"(k) SUPPORT BEYOND PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide funds to States, Territories, and government entities to carry out programs, and other activities as the Secretary considers appropriate, that provide deployment cycle information, services, and referrals to members of the armed forces and their families, throughout the deployment cycle. Such programs may include the provision of access to outreach services, including the following:

(1) Employment counseling.

(2) Behavioral health counseling.

(3) Suicide prevention.

(4) Housing advocacy.

(5) Financial counseling.

(6) Referrals for the receipt of other related services.".

SA 1792. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 7. LIMITATION ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO CAMEROON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no Federal funds may be obligated or expended to provide any security assistance or to engage in any security cooperation with respect to military and security forces of Cameroon until the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of Congress that such military and security forces—

(1) have demonstrated significant progress in abiding by international human rights standards and preventing abuses in the Anglophone conflict; and

(2) are not using any United States assistance in carrying out such abuses.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), Federal funds may be obligated or expended to conduct or support programs providing training and equipping to national security forces of Cameroon for the purposes of counterterrorism operations in the fight against Boko Haram.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 1795. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 573. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROMOTE MILITARY READINESS IN THE PROVISION OF PROSTHETIC AND ORTHOTIC CARE.

(a) GRANTS REQUIRED.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of awarding grants to institutions determined by the Secretary to be eligible for the award of such grants to enable such institutions to establish or expand an existing accredited master’s degree program in orthotics and prosthetics.

(2) Priority.—The Secretary shall give priority to the award of grants under this section to institutions that have entered into a partnership with a public or private sector entity, including a facility administered by the Department of Defense, that provides training or experience in meeting the unique needs of members of the Armed Forces who have experienced limb loss or limb impairment, including by offering clinical rotations at a public or private sector orthotics and prosthetics practice that serves members of the Armed Forces or veterans.

(3) FUTURE PREFERENCE.—In fiscal years after fiscal year 2021, the Secretary shall give preference in the award of grants under this section to institutions that have demonstrated a willingness and ability to participate in a partnership described in subsection (a)(2); and

(b) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals from institutions eligible for grants under this section.

(2) APPLICATION.—An institution that seeks the award of a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary thereat by such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(A) a demonstration of a willingness and ability to participate in a partnership described in subsection (a)(2); and

(B) a demonstration of the ability to achieve and maintain an accredited orthotics and prosthetics program after the end of the grant period.

(c) GRANT USES.—An institution awarded a grant under this section shall use grant amounts for any purpose as follows:

(1) To establish or expand an accredited orthotics and prosthetics master’s degree program.

(2) To train doctoral candidates in orthotics and prosthetics, or in fields related...
to orthotics and prosthetics, to prepare such candidates to instruct in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(3) To train and retain faculty in orthotics and prosthetics education, or in fields related to orthotics and prosthetics education, to prepare such faculty to instruct in orthotics and prosthetics programs.

(4) To acquire equipment for orthotics and prosthetics education.

(5) To acquire equipment for orthotics and prosthetics education.

(a) Period of Use of Funds.—An institution awarded a grant under this section shall give preference to veterans in admission to the master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics established or expanded under this section.

(b) Limitation on Grant Amount.—The amount of any grant awarded to an institution under this section may not exceed $3,000,000.

(c) Admissions Preference.—To the extent practicable, an institution awarded a grant under this section shall give preference to veterans in admission to the master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics established or expanded under this section.

(d) Admissions Preference.—To the extent practicable, an institution awarded a grant under this section shall give preference to veterans in admission to the master's degree program in orthotics and prosthetics established or expanded under this section.

(e) Limitation on Grant Amount.—The amount of any grant awarded to an institution under this section may not exceed $3,000,000.

(f) Period of Use of Funds.—An institution awarded a grant under this section may use the grant amount for a period of three years after the award of the grant.

(g) Period of Use of Funds.—An institution awarded a grant under this section may use the grant amount for a period of three years after the award of the grant.

(1) In General.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program conducted under this section.

(2) Report Required.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of the pilot program and other such matters relating to the pilot program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at a time to be determined, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

NEIL A. ARMSTRONG TEST FACILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate:

(a) Redesignation.—The NASA John H. Glenn Research Center at Plum Brook Station, Ohio, is hereby redesignated as the NASA John H. Glenn Research Center at the Neil A. Armstrong Test Facility.

(b) References.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the station referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “NASA John H. Glenn Center at the Neil A. Armstrong Test Facility.”

(c) Savings.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the relationship between the Plum Brook Station and the NASA John H. Glenn Research Center.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provision of rule XXII, the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, be considered. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate:

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 25, 2020. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provision of rule XXII, the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, be considered. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate:

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate:

Nominees:}

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

(1) Neil A. Armstrong, through his own definition, was first and foremost as a test pilot.

(2) A native of Wapakoneta, Ohio, Armstrong began his inspiring career in space exploration in Cleveland, Ohio, at what is now the NASA John H. Glenn Research Center.

(3) Becoming an expert in land a spacecraft, and then set foot upon, the moon, represents the greatest dream of any test pilot.

(4) Therefore, it is fitting that the premier aeronautics and space test station in Ohio should be renamed in his honor.

(5) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

(6) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

(7) The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

(8) The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at a time to be determined, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

(9) The President pro tempore may designate a committee to conduct a hearing.

(10) The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

(11) The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

(12) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

(13) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

(14) The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

(15) The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.
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CONGRATULATING DARIN LANDRY AS ARKANSAS PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Darin Landry of Lakeside High School in Hot Springs for his recent recognition as the 2020 Arkansas Principal of the Year. Landry was given this award by the Arkansas Association of Secondary School Principals (AASSP) in recognition of his years of service and his innovative techniques for educating Arkansas students.

Among Landry’s successes as an educator is the Second Chance Policy program in which students found to be in possession or under the influence of drugs at school are given the opportunity for community service hours and access to drug and alcohol abuse programs. In addition, he has implemented a “restorative justice program” in which educators implement alternative methods of discipline to see students succeed and decrease student suspensions and expulsions.

Landry has worked extensively with the rest of the school district and with the community to start projects such as the Lakeside Legacy Program, the Project Search program which provides onsite job training, and the Future of Lakeside Committee dedicated to determining a new method of ranking students.

It is clear from Landry’s years of work that his goal is to seek a better learning environment for these students. I take this time to thank him for his commitment to our community’s youngest minds and to congratulate him on this high honor.

RECOGNIZING THE PALISADES FOURTH OF JULY PARADE

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Washington, D.C. Palisades Citizens Association and the annual Palisades Fourth of July parade. I have walked in this parade ever since I was elected, and I deeply regret that the pandemic will keep us from coming together this year to celebrate the 54th anniversary of the parade.

Begun in 1966, the annual Palisades Fourth of July Parade is a time-honored District of Columbia tradition. Each year, the parade, organized by the Palisades Citizens Association, kicks off at 11:00 a.m. and proceeds along MacArthur Boulevard NW from the firehouse on Whitehaven Parkway NW to the Palisades Recreation Center. Last year, I was happy to participate alongside the D.C. Girl Scouts. A true local celebration, the Palisades parade is complete with artfully crafted floats, local leaders, D.C.’s unforgiving summer heat, dancing, music, watermelon and hot dogs. It is a one-mile walk showcasing D.C.’s best.

As we celebrate July 4th this year, in ways that promote social distancing, it is with a historic accomplishment in tow—House passage of the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, for the first time in American history.

Each year, I encourage D.C. residents to march on July 4th to remind the country that the war to end taxation without representation is not finished. We will not be truly equal with the states until the District achieves statehood, which includes equal representation and full self-government. Last week, we moved close to that goal for the first time in 219 years.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me as we celebrate, in spirit, the 54th annual Palisades Parade and honor the Palisades Citizens Association.

RECOGNIZING THE “ANGELS” OF COLES-MOULTRIE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize four employees of the Coles-Moultrie Electric Cooperative (CMEC) for their efforts in saving a life.

On April 3, 2020, Mitch Stanciu, Bob Schafer, Jim Geldert, and Brock Cook were out on a service call when the customer, a veteran from the Vietnam War, collapsed to the ground. The team rushed over, and Schafer and Stanciu, who both knew first aid, rendered assistance. Immediately an emergency call was transmitted as part of the co-op’s rescue procedure, though with a unique wrinkle. Usually these calls would be made because a worker had made contact with an electric line. This time was different as it was a member of the co-op who needed emergency assistance.

The co-op’s IT chief, David Welsh, heard the call and determined the location of the emergency by using his vehicle’s GPS system to find Stanciu’s truck. Welsh immediately provided the coordinates to EMS personnel and an ambulance arrived within fifteen minutes of the incident first occurring. The victim was transported to the nearest hospital and then airlifted to a second hospital, where surgeons removed a blood clot from the man’s brain.

Madam Speaker, I think the victim’s daughter summarized it best when she called the CMEC workers “angels... who didn’t pause in the face of a crisis,” and it is an honor to stand today to recognize their efforts.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 4 JAMES OLIVER TAYLOR, JR.

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Warrant Officer 4 (CW4) James Oliver Taylor, Jr., a 21-year veteran of the U.S. Army and civil servant. CW4 Taylor served in the Army from 1951 to 1972 and completed assignments in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, Germany, Japan, China, Sicily, Italy, France, Germany, Japan, China,
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HONORING DON GREER
HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I offer
these remarks in honor of Donald Edward
Greer of Blacksburg, Virginia, who passed
away on May 28, 2020 at the age of 96. Mr.
Greer was a career military pilot and a pioneer
in satellite technology.
Mr. Greer was the second of Nellie and
Fred Greer’s seven children and was born in
1924 in Rock Island, Washington. While study-
ing at the University of the Pacific, he met his
wife Lynda. They were married in the college
chapel and enjoyed 64 years of mar-
riage together until her death in 2013. He also
played football during his time at the univer-
sity, participating in the Raisin Bowl and play-
ing alongside future NFL quarterback Eddie
LaBaron.
As a military pilot, Mr. Greer served his
country in two wars and held important re-
 sponsibilities. In World War II, he flew B–29s
from the Mariana Islands. In the Korean War,
he completed 33 missions and more than 300
flying hours with his brother Herb in the same
crew, the only set of family members that
were flying combat missions together. He later
flew the latest aircraft for the Strategic Air
Command, piloted Air Force One for President
Lyndon B. Johnson, and served as the con-
gressional liaison for Secretary of the Air
Force Eugene M. Zuckert. He retired from the
Air Force as a lieutenant colonel.
In 1964, Mr. Greer became Vice President
of Executive Services at Communications Sat-
ellite Corporation. In the heated days of the
Space Race with the Soviet Union, he and the
company’s president, Dr. Joseph Charyk,
devoted their energy to the development of
geosynchronous satellites. They traveled the
world and built support for the endeavor. Sat-
etellite communications would become a build-
ing block of the modern world.
Apart from his work responsibilities, Mr.
Greer enjoyed hunting and fishing. He was a
skilled golfer who played in many tournaments
alongside Dr. Charyk. In his later years, he re-
tired to Blacksburg and became a fan of Vir-
ginia Tech, the alma mater of his daughter
Heather and four of his grandchildren.
He is survived by his daughters Heather
and Rhonda and his husbands Wally and
Mike, six grandchildren, three great-grand-
children, and his younger siblings Harry and
Dallas. I offer my condolences to them up-
on the close of Don Greer’s remarkable life.

HONORING MANUEL KILLEBREW
HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam
Speaker, I rise today to honor a living legend,
a vessel of honor Mr. Manuel Killebrew.
Manuel Killebrew was born on November
11, 1950. He is the sixth child born to the Late
Paul and Naomi B. Killebrew. He spent his
early years in Marks and Lambert MS.
Manuel Killebrew attended and graduated
from Quitman County High School in 1970.
After earning his high school diploma, he re-
ceived a B.A. in Industrial Arts from Jackson
State University in 1974. Manuel still lives in
the home that his father had built for
$4,500.00. He has been married to the love of
his life (Jewel Phipps Killebrew) for 47 years.
They are proud parents of Latonia (Marvin)
Thigpen and Manuel Killebrew Jr. They have
been blessed with four grandchildren and five
great grandchildren. He and his lovely wife
have lived in their retirement home in the Un-
etes States and abroad, most re-
cently to Japan, Hong Kong and Beijing. The
highlight of their trip to Asia was to stand on
the Great Wall of China.
While still in high school, he participated in
a walk out in protest to the unfair treatment of
people of color. Mr. Killebrew was a partici-
patent in the March on Washington. He also
participated in the historic Mule Train. He was
honored as a Man of the Year for the Mule
Train Historical Society.

Down thru the years, Mr. Killebrew has
worked as a grocery stock clerk, janitor, bus
driver, teacher, and education trainer for new
teachers. He currently serves as a
deacon and treasurer for Valley Queen M.B.
Church, and president of Delta Burial. He
serves on North Delta Planning Development,
Quitman County Gala, and the Northwest
Springs on her induction in the Arkansas
Women’s Hall of Fame. Dorothy Morris has
received many well-deserved honors
for her faithful service and unparalleled efforts
to conserve the natural beauty and abundant
wildlife of Tennessee. The Tennessee General
Assembly recognized Ed with a joint resolution
for his mentorship service to the citizens of
the State of Tennessee. In addition, the National
Safe Boating Council inducted him into the
National Boating Safety Hall of Fame, and the
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service honored him
with the Conservation Partner Award.
I ask my colleagues in the United States
House of Representatives to join me in con-
gratulating Ed Carter on his retirement after
five decades of public service. All who have
had the opportunity to enjoy the scenic beauty
of Tennessee’s rolling hills and refreshing
waters can thank Ed for his faithful steward-
ship over the years.

HONORING DOROTHY MORRIS FOR HER INDUCTION INTO THE AR-KANSAS WOMEN’S HALL OF FAME
HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise
today to congratulate Dorothy Morris of Hot
Springs on her induction in the Arkansas
Women’s Hall of Fame. Nominated by the
public and selected by a panel of state lead-
ers, Morris received this honor during a life-
time of philanthropic giving to her community
and native home.
Having grown up modestly in Hot Spring
County, Arkansas, she and her husband, Wal-
ter, focused much of their earnings over the
last thirty years toward philanthropic work. In addition to her work with over 50 nonprofits such as Garvan Woodland Gardens, The Arkansas Rice Depot, and the Hot Springs Documentary Film Festival, she spends much of her time on children and teenagers with organizations like Youth Ranches, THEA Foundation, and more other national programs.

Morris also co-founded the Hot Springs Giving Circle with Don Munro, a fellow Hot Springs citizen, with the effort of dispersing funds to numerous local organizations. She additionally started the Morris Foundation with her late husband, Walter.

Her induction into the Arkansas Women’s Hall of Fame speaks to her incredible influence on the people of our state. I take this time to congratulate her on this high honor and thank her for her lifetime of service to the place we both call home.

REMEMBERING DR. THOMAS F. FREEMAN: EDUCATOR, SCHOLAR, AND LEGENDARY COACH AND TEACHER OF THE ART OF DEBATE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Thomas F. Freeman, who for more than 60 years has been a professor of philosophy at Texas Southern University, which is located in my congressional district.

Dr. Freeman died last week, on Saturday, June 6, 2020, in Houston, Texas at the age of 100 years old but forever young.

In addition to being an educator and scholar of the first rank, Dr. Freeman was world renowned as the legendary coach and teacher of the art of forensic debate and who helped shape the lives of countless young people who were his students, including the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who once held the seat I now hold.

Dr. Freeman’s tools were the spoken word. His canvas was the minds of the brilliant and talented young African Americans seeking a higher education.

A prodigy himself, Dr. Freeman graduated from Virginia Union University at the age of 18 and went on to become a professor at Virginia Union University before his 30th birthday.

He would later receive degrees from Andover Newton Theological School; Harvard University; Chicago Divinity School; the University of Vienna in Austria; and the University of Liberia in Africa.

In 1949, Dr. Freeman was among a group of accomplished academicians of color hired by Texas Southern University (TSU).

That same year he held a debate in his TSU logic class using his own undergraduate experience as a guide.

Debate is defined as a contention by words or arguments; or as a formal discussion of a motion before a deliberative body according to the rules of parliamentary procedure; or a regulated discussion of a proposition between two matched sides.

But to Dr. Freeman, it was much more than a contest; it was a way of life.

Dr. Freeman understood, as did Socrates when he said to Glaucon in Book X of the Republic that “the contest is great my dear Glaucon, greater than it seems—this contest that concerns becoming good or bad.”

Dr. Freeman’s success was informed by his passionate belief that strong debate skills translated into a range of life skills that would serve students in their personal lives and professional careers.

Dr. Freeman’s academic roots in moral philosophy and theology came through in his instruction of his debate team students.

Through the art of debate, Dr. Freeman taught what the ancient Greeks called arete, which is defined as an “activity of the soul in accord with virtue in a complete life.”

As Aristotle explains in the Nicomachean Ethics, happiness comes from exercising the full range of one’s vital powers directed toward excellence.

Virtue and excellence is what Dr. Freeman taught his students and that is why he and they were special.

In 1949, the Texas Southern University students who participated in Dr. Freeman’s debate class were so impressed with their experience that they requested that Dr. Freeman form and coach a team.

Dr. Freeman agreed and founded the Texas Southern University debate program which today is world renowned for its skill and for the number of championships won.

Dr. Freeman was internationally known for his debate coaching prowess and for the prominent Americans who studied under his tutelage.

As noted, among them were the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The debating skills that young Barbara Jordan developed under Dr. Freeman’s tutelage were so formidable that she became the first female to travel with the TSU debate team.

She and her debate partner Otis King participated in and won many awards, including the championship at Baylor University, the first integrated debate match held in the South.

Barbara Jordan went on to become a Texas State Senator and the first Texas African American woman elected to the House of Representatives from my state.

She characterized her experience of learning under his tutelage as having shaped her view of the importance of mastering the skills of debate.

Congresswoman Jordan and Dr. Freeman remained close and upon her death he gave the eulogy at her funeral.

Dr. Freeman’s skill as a debate coach came to the attention of Denzel Washington when he sought a model for the role of a debate coach for his role in the critically acclaimed film “The Great Debaters,” based on life of Melvin B. Tolson, who formed the Wiley College debate team that defeated the University of Southern California (USC) debate team for the 1935 national championship.

One of the students in Dr. Freeman’s class during his tenure as a visiting lecturer at Morehouse University was a young Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. Freeman had such an influential effect on him that years later while he and a group of students happened to be in the same restaurant he was surprised when Dr. King approached his table to say hello and reminded him that he had been a student in his Morehouse class and shared with the students how much that experience shaped his life.

Dr. Freeman’s contributions to the Texas Southern University Community included serving as Founding Dean of both the Weekend College and the Honors College.

Dr. Freeman worked with then TSU President Granville M. Sawyer to develop the program to preserve students as its dean.

The Honors College, renamed in his honor as the Thomas F. Freeman Honors College, was developed for academically gifted and motivated students to provide them with the most rigorous and challenging academic regimen.

In 1972, Dr. Freeman was asked by Rice University to join its faculty after it had desegregated.

Dr. Freeman began a 23-year career association with Rice University. As near as anyone recalls, he was the first African American professor to teach at this prestigious university before returning to TSU where he resumed teaching and leading the TSU debate team to countless victories.

The life of Dr. Thomas F. Freeman reminds us all of the impact a great teacher can have in changing the world for the better through his or her students.

Too often a teaching career is viewed by too many as an option taken by those who cannot excel elsewhere.

But those of us who know better know that it is the great teacher that makes it possible for us to succeed anywhere and in any pursuit.

Dr. Freeman was such a teacher.

But as he lived a full and complete life rooted in excellence, virtue, and service, he also was a minister of the gospel, community leader, husband, father, mentor, and a friend to thousands.

It can truly be said of Dr. Freeman that his has been a consequential life.

That is why Dr. Freeman is legendary and why in memory of this great man that I ask the House to observe a moment of silence as a tribute to Dr. Freeman’s service to Texas Southern University, to America, and to humanity.

RECOGNIZING MS. BAILEY DOWLING

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Bailey Dowling of St. Joseph-Ogden High School, who was named the 2019–20 Gatorade Illinois Softball Player of the Year.

The award, which recognizes not only outstanding athletic excellence, but also high standards of academic achievement and exemplary character demonstrated on and off the field, distinguishes Bailey as Illinois’s best high school softball player. Now a finalist for the prestigious Gatorade National Softball Player of the Year award to be announced in June, Bailey joins an elite alumni association of state award-winners in 12 sports.

Ms. Dowling, who was among the most prestigious award in 2018–19, was one of only two high school athletes on the 2019 USA Softball Junior Women’s National Team that won the U19 World Championships last August. In addition
to her superior achievements on the field, Bailey is an incredibly hard worker off the field, volunteering locally as a youth mentor and softball coach while simultaneously maintaining a 3.33 GPA in her high school classroom. Bailey has signed a national letter of intent to play softball on scholarship at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Bailey on her achievement and wish her continued success in both her athletic and academic careers.

COMMENDING FOURTH DISTRICT STUDENTS FOR UNITED STATES SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor four exceptional students of Arkansas’ Fourth Congressional District. These four young men recently accepted appointments into United States Service Academies, bringing their home district extreme pride in their academic excellence, their desire to serve, and their commitment to patriotism.

I take this time to congratulate Cannon Turner of Arkadelphia on his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy, Jacob Tankersley of Pearcy and Daniel Woolsley of Ozark on their appointments to the United States Military Academy, and Samuel Tabler of Hot Springs Village on his appointment to the United States Naval Academy Preparatory School. These young Arkansans embody qualities of academic excellence and service above self which are necessary for such appointments.

These four young men are a tremendous source of pride not just for their hometowns, but for the entire Fourth Congressional District. Their commitment to excellence is to be commended, but it is their love of country, their defense of liberty, and their pursuit of a free America that truly sets them apart from all others.

I take this time to honor them for their successes, to encourage them on this new pursuit, and to thank them for their example to the rest of the country of what a patriot truly is.

HONORING JIM YOUNG

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of James Marion Young of Salem, Virginia, who passed away on June 12, 2020 at the age of 89. Jim devoted his time and attention to serving the people of his hometown through an impressive array of community and philanthropic organizations.

Jim was born on November 15, 1930. He was educated at Andrew Lewis High School in Salem, where he lettered in football and baseball, and at the University of Virginia, where he earned undergraduate and law degrees. He served in the U.S. Army during the Korean War and remained in the Army Reserves for 22 years, eventually attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Jim’s profession was the law. He practiced for years in Roanoke at Dodson Pence Viner Young & Woodrum as a partner and then in Salem on his own. But he was also occupied with making Salem a better place and improving the lives of its citizens. Among the organizations he led were the Salem Jaycees, Salem Kiwanis, Salem-Roanoke County Bar Association, Salem High School PTAs, Roanoke County Council of PTAs, Salem-Roanoke County Chamber of Commerce, and Roanoke Valley Economic Development Partnership. He chaired the Salem Electoral Board for 15 years and served on the Roanoke College Planned Giving Board. At his church, Salem Presbyterian, to which he belonged for more than 70 years, he served as deacon, elder, trustee, and Sunday School teacher.

The Boy Scouts of America had a special place in his heart. He took pride in the achievement of Eagle Scout rank by two of his grandsons. The organization benefited from his voluntaryism over a span of more than fifty years. He was president of the Blue Ridge Mountains Council and provided it with his services as an attorney for free.

Many organizations and causes in Salem and the greater Roanoke region were served well by Jim, and they honored him in return. He was recognized by the Jaycees with the Distinguished Service Award, by the Boy Scouts with the Silver Beaver Award, and the Economic Development Partnership by being named Citizen of the Year. He was also inducted into the Salem High Alumni Hall of Fame.

Beside his many charitable pursuits, Jim enjoyed playing tennis and proved his skill on the court as a three-year Virginia United States Tennis Association doubles champion in the 75- to 80-year-old division and a two-year champion in the 80-plus age group.

I had the opportunity to know Jim personally, including from our mutual service on the board of the Blue Ridge Mountains Council. He invested a lot of time in his own daughters and the children of the community.

Jim’s family was important to him. He was predeceased by one of his daughters, Cathy Harman. He is survived by his wife of 63 years, Barbara, his daughters Debbie Harris, Becky Garrison, and Cindy Courtright and their husbands as well as Cathy’s husband, and eight grandchildren. I offer my condolences to them on their loss. Many in the Roanoke Valley had their lives improved by Jim’s tireless and selfless service.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON BIGGS

HON. RUBEN GALLEG0
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sadagicous Owens on her selection as one of 44 students nationwide to attend the 50th anniversary of the National Urban and Community Scholars Program (NUCSP). Ms. Owens, a student at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB), joins a community of scholars representing 33 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in the country.

According to the White House, students are nominated by their institution’s president and chosen based on their academic excellence, their professional acumen, their leadership experience and potential, civic involvement, and entrepreneurial spirit.

Due to COVID–19, this year’s scholars will not be able to attend the annual meeting in Washington, D.C., but they will instead be participating in virtual events throughout the year. These scholars and activities will focus on creating a platform in which the scholars can communicate and share ideas about professional pathways, government resources, and best practices on careers and professionalism.
We are honored to have one of America’s finest young scholars in the Fourth Congressional District. Ms. Owens’ success highlights not only her commitment to excellence, but also her example try of what perseverance and a strong work ethic can accomplish.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH A. ZANARDI

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of a distinguished resident of the 18th Congressional District, Joseph A. Zanardi.

Joseph was born on April 16, 1943, and died on May 31, 2020. He was born and raised in Los Gatos, California, and was a proud graduate of Los Gatos High School where he was an outstanding baseball player. After high school he joined the family business founded by his grandfather near the turn of the 20th century. A lifetime of hard work followed, although he was always able to find time to coach local youth baseball teams. Joseph retired from Green Valley Disposal in 1999.

Joseph adored his grandchildren and his dog, and he had a multitude of hobbies including hunting, cars, and taking care of his roses. He was a member of the Los Gatos Lions Club for more than 50 years, and he helped launch the Los Gatos Athletic Association which has raised millions of dollars for Los Gatos High School sports.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Joseph A. Zanardi and in extending our condolences to his wife Elizabeth, his sons and their wives, his grandchildren, and his entire family. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him and he will be remembered fondly by his entire community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2020 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 30
10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the digitization of money and payments.
WEBEX
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine COVID-19 and United States international pandemic preparedness, prevention, and response, focusing on additional perspectives.
VTC
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine COVID-19, focusing on an update on progress toward safely getting back to work and back to school.
SD-G50
10:15 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine 2020 filing season and IRS COVID-19 recovery.
SD-215
2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety
To hold hearings to examine safety on our roads, focusing on an overview of traffic safety and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration grant programs.
SR-253
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in the territories.
SD-366
Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness
To hold hearings to examine censorship as a non-tariff barrier to trade.
SD-215
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.
VTC
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the Judicial Conference’s recommendation for more judgeships.
SD-106
JULY 1
10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine exploring a compensation framework for intercollegiate athletes.
SR-253
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine infrastructure development opportunities to drive economic recovery and resiliency.
SD-106
2:30 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the response and mitigation to the COVID-19 pandemic in Native communities, including S. 3650, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to deem employees of urban Indian organizations as part of the Public Health Service for certain purposes.
SD-562
3 p.m.
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold hearings to examine recruitment, retention and building a resilient veterans health care workforce.
SD-106
HIGHLIGHTS
See Résumé of Congressional Activity for April 2020.

Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S3161–S3276

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 4052–4067.

Measures Reported:
Report to accompany S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. (S. Rept. No. 116–236)

S. 4054, to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act.

Measures Passed:

Neil A. Armstrong Test Facility Act: Senate passed S. 2472, to redesignate the NASA John H. Glenn Research Center at Plum Brook Station, Ohio, as the NASA John H. Glenn Research Center at the Neil A. Armstrong Test Facility.

Measures Considered:
Justice Act—Cloture: By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 126), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3985, to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

Subsequently, Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

National Defense Authorization Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Wednesday, June 24, 2020, a vote on cloture will occur at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, June 25, 2020.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill ripen at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, June 25, 2020.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 25, 2020.

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 125), Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nominations:

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
18 Army nominations in the rank of general.
Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total–126)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:45 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2020. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S3273.)

Committee Meetings

(Business not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, “United States Grain Standards Reauthorization Act of 2020”.

AGRICULTURE LEGISLATION
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 3894, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain private markets, after receiving testimony from Brent Bible, Environmental Defense Fund, Lafayette, Indiana; Zippy Duvall, American Farm Bureau Federation, Greensboro, Georgia; Rob Larew, National Farmers Union, Greenville, West Virginia; and Jason Weller, Truterra LLC, Land O’Lakes, Inc., Arden Hills, Minnesota.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Joyce Louise Connery, of Virginia, and Thomas A. Summers, of Pennsylvania, both to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, and 1,285 military nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

Nomination
Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

FCC Oversight
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission, after receiving testimony from Ajit Pai, Chairman, and Jessica Rosenworcel, Michael O’Rielly, Brendan Carr, and Geoffrey Starks, each a Commissioner, of the Federal Communications Commission.

COVID–19 and Mineral Supply Chains
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the impact of COVID–19 on mineral supply chains, focusing on the role of those supply chains in economic and national security, and challenges and opportunities to rebuild America’s supply chains, after receiving testimony from Nedal T. Nassar, Section Chief, National Minerals Information Center, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Joe Bryan, Atlantic Council Global Energy Center, Hyattsville, Maryland; Mark Caffarey, Umicore USA, Raleigh, North Carolina; Thomas J. Dusterberg, Hudson Institute, Aspen, Colorado; and Simon Moores, Benchmark Mineral Intelligence, London, United Kingdom.

Strategic National Stockpile
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the role of the Strategic National Stockpile in pandemic response, after receiving testimony from Gregory Burel, former Director, Strategic National Stockpile, Department of Health and Human Services, Alpharetta, Georgia; Andrew Phelps, Oregon Office of Emergency Management Director, Salem, on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association; Julie Gerberding, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C.; and Daniel M. Gerstein, RAND Corporation, Arlington, Virginia.

Indian Affairs Legislation
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 2165, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, S. 2716, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act, S. 2912, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land located in Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, S. 3019, to protect access to water for all Montanans, S. 3044, to amend the American’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 to expand the Indian reservation drinking water program, S. 3099, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and S. 1572, to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, after receiving testimony from Timothy R. Petty, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, and Darryl LaCounte, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, both of the Department of the Interior.

Nomination
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of David W.
Dugan and Stephen P. McGlynn, both to be a to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, Hala Y. Jarbou, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, Iain D. Johnston and Franklin Ulyses Valderrama, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Roderick C. Young, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, who was introduced by Senator Kaine, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

**NOMINATION**

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Peter Michael Thomson, of Louisiana, to be Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Kennedy, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

---

**House of Representatives**

**Chamber Action**

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 7301–7325; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 1018–1022, were introduced. Pages H2418–19

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H2420–21

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows: H.R. 3094, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–435); and H. Res. 1017, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1425) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a Improve Health Insurance Affordability Fund to provide for certain reinsurance payments to lower premiums in the individual health insurance market; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5332) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7120) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7301) to prevent evictions, foreclosures, and unsafe housing conditions resulting from the COVID–19 pandemic, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations”; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–436).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Butterfield to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H2417

Recess: The House recessed at 2:03 p.m. and reconvened at 7:03 p.m. Page H2417

Senate Referral: S. 327 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page 2417.

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were no Yea and Nay votes, and there were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

**Committee Meetings**

**A COUNTRY IN CRISIS: HOW DISINFORMATION ONLINE IS DIVIDING THE NATION**

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology; and Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a joint hearing entitled “A Country in Crisis: How Disinformation Online is Dividing the Nation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**EXAMINING THE THREAT FROM ISIS AND AL QAEDA**

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled “Examining the Threat from ISIS and Al Qaeda”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.
OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: POLITICAL INTERFERENCE AND THREATS TO PROSECUTORIAL INDEPENDENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Department of Justice: Political Interference and Threats to Prosecutorial Independence”. Testimony was heard from Aaron S.J. Zelinsky, Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney’s Office, District of Maryland, Department of Justice; John W. Elias, Trial Attorney, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING


GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2020; STATE HEALTH CARE PREMIUM REDUCTION ACT; WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT; PROTECTING YOUR CREDIT SCORE ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY RELATING TO COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT REGULATIONS; EMERGENCY HOUSING PROTECTIONS AND RELIEF ACT OF 2020

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 7120, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020”; H.R. 1425, the “State Health Care Premium Reduction Act” [Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act]; H.R. 51, the “Washington, D.C. Admission Act”; H.R. 5332, the “Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019”; H.R. 5332, the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act”; H.R. 5332, the “Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019”, H.R. 7120, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020”, H.R. 7301, the “Emergency Housing Protections and Relief Act of 2020”, and H.J. Res. 90, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations”. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 51, the “Washington, D.C. Admission Act”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–55, modified by the amendment printed in Part A of the Rules Committee Report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1425, the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act”, under a closed rule. The rule provides three hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–56, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the Rules Committee Report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5332, the “Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–56, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the Rules Committee Report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in
the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7120, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020”, under a closed rule. The rule provides four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part D of the Rules Committee Report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7301, the “Emergency Housing Protections and Relief Act of 2020”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 90, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides that the provisions of section 125(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act shall not apply during the remainder of the 116th Congress. The rule amends H. Res. 967, agreed to May 15, 2020, in section 4, by striking “July 21, 2020” and inserting “July 31, 2020”, in section 11, by striking “calendar day of July 19, 2020” and inserting “legislative day of July 31, 2020”; and in section 12, by striking “July 21, 2020” and inserting “July 31, 2020”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Pallone, Chairman Waters, and Representatives Walden, Estes, Tipton, Norton, Hice of Georgia, Gosar, Bass, Armstrong, Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Cline, Jackson Lee, Schweikert, Stauber, and Perlmutter.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AND SMALL CONTRACTORS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure held a hearing entitled “An Overview of the Dynamic Between the Defense Production Act and Small Contractors”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine Customs and Border Protection, focusing on evolving challenges facing the agency, 9:30 a.m., SD–562/VTC.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 685, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General, S. 3398, to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, and the nominations of Owen McCurdy Cypher, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Michigan, Thomas L. Foster, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Virginia, and Tyreece L. Miller, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Tennessee, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SR–325.

House


Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing on H.R. 1776, the “Captive Primate Safety Act”; H.R. 2264, the “Bear Protection Act of 2019”; H.R. 2492, the “St. Mary’s Reinvestment Act”: H.R. 2871, the “Aquifer Recharge Flexibility Act”; H.R. 3957, to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at Highway–155, Coulee Dam, WA 99116, as the “Nathaniel ‘Nat’ Washington Power Plant”; and H.R. 6761, the “Murder Hornet Eradication Act”, 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.
Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Frontline Feds: Serving the Public During a Pandemic”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Examining the COVID–19 Nursing Home Crisis”, 2 p.m., Webex.
# Résumé of Congressional Activity

**SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS**

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

## DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 3 through April 30, 2020</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days in session</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in session</td>
<td>316 hrs., 29'</td>
<td>166 hrs.38'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of proceedings</td>
<td>$2,193</td>
<td>$2,193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions of Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bills enacted into law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private bills enacted into law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills in conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures passed, total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures reported, total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures pending on calendar</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures introduced, total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint resolutions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum calls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yea-and-nay votes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills vetoed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetoes overridden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 34 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 55 reports have been filed in the House.

## DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 3 through April 30, 2020</th>
<th>Civilian nominees, totaling 226 (including 87 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn .......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Civilian nominees, totaling 744 (including 1 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:</td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force nominees, totaling 1,477, disposed of as follows:</td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army nominees, totaling 2,619 (including 3 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:</td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy nominees, totaling 228 (including 2 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:</td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps nominees, totaling 1,422, disposed of as follows:</td>
<td>Confirmed ........................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ......................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summary*

- Total nominees carried over from the First Session .......... 93
- Total nominees received this Session .................. 6,623
- Total confirmed ...................................... 2,867
- Total unconfirmed ...................................... 3,844
- Total withdrawn ................................................ 5
- Total returned to the White House .................. 0
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, June 25
Senate Chamber
Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4049, National Defense Authorization Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Thursday, June 25
House Chamber
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