



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2020

No. 129

## Senate

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 spirit, grant to this Nation and to all people a social conscience built on the vision of the ancient prophets who saw sufficiency for every person and a time when anxiety would overcome chaos and hopelessness. Hasten the day when the small and weak can make their contributions alongside the great and powerful. Lead us to the day when we will see peace among the Nations of the Earth, when swords shall be beaten into plowshares. Use the Members of this body to bring us to the time when Your will is done on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven.

Lord, we trust You with our future. Let Your glory cover the Earth as the waters cover the sea.

We pray in Your mighty 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. LOEFFLER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

### SREBRENICA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, there is an area in Bosnia that goes by the name of Srebrenica. This month is the 25th anniversary of a massacre that

took place there. It happens to be the worst genocide on European soil since the Holocaust.

Twenty-five years ago, 8,000 Bosnians were murdered out of ethnic and religious hatred. Many Bosnians, who witnessed this horrific atrocity, became refugees and found a home in my State of Iowa. We must remember for those Bosnians, Iowans, and for all Bosnians who suffer as they continue to deal with unimaginable memories. It is also important for the rest of us to make a point of remembering what has happened so we can prevent it from happening again.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this week, the Senate will pass the 60th annual National Defense Authorization Act. Every year, this legislation lets the Senate make our top priorities for protecting our homeland, our allies, and our global interests into law, and, certainly, the recent behavior of our adversaries world over shows why this task is as urgent as ever.

Even as our Nation is focused on fighting the pandemic at home, our servicemembers have contended with dangerous behavior from would-be competitors all around the world. The

Russian military has kept probing the bounds of U.S. airspace, and Putin's regime has kept its sights on cyber war and destabilization by proxy.

China continues to treat international commercial lanes like its own private pond, choke freedom and autonomy out of Hong Kong, and try to ethnically cleanse Xinjiang.

Both countries continue to modernize their military capabilities from sea to space. And Iranian meddling, North Korean saber-rattling, and the persistent violence of terrorist groups like ISIS and al-Qaida demand our attention as well.

Amid these threats and many others, the American people and the entire free world look to the men and women of the U.S. military to preserve order and peace. The open and bipartisan process led by Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED has produced strong legislation that will advance their missions.

It is the product of intense committee work; it contains more than 200 bipartisan amendments; and it builds on the historic progress which this administration and this Republican Senate have secured over the past 3 years.

After years of cuts to our military that weakened readiness, imperiled modernization, and called into question our commitment to preserving our global interests, we have reversed the tide. We have invested in strength. We built a new national defense strategy and are investing in rebuilding and modernizing our military to help achieve it.

This legislation will carry the progress even further—more support for defense research and innovation, resources for military housing and healthcare, tools to deepen our commitments with regional partners in Europe and the Pacific.

For most Americans, investing in the greatest fighting force in the world is not controversial. It is a no-brainer. But lest we forget, the radical energy

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4363

on the far left is sparking some truly extraordinary behavior among our Democratic colleagues.

Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.” This is the junior Senator from Vermont—an essay titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator SANDERS’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our colleague from Vermont, a proposal like this may not be particularly shocking. What is remarkable is that the Democratic leader—the leader of their caucus—felt pressured into endorsing it.

Let me say that again: The Democratic leader, who in almost every floor speech tries to accuse this administration of being too soft on America’s adversaries, wants to literally decimate our defense budget to finance a socialist spending spree.

This turns out to be something of a pattern. On the Democratic side, it sometimes seems like we have hawks when it comes to speeches but chickens when it comes time to make policy. When they are on the sidelines, there is plenty of bark, but whenever they actually call a shot, there is zero bite. Lots of bark, little bite; all hat, no cattle.

That is how we end up with spectacles like the Democratic leader playing as a Russian hawk, when about a decade ago, he was publicly arguing we should cozy up to Putin, send Russia billions of dollars of cash, pull the plug on NATO missile defense pacts that hurt Putin’s feelings, and concede to him, “Russia’s traditional role” in the Caspian Sea region.

That was the Democratic leader in 2008. Pay off Putin, and let him have his sphere of influence. And now today, he wants to decimate defense spending. But in between, he spent years insisting that Democrats want to get tough—want to get tough on foreign policy.

You see how the game works: sound like hawks on television, act like chickens when making policy.

Defense spending demonstrates our will to defend ourselves and our interests in a dangerous world. Keeping our Nation safe is our foremost constitutional duty. We cannot shirk it.

My colleagues who profess concern over Putin’s efforts to interfere in our politics, or Xi’s efforts to rewrite the rules of the international system, must

know that we will never—never be able to deter such behavior if we sell our own soldiers short and surrender our technological edge.

I assure you, Beijing and Moscow will be watching this vote. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reject this far-left fantasy. Defeat this amendment. Throughout the Cold War, we maintained a bipartisan commitment to American strength, American alliances, and a global peace built on American values. We will reinforce that stand when we sink—sink the reckless Sanders-Schumer amendment and again when we pass this bipartisan bill.

#### FREE SPEECH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a final matter, since the spring, our Nation has engaged in important conversations about racial justice in policing.

Most people understand that continuing our Nation’s tremendous progress toward justice does not mean battling against American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them.

Yet a group of radicals have latched onto this moment to say we should repudiate our country itself. We have watched as mobs have dragged statues of Washington, Jefferson, and Grant through the dirt. And, in parallel, inside many elite institutions, self-styled intellectuals say we should similarly discard the basic principles they fought for.

One of the key pillars of our Nation is the rule of law. In a civilized society, the same laws need to apply to everyone. The times our Nation has fallen short on this score, particularly for all the years when Black Americans were completely denied the equal protections of law, it has been to our great shame. This has been central to the cause of civil rights. There is a reason the 14th amendment insists on “the equal protection of the laws.”

Yet, in recent months, local leaders have violated this basic tenet. As riots rocked major cities, we saw politicians decline to act. They seem to fear far-left critique more than looting and chaos. And we saw the uneven application of other rules, like when mayors cheered on mass demonstrations but continued to prohibit religious gatherings. That is the rule of law in jeopardy. Of course, the last example is also a First Amendment issue. And the freedom of expression itself is another principle that has come under threat.

As I said a few weeks back, this goes deeper than just constitutional law. America has always prized the spirit of the First Amendment. We citizens must want to protect an open, civil discourse—a true marketplace of ideas. But, lately, the political left has embraced something totally different.

Today’s far left is not interested in winning debates with better arguments. They prefer to shut down de-

bate all together. They don’t try to win the contest. They just harangue the referees to stop the game. If they don’t like an op-ed, they want it unpublished. If they don’t like a tweet, they want to track down the author and get them fired. If they don’t like a tenured professor, they throw around Orwellian accusations that his or her ideas make them feel unsafe.

This hostile culture is getting results. According to one brand-new survey, it is only the far-left Americans who do not feel compelled to self-censor their views because of a hostile climate. Everyone but the left feels the threat.

And 50 percent of self-identified strong liberals say that simply contributing to the Republican Presidential candidate ought to be a fireable offense for a business leader. Let me say that again. Fifty percent of self-identified strong liberals say that simply contributing to the Republican Presidential candidate ought to be a fireable offense for a business leader. In this country?

We recently saw the New York Times apologize for publishing a straightforward policy argument from a U.S. Senator. Since, an editorial staffer resigned from the paper because even center-left opinions were not liberal enough and led to her constant harassment. That was a recent editorial staffer resigning from the New York Times because her center-left opinions were not liberal enough and led to her constant harassment at the times. You see, the safe spaces only go in one direction.

On elite campuses such as Princeton, we see faculty turning on their tenured colleagues and even administrators weighing in to chastise people with unpopular views.

We see online platforms such as Facebook threatening to ban political advertising altogether, chilling our democracy, because far-left employees and outside pressure groups berate them for letting the very speakers use their platform.

Even at a time when there is significant appetite in Congress to take a second look at the legal protections afforded to those supposedly neutral platforms, they still contemplate giving an angry minority of agitators a veto over Americans’ political speech.

The author Salman Rushdie, who was himself threatened with death for controversial speech, once said this:

Two things form the bedrock of any open society—freedom of expression and rule of law. If you don’t have those things, you don’t have a free country.

Free expression and the rule of law—exactly the two things we have seen eroded in recent months.

Rushdie recently signed an open letter with other intellectuals—many liberals—sounding the alarm on this cultural poison. “Editors are fired,” they wrote, “books are withdrawn . . . journalists are barred from writing on certain topics . . . professors are investigated . . . steadily narrow[ing] the

boundaries of what can be said without the threat of reprisal.”

Well, you can guess what happened next. The grievance industrial complex came after the letter itself. The authors were accused of advancing bigotry and the cycle of nonsense started all over again.

The United States of America needs free speech. We need free expression. And all of us, from all perspectives, need the courage to speak up and defend it.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4049, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Portman) amendment No. 2080 (to amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Democrat Senators returned to Washington on Monday prepared to work in a bipartisan way on the next phase of coronavirus relief.

After stalling for months while COVID-19 surged in more than 40 States, Senate Republicans finally said that now—the end of July, more than 3 months after the CARES Act passed—would be the time for another emergency bill. But here we are. It is in the middle of the week, and the Republican Party is so disorganized, chaotic, and unprepared that they can barely cobble together a partisan bill in their own conference.

Indicative was Leader McConnell's speech. He rants and raves about the

New York Times and cancel culture, but there is not a word about COVID. People are ready to lose their unemployment benefits, to lose their apartments and be evicted. Local governments are laying off people because they don't have the dollars. We are in a national crisis.

We don't hear a word out of Leader McConnell as we are on the edge of so many cliffs. Instead, there is lots of talk about the New York Times and cancel culture. That may be fodder for the far right. That is not what America needs.

When Leader McConnell, at this crucial moment, can't even mention COVID-19, it shows what a knot the Republicans are tied in. The bottom line is this: The White House Chief of Staff said Republicans “were on their own 20 yard line” when it comes to their legislative proposal—their own 20-yard line, 2 months and a week after we passed the COVID 3 bill, after millions more Americans applied for unemployment, after many small businesses went under, and many more died and were hospitalized as COVID-19 rages in many Southern States. We are still on the 20-yard line? Where have the Republicans been?

I have never seen a political party in the middle of a crisis so tied in a knot that the majority leader can't even mention it in his speech and spends time ranting against favorite targets of the far right and can't come up with a proposal.

This is not a game. This isn't typical Republican dysfunction about whether or not they did or didn't see the President's last tweet. The disarray on the Republican side has real consequences. Americans will suffer unnecessary pain and uncertainty because of it.

The only reason there hasn't been another relief package in Congress already is due to this Republican incompetence and reckless delay. Even after all of these months, the White House and Senate Republicans are starkly divided about what to do. The White House is insisting on policies, like a payroll tax cut, that would do nothing to help millions of unemployed Americans and that many Senate Republicans don't even support. The Republicans can't even seem to agree on whether to provide any new aid for State and local governments or if the States should be able to more flexibly use the support we have already given.

A few of my friends on the other side of the aisle hardly want to spend any more money to help our country in this once-in-a-generation crisis because it might add to the national debt. Giant corporate tax cuts—\$1.5 trillion to \$2 trillion of them—are OK, but fighting the greatest public health crisis in a century and forestalling a depression is a bridge too far? Where are the priorities on the other side of the aisle? I guess they are for helping big corporate fat cats—wealthy people—but not average people who are hurting. That is the trouble with the Republican Party.

Seriously, there are only 3 weeks left until the August work period, and the Republicans are still in the opening phases of preparing their bill. We don't have time for this mess that the Republicans are in. The moratorium on evictions that we passed in the CARES Act expires in 2 days. The Wall Street Journal reports that nearly 12 million adults live in households that missed their last rent payments and that 23 million have little or no confidence in their ability to make the next ones.

Next week, the enhanced unemployment benefits we passed in the CARES Act will expire while 20 to 30 million Americans will still be without work. A recent study showed that those enhanced benefits prevented nearly 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty—12 million. Yet, because the Republicans can't get their act together, those benefits might expire next week.

Congress needs to act quickly. The Senate Republicans and the White House need to get on the same page, produce a proposal—not just drop it on the floor but start negotiations. Better yet, we could start negotiations on the Heroes Act, which already passed the House, and, unlike the developing Republican proposal, it would actually match the scale of this crisis.

Speaker Pelosi and I met yesterday with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin. Even with all of this chaos, we have had some indications about what the Republicans are trying to do in their bill. Over the weekend, we heard that the administration was trying to block additional funding for coronavirus testing and contact tracing. President Trump has also ended the CDC's data collection efforts, potentially risking access to data that public health experts so vitally need. So, when we met with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin, Speaker Pelosi and I told them to back off these counterproductive and dangerous ideas.

In addition, we will be sending a letter to the administration to demand answers on how data is being reported to the White House, as well as pushing for legislation in the upcoming bill to ensure that COVID-19 data is fully transparent and accessible without there being any interference from the administration.

We know Donald Trump likes to hide the truth. He thinks, when the truth doesn't come forward and when he muzzles government officials, that it changes things. It doesn't. The virus still rages and will rage unless we do something about it, not simply hide the statistics that show his depth in mendacity. We will make sure that those statistics are made public so all of America, including the President, will know how bad the situation is, because that is what we need—the truth to set us free and then to act on it. Let me repeat: If the administration refuses to reverse course, the Democrats will insist on data transparency in the next COVID relief bill.

All of our efforts to bolster the economy, help the unemployed, save small businesses, and ensure our children are safe at school will be meaningless if we don't stop the spread of the virus. Hiding COVID data from the CDC, as well as foot-dragging on more testing and tracing, is absolutely incomprehensible and imperils everything else we are working on. So we need to make a law, and we need to make it soon. Right now, the infighting and partisanship on the Republican side and cockamamie ideas, like hiding data from the CDC, are only adding to the delay.

We also saw the return of President Trump's coronavirus press briefings yesterday. It is remarkable that President Trump has lowered the bar so much that his performance yesterday was seen as a change in tone. It is a very sad state of affairs in our country when one day of the President's reading statistics is hailed as leadership when that is what he should have been doing all along. The mere acknowledgment by the President that COVID-19 is raging through our country is some kind of breakthrough. Is that what people believe? Is that what Trump wants the people to believe? It is crazy.

The truth is, every time the President takes the podium, he is a risk to public health. We are 6 months into the coronavirus, and the President has only just come around to the idea that wearing masks would be a good idea. He deserves criticism for that belated admission, not praise. We are 6 months into the crisis, and the President said yesterday that his administration is in the process of developing a strategy that is going to be very, very powerful—6 months in. Countries in Europe and East Asia developed national testing regimens ages ago. That is why they are way ahead of us in fighting this crisis.

Americans must be hanging their heads in shame and disbelief that this administration is still trying to sort out the basics. Then, when he says he is going to try and sort out the basics months and months too late, as the crisis has raged, people think he should get praise? No, he should be criticized because he hasn't done what he was supposed to have been doing for months.

President Trump started his press conference by labeling COVID-19 the "China virus," which shows the President is still trying to deflect blame and play political games with this deadly, serious virus—games that are divisive. The truth is, more than anything or anybody else, the responsibility for America's failure to deal competently with COVID-19 falls squarely on President Trump's shoulders. It is long past time for the President to start acting like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I read this morning that more Americans have died in the last 3 months

than in any 3-month period in the history of the United States. That is a stunning statistic. We are searching the records to make sure that it is an accurate statement, and I am afraid it is.

So far, we believe 140,000 Americans have died of this COVID-19 crisis that we are facing. This is not a moment of American greatness. They have just done a review of the nations across the world and the safety of living in those nations that face this pandemic. Where does the United States rank among the nations of the world in terms of safety in dealing with the coronavirus? It ranks 58th—two ranks ahead of Russia.

How could we have reached this moment in time when this pandemic has been so devastating in the United States, more so than in many other countries around the world—countries that are supposedly not even close to us in terms of economic development and strength? They have handled this far better than the United States. Yet what are we doing about it now? It is a valid question.

I know that the President has decided he doesn't want the likes of Dr. Tony Fauci by his side any longer when it comes to talking about this pandemic, but Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins, of the National Institutes of Health, were interviewed over the weekend and were asked directly about the issue of testing.

Why does it take so long in the United States to get results, and what kind of problems does that create?

Well, we know. If people suspect they are positive for this virus and go in for a test, they are worried that they may be endangering their own lives, not to mention the lives of others. Then, they have to wait 1 day, 2 days, 3 days, 6 days—more—for the test results. That is unacceptable. We need to invest more money in testing and more money in finding tests to provide quicker results.

You would think that it would be obvious to everyone, but it is not obvious in this negotiation that is taking place now in the U.S. Senate. There are Republican Senators who are resisting the idea of putting more money into testing in the United States. What country do they live in? Do they ever go home from Washington to see what is happening in the rest of this country? We closed down the testing facilities in my hometown of Springfield, IL, this last week. It was disappointing, for we needed it, and we need more.

If we are serious about opening this economy, if we are serious about stopping the spread of this pandemic, and if we are serious about opening our schools and making certain that teachers and pupils are safe, we need more testing. Yet here we are, tied in knots, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier.

The Republicans can't agree among themselves about the issue of putting money into testing in the midst of this pandemic. It is hard to believe. It was more than 2 months ago that the House

of Representatives passed the Heroes Act. Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor regularly to ridicule that effort because he doesn't like the provisions in the act. It is his right to have a difference of opinion, but the obvious questions to Senator MCCONNELL are these: Where is your alternative? What have you been doing for the last 2 months? You should have been writing a bill that we should be voting on as soon as we finish the one that is pending on the floor.

Apparently, the White House and the Senate Republicans can't come to any agreement about how to move forward. There are some who are basically saying: Enough. We are not going to spend another penny. We are not going to waste any more money on any type of COVID-19.

I have seen their testimony. I have seen their statements before the microphones. That is hard to imagine.

I wonder if some of the Senators from States like Kentucky and Texas who have stepped up and said, "We have spent enough money on this," have been home recently. Have they been there to meet people who are unemployed, out of work, or who have been laid off who are receiving the Federal unemployment benefits to keep bread on the table and to pay for the their mortgages and their health insurance?

This \$600 a week may sound like a pretty generous amount of money to some. Try living on it. Try living on \$600 a week when it costs you \$400 a week for health insurance. Yes, that is the average on COBRA premiums—almost \$1,700 a month. So, when you talk about \$600 a week, take out \$1,600 or \$1,700 off the top of that, and tell me what is left to take care of your family.

As for the last Federal unemployment payment under the CARES Act, Senator SCHUMER is right. It ends on July 31—a week from Saturday. We have been told that the last checks will be mailed this Saturday, which is just a few days from now.

Three days from now, the last check goes out. While that check is making its way through the mail, is it even possible that the Republican leadership, with the White House, will come up with a proposal to deal with this? It has been 2 months. Senator MCCONNELL said, during those 2 months, that he didn't feel any sense of urgency—no sense of urgency. Can you imagine the sense of urgency if you can't make your mortgage payment? Can you imagine the sense of urgency if that utility bill is so large you can't pay it? That is the reality facing a lot of families who have been laid off and are unemployed. I believe—and many agree—that one of our highest priorities is to make sure that the resources are there for the families.

I also want to say that we are in the midst of this conversation about public health while the President and his party are trying to kill the Affordable Care Act in the Supreme Court. More

than 140,000 Americans have died from this pandemic, and President Trump and the Republican Party are trying to kill the major source of health insurance for millions of Americans. For 10 years, the Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land, and before it was the law of the land, there were some things going on when it came to health insurance which we should not forget.

Routinely, health insurance companies discriminated against women before we passed the Affordable Care Act and prohibited their practices. There was a time when insurance companies were allowed to charge women more than men for the same health insurance policies. It was common for women to pay three or four times what men pay for on the identical plans.

Important women's healthcare was often excluded from most insurance plans. For instance, most individual policies refused to cover maternity or newborn care.

Insurance companies were allowed to deny coverage and charge higher premiums to Americans with preexisting conditions. That particular discrimination hurt women much more than men. Approximately 24 million American men have preexisting conditions; 30 million American women.

Insurance companies could consider a host of medical conditions to be preexisting conditions: breast cancer, C-sections, victims of domestic violence, asthma, acne, heart disease—all preexisting conditions. Before the Affordable Care Act, that is what the health insurance companies pointed to when they charged women and others more because of it.

The Affordable Care Act put an end to that, and now the Republicans want to put an end to the Affordable Care Act. Well, you must say, they must have a much better idea. There must be a Republican proposal out there far better than the Affordable Care Act. There isn't. We haven't seen any. They have no alternative. They just want to kill anything that might have the name "Obama" on it.

We have to do something about this to protect health insurance for the future, and the notion that the Republicans and President Trump are fighting the Supreme Court to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in this moment in American history, when we are fighting this pandemic, is impossible to explain.

AMENDMENT NO. 1788

Madam President, I have been honored to work on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee since December of 2012, when Senator Dan Inouye, the legendary Senator from Hawaii and recipient of a Congressional Medal of Honor, passed away. Since I have taken that job, I have been impressed many times over by the extraordinary Department of Defense and the actions they have taken—the development of technology like GPS, investing in critical medical research, and the abiding commitment to women and men in uni-

form, who make so many great sacrifices for our country. But I have also discovered at the same time how poorly we manage the Department of Defense. Our procurement system seems designed to generate redtape, delays, and cost overruns. Our top adversaries around the world develop game-changing technologies at a fraction of the cost that it takes us to develop them.

There is going to be an amendment on the floor today about future spending in the Department of Defense offered by Senator SANDERS. I heard what Senator MCCONNELL had to say about it earlier. He seems to believe that any suggestion that there is misspending in the Department of Defense is not patriotic. Somehow you are a chicken if you raise any questions about waste in the Department of Defense. I couldn't disagree more.

The Sanders amendment proposes a 10-percent budget cut in the Department of Defense. Well, I have taken a look, as others have, at the failed audits, the cost overruns, and the sclerotic bureaucracy at the Department of Defense. I believe the American taxpayer deserves more.

One of my early hearings in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee focused on the defense industrial base and the threat of sequestration. The lives of our servicemembers often depend on the equipment and training provided. When managed well, the defense industrial base generates the best equipment, next-generation technology, good jobs, and powerful weapons. However, I am concerned that holding defense contractors accountable for poor performance has not been the priority it should be today.

Listen to this: From 2016 to 2019, military spending rose by 18 percent. During the same period of time, the Department of Defense accumulated \$18 billion in cost overruns for weapons programs. What about the contractors who generated those cost overruns? The top five defense contractors in America saw their profits increase by 44 percent in that same period. This doesn't add up.

Businesses have the right to earn a profit, but taxpayers have the right to demand accountability. With defense spending on such a steep rise, we should be driven by the motto "pay for performance." I don't believe that is the culture at the Department of Defense today.

Senator SANDERS wants to direct \$74 billion to communities across the country—including many needy communities in my State of Illinois—for housing, healthcare, childcare, education, and jobs. Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor and calls that socialism. Socialism when it comes to education and childcare? I don't agree with him.

There is considerable merit to what Senator SANDERS has to say about the run-up in cost at the Department of Defense, but I do not agree with his basic approach of across-the-board

cuts. When you start exempting things like military pay and healthcare, it means the remaining items take a deeper hit.

The 14-percent cut that has been proposed for the remaining items at the Department of Defense would be a hard hit, no question about it. As I have said many times, sequestration didn't work, and we ought to learn a lesson from it.

The National Guard should not have a 14-percent cut. Special victims counsels and sexual assault prevention programs should not be cut by 14 percent. Cleaning up PFAS contamination at military bases should not be cut by 14 percent. Instead, we ought to look at the Department of Defense budget more carefully, not with an across-the-board cut.

Let's start with the \$16 billion OCO gimmick. OCO is the account created to fight a war. We started this account years and years ago, when we actually were engaged in a war. We have kept it alive to this day because it is a way to escape budget rules.

The OCO gimmick funds were requested for routine Army, Navy, and Air Force operations that have nothing to do with fighting a war in Afghanistan or any other place. The administration requested these funds for the sole purposes of evading the caps on the base defense budget. Beyond that—listen to this—the President of the United States, who is arguing for this budget, was the first to raid it and take \$8 billion or more out for his medieval wall on the southern border of the United States.

The \$18 billion in weapons systems overruns that I mentioned earlier—what could we do with \$18 billion in cost overruns? Well, you could increase the budget for the National Institutes of Health medical research by almost 50 percent. That is one thing. You could provide student loan forgiveness for healthcare workers or hazard pay for these same men and women who risk their lives for us every day.

I have to tell you, there is need for us to look to space in terms of our future defense. I still haven't been sold on this concept of the so-called Space Force. Putting millions of dollars into additional bureaucratic costs is hard for me to understand or explain.

Ultimately, the Sanders amendment is going to be considered in this authorization bill, but if it is going anywhere in concept, it will be in the Appropriations Committee, where I serve. Our work as appropriators is to examine the details of the budget and make the best decisions for the taxpayers and for our national defense.

I believe Senator SANDERS is on the right track to demand accountability and to ask that we find cost overruns and expenditures that can be changed without jeopardizing our national defense. His exact approach is not one that I would endorse, but I have to say that I stand behind his concept that we need to ask harder questions about this massive spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to comment, along with my colleague Senator DURBIN, about the Sanders amendment. I must commend how thoughtful and knowledgeable Senator DURBIN is about all these subjects. He has pointed out how there are too many military programs that are not well moderated and that have cost overruns that result in excess cost to the American public. We have to do something about those things, and we also understand that we have huge demand with respect to nondefense spending that we have to meet also.

The Sanders amendment, as Senator DURBIN pointed out, would impose an across-the-board cut to the Department of Defense, except for military personnel accounts and the defense health programs. What he would call a 10-percent across-the-board cut, when you take out health and personnel, becomes really a 14-percent cut to all the accounts at the Department of Defense.

The danger, as so well illustrated by Senator DURBIN, is that this type of indiscriminate getting rid of the good and paying for the bad that doesn't really work. It doesn't make sense. It reminds us all of the battles we had over sequestration, where Departments—not only the Department of Defense but the civilian Departments—had to fund programs because they met the cap and then cut other programs that were much more valuable because they exceeded the cap. That is not a way, as they proverbially say, to run a railroad, nor the Department of Defense.

So we do have to look for specific areas to cut, and, as Senator DURBIN said, a great deal of that is done and will be done in the Appropriations Committee where he is the ranking member. I am a colleague on the committee, and each year we have the challenge of taking the authorization that says “you may do this” and actually putting in the money to do it, and that effort is usually valuable, as is the authorization effort, and critically important.

We have to make sure that a result of our deliberations is, first, the resources that are necessary to protect the men and women in the Armed Forces who protect us and also provide for the quality of life of their families and ultimately, of course, that we are able to deter any threat, and if not, defeat that threat decisively.

This is a very important endeavor, and, again, suggesting that we just cut across the board and then put it somewhere else is not, I think, commensurate with the kind of approach that we must take and we have to take going forward.

The other factor, too, is that there are real ramifications for this that are not sometimes obvious. There are literally thousands and thousands—not just military personnel but civilian

workers and construction workers and equipment manufacturing workers—who, in this indiscriminate, across-the-board cut, would lose their jobs at a time when we can't lose any jobs. This approach would be disruptive. I would not want to make a point to the disadvantage of the thousands and thousands of men and women who are working hard to take care of their families all across this country.

Again, we do have to make serious investments in communities across this country that have been neglected, and I have been consistent in support of those efforts. We do have to make investments in our infrastructure for our economic liability and our economic efficiency. We do have to provide support in many, many different ways that transcends and goes beyond just the Department of Defense. In fact, one could say that just as vital a part of our national defense as our military budget is our education budget and our healthcare budget because our strength is not just military forces; our strength is knowledgeable citizens, our strength is healthy citizens, and our strength is an efficient economic system.

But I think this approach, as I suggested today and I think the suggestion from Senator DURBIN also was that this just across-the-board approach is good for a headline, it is good to make a point, but we are here to make policy, and I hope we do make policy. I hope we can continue in this National Defense Authorization Act to try to argue about issues that people feel are not appropriate spending or if, in fact, we need more spending and that in the appropriations process we will do that once again.

Just as a reminder, this bill adheres to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019. It is the final year of the Budget Act. So the numbers we are talking about today for the Department of Defense are not willy-nilly; they were not negotiated without the context of non-defense spending. It was a bipartisan agreement to set the levels of spending for both defense and nondefense, and that is what we are doing here today.

We need a serious discussion about national spending priorities, not just defense spending priorities but priorities that look back to poor communities, industrial policy, infrastructure, education, daycare, the impact of artificial intelligence on the workplace. We have a lot to do, and I think we should get on to doing it but not with the shorthand message of “let's cut everything here, and put it over there.” Let's look at the serious issues, and let's confront them, and let's propose serious solutions.

So because of these indiscriminate cuts, I will be forced to oppose this amendment by Senator SANDERS.

There is another amendment that will come before us today proposed by Senator TESTER, and that is one I do support. Senator TESTER's amendment will add additional diseases to those

that the Veterans Administration already presumes are the result of exposure to Agent Orange by veterans during their military service in Vietnam.

We know that exposure to the toxic chemical Agent Orange has had severe health consequences for veterans who answered the Nation's call to military service during the Vietnam conflict. Recognizing this, the Veterans Administration already presumes that certain diseases affecting these veterans are service connected as a result of the exposure to Agent Orange. These diseases include non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma, respiratory cancers, myeloma and type 2 diabetes.

We also know that there are other diseases that are not yet covered and that there are veterans who suffer from these diseases, and this conclusion is supported by a scientific review by the National Academy of Medicine. Parkinson's, bladder cancer, and hypothyroidism should share the same presumption of service connection as the diseases already presumed to be service connected.

Our Vietnam veterans should not have the burden of proving by independent evidence that their diseases were caused by exposure to Agent Orange. The failure to add these conditions to the Veterans Administration's presumptive list continues to deny sick and aging veterans the healthcare and compensation that they have earned through service to our Nation and that they desperately need.

Senator TESTER's amendment begins to remedy this inequity, and I urge all Senators to vote for the Tester amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, in about an hour we are going to take a vote that our servicemembers around the world will likely be watching. It is a critical vote on the amendment of my colleague from Vermont to blindly cut defense spending, taking a hatchet to the already agreed-upon Bipartisan Budget Act.

We have heard from my colleague JACK REED from Rhode Island, who is part of the strong leadership on the Armed Services Committee and just spoke out against it, and I am going to speak out against it.

I am going to spend some time explaining what this means. This is not just one amendment. This has national implications, and if you are watching in America, I want you to think about what is really going on here.

First of all, my colleague from Vermont says that it is a 10-percent cut, but it is going exempt military personnel and healthcare accounts—which is true as part of the amendment—but it is actually going to compensate for the other cuts, so it is actually a 14-percent across-the-board cut to the Department of Defense. That is the amendment we are going to vote on.

To paraphrase one of our great Presidents, Ronald Reagan: There they go again. There they go again.

I chair the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Armed Services Committee. One of the reasons I ran for the Senate in 2014 was exactly this issue of military readiness. As a colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, I had a little bit of an up close and personal view on it.

The readiness of our Armed Forces in the second term of the Obama administration was plummeting. In the second term of the Obama administration, defense spending was cut by 25 percent, and, with that, the readiness of the men and women in the military plummeted. By the way, at the same time defense spending was cut by 25 percent, Russia was increasing defense spending by 34 percent, and China was increasing by 83 percent.

So let me just give an example. These numbers actually were classified, and they have been declassified. In 2015, when I arrived in the Senate, these were some of the numbers relating to readiness. Remember, we are supposed to be in charge of readiness here. Three of the 58 brigade combat teams in the U.S. Army—the brigade combat team is the 5,000 men and women deployed block in our military, and 3 of the 58 were at the tier 1 level of readiness that you want for a deployed unit. You can understand why that was classified in 2015 because we certainly didn't want our adversaries to know that. So 5 percent of the U.S. Army was fully ready to fight. Less than half of Marine Corps Navy aviation could fly—another classified number, now unclassified. Training and flight time for all military pilots plummeted.

When I arrived in 2015, the Obama administration proposed a cut of another 40,000 Active-Duty troops for the U.S. Army. One of the units they were looking to cut was the 4th Brigade of the 25th Infantry Division—the 4-25 at JBER in Alaska, the only airborne combat team in the Asia Pacific. I put every ounce of my energy into fighting that misguided decision. The 4-25 was not cut, thankfully. All the rest of the 40,000 were cut. We are still digging out of that hole.

So I want to throw something out there because people don't think about it. Imagine if there had been a major contingency or, yes, a war in 2015 with these readiness numbers. Sometimes wars hit us when we are least expecting them. I am going to talk about that.

I will tell you this: It would have been very ugly—not only for our national security but more importantly for our troops—for the men and women we are supposed to make sure are trained so that they never have to go into a fair fight, so we know they are always going to win.

We just celebrated the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean war on June 25, 1950. I am a bit of a Korean war history buff. I will tell you this: What we didn't celebrate was actually what happened in the summer of 1950 at the outbreak of the Korean war.

Here is what happened. The greatest military power in the world in 1945 was the U.S. military. We had just won World War II. By 1950, due to dramatic defense cuts, lack of training, lack of readiness, our military had a very difficult time halting the invasion of a third-world army, the North Korean army.

For the history buffs who understand Korean war history—the military certainly does—they know what Task Force Smith was. It was the first American unit that went in to stop the North Korean army. Task Force Smith was obliterated. Hundreds were killed in the summer of 1950. As a matter of fact, thousands of young Americans died horrible deaths during the summer of 1950 because the leadership in Congress, the leadership in the executive branch, and the leadership in the Pentagon let the readiness of our Armed Forces plummet. Let me repeat that: 70 years ago right now—if you look back 70 years ago in the summer of 1950 on the Korean Peninsula—thousands of young Americans were being killed because they weren't trained and they weren't ready.

This was probably one of the biggest derelictions of duty in U.S. history. Because it is a forgotten war, not many people know about it. But it was a dramatic failure of leadership in the Congress, the executive branch, and the military. The military even has a saying for this: "No more Task Force Smith." We will never ever—ever—let our young men and women go fight a war where they are unprepared, and because of that, they die.

I agree we need to do all we can to address many of the social issues that my colleague from Vermont highlights, particularly during this pandemic. But we must never, as a Congress, gut our military readiness to such a degree that our young men and women come home in body bags as opposed to victors. That is what happened in the summer of 1950.

We were on a path toward this dangerous lack of readiness during the second term of the Obama administration. I cited the numbers. I chair the Subcommittee on Readiness. I have been all focused on this issue of rebuilding our readiness.

Here is the good news. With the Republicans in control in the Senate and the White House, we have begun to dramatically rebuild our military and our readiness. This has been a priority of ours. This has certainly been a priority of mine. Many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, particularly on the Armed Services Committee, have been working on rebuilding our military. When we were looking at these numbers, so many people on the Armed Services Committee, including JACK REED, who just gave a very eloquent speech, recognized, whoa—dangerous world, dangerous neighborhood, and a military that is not ready. So we got to work.

I enjoy my bipartisan work here in the Senate. Some of my best friends

are from the other side of the aisle, but there are principle disagreements on key issues between some on this side of the aisle and the other side. One of them is about the degree to which we support our military and national defense.

I know all of my colleagues are patriotic. I don't like doing the patriotism argument. Every Member of this body, all 100—we love our country. But there are some impressions when you look at what goes on here, when you look at the sweep of history with regard to readiness and funding our military.

Again, to my Democratic colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, Defense Appropriations, who, like me, attend the hearings regularly, dig into the issues, know the threats our country faces, I think we work together to rebuild readiness. But at the national level, here are the facts. Think about it. Carter, Clinton, Obama, Biden—what do those administrations all have in common? They get into power, and they cut our military, and morale plummets, and readiness plummets.

Let me go a little bit closer to home. Since I have been elected, the No. 1 bill my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have filibustered—the No. 1 bill when they want to take something hostage—is the Defense appropriations bill. Ten times, since I have been in this body, the funding for our men and women has been pulled in as a hostage—ten times. No other bill in the last 5½ years, since I have been here, has been filibustered more than the Defense appropriations bill.

Our friends in the media never report on this, but that is one of the issues that really burns me up here because it happens all the time. Trust me, our troops know it. They watch it, and they know it.

Now we have a Sanders amendment for across-the-board DOD cuts of 14 percent just as we are digging out of the readiness hole that we all know that we are in. If you don't acknowledge it, you are not paying attention.

The Senate minority leader has recently come out in favor of the Sanders amendment. I wonder where Joe Biden is on the Sanders amendment.

Of course, as my colleague from Illinois just mentioned, the Pentagon must do a better job of managing waste and cost overruns. I fully agree with that. In fact, the Trump administration was the first administration to finally undertake an audit of the Pentagon. Again, Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee pressed for it, and we finally got it. It took decades, but an audit of the Pentagon has finally happened.

Make no mistake, the Sanders amendment is the first salvo in the national Democratic leadership's goal of defunding the military across the board. If you don't want to take my word for it, here is the POLITICO op-ed from Senator SANDERS about his amendment titled: "Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case."



"Defund the Pentagon"—there they go again. This is a really important issue. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle defeat this amendment overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly. The men and women of the military are watching this amendment. The men and women of the military know that their readiness 5 years ago was in a really bad state.

The vote today and what is going to happen later—literally, if you look at history, we never know when the next conflict is coming. We didn't know that in the summer of 1950, the military was going to be rushed to the Korean Peninsula and would barely be able to hold its own. Thousands died because they weren't ready because of defense cuts by the Congress and the executive branch and the Pentagon.

So this is an important vote. The lives of the men and women in our military and their readiness could well depend on this vote, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly reject it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REMEMBERING JIM POSEWITZ

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment and get to the issue of our veterans in this country, I want to say a few words about a good friend and a legendary Montana conservationist named Jim Posewitz, who passed away a few weeks ago.

He was a towering figure in Montana and in the history of conservation in our great State. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

Poz's accomplishments are too long to list, but any Montanan who fished in the Missouri River, learning the ethics of hunting or hiking in Montana's Rocky Mountain Front, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Poz's more than 30 years of work for the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and to his post-retirement work as a conservation advocate, ethicist, and leader.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says that America's wildest places are those where man himself is a visitor. Poz understood that power, that magic, and the importance of these places. He was relentless in his fight to protect them, and he was uncompromising in his faith that they bring us closer to nature, to each other, and to ourselves. He never stopped fighting for Montana and for the wild places in Montana.

My heart goes out to Poz's family, including his life partner Gayle; his sons, Brian, Allen, Carl; Matthew and Matthew's wife Heather and their daughters, Sarah and Lindsay; his son Andrew and Andrew's wife Kelly and their daughters Madison and Charlotte; his stepdaughter Ann and Ann's husband Nate and their children, Joslin and Lyzander; his stepson Clayton and Clayton's wife Michelle and daughter Ayla. Poz is also survived by his brother John and John's wife Mary and their four children.

He will be greatly missed. He is somebody they only make one of, an incredible human being.

AMENDMENT NO. 1972, AS MODIFIED

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1972, as modified, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1972, as modified, to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ ADDITIONAL DISEASES ASSOCIATED WITH EXPOSURE TO CERTAIN HERBICIDE AGENTS FOR WHICH THERE IS A PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.**

Section 1116(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(I) Parkinsonism.

“(J) Bladder cancer.

“(K) Hypothyroidism.”.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I want to turn to the issue of the day, and that is this amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

Senator REED talked about it a few minutes ago because, quite frankly, justice is long overdue for thousands of veterans who are currently suffering and dying from illnesses related to exposure to Agent Orange in Vietnam.

You know, one of our most sacred duties is to take care of those who are wounded in service to this country, and the fact is, this administration, the Trump administration, has refused to expand the list of presumptive health conditions associated with Agent Orange to cover illnesses such as bladder cancer, hypothyroidism, and Parkinsonism. They don't seem to think that exposure to these toxic chemicals in Vietnam is a cost of war. Well, let me tell you, they are wrong. It is a cost of war. The fact is, this administration wants to outlive the Vietnam veterans, and they don't want to pay for it.

Every time we get in a situation—and I should say the last time we got in a situation, for sure—we sent off our young men and women in the military, and we put the cost on the credit card for our kids to pay and don't think a thing about it, but when they come back and they are changed, all of a sudden, we don't want to pay for it, especially when these conditions, in particular, already meet the historical standard to be added to the Department of Veterans Affairs' presumptive list for service connection.

Now, this is not just me talking. This is the National Academies of Medicine weighing in with their reviews of scientific evidence—scientific evidence. Each day this administration stone-

walls benefits, more and more veterans are forced to live with the detrimental effects of their exposure without the assistance that not only they have earned but that we owe them—veterans like Bill Garber from Great Falls, MT.

In 1967, Bill enlisted in the U.S. Army, and within 6 months he was sent to fight in Vietnam, where he served as a combat engineer and demolitions expert with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 101st Airborne Division. During his yearlong tour in Vietnam, Bill saw heavy combat, and like most military folks who were in Vietnam, was exposed to Agent Orange.

Now, more than 50 years later, after his service and his sacrifice, Bill suffers from tremors diagnosed as Parkinsonism, one of the three conditions that would be covered by the Department of Veterans Affairs if this amendment passes. Bill's story is heroic, but the truth is, he is one of tens of thousands of Vietnam veterans in this country who are still waiting for this White House to grant them the benefits they have earned.

No more waiting. No more trying to outlive the Vietnam veteran. My amendment directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to acknowledge the overwhelming scientific evidence already put forward by veterans, scientists, and medical experts, and provide Vietnam veterans with the benefits they have earned in service to our country.

Today, we have an opportunity to end the needless suffering and disappointment for an entire generation of veterans who are counting on Congress to simply do the right thing. The reality is that taking care of our veterans is a cost of war and is a cost that must be paid. We must hold this administration accountable on behalf of thousands of veterans like Bill who gave so much for this country, and I urge my colleagues to get this done with a “yes” vote on this amendment so we can end the wait for veterans who have already sacrificed greatly and who shouldn't be forced to wait 1 minute longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will vote on the Sanders amendment, which I support. As vice chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have worked with the Republican leadership and with Chairman SHELBY in recent years to strike budget agreements that resulted in parity between defense and nondefense spending. At the same time, amid a national and international public health crisis, the need to infuse more resources into public health, education, and business development programs has never been greater.

I have heard from my Republican colleagues on the floor objecting to the Sanders amendment. I would say to them that if they feel that strongly—



this is not authorized—but if they feel that strongly, they should tell their Republican leadership to allow the appropriations bill to come up so they can actually vote on the Defense bill. Right now, this is just idle chatter when they object to Senator SANDERS' amendment, and yet they are unwilling themselves to actually vote up or down on the appropriations bill for not only the Department of Defense bill but the other Departments. The Sanders amendment, after all, maintains full support for the personnel needs of the Department of Defense, as well as the critical medical research supported throughout the Department. It would also take some of the Department's sweeping budget and reserve it for underfunded domestic needs. This is long overdue.

I again call on my Republican colleagues to stop talking about the money you want or don't want to spend. Tell the Republican leader to allow the appropriations bills to come to the floor and vote up or down.

#### REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. President, on another issue, I have had such an incredibly heavy heart since I heard Friday night my dear friend and hero, John Lewis passed away. I stand here on the Senate floor today to talk about him.

When I got a call at our home in Vermont late that night, my wife, my son, and I just sat there and talked about John for hours and cried. We knew America lost a genuine hero—an unwavering lodestar who, over decades of selfless activism and public service, drew us closer to our ideals.

I remember when he invited me in to watch actually a sit-in by Democratic Members in the House of Representatives when the Republican Speaker had closed down the House for them to have votes. He saw me outside, and I asked him what is going on, and he said: You are my brother.

He took me by the arm, brought me in, and sat me down in the well of the House to watch what was going on. I was always humbled and honored to be called his brother, as he often did when we were together, including an unforgettable visit he had with us in Vermont just last year.

I have been thinking so much of what we can say, and there aren't enough words—there certainly aren't—in paying tribute to a man whose life was defined by the relentless and fearless pursuit of equality. John bled, literally, and his bones were broken, literally, for the causes of civil rights. He came to Congress bearing those scars—a living, breathing reminder that our society's progress on racial equality came through the sacrifices of heroes like him.

In Congress, John Lewis stood with equal moral clarity, serving as its conscience and reminding us that our work to build a genuinely equal and just society remains unfinished. His thundering words just months ago echo even more loudly today. He said:

When you see something that is not right . . . you have a moral obligation to say something. To do something. Our children and their children will ask us, "What did you do?"

That is a question all of us must ask ourselves.

#### VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

Mr. President, there is one thing I am doing today that I want to share with my fellow Senators and Americans. Today, I am reintroducing the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and we are renaming it the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

This is bipartisan legislation. It has 47 Senate cosponsors. It would safeguard what John fought over a lifetime to achieve: equality at the voting booth. The bill would restore the Voting Rights Act to end the scourge of minority voter suppression.

Now, the House already passed a companion to the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act in December. Now let's do our part. We can't claim to honor the life of John Lewis if we refuse to carry out his life's work. Of course, if we stand in the way of that work, that would be the wrong thing to do.

So I would urge my fellow Senators, join me in calling on Senator MCCONNELL to allow a vote up or down on the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Let's do that for John, but let's not do it simply because it is named after him but because it is precisely what John would do. And if we have a moral compass, we should do it and take action to forge a more perfect Union, protect our democracy, and above all, do what is right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1788

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1788, and I ask that it be reported by number.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for himself and Mr. MARKEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1788 to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest that money in jobs, education, health care, and housing in communities in the United States in which the poverty rate is not less than 25 percent)

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . 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—

(1) 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

(2) the amount equal to 14 percent of the aggregate amount described in paragraph (1).

(b) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply on a pro rata basis 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);

(2) be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned; and

(3) be used 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 Secretary of 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 provision of drinking water 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 the 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.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term "eligible entity" means—

(i) a county government with respect to a high-poverty county;

(ii) a local or municipal government within the jurisdiction of which there are not fewer than 5 high-poverty neighborhoods; and

(iii) a federally recognized Indian Tribe that exercises jurisdiction over Indian lands (as defined in section 824(b) of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1680n(b))) that contain high-poverty neighborhoods;

(B) the term “high-poverty county” means a county with a poverty rate of not less than 25 percent, according to the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 2018;

(C) the term “high-poverty neighborhood” means a census tract with a poverty rate of not less than 25 percent, according to the 5-year estimate of the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census for years 2014 through 2018; and

(D) the term “public school” means a public elementary school or secondary school, as those terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEAHY for his support of our amendment, for his beautiful words on John Lewis, and for his insistence that this Senate makes sure that every American has the right to vote. That is not asking too much, and that is a bill we should deal with.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment I have filed for the National Defense Authorization Act to cut the bloated \$740 billion Pentagon budget by 10 percent and use that \$74 billion in savings to invest in human needs here at home.

This amendment is being cosponsored by Senators MARKEY, WARREN, MERKLEY, WYDEN, and Senator LEAHY and will receive a rollcall at 12:10 p.m.

This amendment has been endorsed by more than 60 organizations representing millions of working people, environmentalists, and religious leaders, including Public Citizen, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and Physicians for Social Responsibility.

In America today, we are experiencing an extraordinary set of crises unprecedented in the history of the United States of America. We are in the midst of a public health crisis that is worse than at any time since the Spanish flu of 1918. Over the past 4 months, the coronavirus has infected more than 3.7 million Americans and caused nearly 140,000 deaths.

We are in the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. During the COVID-19 pandemic, 119 million Americans have seen a decline in their income—unbelievable. One hundred and nineteen million Americans have seen a decline in their income, 50 million have filed for unemployment, and American households have lost over \$6 trillion in wealth.

All over this country—in the State of Vermont and in every other State in America—people are going hungry in America. People are going hungry. And many, many people are frightened to death that they will soon be evicted from their apartments or will lose their homes to foreclosure.

That is where the American people are today: loss of jobs, loss of income, hunger, eviction.

On the other hand, there is another reality going on in America today. We

don't talk about it much, but we should, and that is that 600 billionaires in our country have seen their wealth go up by \$700 billion during the pandemic. So we entered this pandemic with massive income and wealth inequality since the pandemic, and the very rich have become even richer, while working people have seen a significant decline in their income and wealth.

The current crisis, or series of crises, have revealed the extraordinary inequities in our economy. If people didn't know it before, they surely know it now.

In the United States today, over half of our workers live paycheck to paycheck. Not surprisingly, when you live paycheck to paycheck, and the paycheck stops coming in, you are in financial distress. That means that your economic situation goes from poverty, which is low wages, to desperation, which is no income coming in at all. That means that you go hungry. It means that you may become homeless. It means that when you get sick, you no longer have health insurance or the income to see a doctor.

What the pandemic has taught us is that a relatively low unemployment rate, which is what we had before the pandemic, does not adequately guarantee for the security and well-being of working families.

When tens of millions of our people earn starvation wages, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a \$400 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 87 million people are uninsured or underinsured, that is not a good economy. In other words, to create a good economy, we are going to have to do a whole lot better than that.

Further, over the last few months, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets to demand justice for the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and Ahmaud Arbery, among many others, and to end the rampant police brutality that we see in America today. These tragic killings of unarmed African Americans have highlighted the urgent need to rethink the nature of policing and to fix a broken and racist criminal justice system.

On top of all of that—on top of a pandemic, on top of an economic collapse, on top of systemic racism—we have to address the existential threat facing this planet of climate change.

A few weeks ago, temperatures in Siberia—the coldest region on Earth—topped 100 degrees, shattering records. If we do not get our act together and transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into renewable energy, we will be leaving this planet increasingly unhealthy and uninhabitable for our kids and future generations.

That is where we are today: hunger, homelessness, racism, a warming and dangerously warming climate. These are the issues that we have to focus on. Our attention must be on improving the lives of ordinary Americans—working people, lower income people—and doing what we can to work with countries around the world to help the billions of people living in economic distress.

With that, I rise today to make it abundantly clear that if we are going to address those issues, if we are going to protect the working families of this country who are now under so much stress, it is absolutely imperative that we change our national priorities.

The status quo and conventional wisdom that we see on TV every day and that we hear on the floor of the Senate is no longer good enough. History has overtaken us. Unprecedented crises have overtaken us. The status quo is not good enough. We must respond.

We must finally have the courage to stand up to powerful special interests and all of their campaign money and understand that we cannot allow these people to continue to have so much power over the economic and political life of this country; that we must start developing policies that work for working families, not just the rich, not just the powerful, and not just those who contribute to super PACs.

Fifty-three years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., challenged our country to fight against three major evils: “The evil of racism, the evil of poverty, and the evil of war.” That was what Dr. King said 53 years ago. And if there were ever a moment in American history when we need to respond to Dr. King's clarion call for justice and demand, as he stated, “a radical revolution of values,” now is that time. This is the moment for us to bring about what Dr. King called “a radical revolution of values,” whether it is fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, whether it is transforming our energy system away from fossil fuel, whether it is ending a cruel and dysfunctional healthcare system, or addressing the grotesque level of income and wealth inequality in our country, now is the time for change, real change.

In my view, given all of the unprecedented crises our country faces, now is not the time to increase the Pentagon's bloated \$740 billion budget, which is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in America. Let me repeat that. The military budget alone is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in this country.

At a time when 28 million Americans are in danger of being evicted from their homes, now is not the time to be spending more on the military than the next 11 nations combined.

At a time when 30 million Americans have lost their jobs, now is not the time to be spending more on national defense than we did at the height—the height—of the Cold War or the wars in

Korea or Vietnam. Let me repeat: spending more in real, inflation-accounted-for dollars today on the military than we did during the Cold War or the wars in Korea or Vietnam.

At this unprecedented moment in our history, now is the time to provide jobs, education, healthcare, and housing in American communities that have been ravaged by the global pandemic, by extreme poverty, by deindustrialization, and mass incarceration.

If this horrific pandemic we are now experiencing has taught us anything, it is that national security means a lot more than building bombs, missiles, jet fighters, submarines, nuclear warheads, and other weapons of mass destruction. National security also means doing everything we can to improve the lives of our people, many of whom have been abandoned by our government decade after decade.

The amendment that I am offering today would cut the \$740 billion budget—Pentagon budget—by 10 percent and use that \$74 billion in savings to invest in distressed communities in every State in this country, communities that have been ravaged by poverty, mass incarceration, and other enormous problems.

Under this amendment, distressed cities and towns would be able to use this \$74 billion to create jobs by building affordable housing, new schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries, sustainable energy projects, and clean drinking water facilities. These communities would also receive Federal funding to hire more public school teachers, provide nutritious meals to children, and offer free tuition at public colleges, universities, and trade schools.

Over and over again, our Republican friends—my colleagues here—have told us we cannot possibly afford to address the enormous problems facing working families: We just can't afford it. We don't have the money to deal with homelessness and hunger and inadequate education.

That is what they say every day. We have been told that we cannot afford to make public colleges and universities tuition-free or to provide a decent income for every man, woman, and child. But when it comes to spending \$740 billion on the military, well, suddenly, hey, money is no problem; we can spend as much as we want. Hey, let's listen to all of the lobbyists from the military-industrial complex who flood Capitol Hill and tell us all their needs. We have to listen to them, but we don't listen to the children in this country who may not have enough food to eat or the workers in this country who are sleeping out in their cars. We don't listen to them, but when it comes to the military, hey, no end to the money that we can provide.

To my mind, that is unacceptable. We don't need more nuclear weapons. We don't need more cruise missiles. We

don't need more fighter jets. What we do need in this country, desperately, is more healthcare, more housing, more childcare, and better schools.

Now is the time to fundamentally change our national priorities, and that is what this amendment is all about. This amendment in itself is not going to do anywhere near what we need to do as a country, but it is an important step forward in changing the way we think about our needs.

Let me be clear. If we were to institute a 10-percent cut in military spending, that \$74 billion could provide high-quality childcare to every family in America. Imagine that. We could solve the childcare crisis in America just by cutting the military budget by 10 percent.

We could, by cutting the military budget by 10 percent, provide section 8 housing vouchers to all of the 7.7 million families in America who are paying more than half of their limited incomes on rent.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon could provide a free college education for 2 million low-income students.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon is enough to hire 900,000 teachers in the poorest schools in America.

So I am a little bit tired about hearing that we don't have enough money for nuclear weapons, that we need more money for missiles and tanks and guns—that we need more for all of that, yet we are turning our backs on Americans who are hurting the most.

I believe this is a moment in history when it would be a very good idea for all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to remember what former Republican—Republican—President Dwight D. Eisenhower said in 1953. I think we all recall that Eisenhower knew something about military budgets and the war because he was the four-star general who led the Allied forces to victory in Europe during World War II. He was not a passivist. He was not an anti-war activist. He was a four-star general.

Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

Right now, when the world is searching for treatment of the coronavirus, when we are searching desperately and spending billions looking for a vaccine, maybe it might be a good idea to be educating our young people to figure out how we deal with disease—with cancer and schizophrenia and Alzheimer's and diabetes—rather than putting more and more scientists into figuring out how we can blow the world up a dozen times over.

What Eisenhower said was true—profoundly true—67 years ago, and it is true today, maybe even truer today.

When we analyze the Defense Department budget, it is interesting to note

that the Congress has appropriated so much money for the Defense Department that the Pentagon literally does not know what to do with it. Between 2013 and 2018, they actually returned more than \$80 billion in funding back to the Treasury. They had more money than they could spend.

In my view, the time is long overdue for us to take a hard look not only at the size of the Pentagon budget but at the enormous amount of waste, cost overruns, fraud, and at the financial mismanagement that has plagued the Department of Defense for decades.

Let's be clear. We don't talk about it, but let's be clear. About half of the Pentagon's budget goes directly into the hands of private contractors, not our troops. Over the past two decades, virtually every major defense contractor in the United States has paid billions of dollars in fines and settlements for misconduct and fraud, all while making huge profits on those government contracts. Virtually every major defense contractor has been found guilty of misconduct or fraud.

Since 1995, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, and United Technologies have paid over \$3 billion in fines or related settlements for fraud or misconduct. Further, I find it interesting that the very same defense contractors that have been found guilty or reached settlements for fraud are also paying their CEOs excessive—excessive—compensation packages. Last year, the CEOs of Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman both made over \$20 million in total compensation, while around 90 percent of these companies' revenue came from defense contracts. In other words, for all intents and purposes, these companies are basically government agencies. Ninety percent of the revenue coming in comes from the taxpayers of this country. Meanwhile, the CEOs of those companies make over 100 times more than the Secretary of Defense makes. It is not too surprising, therefore, that we have a revolving door where our military people end up on the boards of directors of these major defense companies.

Moreover, as the GAO has told us, there are massive cost overruns in the Defense Department's acquisition budget that we continue to ignore year after year. According to the GAO, the Pentagon's \$1.8 trillion acquisition portfolio currently suffers from more than \$628 billion in cost overruns, with much of the cost growth taking place after production.

A major reason why there is so much waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon is the fact that the Defense Department remains the only Federal agency in America that has not been able to pass an independent audit. Many of us will recall what then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld—George W. Bush's Secretary of Defense—told the American people on the day before 9/11. It never got a lot of attention—the day before 9/11. Rumsfeld said:

Our financial systems are decades old. According to some estimates, we cannot track \$2.3 trillion in transactions.

I don't know that the situation has changed very much since 2001 and Rumsfeld's remarks. Yet, nearly 20 years after Rumsfeld's statements, the Defense Department has still not passed a clean audit, despite the fact that the Pentagon controls assets in excess of \$2.2 trillion or roughly 70 percent of what the entire Federal Government owns.

I believe in a strong military, but we cannot keep giving more money to the Pentagon than it needs when millions of children in this country face hunger every day and 140 million Americans cannot afford the basic necessities of life without going into debt.

In 1967 Dr. King warned us that "a nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death." I believe the time is long overdue for us to listen to Dr. King.

At a time when, in the richest country in the history of the world, so many of our people are struggling, now is the time to change our priorities because, as Dr. King stated, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth, at a time when 60,000 Americans die each year because they can't get to a doctor on time and 1 out of 5 Americans cannot afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe, we need to start focusing on those people, not on the military-industrial complex.

At this moment of unprecedented national crisis—a pandemic, an economic meltdown, the demand to end systemic racism, and an unstable President—it is time for us to truly focus on what we value as a society and to fundamentally transform our national priorities. Cutting the military budget by 10 percent and investing that money in human needs is a modest way to begin that process.

Let me conclude by once again quoting Dwight D. Eisenhower. I don't know that I have ever quoted a Republican quite as much as I have during these remarks, but he is somebody whom I respected very much.

This is what Eisenhower said when he left office. This was back in 1961. He was out, and John F. Kennedy was coming in. This is what he said. I hope we can all remember this. He said:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

Eisenhower was right then, and, if anything, the situation is worse today. Now is the time for us to stand up to the greed and irresponsibility of the military industrial complex. Now is the time to address the needs of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor.

Let us vote for the Sanders-Markey-Warren-Merkley-Wyden-Leahy amendment to cut the Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest in human needs here at home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am proud to speak in support of my amendment with Senator SANDERS to prioritize investments in our communities over a bloated Pentagon budget. I thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership on this issue, bringing forth this fundamental tension that exists within our society.

The men and women of the Armed Forces deserve our admiration, our respect, and our support. Day in and day out, they defend our country's interests in all corners of the world, and their families sacrifice alongside them. But what makes America the envy of the world is not simply the strength of our military but the strength of our people.

And 2020 has brought historic challenges: a global pandemic, a growing recession, a reckoning on the systemic racism that pervades our country. We have also seen an estimated 5.4 million American workers lose their health insurance between February and May, leaving them even more vulnerable to a virus surging in every corner of this country.

The Sanders-Markey amendment states that we cannot afford, in this, our moment of national crisis, to spend three-quarters of a trillion dollars on bloated defense spending—spending that is supposed to protect our country yet did nothing to inoculate against the most profound public health emergency in a century.

This amendment is also in keeping with President Eisenhower's warning, as Senator SANDERS said, that "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist."

Persist it has. This \$740 billion fiscal year 2021 budget before us is the fulfillment of Ike's worst fears. In his address to the American people, President Eisenhower also predicted that a permanent arms industry would come to call the shots. After Japan surrendered aboard the USS *Missouri* in 1945, ending the Second World War, that permanent arms industry made its fixture.

After we emerged victorious in a historic and ideological struggle against the Soviet Union that brought us to the brink of nuclear holocaust, Eisenhower's feared permanent arms industry stuck around and retooled to advocate for new weapons to fight the endless war to come.

The catastrophic attacks of September 11 led to more than a doubling of the Pentagon's budget. Multiple Presidents have stretched a limited authorization of military force to go after

those responsible for the 9/11 attacks—to fight new enemies in new geographies, outside of Afghanistan.

All told, so far, we have spent \$6.4 trillion in the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and other places since 2001. Even as those wars wind down, the defense industry is pushing for costly new acquisition programs to maintain superiority over China and Russia.

The forecasted "permanent arms industry" begins to explain why the Pentagon accounts for half of the entire fiscal year 2021 U.S. discretionary budget. Our military budget is larger than the next 10 countries combined. Our battle fleet is larger than the next 13 navies combined, with 11 of those 13 navies represented by our allies or our partners.

However, every dollar spent on the Pentagon is one fewer available to fight the scourge of poverty in this country, to strengthen the social safety net and protect American families. Our communities have suffered while we spend ourselves into extreme U.S. military dominance.

I fear that the Pentagon budget we debate today shows to a child that we don't prioritize giving him or her a quality education; shows mothers and fathers that, in the wealthiest country in the world, they will forever remain one illness away from financial ruin; shows a family that the dream of homeownership, much less affordable rental housing, will remain out of their grasp; shows frontline heroes working in hospitals and nursing homes in Chelsea, MA, and across the country that they have no choice but to go work sick because their employer does not offer paid leave.

I reject the false choice between a strong U.S. military and strong American communities. Trillions of dollars in defense spending did nothing to protect us from the coronavirus pandemic. The defense spending can't protect us from the destruction of the environment and the worsening climate crisis. Yet we are due to spend nearly 70 times more on defense than we will to protect against the next pandemic and other global health challenges.

We must no longer equate national security with our inventory of planes, missiles, and nuclear weapons system, and if coronavirus is truly a war, as President Trump says it is, he is duty-bound to embrace the fact that national security also means health, housing, and financial security, and national security means doing everything we can to save and improve lives in American communities, particularly communities of color, that have been neglected for too long and that have born the worst of the coronavirus impacts.

Our amendment begins that important work by making smart cuts of 10 percent to the budget of the Pentagon for this fiscal year and redirecting those funds to the Department of the Treasury to administer a grant program to strengthen vulnerable, low-income communities.

For example, in Massachusetts, we would be eligible to receive up to \$1 billion in Federal funding to create jobs by building affordable housing, schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries, and clean drinking water facilities, removing lead pipes and replacing vacant or blighted properties; to improve education by hiring more public school teachers to reduce class sizes, increasing teacher pay, providing universal nutritious meals, and providing free tuition to attend public colleges, universities, or trade schools; and to make housing more affordable by providing rental assistance and eliminating homelessness.

We should prioritize eradicating poverty, not war. We should prioritize battling global killer diseases, not developing a new weapon designed to eradicate the human race. It is time we funded education, not annihilation—Medicaid, not missiles.

Where do we start to make Defense Department cuts? First, we must end the war in Afghanistan, which would save tens of billions of dollars. The time is long overdue to bring our men and women home. And it is time to double down on other tools of U.S. statecraft—diplomacy and development—to shape a better future for Afghanistan, particularly Afghan women.

As we work to put a stop to endless war and repeal the 2001 AUMF, the Pentagon must realign its budget to reflect the cold, hard wisdom of Ronald Reagan that “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

Between the Departments of Defense and Energy, we are due to spend nearly \$50 billion on nuclear weapons in fiscal year 2021. Over the next three decades, we are on course to spend \$1.7 trillion on nuclear weapons overkill. We can field a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent—one that assures our allies and partners—all without breaking the bank.

Our people, not our military parades, are the source of American greatness. Over the past few months, this country has experienced a reckoning, as Americans from all walks of life have had enough. They have had enough of being lied to by the President about the true threat of a deadly disease. They have had enough of people of color being murdered in cold blood by the very police forces meant to serve and protect them. And they have had enough of being told there just isn't enough money to support the well-being of their communities, while they can see billions in taxpayers' dollars going to unnecessary wars and nuclear weapons programs and to benefit the President's friends and family.

The choice today is very clear. We are ready to take the smallest step, a 10-percent cut, to begin to address the gap in resources in this country. This is the time for us to stand up. We are about to have a debate on how much money we have to help families in this country through this pandemic. We are

being told that money is not there for unemployment insurance; for cities and towns not to have to lay off teachers; for cities and towns to have the testing, the contact tracing, and the personal protective equipment to protect families in our country; to make sure we can provide sick care leave; and to make sure we can provide childcare for families in this country. We are told there is not enough money. Yes, there is, and that money is in the defense budget of the United States of America, so that we can protect those families.

Too many people right now are nostalgic for a time that never was, instead of having the idealism which we need to battle the issues of today. But for the poor, the sick, the elderly, the disabled, the Black and Brown and immigrant families in this country, the past is just a memory and the future is their hard reality.

This is the time for the U.S. Senate to stand up and to begin the funding of the programs which every family needs to protect themselves. I urge an “aye” vote on this amendment, and, again, I thank Senator SANDERS for his incredible progressive leadership on this issue and for so many others.

I yield back.

#### VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1788

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the Sanders amendment No. 1788.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 77, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

##### YEAS—23

Baldwin  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Casey  
Durbin  
Gillibrand

Hirono  
Klobuchar  
Leahy  
Markey  
Merkley  
Murphy  
Murray  
Sanders

Schatz  
Schumer  
Smith  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warren  
Wyden

##### NAYS—77

Alexander  
Barrasso  
Bennet  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boozman  
Braun  
Brown  
Burr  
Capito  
Carper  
Cassidy  
Collins  
Coons  
Cornyn  
Cortez Masto  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines

Duckworth  
Enzi  
Ernst  
Feinstein  
Fischer  
Gardner  
Graham  
Grassley  
Harris  
Hassan  
Hawley  
Heinrich  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Jones  
Kaine  
Kennedy  
King  
Lankford

Lee  
Loeffler  
Manchin  
McConnell  
McSally  
Menendez  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Paul  
Perdue  
Peters  
Portman  
Reed  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rosen  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)  
Shaheen  
Shelby  
Sinema  
Stabenow

Sullivan  
Tester  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey

Warner  
Whitehouse  
Wicker  
Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 23, the nays are 77.

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

The amendment (No. 1788) was rejected.

#### VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1972, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Tester amendment, No. 1972, as modified.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

##### YEAS—94

Alexander  
Baldwin  
Barrasso  
Bennet  
Blackburn  
Blumenthal  
Blunt  
Booker  
Boozman  
Brown  
Burr  
Cantwell  
Capito  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Cassidy  
Collins  
Coons  
Cornyn  
Cortez Masto  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Daines  
Duckworth  
Durbin  
Enzi  
Ernst  
Feinstein  
Fischer  
Gardner

Gillibrand  
Graham  
Grassley  
Harris  
Hassan  
Hawley  
Heinrich  
Hirono  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Jones  
Kaine  
King  
Klobuchar  
Lankford  
Leahy  
Loeffler  
Manchin  
Markey  
McConnell  
McSally  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Perdue  
Peters  
Portman

Reed  
Risch  
Roberts  
Romney  
Rosen  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sanders  
Sasse  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Scott (SC)  
Shaheen  
Shelby  
Sinema  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Sullivan  
Tester  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Udall  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wicker  
Wyden  
Young

##### NAYS—6

Braun  
Cruz

Kennedy  
Lee

Paul  
Scott (FL)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). On this vote the yeas are 94, the nays are 6.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1972) was agreed to.

#### 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 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 amendment No. 2301 to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, 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, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Thune, James M. Inhofe, Jerry Moran, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

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 amendment No. 2301 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to S. 4049, 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

#### YEAS—87

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Baldwin	Feinstein	Peters
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Rosen
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Jones	Shaheen
Casey	Kaine	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Young

#### NAYS—13

Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Paul	Wyden
Kennedy	Romney	
Lee	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 13.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion was agreed to.

The Senator from Iowa.

#### CHINA

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the coronavirus doesn't come with a label saying "Made in China," but perhaps it should. This pandemic, which began in Wuhan, China, has flooded the world just like so many products from China

that we all now rely upon to protect ourselves against the spread of the contagion. The situation underscores the conundrum our Nation faces balancing the need to work with the Chinese Government and the challenges of holding the Communist Party accountable for its devious deeds.

Plain and simple: The Chinese Communist Party attempted to cover up the outbreak of COVID-19 from the very beginning and continues to do so today. Rather than containing the spread of the virus, the regime has focused on containing knowledge of the outbreak, going so far as punishing Chinese scientists who dared to warn about the virus's imminent danger.

As a result, we now face a worldwide pandemic that has claimed countless victims and could impact every aspect of our lives for months, if not years, to come. China doesn't play by the rules. They constantly seek to undermine the law. And if you ask an Iowa farmer, they will tell you the same.

For years, China has stolen intellectual property and reneged on their trade agreements. While we have seen China still purchasing some of our corn and soybeans, they haven't completely held up their end of the deal when it comes to China phase one.

Folks, when China cheats on trade deals, the impact is real: American jobs are lost and wealth is transferred from the United States to the Communist Party of China. This is unacceptable, especially after the damage already caused to our economy by China's mis-handling of the coronavirus outbreak.

For decades, our leaders in Washington played along, remaining quiet as China stole American intellectual property and scientific research, cheated on trade deals, and violated basic human rights. Those days are over.

President Trump is standing up to China by taking decisive actions against the Communist regime for its flagrant violation of trade deals and crackdown on the autonomy and rights of Hong Kong.

I have heard this from farmers in Iowa. They know that this President is standing up for them and pushing back on China. And here in the Senate, my colleagues and I are also holding China accountable.

Right now, I am laser-focused on decreasing our dependency on China for critical supplies. The COVID-19 pandemic has been what I call a great awakening when it comes to the vulnerabilities in our supply chain. The United States has become far too dependent on Communist China for items like personal protective equipment, prescription drugs, and other essential medical supplies. We need to fix that. And that is what I am fighting to do.

During my military service, including as a logistics battalion commander in the Iowa Army National Guard, I learned firsthand the importance of securing the defense supply chain. We cannot continue to rely on our adversaries, like China, for critically important national security materials.

That is why, in this year's annual Defense bill, I made it a priority to boost support for university research in places like Iowa to ensure we can make and manufacture metals and materials here at home. This will help make sure China doesn't corner the world market on key materials.

Retaking our supply chain from Red China also means removing unnecessary redtape imposed by Washington. I am working to waive the tax penalties for manufacturing and medical supply companies that choose to relocate to America.

I have also demanded the Treasury Department investigate how Chinese companies are avoiding taxes that U.S. businesses have to pay.

Iowans across the State have told me how much they appreciate this President standing up for them by pushing back on the years of bad actions by the Communist Party. They also want to end our dependence on that same Communist regime.

Yes, we can and we should continue trading important agricultural products. But at the same time, we should bring jobs back and make critical supplies ourselves so that when you look at a product's label, it proudly reads "Made in the U.S.A."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator ERNST for putting this colloquy together. What she just said with regard to the importance of having reliable sources here in America is absolutely right.

The supply chain issue is one that I hope we will address in this COVID package—for starters, with regard to our personal protective gear, the PPE, because if we can't rely on having masks and gowns and other PPE made here in America, it is tough for us, particularly during an international pandemic like this, to build and rely on countries like China. Also, frankly, some of the product that comes from China has not been reliable itself.

I appreciate what you are doing there and also the work you are doing to encourage us to be more resourceful here at home, to be sure we are doing the things we have to do to protect ourselves from foreign influence, including China.

Part of our issue with China, I think, is that for the last several years, a lot of us point fingers at China and we are not pointing fingers, frankly, at our internal problems. We need to get our house in order here in America and protect ourselves better. We have legislation to do that, which we just reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee today. It has to do with this issue of China coming to the United States and systemically targeting promising research and promising researchers, and saying: We would like to get that research.

The research is often supported by the U.S. taxpayer. It is sort of tough



here for us in America to lose our research and our innovation and our intellectual property to other countries. It is particularly tough when taxpayers pay for it, and \$150 billion a year of taxpayer money goes to the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy to do basic research.

That is good. We have helped to develop important therapies and cures for some kinds of cancer. We helped to develop the internet. It has been very helpful on manufacturing processes. A lot of great things have come out of that research.

But one thing that really troubles me is that for 20 years now, with China taking the lead and other countries, as well—Iran, North Korea, and others—they have again targeted these researchers and this research and said: We want to get that. And, frankly, they get it on the cheap because the research is being paid for by our tax dollars.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. Recently, in my home State of Ohio, there was a case along these lines. I applaud the FBI and the Department of Justice and our U.S. attorneys for finally getting on top of this issue. We spent a year studying this issue here in the Congress in what is called the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We found out that this was a huge problem and wrote a report late last year.

In the report, we implored our Federal law enforcement agencies to get on this issue. In fact, we had a hearing where an FBI agent testified and said that it is true. We haven't been focused on this, and we have to make that up now.

They are making up for it. They are arresting a number of people. They are doing the things that should be done to try to stop some of this stealing, really, of our seed corn, our technology, our innovation, our intellectual property.

Here is the Ohio example. Recently, the FBI announced that it had arrested a researcher connected with the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic and Case Western Reserve University. This individual had received a huge grant from the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. That grant was for about \$3.6 million. But then this same individual—of course, not telling NIH or telling Cleveland Clinic or Case Western or anybody else—had accepted money from China.

In the contracts that we were able to research during our investigation, these contracts with China say you are not allowed to reveal that you have this relationship with China, that you are getting the money from China. They not only gave this guy money—\$3 million—but they gave him a deanship at Wuhan University. They gave him money to hire people in Wuhan. They gave him the ability to travel around America recruiting others. We think he

recruited 30 or 40 people, according to the FBI.

Again, these are all allegations. His arrest has been made. He actually is alleged to have taken biological samples from Cleveland, OH, to China—this taxpayer-paid NIH research—literally, physically taking these to China. They also, by the way, provided lodging for him with a three-bedroom apartment in Wuhan. That is luxury.

This is about money. Unfortunately, this is about people who are not patriots but instead are willing to sell us out by selling their research, their expertise that our taxpayers have funded to China and other countries.

NIH, recently, by the way, fired or forced the resignation of 54 researchers—not 1 or 2 or 3, but 54 people. We have been pushing them hard to find out who these people are and what they are doing. They haven't been willing to reveal that yet because this is a matter under investigation. They have told us that of those who are under investigation at NIH, 90 percent have ties to China—90 percent.

Wake up, America. Here we are. We are in a situation where other countries, particularly China, have targeted American research, American researchers, and are now taking this back to China to benefit their military, to benefit their economy, and to benefit their healthcare system.

By the way, I do not believe this is for academic purposes. It is wrong what is happening, but it is even more wrong because this is not as if they are taking it back to do joint research on an academic basis.

Let me tell you what the State Department told us at our hearing on this topic at the end of last year. They said: "The Chinese Communist Party has declared the Chinese university system to be on the front line of military-civilian fusion efforts for technology acquisition."

This is our own State Department. That means there is a clear link between the research that is being taken in America and the latest advancement in China's military and its economy.

It has been happening for 20 years. It is time to put an end to it. The legislation that we were able to get through committee today takes a really important step in that direction. There are four or five elements of it.

One of the most important to me is giving the FBI and law enforcement the tools they need to go after these individuals by creating a new criminal law that says if you lie on these forms, if you are taking money from China, it is certainly a conflict of commitment and a conflict of interest. You can be taken to task for that and held accountable. Right now you can't.

They are arresting these people on things like mail fraud, tax evasion. It is a little like how they used to go after gangsters before there were laws directly related to racketeering and so on. This is something where we need to be sure that we are giving people the tools that they need.

We also help the State Department to keep these people out, and we help with regard to our universities to ensure that we are reporting and being transparent as to the money universities are receiving from China and other countries.

Again, I thank my colleague from Iowa for having this colloquy. I see we have two other colleagues here. I know they are really well-versed and involved in these issues, and I want to hear from them, as well.

I would just say that I hope, on a bipartisan basis—by the way, our legislation is bipartisan. Our investigation was bipartisan. I would say this is non-partisan. This is an American issue. We should all be standing up to protect the American research enterprise and to be sure that our taxpayers, when they pay for this important research, have the benefit of it rather than its being taken, in particular, by China to benefit their military and their economy, which has been going on for 2 decades.

It is time to wake up.

I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Arizona.

**MS. MCSALLY.** I thank my colleague from Ohio and others here from Florida and Iowa for coming together to talk about this important American issue and national security issue.

I served 26 years in the military. In my last years in service and since then, we have seen the threat of the rise of China. It is a threat to America's security, our jobs, and our role as a leader in the world. They are on a deliberate path to try to dominate the world and shape it into their vision. They need to be stopped.

When I was a cadet at the Air Force Academy, we had an honor code that said: "I will not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate among us anyone who does." China has been lying, cheating, and stealing for far too long. Americans are now waking up to this threat and are resolved to change the trajectory and hold China accountable, but this can't be done by us alone. Our European partners and others in the Pacific and elsewhere need to join with us and also wake up to China's dangerous path and work with us to stop them.

We have been calling this geostrategic shift a return to "Great Power Competition," as if to assume that we are all playing by the same rules. We aren't. China is playing by their own rules and cheating the system for their own gain and power. The Chinese Communist Party is a reckless, predatory adversary that is dedicated to subverting U.S. interests and supplanting our Nation as the world's dominant leader.

Over the past 10 years, China has increased their military spending by 85 percent. Their investment in defense has been used to build their navy, expand their missile stockpile, and emerge as a leader in technologies like hypersonics, cyber warfare, and artificial intelligence.

This buildup has been far from defensive alone. From their illegal maritime claims among several sovereign states, then building artificial islands where they didn't exist before to militarize them in the South China Sea with their maneuvers and exercises that are aggressive and belligerent, to their covert attempts to infiltrate the United States through our universities and stealing our technology, Chinese forces are expanding their tentacles far beyond our borders, to the detriment of American national security interests.

Congress must do our part to respond to this threat. For these reasons, I introduced several pieces of legislation that immediately stopped China from taking advantage of government funds and taxpayer dollars to purchase products and services from Chinese companies with ties to Chinese military.

To end our reliance on China's control and manufacturing of PPE, I introduced legislation to authorize the President to incentivize American companies to produce medical devices, equipment, and drugs.

We saw at the onset of the coronavirus that it was clear that outsourcing the production of PPE to an adversary was wrong and risky. I witnessed firsthand the ingenuity of Arizona companies that stepped up to help fill the gap. That is no excuse for ignoring the fact that we have to bring manufacturing home of vital medical equipment and PPE so that, once again, it is made in America.

Finally, the coronavirus outbreak has taken a catastrophic toll on our country and the world. Make no mistake. The virus began in China and spread globally because the Chinese Government lied about what they knew about it, and they destroyed evidence and silenced doctors and whistleblowers.

Like the rest of the Nation, Arizona has suffered devastating consequences due to this pandemic. Already, we have lost over 2,900 Arizonans, plus the economic toll.

Communist China unleashed this virus on the world, and it should face severe repercussions for their coverups and lies about the origins and spread. China's actions cost lives and devastated the world economy, and it must be held accountable.

I moved to do just that this week by introducing the Civil Justice for Victims of COVID Act. Americans who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to include those who lost loved ones, suffered business losses, or personally harmed—deserve the opportunity to hold China accountable and demand just compensation.

I appreciate many of my colleagues joining with me on this legislation. It is due time that we hold China accountable for their malevolent behavior—not just over the past several months but over several decades.

The United States must take immediate action and, with strength, dem-

onstrate that the greatest country in the world will not be taken for a fool. Our Republic and our freedoms that it stands for will allow our country to prevail over China's Communist and rogue agenda. With American will, American innovation, and the American spirit, we will prevail.

I appreciate my colleague from Florida joining as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to recognize my colleagues from Arizona, Ohio, Texas, and Iowa for their commitment to holding Communist China accountable and supporting Americans.

I rise today to discuss the threat of Communist China—a threat that poses a huge risk to the national security of the United States, our allies, and the stability of world markets.

Communist China is simply stealing American jobs and technology and spying on our citizens.

General Secretary of the Communist Party Xi is a dictator and a human rights violator who is denying basic rights to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissidents, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

Uighur prisoners in Communist China are being rounded up, blindfolded, shaved, and loaded onto trains to be taken to concentration camps simply because of their religion. You can't believe this is happening today in this world.

Communist China's deceptions surrounding the coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw for every American. It doesn't matter to Communist China that their lies and misinformation killed hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Communist China is on a mission to be the dominant world power. Chairman Xi will stop at nothing to grow Communist China's influence. For Communist China and Chairman Xi, this great power conflict is a zero-sum game. In order for China to be stronger, America and all freedom-loving countries around the world must be weaker. We can't allow that to happen. It is time we finally stand up and address the new Cold War occurring between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.

For too long, Washington politicians have been more concerned with short-term political success than with the long-term threats to our way of life—but not anymore. It is time for action. We can no longer rely on countries like Communist China for our critical supply chain. We need to build up the national stockpile of PPE and our pharmaceutical industry with supplies from American-based producers. We can no longer accept Chinese technology that could be used to spy on us, and we are working to prohibit the Federal Government from purchasing drones from our adversaries.

We can no longer allow Communist China to steal from us. We have to be

aggressive in protecting American research and American innovation, including potentially lifesaving research into a coronavirus vaccine. We should do everything we can to stop buying products "Made in China" because, every time we do, we are putting another dollar into the pockets of those stealing our technology, denying their people basic human rights, and propping up dangerous dictators like Maduro in Venezuela.

We have to hold Communist China accountable and financially liable for its lies that led to the coronavirus. It is responsible for the devastation. We have to stand up and say that it is wrong to allow Beijing to host the 2022 Olympics. That is wrong. The world community cannot condone or reward its despicable behavior and human rights violations.

It is important to be clear-eyed. We have to see Communist China for what it is. We all must do our part to support our Nation and make it clear to Communist China that the people of the United States will not stand for its behavior.

I will not stop fighting until our future and the futures of all of our children and our grandchildren are secure from this threat.

I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in discussing the single greatest geopolitical threat facing the United States for the next century, and that is the rise of Communist China.

We are, right now, months into a deadly global pandemic that has sickened over 14 million people worldwide and has taken the lives of over 600,000 people. Why are we in the midst of a global pandemic? It is because the Chinese Communist Party deliberately lied to the world. It covered up the outbreak and allowed it to spread. The coronavirus pandemic has thrown into high relief the fact that China is our most dangerous threat.

For 8 years in the U.S. Senate, I have worked hard to lead the fight to address the threat of Chinese Communist power and aggression and hostility head-on, to make the U.S. economy as free and independent from China as possible, and to thwart the never-ending propaganda and censorship campaign from the Chinese Communists.

Last week, the Chinese Communist Government made the decision to sanction me personally, so I am now—I awoke to discover—prohibited from traveling to Communist China. Somehow, I think I will overcome that great burden, and I will tell you I wear China's sanction as a badge of honor. There is a reason they are lashing out. There is a reason it has decided to direct personal sanctions on me—because they are scared; they are terrified. The Chinese Communists are murdering, lying, torturing tyrants.

For a long time in Washington, there were politicians in both parties—Democrats and Republicans—who were apologists for China, who denied the threat was there, who insisted that the path forward was getting more and more and more in bed with the Chinese Communists. The most significant long-term foreign policy consequence of this global pandemic is that people's eyes are opening up on both sides of the aisle here in Washington and across the world. One need look no further than the United Kingdom's reversing its decision to allow Huawei to build its telecom infrastructure in order to understand how China's mendacity has been revealed to the world.

So how do we hold China accountable? How do we deal with the Chinese Communist Party?

First of all, we should sanction Chinese officials involved in the ongoing suppression of medical experts, of journalists, and of political dissidents, all of whom have been "disappeared" by the Chinese tyrants. I have introduced legislation to do just that. Over the past several years, I have introduced, roughly, a dozen separate pieces of legislation that have all focused on different aspects of addressing the China threat.

Another aspect is Chinese propaganda—Chinese propaganda that is reflected here in the United States. Big Business, giant corporations, the media, Hollywood all are terrified to take on Communist China. All see the billions they can earn from access to the Chinese markets as being more important than free speech.

With respect to Hollywood, sadly, too many movie producers here in the United States have been perfectly content to allow the Chinese Communists to censor American movies. For example, later this year, the sequel to "Top Gun" is scheduled to come out—"Top Gun," one of the greatest military recruiting films ever made. In the sequel, on the back of Maverick's bomber jacket, the flag of Taiwan has been removed and the flag of Japan, both of which the Chinese overlords deemed to be offensive, and our heroic First Amendment champions in Hollywood dutifully complied with censorship.

By the way, it needn't just concern geopolitical affairs in Asia. With another Hollywood movie, "Bohemian Rhapsody"—a fabulous biopic of Freddie Mercury, the lead singer for Queen—the Chinese censors decided it offended their sensibilities to have scenes in the movie that revealed that Freddie Mercury was homosexual. Now, I ask you to pause for a second and ask: How on Earth do you tell Freddie Mercury's life story without including the fact that he was gay? It was integral to who he was. Yet those in Hollywood, which on so many other issues are glad to be woke social justice warriors, dutifully complied when the Chinese censors said to take it out, and they deleted the scenes from "Bohemian Rhapsody."

I have introduced legislation in this body called the SCRIPT Act that will impose consequences when American companies allow the Chinese Government to censor our films. The consequences are simple. We don't have the power as the government to impose direct negative consequences, but what we do have the power to do is to use the incentives we have; namely, lots of movies borrow Federal assets. When you go watch a movie and see a plane or a ship or a tank or when you go watch a movie on the border and you see DHS assets, all sorts of Federal agencies allow movies to use equipment that is the property of the Federal Government. The SCRIPT Act is very simple. It says, if you are going to allow the Chinese Communists to censor your movie, the Federal Government is not going to loan you our equipment and materiel. We are not going to facilitate making a movie if you are going to give the Chinese Communists the editing and censoring pen.

Not only do the Chinese Communists engage in propaganda in Hollywood, but they also engage in espionage and propaganda on our university campuses—a very deliberate, systematic effort to steal and deceive. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, I was proud to secure a funding prohibition for the Department of Defense from funding universities where the money could go to a Confucius Institute. As a result of that bipartisan legislation, which earned support from Republicans and Democrats, 17 Confucius Institutes have been shut down.

When it comes to our supply chain, we have seen, in recent months, the incredible foolishness of allowing the American supply chain to be dependent on China—medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, PPE. In the midst of this pandemic, one Chinese Government state-controlled newspaper explicitly threatened to cut off lifesaving pharmaceuticals to the United States of America as a tool of economic warfare. If it were to do that, that wouldn't just be economic warfare—that would be actual warfare. That is literally threatening the lives of millions of Americans.

We need to break our supply chain dependence on China, especially concerning critical infrastructure, and I have introduced hosts of legislation designed to do so with respect to pharmaceuticals, with respect to critical minerals. We have to keep the American people's lives and safety not dependent upon the whims of Communist China.

In my final point right now, in China today, there are, roughly, 1 million Uighurs in concentration camps—an Orwellian-style, dystopian government, where the government has all power to monitor what you say, to monitor whom you talk to, to monitor your beliefs. I introduced legislation to impose sanctions on any American technology companies that facilitate the monitoring and oppression of the Chinese

people. I am proud to say the Trump administration took major portions of that legislation I introduced and implemented them to increase the pressure to stop facilitating Chinese torture and oppression.

The overwhelming challenge for this body and for this country for the next century going forward is how we will stand up to the threat of China. China is waging a 1,000-year war. For the sake not only of Americans but for the sake of the free world, America needs to win this contest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I was thinking a bit earlier today about what we were doing at this time last year. We were busy hosting Tennessee Tuesdays and welcoming Tennesseans and families and children with such curiosity and bright eyes and lots of questions about our Nation's government, about these beautiful buildings in which we work every day, and about the job that we have in representing them. I like that curiosity, and I like that energy that, generally, is brought to our Chambers and to our work during the summertime. This year, things really are a little bit different. I think it is a very worthwhile exercise—and I appreciate that my colleagues are participating in this exercise—to remind ourselves why this year is different.

The answer, of course, as to why is this year different is the Chinese Communist Party. It is the one that is to be held responsible, to be blamed for the sickness, the chaos, for this crisis that we have had, which is a health, food, and financial crisis all rolled into one. It has happened because of decisions that China made, decisions that were made by the Chinese Communist Party's leadership.

There are some things that are the known knowns, if you will. They are the things that we know happened as you look back over what has happened with COVID-19.

What we know is this: On December 31, 2019, government officials in Wuhan, China, confirmed they were monitoring the spread of a disease that looked a lot like pneumonia. They didn't know exactly what it was. It didn't have all the markers, but a lot. But on New Year's Eve, they let us know: Hey, we have a problem out here. Just days later, they confirmed it was caused by a novel virus that had infected dozens of people. We now know it was hundreds of people.

It wasn't until January 23, however, that authorities shut off Wuhan from the rest of the country. By this time, the virus was spreading like wildfire. Let's pay close attention to what I just said. They shut off Hubei Province, they shut off Wuhan not from the rest of the world, not from other countries, but from the rest of China. Don't you dare go anywhere else in our country. This is contagious.

Now, as if that 23-day gap wasn't bad enough, credible watchdog reports revealed that the CCP—Chinese Communist Party—lied—they lied to global health officials about the danger posed by the virus for not just a day or two while they figured it out but for 51 days before they sounded the alarm and said: Listen up. Pandemic. Pandemic. Fifty-one days. This deception allowed a regional outbreak to spread into a global pandemic that has so far killed more than 140,000 Americans.

It would be easy to chalk all of this up to incompetence and overwhelmed bureaucrats, but every Member of this body knows that is not what happened. That is why, over the past few weeks, more and more of my colleagues here in the Senate have agreed to support legislation that will allow Americans to hold China accountable for the destruction caused by the pandemic.

On Monday, Senator McSALLY introduced the Civil Justice for Victims of COVID Act—a bill that I am very pleased to support and to be a cosponsor. This bill contains elements of my Stop COVID Act, which I introduced earlier this year. It would strip Chinese officials of their sovereign immunity for reckless actions that caused the pandemic and would give our Federal courts the authority to hear claims that China has caused or contributed to the COVID-19 pandemic. This is not an unusual step. We did this after 9/11 for the 9/11 families. What we would do is give them the opportunity to go to court and make their case—hold China accountable.

It is time for this body to reject the artificial backstops that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle use to protect China from criticism, and I encourage those colleagues to ask themselves: What are you afraid will happen if we hold China accountable for what they have done? What do you fear?

We have known for years that Beijing uses every tool in its toolbox to spy on us. Look at what we have learned about Huawei. They embed the chips in the hardware. You do not know they are there until they activate. We know they steal our intellectual property. Look at what they have done to the music industry, to the entertainment industry, to publishers, and to automotive engineers. China—they can't innovate their way to success, so what do they do? They steal their way to success, and then they lie about it.

China continues to cause chaos on the international stage. Look at their work pushing into the South China Sea. Look at what they have done to the freedom fighters in Hong Kong. Look at how they act and how they pressure and try to stifle Taiwan. This is standard operating procedure for the Chinese Communist Party.

Now, because they chose to lie and not come forward, we have more than 140,000 Americans who are dead. Millions more have lost their jobs, and they have lost their sense of commu-

nity. How much further are we willing to let this go? I will tell you this: As I, every single day, talk to Tennesseans about China and what has happened with China and how China has not been an honest broker, not only in this but for decades, Tennesseans have had enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the world is watching and dealing with COVID-19—the economic effects and health effects. It has affected every single one of our families in some way.

While the world is watching and we are dealing with all those issues here in the United States, we can't lose track of what is happening on the world stage because China is using this moment when the world is distracted to push its way into Hong Kong and to break its word.

When we deal with China, we know what they have done, the predatory tactics they have taken either on their own people or on countries around the world.

The United States of America—when we do foreign aid, we go help other countries gain more freedom, more security, more stability, and more economic growth. We don't ask anything in return. We engage with them to help them.

China is working with developing countries around the world by moving into different countries and taking collateral of their ports, of their airports, and establishing military bases around the world when poorer countries default on the loans they give them. They are not helping other countries; they are taking over other countries.

They are stepping into country after country and offering them great new technology from Huawei to help their cell phone systems. They are establishing security systems around their banks. But what they are really doing is monitoring their people and gathering data on people all around the world. The security systems aren't there to set up and prop up dictatorships in poor countries; they are there for the dictatorship of China to track what is going on there and any international development.

We should be aware of what China is doing, and we should not ignore this moment for the free people of Hong Kong.

Today, many Americans are aware of how China has handled the issue of protective equipment. The medical equipment that we desperately needed in March, April, May—much of it manufactured in China—we could not get because the Communist Government of China kept the materials from American companies that were manufacturing in China. The Chinese Communist Government wouldn't allow the exportation of that, and they just took that equipment over, putting all of the schedules behind. Suddenly, Americans woke up and understood that our sup-

ply chains are at risk. Our pharmaceutical supply chains are at risk, and our PPE supply chains are at risk.

What many people don't know is that our rare earth minerals and critical minerals supply chain is at risk. Lots of folks really like the solar panels and electric car batteries. Well, great—except we are completely dependent on China for the rare earth minerals that are in those.

If we don't develop our own sourcing for those rare earth minerals—and we do have those same rare earth minerals here—if we don't develop our own supply chain, if we don't develop our own manufacturing for pharmaceuticals and for the precursors of pharmaceuticals, we will continue to be vulnerable to the Chinese Government, and at the moment the Communist government determines, they will take over that supply, and we will be at risk.

For decades, the Confucius Institutes have thrived on college campuses, spreading a Communist philosophy all through our college campuses. It is now at a moment that college campuses and leadership in colleges are starting to wake up to say: Why are we allowing Communist indoctrination on our campuses?

It is a bill that I have pushed, that I will continue to push to be able to wake up our universities, to say: Why are we allowing this on our campus?

It is an issue that I have pushed for years, dealing with Chinese Communists spying on American technology, stealing technology, and also stealing our science and inventions.

They come over with a grant from the United States and say they are going to send over researchers, when really what they are doing is harvesting the research and taking it back to China.

They take materials, whether it be music or movies or any items of production, and all that manufacturing that comes to China, they then take that same technology, move it to a different factory, and literally compete against the first company, because to do business in China, you have to turn over all your intellectual property to the Communist government, which then takes it and uses it on their own.

The Chinese Communist Government is not the ally of freedom for the world, and we should be aware of that. Certainly the people of Hong Kong are aware of that.

In 1997, after 150 years as a British territory, Hong Kong became a part of China under the Joint Declaration. It was one country, two systems—that Hong Kong for 50 years would remain autonomous and free.

Well, just over two decades later, the Chinese Government has broken its promise, and Hong Kong is no longer free. While the world is consumed with what is happening with COVID-19, the Communist government has moved into Hong Kong and has taken it over. They passed a law in Beijing that they

sent over and declared in Hong Kong that they can't have any of what they call subversion, organization or perpetuation of what they call terroristic activities, collusion with a foreign country or an external element, which I will explain later.

This new security law literally was delivered to the people of Hong Kong at midnight, and it went into place immediately. Then the next step was that the Chinese Communist police—military law enforcement—moved into Hong Kong to begin to implement this.

Free speech immediately stopped. Those protesters who were out on the street just wishing to be able to vote and to speak their mind were immediately rounded up.

Teachers and academics have been arrested or fired or threatened. Communist Chinese leaders have contacted them to reprimand them about teaching about human rights in their classrooms, remembering that in Hong Kong it was required—it was a required class in Hong Kong just weeks ago—to learn about human rights and freedom, and now the Chinese Government is removing those teachers and threatening any other teacher who teaches about human rights that they will be removed.

Faith leaders have been squashed. You see, under this security law that has passed, you can't have any external element collusion. They define "external element" as any kind of worship of God as well that does not align with the Communist Government. So any faith-based group who is there in Hong Kong is immediately being squashed.

The Muslim Uighurs are gathered up in Communist China and put in concentration camps to reeducate them on how to be more Chinese. Now the people of Hong Kong are experiencing that same type of oppression as the first step has stepped in to take away their right to free speech, their right to gather and protest, and now also their right to have freedom of faith. Leaders of the democracy movement have already been rounded up and arrested. This is something that we should not ignore. We have said as a world "Never again," and we should engage.

I know many people in my State say we should focus on COVID-19, and we should. There is much that needs to be done. We cannot take our eyes off of freedom around the world, as well, and the people of Hong Kong. As they lose their freedom, the world loses freedom, and China sees it can move into one more place one more time. Taiwan is next, and they will continue to move in this same way. We should stay engaged.

There are multiple bills this body has already done on sanctions, and we should continue. We should continue to press in and speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves in Hong Kong. They are being isolated. Senator TIM KAINE and I just dropped a bill yesterday dealing with internet freedom for the people of Hong Kong, saying

that the American Government should be engaged in trying to break through what is called the great firewall in China. We know they will extend this firewall into Hong Kong, as well, and will prevent the people from Hong Kong from access to social media, information with each other, or information from the outside world, just as they have with the people of China. But the people of Hong Kong have grown up and lived in freedom, and they know what it means to get outside information, and the Chinese Government is actively working to shut that down. We should actively work to push back on that to make sure the free people of Hong Kong continue to communicate with each other and with the outside world. We can stay engaged with that basic function of human rights. That is why Senator KAINE and I are so passionate about this.

We should engage as a government to make sure that they can continue to have the free speech that we have. When anyone loses their human rights and dignities, the world loses human rights and dignities.

Again, I am aware that there are many things that need to happen with COVID-19 right now, and we are actively working on those things as well, and we should. But we should not lose track of freedom. Freedom is our responsibility to model and to live and to help other free people to guard. Let's stand with the people of Hong Kong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3627

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to talk for a bit on the floor of the U.S. Senate on U.S. policy toward China because there has been no better friend for Chinese interests likely in our lifetime than President Donald J. Trump.

Articles suggest that when you survey Chinese Communist Party leaders, they are, to a person, rooting for the reelection of this President. I don't need to go through the litany of ways in which China has become more influential and more powerful all around the world because of this administration's policies, but at the top of that list is the abdication of the United States' traditional leadership role on human rights, which has allowed the Communist Party to march on the Uighurs and others. It is a failed trade policy that has allowed China to extend its influence into places like Africa and throughout the Silk Road. It is America's break with Europe that has shattered our ability to negotiate together the future rules of the economic order.

But what China is really ecstatic about is this President's performance since March in the wake of a virus that now shows the United States as having 25 percent of the world's COVID cases while having only 4 percent of the world's population.

My friend Senator BLACKBURN recited the early moments of this virus out-

break in China, and she is right that China was nontransparent and unhelpful in those early days. But do you know who the greatest cheerleader for China was in the first 2 to 3 months of COVID-19's outbreak there? President Donald Trump. On 45 occasions he went on social media or gave statements to the press in which he lauded China's response. He talked about how transparent they were and how they were doing a great job. The world community couldn't put pressure on China to open up with respect to what they knew about the virus in large part because the leader of the Nation's most powerful country was doing the bidding of the Chinese Government.

The second thing that this President has done that makes China very, very pleased is to essentially make the argument for the Chinese that the autocratic model that they are perfecting is the best method by which to organize society around the world, because they say: Listen, we got this virus under control in a matter of months, and the world's greatest democracy is still dealing with an epidemic that looks to be raging newly out of control. So as we engage in this broad fight between models of governance, our inability—this administration's inability—to get this virus under control is maybe the greatest gift that this President has given to China.

Here is what makes it so unconscionable: We know that democracy is inefficient. We know that capital markets can sometimes be inefficient when pressed up against the wall by emergencies. So we built into the statutes of the United States emergency powers to give to this President—to any President—so that when they are faced with an emergency, they can cure some of the inefficiencies of democracy.

We are on the floor today—Senators BALDWIN, STABENOW, BROWN, and I—to talk about one particular power this President has. It is an act called the Defense Production Act, and it allows the President during moments of emergency to commandeer parts of the manufacturing supply chain in this country to make sure we are making everything we need in order to repel a foreign invader. Sometimes that may be an army, but in this case it is a pathogen.

What we have known from the very beginning is that there was no way for this country to have enough personal protective equipment—masks, face shields, gowns, and gloves—and there was no way for this country to be able to have enough tests to know who has it so that we can track it and get rid of it without the Federal Government stepping up and utilizing the Defense Production Act.

Twenty percent of nursing homes today have less than a week's supply of PPE.

Doctors at one hospital in Houston, where the outbreak is raging out of control, are being told to wear their N95 masks for 15 days in a row when it is recommended for a single use.

The national strategic stockpile once had 82 million gloves. Today they have less than 1 million.

Guess what. It is going to get worse. More people need to be tested. Schools are about to reopen. The superintendent of the 100,000-student Jefferson County school district in Louisville, KY, says that he needs \$10 million to order face masks alone. It is going to cost schools across this country \$25 billion to purchase medical supplies, and these medical supplies are going up in price because the supply is so low. We have a solution: the Defense Production Act.

We also don't have enough tests. It now takes 7 to 10 to 14 days to get a test back. In Connecticut, it used to take just 1 day. You can't beat this virus if you don't get results for 7 to 10 days. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time.

James Davis from Quest Diagnostics said:

We would double our capacity tomorrow . . . but it's not the labs that are the bottleneck. [It] is our ability to get physical machines and . . . our ability to feed those machines with chemical reagents.

That is equipment that could be produced in the United States if the President took control of the manufacturing supply chain—not forever, but to the extent of this crisis.

So the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act, which Senator BALDWIN and my colleagues will talk more about, essentially picks up the ball the President has dropped and commands the President to operationalize the Defense Production Act and put somebody in charge of its effectuation to make sure we are producing in this country all of the medical equipment—the masks, the gloves, the testing reagents, the cartridges—that it is possible to produce in this Nation.

The level of gleeful, willing, knowing, purposeful incompetence from this administration is absolutely stunning, and no one should normalize an administration that has the power to save lives and refuses to operationalize it.

Why won't this administration take control of the supply chain? Why are they willing to let people die? States can't run the supply chain by themselves. It is a national and international supply chain. Hospitals can't create their own supply chain. They need to be focused on saving lives, not being miniprocurement organizations.

We know that democracies and capitalist economies are by nature and design often inefficient when faced with these urgent crises. That is why we give Presidents these enormous but temporary powers to smooth out the inefficiencies of a multibranch, multidirectional democracy.

When it comes to calling in the Federal troops to beat the hell out of protesters, this President seems perfectly willing to exercise his powers as Commander in Chief, but when it comes to making sure that my kids' teachers or my local doctor has a mask this fall,

this President is all of a sudden impotent. It falls to us, Members of the U.S. Congress, to stand up and pass legislation, the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act, to make sure—to make sure—that we are using the extent of the statutes provided to this government and this President to make sure that people are safe and make sure people are tested in the middle of an ongoing epidemic.

I am glad to be joined on the floor today by a number of my colleagues to talk about the need to pass this legislation. We are going to offer a unanimous consent request. Senator BALDWIN will do that. I have been very pleased to be a partner with her in developing this legislation to require the operationalization of the DPA, but before she speaks, let me turn it over to my colleague and our caucus's leader on issues of healthcare, Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, it is wonderful to be here with my great friends from Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Ohio. This is such an important discussion we are having today and such an important bill that needs to be passed.

Let me start again by underscoring something that Senator MURPHY said, because despite what happened in the beginning as it relates to China and certainly over the years, I have not been shy to address concerns related to stealing our intellectual property rights or other issues related to China. The reality is, despite whatever the smokescreens are about China, you can't say that they are the reason that with 4 percent of the population, we have 25 percent of the cases of COVID-19 and 25 percent of the deaths in the world. There is much more to it, and, unfortunately, it lands right in this country with the lack of national leadership that has been completely AWOL when it comes to the kind of national strategy we need to get our people the equipment, the support they need, the testing they need, and to have a strategy to safely reopen the economy and our schools while, at the same time, putting the health and safety and lives of Americans first by addressing the pandemic.

So I rise today to urge the Senate to take up and immediately pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I want to thank Senators BALDWIN, MURPHY, and BROWN for introducing this important legislation. I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

As all of you know, throughout history—and I love history—perhaps no State was as crucial to our Nation's victory in World War II as was Michigan. My colleagues may debate that, but I have the mic, so I will talk about Michigan.

The truth is that more than half of Michigan men and women proudly served in uniform, including my own

dad. Back home, the people of our State were hard at work producing the bombers, the tanks, the trucks, the helmets, and the guns needed to win the war. In fact, Michigan was called at that time "the arsenal of democracy." We make things, and during World War II, we were making the things that were needed to win the war—the arsenal of democracy. Both at home and abroad, victory in many ways depended on the people of my State.

For the past 6 months, our Nation has been fighting a different kind of war, a raging health pandemic, taking over 141,000 American lives so far. Unfortunately, this time our national generals appear to be missing in action. How is it possible that 6 months after the first case of COVID-19 on January 20, our healthcare workers still are struggling to get the personal protective gear they need to treat patients while keeping themselves safe? How can that be?

How is it possible that 6 months after the first case of COVID-19 was detected in the United States, people are still struggling to get tested? Well, I will tell you how. It is because of the complete lack of Federal leadership coming from this White House that we have seen, since day one, in this crisis.

None of us want it to be this way. We all live here. Our families are here. We are desperately concerned about our families, our friends, and people in our States. We want this White House to be successful in fighting the pandemic. We all need to be successful in fighting this pandemic.

But the reality is that the administration could have immediately used the Defense Production Act to ensure that we have quality protective equipment and testing supplies in the right place at the right time. It could have happened immediately. Instead, we have the administration providing example after example of telling the Governors: OK, you do it. We don't want to do it. You do it. We will be right behind you.

Then Governors turn around, and nobody is there.

They don't want to support the Governors and local communities now that we were once required to step up. But you go ahead. Or they are putting together shady contracts—no-bid contracts—one after the other.

One I will mention to you is called Fillakit, which was a \$10 million no-bid contract to produce testing supplies by somebody who already had had problems in the past and who was given a no-bid contract after setting up a new company. We heard this over and over. And ProPublica reported that the testing tubes Fillakit produced were, in fact, repurposed miniature plastic soda bottles and described the packaging process as unmasked employees using "snow shovels" and dumping them into plastic bins before squirting saline into them all in open air. Well, Michigan received some of those so-called testing supplies, and needless to say, they were not useable.



Meanwhile, Governors, hospitals, and nursing homes have spent time, energy, and money bidding against one another and being pitted against one another for lifesaving PPE and testing supplies. This is no way to fight a pandemic. This is no way to fight a war, and, certainly, no way to win a war.

In Michigan, after the CARES Act passed, going back to the State, working with our State Governor and her team and our delegation, I, literally, was in a situation of reaching out—because of my work in healthcare—to people in the medical supply business, and we got some of the first masks because I knew a guy who knew a guy who knew a guy in China. That was how we got the masks—no national supply chain.

Masks were coming in. Fifty-cent masks were being bumped up to \$5, \$6, \$7 apiece—no accountability, nobody worrying about the United States and whether we could get the best deal and whether our hospitals were able to get what they needed. Frankly, it was chaos—complete chaos. Again, that is no way to fight a pandemic, and it is certainly no way to fight a war.

During World War II, Michigan didn't decide to become the arsenal of democracy on its own. The Federal Government saw a need and called on Michigan companies and workers to fill it, and we did. It is the same thing this administration should be doing right now, today—today—to produce the PPE and testing supplies we need to end this pandemic. Instead, doctors and nurses are wearing the same masks for a week or more. People are waiting more than 10 days for test results, and more than 141,000 Americans, so far, have died, including more than 6,100 in Michigan.

It is time to pass this important bill. It is past time. It is time to put our great American companies to work producing the supplies we need. It is time to win this war. We have done big things before, and we can do it again. I join with my colleagues in urging that this bill be taken up immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senators MURPHY and STABENOW and Senator BALDWIN's terrific leadership on this. I echo Senator MURPHY's earlier comments about China.

I see on the other side of the aisle Senators and President Trump. It is campaign season. So it is time to bash China, even though they have been in the pockets of China.

I was in the other body when corporate interests came and lobbied the House of Representatives and lobbied the Senate asking for China to get all of these trade breaks and tax breaks so that American companies could shut down production in Milwaukee or in Cleveland and move overseas to China and get all kinds of tax breaks. And then my Republican colleagues were also pro-China because they wanted

these American corporations and their contributors, starting with Senator MCCONNELL down the hall, to get all of these advantages for China.

Now, if you are thinking about running for President of the United States in 2024 as a Republican, you bash China. If you are in a tough reelection right now for the Senate, you bash China. If you are a House Member and afraid of being defeated, you bash China. If you want to help the cause for Donald Trump, you bash China. It doesn't matter that President Trump has been the best friend of China. It doesn't matter the Republican leadership has been in the pocket of Chinese Communist interests because of their support for American corporations. It is just good politics to bash China. So we know that, and Senator MURPHY touched on that.

S. 4049

Mr. President, I want to say a few words first about Agent Orange and thank Senator TESTER for his work on behalf of the tens of thousands of Vietnam vets who suffered because of exposure to Agent Orange.

We all know what the issue is. The National Academy of Sciences has recognized the four illnesses that are suggestive or where there is sufficient evidence associated with Agent Orange. For years, we have known that. The VA has added illnesses in categories to the list of presumptive medical conditions associated with Agent Orange. They have resisted this.

Time is running out for these veterans. We did this to them. The American Government decided to spray Agent Orange. We knew it was harmful. We definitely know it is harmful now. If you were exposed to poison while serving our country, you deserve the benefits you earned, period.

For 3 years, in the Veterans' Affairs Committee—I sat in the Veterans' Affairs Committee—I begged the Veterans' Administration to recognize that these three illnesses are caused by Agent Orange and they should get Veterans' Administration benefits. I begged the Veterans' Administration, and no answers. I begged the President of the United States, and President Trump said he is a friend of veterans, but he couldn't be bothered to add these three illnesses on the list. So these veterans, individually, have to get down on their knees—figuratively, if not literally—and beg the VA for benefits when it ought to be automatic. That is what Senator TESTER's amendment does today. It makes it automatic.

Instead, the White House said no and the Veterans' Administration said no, but because of the work of Senator TESTER today, my colleagues are finally—it doesn't happen often around here. My Republican colleagues actually stood up to the President of the United States and said: No, Mr. President, you are wrong on the VA about covering these illnesses for Vietnam vets. And, finally, this Congress did the

right thing. I thank Senator TESTER for that work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3627

Mr. President, we know a lot of things. We know 144,000 Americans are dead. We have grown numb to these numbers. We can't forget who they are. They are our friends, our sisters, our brothers, our parents, and our neighbors.

As has been said, we are 4 to 5 percent of the world's population. We have accounted for almost 30 percent of the deaths in the entire world. That is not because we don't have skilled doctors. It is not because we don't have smart scientists. It is not because we don't work hard. It is because of leadership.

We know this President and the majority leader down the hall, who does the bidding every single day of this President, had chance after chance to get ahead of this virus. President Trump failed and Senator MCCONNELL failed. Now they have stopped even pretending to try.

The President demands that schools reopen—no plan to protect teachers and students. He demands businesses open up—no plan to protect workers and consumers. The American people have done their part and made incredible sacrifices. Essentially, they bought President Trump time in March, April, May, and June, and he wasted it.

This spring, people stayed home. They worked hard to flatten the curve. Members of both parties—both parties—begged him to use the Defense Production Act to scale up the production of medical supplies, including testing supplies, and coordinate their deployment. All the way back in March, we knew we faced shortfalls in N95 masks, gowns, and the materials we needed, most importantly, for test production, like cotton swabs. I immediately convened Ohio manufacturers back in March. I know Senator BALDWIN did the same thing in her State. I asked them what support they needed. I released a plan and sent a letter to the White House outlining Executive actions the President could take immediately. This was March. Since then—April, May, June, July—and essentially nothing happened. The Federal Government can acquire the resources our country needs and send them when they are needed most.

Senator CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, and I worked together to include provisions in the CARES Act ensuring the President has the ability to use DPA authority he already has without delay. We worked with our colleagues in the Appropriations Committee to include \$1 billion in new DPA funding. Yet hundreds of millions of dollars just sit around waiting to be used.

Our States and our healthcare workers continue to face supply shortages. What exactly is the President waiting for? Imagine if he had used that DPA money and DPA authority in the spring and said we need to be producing a million tests a week by the end of summer, or imagine if we said our goal

is to be ready to open schools in the fall and I am calling on American businesses and American workers to manufacture the tests we need to do it? Look around the world. Other countries figured this out. We are being left behind. It is time for us to step up. If the President will not lead, we must. If the President will not use DPA on its own, Congress must use its authority to force him to.

That is why it is so disappointing to see my Republican colleagues objecting to Senator BALDWIN's bill. But, of course, they are objecting because they are doing the bidding of President Trump, and they want to blame China for everything, instead of take any responsibility themselves. But objecting to Senator BALDWIN's bill, which would force the President to actually do his job and coordinate a national response to a national crisis—that is the answer.

The American people should not have to fend for themselves again and again and again in the middle of a pandemic. I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Wisconsin.

**Ms. BALDWIN.** Mr. President, President Trump's response to this pandemic has been a failure of leadership. So we are here today to provide leadership in the Senate to do what the Trump administration has failed to do.

In April, with my good friend Senator MURPHY from Connecticut, the two of us introduced legislation called the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. That act would force President Trump to take action and scale up American production of things like test kits, swabs, reagents, personal protective equipment, and the medical equipment needed at the local level to address the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in our country.

Three months later, States still do not have the supplies they need. Now more than 3.8 million Americans have been infected with the coronavirus, and, tragically, over 141,000 people have died in our country. For 3 months, our legislation has been in the majority leader's legislative graveyard.

Since this public health crisis started, the Trump administration has had no national testing plan, and they have never had a plan to provide States with the testing supplies they need to combat this pandemic. As a matter of fact, last month, the President said we needed to slow down testing, and, this weekend, as President Trump once again said the coronavirus would disappear, there were reports that the White House is trying to block Federal funding for States to conduct testing and contact tracing.

President Trump has not only abandoned each and every one of our States, he has also turned his back on front-line healthcare workers, who continue to face shortages of personal protective equipment, including gloves, gowns, face shields, and masks.

The Trump administration has created absolute chaos in the medical sup-

ply chain, leaving healthcare workers at hospitals and long-term care facilities at the forefront of this crisis to fend for themselves, rationing the scarce personal protective equipment that has been provided to them. In fact, just a couple of weeks ago, Vice President MIKE PENCE, who was put in charge of our pandemic response, said the administration will be issuing guidance encouraging healthcare workers to reuse personal protective equipment. This is the same Vice President who declared that the United States would "have this coronavirus pandemic behind us" by Memorial Day weekend. He was tragically wrong, and this White House continues to play catchup on a pandemic and a virus that is spreading faster than ever.

The person whom President Trump put in charge of our medical supply chain was his son-in-law, Jared Kushner. Jared Kushner predicted in April that by June we would be back to normal and that in July we would be "rocking again." It is July. It is July, and this is where we are.

Last Thursday, America had its highest number of new coronavirus cases in 1 day. And in my home State of Wisconsin, we had our highest case count ever yesterday—yesterday—and we have many hospitals across my State with less than a week's supply of face shields, goggles, gowns, paper medical masks, and N95 masks.

This public health crisis has not disappeared. We are not back to normal, and we are not "rocking again."

The fact is, President Trump has failed to lead, and this White House has taken us in a wrong direction in our fight against this pandemic. New coronavirus cases are rising in the States that we work for, which means we need more testing supplies, more testing, and more personal protective equipment for our workers.

The question this Senate needs to answer is whether we are going to let this President continue to take our country in the wrong direction, or are we going to lead and do what we all know needs to be done?

Not one of my Senate colleagues can make an honest case that their State has everything it needs to fight this pandemic.

In Wisconsin, we have been shortchanged by this administration. They have failed to provide adequate supplies for our State's clinical and private labs, paralyzing our ability to expand testing to the levels we need. In some cases, what we have received from the Trump administration were unsuitable and unusable testing supplies—foam applicators that cannot be used for swabs and saline tubes that were too short to transport swabs used in the majority of COVID-19 tests.

In addition, the majority of labs conducting COVID-19 tests in Wisconsin are clinical or private labs. These labs cannot access resources from the administration and are essentially being told to "figure it out." Over 80 Wis-

consin labs that are currently performing tests do not have access to a consistent supply of reagent.

We are not alone. States across the country have been abandoned by the Trump administration. They have been forced to go this alone, while President Trump has tried to pass off responsibility for his own failures.

Every single one of us knows that our States need more resources and supplies so we can ramp up testing, identify those who are infected, isolate positive cases, and safely trace all contacts so that the spread of this virus can finally be contained. We all know that President Trump's broken supply chain has been a failure, and my legislation with Senator MURPHY, supported by 46 Democrats, will help fix it.

In order to put people back to work and safely reopen businesses and schools, we need both a national testing plan and the supplies to implement it. This is true in Wisconsin and every other State in our Nation.

Our legislation will help respond to this public health crisis and prepare for the future by mobilizing a Federal response to increase our national production of the testing and medical supplies we need at the State and local level. Specifically, the bill will provide critical oversight of the distribution of medical supplies and put an expert in charge to oversee COVID-19 equipment production and delivery so we know we are putting science and facts over politics and private distributor profits when it comes to responding to this pandemic.

Finally, our legislation unlocks the full authority and power of the Defense Production Act so that we can produce and deliver tests, testing supplies, personal protective equipment, and medical equipment that we need to take on this pandemic, treat patients, protect workers, open businesses and schools, and save lives.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have a choice: They can continue to ignore President Trump's failure to respond to this public health crisis, knowing full well that until we confront it in the bold and effective way that we should, we will not solve our economic crisis, or they can choose to liberate themselves from this failure and support a solution that will serve the people who sent us here to work for them.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as this Vice President does, that this pandemic is behind us, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as Jared Kushner does, that we are rocking again in July, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as President Trump does, that the coronavirus will just magically disappear, well, then, object.

If you oppose the failures of this President and this administration in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, then I ask for your vote to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act today.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3627, the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say first that I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin's work on this issue. It is an important issue. It is one that our committee has been working diligently on.

Since the beginning of the COVID crisis, we have held five hearings and a roundtable on exactly this issue—exploring and doing oversight on the national stockpile and its supply chain vulnerability. Just today, we marked up five pieces of legislation very similar to what my colleague from Wisconsin is introducing here and trying to pass by unanimous consent. The five pieces are the Federal Emergency Pandemic Response Act, Securing Healthcare Response and Equipment Act, National Response Framework Improvement Act, National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center Pandemic Modeling Act, and finally—this one closest to my colleague's bill—the PPE Supply Chain Transparency Act, which is actually the piece of legislation we have had the most discussion on—two amendments, including a second-degree amendment to one amendment—before passing it unanimously. So our committee has done a lot of work.

My concern about what my colleague is doing here—trying to pass this by unanimous consent—is by and large bypassing the committee process. It is true her staff reached out to my staff a couple of weeks ago. We asked, have you vetted it through the Department? Apparently, she has begun that process, but this piece of legislation has not been properly vetted. It has not gone through the proper and full committee process.

Again, without expressing an opinion on a piece of legislation but also acknowledging the fact that our committee has done a lot of work—passed five pieces of legislation on a non-partisan basis today because we are concerned about this as well—I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. I am, of course, very disappointed that we cannot move this forward.

I want to respond to a couple of the comments made by my colleagues from

the State of Wisconsin, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

It is July. It is July, and cases are rising. Action was not taken in February, March, April, May, June, or so far in this month of July. We had more than fair warning that we had shortages of masks and gloves and gowns and face shields and testing swabs and testing media and reagents, and yet it is July.

As I said earlier, yesterday Wisconsin announced the most cases positive for coronavirus in a single day that we have seen since the pandemic began.

As we strive to reopen our economy, the President exhorts all schools to hold 5-day-a-week, in-person classes.

We know that the demand for testing and the demand for masks will only increase exponentially—the need to keep workers safe as they return to work and the need to keep customers safe as they enter and engage in commerce. To say that this needed to happen back in February is an understatement.

I am pleased that my colleague has held hearings, but this bill was filed in April when it became apparent that the President was not going to act. This bill has been available for committee review since April.

The House passed many elements of the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act in their Heroes Act, which they passed 2 months ago. I just ask, where would we be today had this been put into law?

There has been time to review. There has been time to study. But it is past time to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I hope we can create another opportunity for the Senate to act on this in the days to come because it is so overdue.

I want to again thank my colleagues who joined me on the floor this afternoon—my coauthor, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut; my colleague from Michigan, DEBBIE STABENOW; and my colleague from Ohio, Senator SHERROD BROWN; and the 45 other Members of the U.S. Senate who have joined me in sponsoring this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues, Senators BALDWIN and MURPHY, for their urgent words on this most important issue. I am proud to join them as we seek passage to pass legislation to finally require the President to invoke the full authority of the DPA, the Defense Production Act, so that the Federal Government can more speedily get testing supplies and PPE to the parts of our country struggling under the weight of the pandemic.

Make no mistake, medical professionals and frontline workers fighting this virus still—still—do not have the protective equipment and the testing supplies they need because the Trump administration failed to fully invoke the DPA earlier this year. This is a crisis of President Trump's making.

As we speak, COVID-19 continues to surge across the country. As cases keep growing, our testing supplies and our PPE, already in short supply, are reaching critical levels. From Seattle to Miami, people are waiting in line for hours to get tested, and their results might take days, if not more, to come back. In many places we are missing basic supplies—swabs, gloves. In certain hospitals it has been reported doctors and nurses are being told to reuse their N95 masks as many as 15–15–times.

It has been 6 months since we have been fighting this virus. How is this still happening? The problem should have been solved months ago, but the President has been derelict in his duty. His administration has been a total failure when it comes to testing and PPE.

Instead of fully invoking the DPA and ramping up the production of critical supplies early on, President Trump has left doctors, nurses, and medical staff fighting this disease with one hand tied behind their back. He has failed to keep us and those working on the frontline safe.

This bill, however, would finally—finally—force the President to do what he should have done ages ago. We have been talking about the DPA since way back in April. I called the President in April, got him on the phone, urged him to invoke it. He told me he would and then contradicted himself a few hours later. How typical, but how devastating for the American people. Then he quickly lost interest—again, typical of this President, whose attention span is much too short for the big fight that we have with COVID.

So what we say is the President's approach to the pandemic was—typically here—no followthrough, no strategy, no comprehension of the problem. The President's mind-boggling refusal to invoke the DPA shouldn't be piled on top of the challenges our medical workers and citizens already face.

I am sorry we didn't pass this legislation. I hope we can do it soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I begin, I would like to take a moment to honor Congressman John Lewis, who died on Friday. A leader of the civil rights movement, he was one of the 13 original Freedom Riders and an organizer of the 1963 March on Washington. He was a man of conscience, conviction, and supreme courage.

“When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to do something,” he would say.

John Lewis did something. Confronted by the great sin of segregation, John Lewis put himself front and center in the fight. He organized sit-ins. He led demonstrations. He marched for

freedom. And he paid for his convictions with his blood. A man who espoused nonviolence, he suffered incredible brutality at the hands of both police officers and civilian mobs. He was attacked and beaten an untold number of times.

During a march in Selma, AL—on a day that lives in infamy—a police officer fractured John Lewis's skull, leaving him with a scar that he carried to the end of his life. Yet John Lewis was unbowed. No matter how many times he was attacked or what he suffered, he got up again and rejoined the fight.

His death is a great loss, but John Lewis will live on in the annals of American heroes. May we all have his courage in fighting for the right.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, so far, Congress has provided \$2.4 trillion to fight the coronavirus. Over the past couple of months here in the Senate, we have been closely tracking the implementation of this money and working with the administration on disbursement.

In June alone, we held 30 hearings in the Senate on COVID-related issues. All of this has helped us identify the priorities that need to shape our next bill, which we are hoping to pass in the next couple of weeks. Those priorities are kids, jobs, and healthcare.

First, kids: Getting kids back in school safely needs to be a priority. Being able to attend school in person is important for students' academic development and for their social and emotional well-being.

The American Academy of Pediatrics has stated: "All policy considerations for the coming school year should start with a goal of having students physically present in school."

Now, not every school may be able to fully reopen this fall, but we need to make sure that those schools that can reopen have the resources they need to reopen safely. That is why the legislation the Republicans are drafting here in the Senate would provide more than \$100 billion to help schools ensure they have what they need to safely welcome students back to class.

While our first priority in getting kids back to school is ensuring their academic and social well-being, getting students back in school is also important for families' economic health. There are a lot of parents in this country who can't afford to have one parent stay home to homeschool. We need to ensure that those parents have access to schools and childcare wherever possible so that they can keep or return to their jobs.

Enabling Americans to return to work is key to our economic recovery. Currently, there are more than 17 million unemployed Americans. While this is a significant improvement from where we were 2 months ago, that number is still much too high, and we have to do everything we can to get these Americans back on the job and receiving a regular paycheck.

That is why the legislation we are drafting will provide incentives for

businesses to hire and to retain workers. It will provide a refundable tax credit for Main Street businesses for the protective equipment and cleaning supplies that they need to keep their employees and customers safe and to encourage Americans to return to their businesses. It will provide another round of assistance to small businesses, with a focus on those that have been hit the hardest by the pandemic.

We also expect to issue another round of direct payments to hard-working Americans to help them get back on their feet and to stimulate the economy.

The third bucket of our coronavirus response is, of course, healthcare. We have to keep ensuring our healthcare professionals have the resources needed to treat patients, develop new treatments, and to find a vaccine to tame this virus once and for all.

The coronavirus legislation that we are drafting will address all three of those priorities.

Our legislation will also include another important priority that will protect jobs, schools, businesses, and healthcare workers, and that is liability protections. No matter how many precautions schools and businesses take, there is no way for them to completely eliminate all risk of employees, students, or customers contracting the virus, but an army of trial lawyers is waiting to levy lawsuits against even the most careful schools and businesses.

There is absolutely no question that schools and businesses should be liable for gross negligence or for intentional misconduct, but businesses and schools that are taking every reasonable precaution to protect employees and students and customers should not have to worry about facing lawsuits for virus transmission that they could not have prevented.

Healthcare workers giving their all on the frontlines to treat coronavirus patients should not have to worry that their efforts will be rewarded with lawsuits.

I would like to think that we can put a bipartisan bill together and get it to the President's desk in the next couple of weeks. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats to get this done. We will introduce our draft shortly and be ready to negotiate with Democrats to arrive at a final bill, the same process that we followed with the CARES Act, our largest coronavirus relief bill to date.

This will work only if Democrats are willing to come to the table and negotiate a reasonable bill. My Democratic colleagues sometimes behave as if government money is drawn from a magical pot of gold that will never run out, but it is not. It is not.

Every dollar of the coronavirus funding we provided so far has been borrowed money, and every dollar we appropriate in the phase 4 bill we are drafting will likely be borrowed money as well.

It can be argued that it is money we need to borrow, but we need to remember that it is borrowed money and that the bill for that money will eventually come due. The more we drive up our debt, the greater the threat to the health of our economy, not to mention to the economic future of today's younger workers. We have an obligation to them to limit our borrowing to what is absolutely necessary to fight the virus.

The Democratic leader has come down to the floor the past couple of days and suggested that the Heroes Act—a \$3 trillion coronavirus bill the House passed is—"a good product to start with" when it comes to a phase 4 coronavirus relief bill.

That is ludicrous. The bill the Democratic leader is promoting—the bill he thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus legislation—is a bill that mentions cannabis—cannabis more often than it mentions the word "jobs."

Let me just repeat that. The bill the Democratic leader thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus relief legislation mentions the word "cannabis" more often than it mentions the word "job."

While the Democratic leader is certainly welcome to disagree with me, I don't think diversity studies in the cannabis industry have a major role to play in defeating this virus or getting Americans back to work, nor does federalizing election law—another priority the Democrats included in their bill.

Despite its \$3 trillion pricetag, the bill the Democratic leader is endorsing fails to meet one of the most basic requirements of any coronavirus relief bill, and that is providing a meaningful plan for getting Americans back to work. It is disappointing to hear the Democratic leader promoting such an unserious piece of legislation at a time that we should be devoting all of our efforts to getting a bipartisan bill to the President.

I hope my other Democratic colleagues in the Senate are ready to look beyond partisan wish lists and focus on negotiating a relief package that addresses the real priorities we are facing: helping kids and parents, getting Americans back to work, and providing the healthcare resources needed to fight this virus.

Republicans are ready to come to the table, and I urge Democrats to join us. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4243

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am expecting the Senator from Utah to come to the floor momentarily to resume debate over an issue which was raised yesterday and suspended to move to a vote that had been previously scheduled.

Since this item, this issue, we are discussing is of such importance to so many individuals in our country

today—and many of them are following this carefully and closely—I wanted to make sure we returned to it today to at least consider one aspect of the debate.

Yesterday, when I made a unanimous consent request, Senator LEE said he had not had time to look at my proposal. That is why I waited until today to come back, so that he would have that opportunity.

Yesterday, I came to the floor to speak about the plight of immigrant workers who are suffering because of a serious problem in our immigration system known as the green card backlog. Many of these immigrants are essential workers who are helping to lead the fight against COVID-19, but the green card backlog puts them and their families at risk of losing their immigration status and being subject to deportation.

Under the current law, there are clearly not enough immigrant visas—also known as green cards—available each year. The numbers that we have established in 1990 are still applicable today, though our national economy has doubled since then. We are still talking about 140,000 employment visas each year.

These so-called green cards have resulted in many people waiting for long periods of times—literally for years—for the opportunity to become legal permanent residents and securing one of the green cards. While they are waiting, their families are at risk.

These backlogs are particularly difficult on children because as they wait, the children, of course, advance in age, and when they reach age 21, they are subject to deportation. I have met with these families, and I have talked with them. It is a heartbreaking situation.

The unanimous consent request, which I will make today, addresses the plight of those children directly. Senator LEE objected to it yesterday. He said he had not had a chance to look at it. I hope he will reconsider when I make the same request today.

These children who face, what we call, aging out at age 21 would be protected by this unanimous consent request, which I am making. In addition to the green card backlog, it is clear there is a solution to this issue, which I am afraid we are not going to be able to achieve. It is to increase the number of green cards available each year in this country.

These immigrant workers who are seeking green cards are already in the United States working legally. This is not a question of increasing the number of green cards, of bringing in new immigrants to compete with American workers. These workers are already here. It is about whether immigrant workers will continue to be able to work on temporary visas, where they have to depend on their employer for their immigration status and their future is uncertain.

I introduced legislation known as the RELIEF Act. My cosponsors are Sen-

ator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont and Senator MAZIE HIRONO of Hawaii. The RELIEF Act would increase the number of green cards to clear the backlog for all immigrants waiting in line for green cards within 5 years—eliminate the backlog for green cards within 5 years.

This RELIEF Act would keep immigrant families together by treating children and spouses of green card holders as immediate relatives, just as the children and spouses of citizens are, so they don't count against the green card caps. The RELIEF Act would protect the aging-out children who qualify for a green card based on parents' immigrant petition.

The RELIEF Act that I am describing is not novel or controversial; it is based on a provision of the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I helped to write with the so-called Gang of 8. That included Senator McCain, Senator GRAHAM, Senator Flake, as well as Senator RUBIO on the Republican side; myself, Senator SCHUMER, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator BENNET on the Democratic side. We worked hard and passed that measure through the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the floor by a vote of 68 to 32.

What I am proposing is something I have proposed in the past, crafted, passed, and offered to the House of Representatives to help start to solve the immigration crisis, which we currently have in this country. Unfortunately, the Republicans, who controlled the House of Representatives when this measure came before them several years ago, refused to even take up this measure and debate it.

If they had, we wouldn't be here today. The green card backlog would not exist based on the provision which I offered with others in the comprehensive immigration reform bill. Unfortunately, some of the Republicans on the other side of the aisle are still unwilling to increase any number of immigrant visas. They want to keep the immigrant workers on a temporary basis, where they and their family are at risk of losing their immigration status and being deported.

The senior Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE, has introduced S. 386, known as the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, to address the green card backlog. I have a basic concern with that bill. It includes no additional green cards. Without any additional green cards, S. 386 will not reduce the green card backlog. Without additional green cards, S. 386 will not reduce the green card backlog.

Don't take it from me. There are those who will disagree and say: Oh, DURBIN is wrong. He is just mistaken in saying that.

Please go to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service. Here is what they said about S. 386, Senator LEE's legislation. "S. 386 would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law."

Despite my concerns about Senator LEE's bill, I agreed to sit down and

work in good faith with him to resolve our differences. Last December, we reached an agreement—I believed we did—on an amendment to the bill. The amendment doesn't address the core problem because it doesn't increase the number of green cards. As a result, it would not reduce the green card backlog, but there was an improvement in the amendment which we put together. I talked about it yesterday.

Let me highlight two key provisions of our agreement. We protected the families who are stuck in this backlog waiting for a green card. Immigrant workers and immediate family members would be allowed to "early file" for their green cards. That was a proposal that came to me from Senator LEE, and I thought it was reasonable. These individuals would not receive their green cards early, but they would be able, while waiting, to switch jobs and travel without losing immigration status. I think that is reasonable. Early filing adds a critical protection that wasn't in S. 386.

Listen carefully. Our agreement prevents the children of immigrant workers from aging out of green card eligibility so they will not face deportation while they are waiting for a green card.

Our agreement also would crack down on the abuse of H-1B temporary work visas. Really, I think this is at the heart of the problems we are running into. There are corporate entities in India, which have extraordinary power over the securing of these H-1B visas.

The amendment we put together would allow legitimate use of H-1B visas, but here is what it would say. It would prohibit a company from hiring additional H-1B workers in the future if the company's workforce is more than 50 employees and more than 50 percent of those are temporary workers.

The 50-50 rule is from a bipartisan H-1B reform bill that I authored with Senator GRASSLEY. This provision was included in the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Senator LEE has said publicly: This is a commonsense reform to root out abuse. I think he is right. I know these companies despise this provision, and I think it is one of the reasons we find ourselves with no common ground today. If this is included, they don't want anything to pass, and they are doing their best to stop it.

The reality is that the top recipients of H-1B visas today are outsourcing companies that use loopholes in the law to exploit immigrant workers and offshore American jobs. In the most recent year for which data is available, 8 of the top 10 recipients of new H-1B visas were outsourcing companies.

Unfortunately, yesterday, Senator LEE objected to this proposal, which we had put together. Instead, he offered a revised version that included changes that were requested by the Trump administration. Let me explain Senator LEE's changes because I think they are basic, and I believe they are a problem.

First, he wants to remove a provision from our original agreement, known as the hold harmless clause. What it says is very simple. It assures immigrants already waiting in line for green cards that there is nothing we will do that will, in any way, injure or delay their pursuit of a green card; they can't fall further behind in line. We hold them harmless from any change we make. Why wouldn't we? Some of these people have waited for years. The hold harmless provision basically says we are going to protect wherever you stand in line.

The second thing that Senator LEE wants to do is to delay for 3 years the effective date of the 50-50 rule to crack down on outsourcing companies. I don't know why we want to wait 3 years to do that. We don't have to. We shouldn't. Why on Earth would we give these companies that are outsourcing American jobs and exploiting immigrant workers a free pass for an additional 3 years?

Third, Senator LEE wanted to delay for years early filing for people who are stuck in the green card backlog. The object behind the early filing, and the reason why it is so appealing to me, was that it would protect the individuals applying as well as their families from the start, and now the Senator suggested that we delay this. That just means that many children will age out during that 1-to-3-year period of time and be subject to deportation. We shouldn't do that to these children and these families.

Yesterday, I made a simple proposal to Senator LEE, which he hadn't seen personally, and that is why we had to come back today. While we continue to debate the best way to fix the green card backlog, let's make sure no children of the affected families are harmed or deported. It is just that simple.

I offered a new bill—very simply stated—the Protect Children of Immigrants Workers Act. This brief, three-page bill would ensure that children do not age out while waiting for a green card.

Imagine if you brought your family to the United States, worked on an H-1B visa, applied for a green card to stay in this country, and your children are waiting with you for the green card. You are paying for them to go to college because they don't qualify as American citizens for any type of Federal financial aid. You are making great sacrifices for them. Then the day comes when they reach the age of 21 and they can be deported and the family divided. Why would we want to let that happen?

This three-page bill, the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, protects those children. It would not increase the number of green cards. It would not provide any special benefits. It would simply allow children of immigrant workers to keep their place in line for a green card and be protected from deportation until they can get that card.

Yesterday, Senator LEE said he had not had a chance to review it, so I wanted to return to the floor today. I believe this is timely and important, and now he has had a chance to look at it. Senator LEE's original bill does not offer any protection for those children, which I think is a major humanitarian problem caused by the green card backlog.

The early-filing provision in my agreement with Senator LEE will immediately protect the kids in the backlog under the age of 21. However, if early-filing is delayed, Senator LEE now proposes those kids would age out and lose their green card eligibility.

I have met many of these young people. It breaks my heart to hear their stories, that they may be reaching a point where they have aged out and could be deported. That is why I want to offer this specific single provision. There is no reason these children should be punished for a broken immigration system. It is beyond their control, but it is not beyond our control to help them.

I now am going to ask unanimous consent for the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged of S. 4243, the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, for well over 8 months, my friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, has been publicly blocking legislation protecting the children of immigrant workers. Now there is something called the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act. He comes to the floor asking that we pass this bill by unanimous consent—a bill that, as he notes, was introduced just yesterday. Well, we must pass this right now, he says, because these children shouldn't have to suffer 1 more hour. With all due respect, they could have had relief months ago. They can still have relief today.

I have taken the time since yesterday to review Senator DURBIN's legislation, and I cannot support it. This legislation allows the children of H-1B workers to remain in the country for the 20 to 30 years that their parents have to wait in the green card backlog—the same green card backlog the Senator is now decrying.

When their parents die, children of immigrant workers will not be immediately deported. But this prolonging of dependent status is helpful only if the parent lives and works in this country until his or her green card application is actually adjudicated. It

does nothing for the child of an immigrant whose dead parent's green card application is ultimately denied because his or her job is no longer available—nothing.

To be honest, the 20 to 30 years is a short wait for most of the Indian nationals currently stuck in this awful, hellish green card backlog. In fact, it is a drop in the bucket. In 2020, the wait for an EB2 green card is not, in fact, 20 to 30 years for an Indian national. What is it, then? Is it 30? Is it 40, 50, 60? No, it is much longer than that. It is 195 years. This means that someone from India entering the backlog today would have to wait 195 years to receive an EB3 green card. Even if we give their children this limbo status, none of them will have a prayer of becoming a U.S. citizen.

To put this in perspective, 195 years ago, John Quincy Adams had recently been inaugurated as President of the United States.

The legislation purports to allow aging-out children to move to a student visa status, but it also fails to accomplish even this. Student visas require the applicant to have residency in a foreign country, which, obviously, these children do not have.

Perhaps these are merely drafting errors, but as such, they underscore my concerns about passing slapdash legislation just because it bears a title that compels us to believe that it will correct the most egregious problems and protect the most vulnerable populations.

Even if we generously overlook these "drafting errors," this legislation goes from sloppy to worse. Most egregiously, it will increase the existing green card backlog. If we pass this legislation on its own, high-skilled workers from highly populated countries will have fewer and fewer green cards available to them, meaning they will have to wait longer and longer for relief. In fact, by the time we stretch this out to 2030, the 195-year backlog I mentioned a moment ago would be extended out to a 400- to 450-year backlog. That is not fair. I can't imagine that is what the Senator from Illinois wants.

If we want to actually protect the children of immigrant workers, we need to end the inequities of the green card system. Real protection for the children is impossible unless we have a fair path forward for the parents.

I have worked for 9 years on a thoughtful solution to these problems in the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. This compromise protects children, protects widows and widowers, and it provides an equitable path forward for all our high-skilled immigrants. That is why I call on Senator DURBIN to lift his hold on the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act and to provide relief to immigrant children and to their parents.

As to the suggestion that the changes made to this legislation were bad, that they were a departure from what we



agreed on, it is not true. The implementation delay simply allows the USCIS a time to develop the adequate infrastructure to implement what we had proposed, the 50-50 rule change. This 3 years is there to protect the H-1B visa holders who were already here. The hold-harmless provision was taken care of with the 3- to 9-year transition that now covers them.

In any event, this legislation—the one Senator DURBIN now tries to pass by unanimous consent, introduced for the first time yesterday that I have now reviewed—is sloppy. It doesn't solve the problem, and it would make a lot of things worse. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there is no question that there is a green card backlog for immigrant visas. We issue 140,000 employment-based visas a year and 226,000 family visas. There are some 5 million seeking them. I want to increase the number of green cards. The Senator from Utah opposes that. As a result, the bill that he introduced, according to analysis by the Congressional Research Service—this is not DURBIN's language; this is the Congressional Research Service: S. 386, the lead legislation, would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law.

When he talks about 195 years and John Quincy Adams or whatever his historical analogy was, he doesn't address that at all in S. 386.

The problem, of course, is that he is bound to a position of his party that will not allow one additional new immigrant—none. I don't take that position. These men and women and their kids have been living in the United States. Many of them have been here for years, some of them for decades. Some of them are doctors in hospitals in my hometown. I trust them, and I trust their kids. What I am asking him to do today is simply join with me in protecting their children while we resolve the other issues. He refuses. He refused yesterday. He refuses again today.

He calls my approach sloppy. Let's see the Lee alternative to protect the children. I would like to see what he would like to propose. Maybe it is language that is better, and maybe I can embrace it. But let's take care of that discrete part of this issue. Why would we leave these children now aging into adults at risk? That is just the wrong way to approach this. We can solve this problem, and we should. While we solve it, we should protect these children. It is within the ken of both Senator LEE and myself to sit down through staff and come up with that language. I believe we can.

I want to say I will continue to offer this opportunity for Senator LEE to protect these children until we can sit down in good faith and resolve any differences we have between us. I have heard this case over and over again

about the plight of these children. I am trying to address it. He continues to object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we have the opportunity right here to pass this right now. This bill fixes this problem.

As to the suggestion that we can't do any of this without increasing the total number of green cards—this is a poison pill. My friend and colleague knows that it is a poison pill. In fact, we had that very discussion. I don't ordinarily—in fact, I have a uniform policy against publicly talking about private conversations we have as colleagues. We have now brought it to the floor.

We talked about this. This was the basis upon which we reached a deal in his office in December. The point there was to understand that we can't pass something—certainly by unanimous consent—that increases the total number of employment-based green cards. It is not going to happen. So we are dealing here with that finite universe. That is the basis of the deal we reached in December.

As to the suggestion that we can't do anything without increasing the total number of green cards, the Senator knows that is not on the table. That is not fair. What we want to do is make this process fair, even if we only have a limited number of green cards to work with, which is the case. Whether you like that political reality or not, it is the political reality. It is the factual understanding that the Senator and I discussed and understood in December when we made that deal. The Lee alternative is the encapsulation of that.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the Lee amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Just do the math; 140,000 EB visas and 226,000 family visas per year and 5 million people waiting. If you think you can solve this without changing the number of green cards, you can't. You may address it from one angle or another. You may help some who are waiting as opposed to others. You only give assistance to some at the expense of some other group.

I understand the Senator's position. I don't quarrel with the fact he made it clear from the start that, from his perspective and perhaps from his side of the aisle, there is just no appetite for increasing the number of green cards,

even for these people who have been living and working here in the United States for years and sometimes decades, even for physicians from India and other countries who are literally risking their lives today on COVID-19 patients. The Senator told me there is no appetite for giving them additional green cards so they can stay here on a permanent basis. I think that is unfair, and that is my position.

The Senator made it clear—and I am not saying otherwise—that he disagrees with me. So what I tried to do is come in and say that at least during the pendency, while they are waiting for green cards—which could be decades unless the law is changed—let's at least protect their families. That is all I basically said.

He has come back and said: I want to put in a provision that takes out the hold-harmless protection. I want to protect these people who are outsourcing companies in India that have captured the lion's share of these H-1B visas. I want to make sure that those who are going to be protected have to wait up to 3 years before there is any protection.

Why in the world would we do any of those things? I am willing to sit down and talk to you, but I am not going to accept these at this point unless we can find a starting point, which is protection for the children of these families. If you will agree to that, I will be more than happy to discuss the other provisions again, but because the other provisions are now what you are offering, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the protection for the children is now found in the proposal, in the amendment at the desk—the one that was just objected to by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Illinois.

I would ask my colleague rhetorically or directly, as he may choose: If, in fact, he is unwilling and remains unwilling to negotiate on any bill addressing this problem without increasing the total number of employment-based green cards, why in the world did he waste months of my time? Why did he lead me to believe, while in his office, that he was open to such an agreement that was, in fact, the premise upon which we proceeded? We spent months on that, and I worked in good faith.

As I mentioned yesterday, it was against my better judgment that I agreed to announce with the Senator on the Senate floor that we had reached an agreement because I knew that we had to work out a few kinks, but I proceeded based solely on the feasibility and our ability to implement that bill. That was the only change that we made.

Now, if the Senator wants to make some adjustment to that, bring it forward. I would love to consider it. Yet what he is now telling me is that the premise upon which we proceeded on those negotiations and then spent

weeks and months working on was false in that the whole premise that we could reach some sort of compromise—an actual compromise—that wouldn't increase the number of total green cards available was illusory. I find that disappointing.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senator has addressed a question to me, I believe.

Mr. LEE. Rhetorically or otherwise, the Senator is welcome to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know other Senators are waiting to speak, so I will try to be as concise and brief as possible.

I understand the Senator's position. He doesn't want another green card. He believes Members on his side of the aisle don't want an increase in the number of green cards—period. I knew that going in. He made that abundantly clear. We can't solve the underlying problem without it, but we can make it better. That is why we continue to talk and negotiate, and I hope we will continue to talk and negotiate. Yet, for goodness' sake, the starting point ought to be the protection of these children.

Can we not agree that we will protect the children and then proceed to continue the negotiations on the premise that the Senator cannot accept one more green card? I can, and the Senator can't, but we will try to improve the system with that premise accepted. At the starting point, for goodness' sake, let's protect the children while we negotiate and debate. Hopefully, we can do it on a timely basis. That is my response.

I am willing to continue to work. I understand the Senator cannot issue another green card. The math never works with 5 million people waiting and 140,000 employment green cards and 226,000 family visas a year. It is never going to work, but I am willing to try to make the system better, with the understanding that I will increase the number of green cards and that the Senator will not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am always happy to discuss any counterproposal. If the Senator would make one, I would love to see it. It is not fair to say I don't care about those kids because I am unwilling to create additional green cards. If the Senator wants to protect these children, pass this bill. Pass it today. Pass it at this very moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4019

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of S. 4019, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act—legislation that I have introduced along with Senator CORNYN. We have 54 cosponsors and broad bipartisan support that would make Juneteenth a

Federal holiday. In a few minutes, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up and pass this important bill.

Our country is in the midst of a long overdue reckoning on race and justice. The murder of George Floyd by members of the Minneapolis Police Department has galvanized the Nation as protesters have taken to our streets, demanding justice—justice for George Floyd, justice for Breonna Taylor, and justice for countless other Black and Brown Americans who have been hurt or killed at the hands of law enforcement. Yet this reckoning goes well beyond seeking accountability for police officers who betray the trust we bestow upon them.

The disparate treatment and mistreatment of Black and Brown Americans permeates our society. It infects our courts, our schools, and our places of work. It reflects the unfulfilled promise of a nation built upon the notion that all are created equal, and it has its roots in our Nation's original sin—slavery—a crime against humanity that we have for far too long failed to acknowledge, address, or come to grips with.

One way to further the process of racial reconciliation and healing is to recognize, honor, and celebrate the formal end of slavery in the United States and to do so at the Federal level. Perhaps the most effective, direct, and far-reaching way to do that is with a Federal holiday commemorating that historic event.

For more than 150 years, the Juneteenth holiday, which marks the emancipation of slaves, has been observed one way or the other across our Nation, including in Texas, but it is long past time to place Juneteenth on par with other Federal holidays so that all Americans in all 50 States will celebrate Juneteenth alongside Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Martin Luther King Day, and other Federal holidays.

The celebration of Juneteenth dates back to June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers, led by MG Gordon Granger, traveled to Galveston, TX, with the announcement that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were now free. This was 2½ years after the date of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, but either the news of Lincoln's order had not reached many, including those in Texas, or local officials had refused to enforce it.

On June 19, 1865, Major General Granger read to the people of Texas General Order No. 3, the first lines of which told them clearly and unequivocally: "The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free."

Juneteenth celebrations followed as did the recognition of Juneteenth as the formal end of slavery in the United States. Since 1865, communities all across the Nation have celebrated Juneteenth with parades, cookouts, prayer gatherings, historical and cul-

tural readings, musical performances, and many other celebrations. These events have provided many with the opportunity for reflection, education, and a deeper understanding of our history as a nation—the whole history—and how it has affected and shaped the lives of Black Americans.

Nearly every State and the District of Columbia have passed legislation recognizing Juneteenth as a holiday or observance, and the Senate has passed a resolution designating June 19 as Juneteenth Independence Day, but Juneteenth has never received the higher status it deserves as a Federal holiday. The Juneteenth National Independence Day Act rights this wrong and makes Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

We still must travel a long and difficult road to justice and equality in the United States, but we cannot get there without recognizing the original sin of slavery and marking its end. It is incumbent upon all Americans to truthfully acknowledge and understand our past and how it affects our present and our future. Making Juneteenth a Federal holiday will not right all of the wrongs of the past or fix what remains broken, but it is an important step. It is the truth of our history and the missing half of the story of our Nation's freedom and independence. It is long past time to recognize Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Let me stop there and recognize my partner in this effort, the senior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I will be brief.

Let me just tell the Senator from Massachusetts that I agree with everything he has said. It shows how people of, maybe, different political ideologies—certainly different parties—can come together and recognize that there is a moment available to us here in which we can demonstrate our nonpartisan support for this act of racial reconciliation in our country.

I agree that slavery was the original sin. Our founding documents said that all men and women were created equal, but that certainly wasn't the practice when it came to African Americans at the time who were officially designated as something less than fully human. It was an outrageous act at the time, and our country has paid a dear price for that over the years—from the Civil War to the violence that led up to the peaceful civil rights movement in the sixties. It is obvious from the recent events—George Floyd's death in particular—that we are not where we need to be. We still have room to grow as part of our developing that more perfect Union.

I know our friend and colleague TIM SCOTT, who has been at the forefront of this discussion with his advocacy for the Justice Act, has a lot of bipartisan ideas for police reform. He points out that, as an African American, his experience has been much different from

those who are non-African Americans. He said, over the last two decades, he has been stopped—as he puts it, “driving while Black”—about 18 different times.

At a roundtable that was sponsored by Mayor Sylvester Turner and that I had requested, I sat next to a pastor of a church in Houston who happened to be the local head of the NAACP.

He said: I honor the police. I respect the police. I support the police. Yet he said: My son is afraid of the police, and we have to do everything we can to cure that trust deficit.

In Texas, we have recognized Juneteenth as a State holiday for 40 years, obviously, because of the fact that this occurred as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation's being announced in Galveston, TX. Yet I recently cosponsored a bill with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE to study a trail, basically, from Galveston to Houston as the possible designation of a national park in further recognition of this event.

I believe strongly that we need to remember our history because if we don't remember our history, in the words of one sage, “we will be condemned to relive it.” We have come so far, but we know we still have further to go. I do believe that the appropriate word to use is “reconciliation.” This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate our concern and our commitment to equal justice and equal treatment under the law by recognizing Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Texas. This is a thoroughly bipartisan effort, and it is long overdue.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. 4019; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, let me start out by saying that I agree with virtually everything my colleagues from both Massachusetts and Texas have said about celebrating the emancipation of the slaves. That was an important moment in U.S. history. It should be observed, and it should be celebrated. I have no disagreement whatsoever with that at all. The one area of disagreement is how the bill's sponsors have chosen to celebrate that holiday.

As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, since 1865, it has been observed with celebrations and cookouts, which is the appropriate way of doing this. I object to the fact that, by naming it a national holiday—and what they are leaving out of their argument and its main impact—it will give Federal workers a paid day off that the rest of America will have to pay for.

When I asked for a CBO score, the sponsors of the bill had not even obtained a score, and I still don't think they have obtained a score. The estimate, in terms of what it will cost American taxpayers in the private sector to pay for a paid holiday for Federal workers, is about \$600 million per year. The CBO score would come in at \$6 billion over 10.

In terms of why I object, let me just put a couple of facts to that \$600 million bill that hard-working taxpayers would have to foot in an era when we are \$26.5 trillion in debt and when 17 million of our fellow Americans are currently unemployed.

The first chart here—let's just talk about how many days off Federal workers get currently.

I have two columns—minimum and maximum. For paid holidays, they get 10, which is pretty generous. Most people in the private sector get something similar—7, 8, 9, or 10. For paid leave days, there is a minimum of 13, up to 26; for paid sick days, 13, minimum and maximum.

What we just added in last year's NDAA was paid parental leave, which allows an individual—either mother or father, with either a natural childbirth or an adoption—60 days of paid leave.

So for a total, at a minimum, there are 96 days, up to 109 days if they take paid parental leave.

Looked at a different way, as a ratio, if they take the maximum number of 109 days, that is, basically, for every 1.4 days you work, you get a day off. On a minimum basis with paid parental leave, for every 1.7 days you work, you get a day off.

Now, again, I realize the paid parental leave is a “just a few times in somebody's career” phenomenon, so let's take a look at this without paid parental leave, and it will show that the number of days with pay that Federal workers get off is still quite generous.

Again, paid holidays, they get 10; paid leave, 13, up to 26; paid sick leave, 13, for a total of 36 to 49.

So, again, going back to that ratio, the maximum number of days without paid parental leave, a Federal worker can work 4.3 days and then get a day off—basically a 4-day workweek for the entire year. That is quite generous.

So what I am objecting to is creating a national holiday that gives Federal workers another day off with pay, paid for by the American taxpayer, and we are collectively already \$26.5 trillion in debt.

Last slide. I would like to just, in general, talk about the private sector pay versus Federal worker pay. I know there are some disputes about this in terms of education and that type of thing, but still, this is pretty solid information.

The 2018 average annual wage—just wages, salary or wages—for Federal workers is over \$94,000. For private sector workers, the average is about \$63,000 or about 67 percent of what a Federal worker makes.

When you add in benefits, total compensation, the average total compensation for Federal workers in 2018 was \$136,000, just shy of \$136,000. In the private sector, the total cost of compensation is a little more than \$75,000—55 percent of what Federal Government workers make.

So if you strip out and just compare the benefits, again, we are talking about an extra paid day off, an extra paid holiday for only Federal workers to celebrate Juneteenth, paid for by American workers who make about \$12,000, on average per benefit, compared to \$41,000 in benefits for Federal workers. That is only 29 percent.

So those are the facts. Again, that is what I object to.

Again, I am happy to celebrate Juneteenth. I think we should celebrate the fact that we did remove that original sin by emancipating the slaves. That is a day of celebration. I agree with that. I simply don't believe we should make American taxpayers in the private sector pony up \$600 million a year, \$6 billion over 10 years, to give Federal workers, who already are paid quite generously and have quite a few days off one more paid day off.

So what I am proposing—again, I don't object to Juneteenth and a celebration, but if we are going to make that a Federal holiday, the main impact of that is giving Federal workers a paid day off. I would just suggest this: Why don't we take away one of their days of paid leave?

So I have an amendment at the desk, and I would ask that the Senator from Massachusetts modify his request to include my amendment at the desk; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Senator's proposal—rather than allowing this unanimous consent request to go through, the Senator proposes to hold it hostage to taking away the leave benefits that come with paid holidays for American workers. That is something we have never done before, and with good reason. We shouldn't be penalizing our workers by taking away benefits, especially not in the current environment and especially not as the price to pay for recognizing a long overdue Federal holiday.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and to quickly respond to the Senator from Massachusetts, I am not taking anything away from Federal workers. I am just not willing to give them an extra day paid.

So if we create Juneteenth as a Federal paid holiday, they will get an extra day, and I am just saying let's keep them whole by removing a paid leave day, and then they will have the exact same number of days off as they have currently, and the American taxpayer will not be out an extra \$600 million per year or \$6 billion over 10 years.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, before I speak, several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, over the next several minutes—well, probably for more than a half hour—will be coming to the floor to discuss what I am discussing, which is a very important problem we have of rapidly increasing drug prices.

After I speak, these other Senators will come to the floor: Senator BRAUN, Senator CASSIDY, Senator COLLINS, Senator HYDE-SMITH, Senator MCSALLY. All of these people have been very favorable in support of the Prescription Drug Reduction Act, and I want to thank them for participating in bringing attention to this very important issue of unjustified increases in drug prices.

After these folks I just mentioned speak, I understand that my colleague from Iowa, who is in support of the legislation, is going to come at a later time today.

So thank you to my colleagues.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 9 out of 10 Americans are concerned about prescription drug prices. Specifically, they are concerned that the pharmaceutical industry will take advantage of the current pandemic to increase drug prices. That poll was published a month ago. Unfortunately, those concerns have become a reality now.

Two weeks ago, POLITICO reported that pharmaceutical companies have raised prices on hundreds of prescription drugs just during the pandemic. The report says that there have been more than 800—800—price increases just this year.

I have been working on a bill for over a year and a half to stem these increases and rein in drug prices. It would cap costs for Medicare recipients, cap increases to the rate of inflation, and save taxpayers nearly \$100 billion. It wasn't simple, but I am glad to have produced this kind of bill with Ranking Member WYDEN and my colleagues here with me today.

But I am disappointed. My partner and all of my Democratic colleagues who approved this bill in committee by a vote of 19 to 9 declined to cosponsor an improved version of the bill that they helped put together in the first place, and this is the work of about 18 months.

I can't be sure why, but I have to assume it is because it is an election

year, and, somehow, passing a bill that would do so much good in a time with so much hardship might help Republicans who also support the bill, hurting Democrats' chances of taking the majority.

As we consider a new relief bill, we ought to put aside that kind of politics-before-people method of legislating. We need to approve the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act as part of this package. Our country is facing the most serious public health crisis in a generation—not just a generation, if you think back—in generations.

Millions of Americans are newly unemployed, and many small businesses have slowed or shuttered altogether. People across the country are stretching their paychecks and their savings to get through this virus pandemic.

In the CARES Act, passed in March, and in subsequent legislation, we helped slow the hurt caused by this virus. But there is only so much a stimulus check or tax relief can do when your bills just keep coming and going up—meaning the pharmaceutical bills.

These drug price increases are a weight that Americans shouldn't have to bear, especially seniors on whom the virus is taking a particular toll.

The increases aren't a result of a functioning marketplace or an industry with healthy competition. Addressing these price increases is also something we all largely agree on.

In 2016, the President campaigned on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable for patients. He won. He even talked about that promise in a State of the Union message when he said that he wants Congress to send a bill for him to sign this year.

So the President made that campaign promise in 2016, and the President has done many things since then to carry out that campaign promise. He has even helped me in the development of this legislation.

That was 2016. This is 2020. In 2018, we have had many House Democrats campaign on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable. Many of them won, and they took over the House of Representatives. It is time to put politics aside and finally act.

Just because Big Pharma was bankrupting patients before the pandemic doesn't mean that we should allow them to keep on doing it now. In fact, there is no better time to put an end to Big Pharma's price gouging than right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, Senator GRASSLEY and I share a passion that I think most Americans do in that it is time that we end this stranglehold that the healthcare industry has on all of us because they pose as free enterprisers, but there is nothing free about the way they actually operate.

"Free enterprise" means you embrace competition. You are not putting up barriers to entry. You engage the consumer so that they can see what you are charging them. That does not occur. The alternative will be as clear on the other side of the aisle; they want to make government the business partner of healthcare. If the industry doesn't get with it and start doing what all the rest of us do when we go to the marketplace—embrace competition, be willing to compete, don't ask for barriers to entry, and, yes, we tell the customer what we charge them before they buy it. That doesn't happen in healthcare.

The market is opaque and complex. There is nothing free about it, except that drugmakers are free to charge whatever they want. The market is dependent on government-sanctioned rebates and monopolies by the FDA exclusivities and patent abuse. It is time to fix this. PBM may not mean much to the public, but it stands for pharmacy benefit managers. This is a structure of middleman that is not present in other industries. Normally, with transparency, prices cascade down through the system in a way that everybody can see it, and the successful survivors in that industry have performed because they give good value to their customers; they keep their overhead low; and they earn the business.

PBMs use techniques like spread pricing. Normally, there is a spread—you buy it for this and sell it for that—but not where people can't see it. It is time that we get away from this complexity and the opaqueness of it because the day of reckoning will come, and the day of reckoning is not too far away.

I recently came from the business world. No one likes the healthcare industry other than the CEOs and owners of these businesses. All of us who have to deal with them are just asking for that one simple thing: Show us what things cost. Quit hiding it. Insurance companies have these secret deals with hospitals, with pharma, and it is starting to cost too much. It shows up in the fact that it is nearly 20 percent of our GDP in the United States, and it costs almost half of that in most other developed countries. The sad thing is, the results aren't any better. In many cases, the results are better at a price that is half the cost.

Both Chairman GRASSLEY and I have talked with President Trump. President Trump has been the most vocal individual in DC about trying to get the industry to work like the rest of us entrepreneurs do. Every time he has an Executive order, they take him to court. That is ending because just recently the hospitals tried that, and the district court overturned it. They will probably appeal it, and, hopefully, the appellate court will overturn it.

I have a transparency bill which is as simple as: Show us what you are charging us before we engage your service.

Mr. GRASSLEY has the same thing basically on drug pricing. Let me tell you how that works.

This is a real live experiment that I put into place 12 years ago. I was so sick and tired of the insurance agents coming in and telling me how lucky I was that it was only going up 5 to 10 percent this year. I didn't think I was very lucky. My company wasn't large enough to spend a lot of time on it. When we got to be 300 employees, that starts to add up. Now we have 1,000 employees. Thank goodness my kids have to deal with that with a good, young executive team, but I put something in place 12 years ago that I am proud of.

I said enough was enough. What do we have that is really going to change the dynamic? You have to remember, this is 12 years ago—talk about trying to find transparency then. We were lucky that we were large enough to self-insure. By doing that, we probably saved close to 25 percent, and by engaging our employees in their own well-being and incentivizing them to shop around to enable their ability to find better prices, it was even there if you looked for it hard back then. Long story short, we have not had a premium increase at my company in 12 years. I am proud of that. We covered preexisting conditions with no caps on coverage because we took a radical change to how healthcare should be bought by the consumer, the employer, and forced the transparency out of a system that wasn't giving much of it then.

Now there is more transparency, but it is just on the fringes. If you get that to happen, prices will cascade down through the system. President Trump had another Executive order for pharma—all these expensive drugs you see advertised—to put the price along with the advertisement. A lot of times it is deceptive—you can get it for as little as \$5 a month. Well, somebody is paying for that \$60,000 or \$70,000 drug. Generally, it is the employer, and the employee some of it, but it is, again, due to the fact that we can't see anything.

Americans are blindfolded from prices, only to receive medical bills, often, that arrive 2 months later. They have no idea, and they open up the envelope with trepidation. Oh my goodness. It wasn't what I thought it would be. More often than not, it is: Oh, my gosh. This is terrible. It has got to end.

It would be different if we were asking for something that is radical. What we are asking for is tell us what you are charging us before we have to engage your services.

That is why it is so important. The White House is behind it. Hopefully, the other side of the aisle will get behind it. Support Chairman GRASSLEY's bill, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, and support my bill, the Healthcare Price Transparency Act. The story I told you about my own company would happen across the country, and we wouldn't be com-

plaining about these surprise billings. We wouldn't be holding our breath. We would simply be doing what all educated consumers do when they go to buy from a truly free enterprise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, COVID-19 is a continuing threat to Americans' physical and financial health, and it is at this intersection that Congress can make a meaningful impact on the family budgets of all Americans by passing sensible legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs through measures such as the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act or, as I like to call it, the "Making Coronavirus Medications Affordable Act."

There is an urgent need to lower the cost of prescription drugs. The high price of drugs is not a new problem, but it is a problem that is going to be made worse by the coronavirus pandemic. Millions of households have seen their incomes suffer due to economic lockdowns aimed at containing the virus.

It is encouraging that job numbers continue to outpace expectations, but still, millions of fellow Americans are out of work, which affects their pocketbook and potentially their insurance coverage. Americans do not need the added burden of expensive drugs, particularly right now.

Congress is providing relief for American families and businesses through the COVID-19 crisis, and we are considering another round of support. I think we should include how do we make drugs more affordable. That way, if folks become ill, they know that they will be able to afford the cure. I believe the best path forward is the "Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act," as I call it, or, as Chairman GRASSLEY calls it, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. I like mine better.

Now, the difficulty in addressing the issue of the price of medications is that a balance must be struck between making sure the medication is affordable but also making sure there is still a profit motive that will incentivize the researchers and pharmaceutical companies to find these cures that we know we need. Just think about it. Without innovation, we would not be able to find a vaccine for coronavirus—a vaccine that will save millions of lives worldwide and allow us to go back to a normal life.

Let me just praise the pharmaceutical industry. We have seen them respond to this crisis in many helpful ways. Additionally, they recently committed a billion dollars to antimicrobial resistance, which is to say, to find an antibiotic that will work when other antibiotics no longer do. They have invested in large-scale and rapid treatment options, and, again, it is only through innovation that we will beat this virus and end the pandemic.

But we must remember this: If a patient cannot afford the innovation, the

new medicine, it is as if the innovation never occurred. The "Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act" strikes the balance between lowering costs for families and incentivizing companies to find those cures.

Let me show you what this bill does. It caps the patient's out-of-pocket expenses. It lets patients pay over time. It protects patients from price gouging, and it preserves the incentive for companies to find cures. Let me explain each of these.

First, the bill caps the out-of-pocket expense for those in the Medicare Part D Program, our senior citizens, and particularly for the most vulnerable seniors with chronic conditions. Research has shown that seniors are at the most risk for severe complications and death from COVID-19. When a treatment or cure is widely available, cost should never be a barrier for a senior to access the drug that she or he needs to survive.

Under the current system, this is what a senior citizen pays for their medicinal benefit under Medicare Part D. They have a deductible for which the senior pays 100 percent; the initial coverage phase and the coverage gap phase, for which they pay one-fourth of the expense; and then in the catastrophic phase, the patient pays 5 percent of the cost no matter how high that expense goes.

So let's imagine a medication which costs over \$1 million. They are paying 5 percent of that medication cost, and if I could stand up any higher—but I keep losing my microphone—they will pay 5 percent of that. Think about a theoretical drug that costs \$3 million a year. The senior would be required to pay 5 percent of whatever that drug costs. That is under current law. What we are trying to do is fix this. If this occurs, the senior will not be able to afford lifesaving medications.

Under the legislation that we are attempting to pass, it would change the Medicare Part D standard benefit so that there is still the initial deductible in which the senior pays 100 percent, but after paying 20 percent of the initial coverage phase, there is no longer that 5 percent toward infinity. We make medications affordable for the senior. If that is all the bill did, we would do something quite remarkable for the ability of a patient to be able to afford a potentially lifesaving drug.

By the way, as a physician, I know this is a barrier for patients to be able to have their drugs. So we address that in this bill.

The second thing we do—you might say: Wait a second. The senior citizen if he or she has to pay for all this for a very expensive drug in the month of January, they can't afford that. Under the current situation, the senior has to pay her deductible and her initial coverage phase whenever it is due, which might be in the first week of the year. What we also do in this bill is we give the senior citizen the opportunity to pay all this lump sum as a series of

payments over 12 months. So let's imagine that this was \$10,000. Instead of having to pay all of it in January, she could pay \$800 every month over the course of the year. That allows her to budget and to factor it in with the other sources of income that she has. Not only do we cap the senior citizen's out-of-pocket expense, but we also allow her to pay that expense over a set of months so she can factor it into her budget. That is the second great thing that this bill does.

What is another thing that we do? Senator BRAUN also referred to this, but we also have cost transparency. If there is a medication which has the price being elevated unnecessarily, and if the customer knew that, she would know: Wait a second. I can get my medications far less expensively here versus there or, if I accept a substitute, again, the medication will be more affordable. We mandate that kind of price transparency that allows the customer to make an informed decision.

Now, I know there are competing ideas on how to lower drug costs. House Democrats, for example, have introduced legislation that they claim would lower costs. But, remember, I told you that there is this tension. How do we preserve the incentive to innovate while still making sure the innovation is affordable?

House Democrats have put up a bill. Yes, it makes medicine more affordable, but it kills the desire to innovate. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that if the bill the House Democrats have proposed is passed, there will be 38 fewer cures invented by pharmaceutical manufacturers—38 fewer cures.

Let me tell you a story. I mentioned that I am a physician. I came of age in my residency, if you will, when the AIDS epidemic hit. I was 25 years old or 27 years old, and I would see men my age dying of HIV. We didn't have an antibody then. If you were diagnosed with HIV—again, we called it AIDS then—you basically were dead because we had no cures. Since then, we now have medications that—if you are infected with HIV, you can live until you are 75 years old or 80 years old. We have found something that doesn't quite cure, but it allows it to be treated as a chronic condition. What if we didn't have that cure? What if that were one of the 38 cures we never had?

What if one of the cures we lose out on is a cure for Alzheimer's? My parents died of Alzheimer's. All of us know somebody affected by Alzheimer's or dementia. What if the cure we lose is the cure for Alzheimer's?

You may think you are making medications less expensive, but in terms of human life, you are making it that much more expensive because instead of finding that cure for Alzheimer's, you instead have consigned those people with Alzheimer's to a slow, awful death—awful for them and awful for their loved ones as they see their parents decline. I would argue that it is

fool's gold to say that the House Democratic bill saves money. It just shifts it, and it shifts it to the misery of the family who will never enjoy one of these cures that are not otherwise developed.

To fix the problem of the high cost of drugs, it will take a bipartisan coalition. We have that with this bill. It ends government handouts to pharmaceutical companies, but it doesn't price-fix. It saves \$80 billion for the taxpayer and for the patient, and it maintains incentives for lifesaving innovations.

Some in this Chamber will be tempted to stop this bill until after this year's election. To them, I would say: Don't let politics keep us from delivering drug-pricing relief for American families. Too much is on the line, especially during this pandemic. To do nothing while families try to pay medical bills is wrong. Let's work together to pass this bill to lower the cost of drugs, to protect innovation, and to save lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, let me recognize and thank Senator GRASSLEY for his extraordinary leadership on an issue that matters so greatly to the American people, and that is the high cost of prescription drugs. His persistence has produced the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, a far-reaching set of bold proposals that I strongly endorse and that build on the work I have done as the chairman of the Senate Aging Committee.

More than half of all Americans and 90 percent of our seniors take at least one prescription drug each month. We should be able to work together to help the American people—particularly our seniors—on an issue that affects their health and their finances. No senior should be faced with the choice of buying food they need, paying a bill for the oil to heat their home, or buying their prescription drug.

I remember very well being in line at the pharmacy in Bangor, ME, and the couple in front of me found out that their copay was \$113. The husband looked at his wife and he said: Honey, we just can't afford that. They left the prescription that one of them needed that was prescribed by their doctor there on the pharmacy counter. When I asked the pharmacist how often this happens, he said: Each and every day. Every day.

That is why we should be working together to pass Senator GRASSLEY's bill, as well as many of the other bipartisan bills that you have heard described today, including legislation that I have advocated to improve the lives of millions of Americans. This goal surely should be beyond partisan politics.

In just the last year, three Senate committees advanced legislation to reform our flawed drug-pricing system. I can't think of anything else that we buy where the price is less transparent

and is more opaque than prescription drugs.

The Finance Committee's bill, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, which I am proud to cosponsor, would make crucial improvements. As Senator CASSIDY just ably explained, one of the most important improvements is to Medicare Part D. It would protect our seniors with an out-of-pocket spending limit. It would also include cost-control measures, such as an inflationary cap to limit price hikes. We have made some progress in this area.

I have authored legislation that is making a difference for patients. One of the laws I authored bans gag clauses that had prohibited pharmacists from informing their customers if there were a less expensive way to purchase their prescription drug. Amazingly enough, sometimes it is cheaper to pay out-of-pocket than to use your insurance card—not something that most consumers would ever realize unless the pharmacist informed him or her.

My bill also updates a 2003 law requiring drug manufacturers to notify the Federal Trade Commission of patent settlement agreements, giving the agency greater visibility into whether they include tactics such as anti-competitive reverse payments that slow or defeat the introduction of lower cost drugs. Another law I authored is helping to bring lower cost generics to the marketplace more quickly by expediting their approval by the FDA.

But clearly there is more that we must do. At a time when economic and health security are more linked than ever, Congress has an opportunity to deliver a decisive victory in lowering costs for patients.

In addition to the Finance Committee package, the HELP Committee bill—I serve on the HELP Committee, which is chaired by Senator ALEXANDER—incorporated more than 14 bipartisan measures to increase price competition, including portions of a bill that I introduced with Senator TIM KAINE, the Biologic Patent Transparency Act, which is intended to prevent drug manufacturers from gaming the patent system.

Patents are important to encourage the development of earth-breaking, groundbreaking new pharmaceuticals, but the system should not be gamed so that when the patent is about to expire, a host of new patents are filed on the medication in order to block a lower cost generic from coming to market.

In October, the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review published its first annual report on unjustified price increases of prescription drugs in our country. It should surprise no one that HUMIRA, the poster child for patent gaming, led the list. HUMIRA's price increased by nearly 16 percent from 2017 to 2018, costing American patients and insureds an extra \$1.86 billion. Why do we want to wait any longer, and how did HUMIRA do it? It once again put up



this patent thicket—its manufacturer did—in order to block the lower price biosimilar.

The Judiciary Committee has advanced bills that empower the Federal Trade Commission to take more aggressive action on drug pricing. This year, the FTC charged the infamous Martin Shkreli with a scheme to increase the price of the lifesaving drug Daraprim by more than 4,000 percent overnight, which was the focus of an Aging Committee investigation that I led with former Senator Claire McCaskill in 2016.

Floor consideration should also allow for action on other important prescription drug bills, such as legislation that Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN and I have authored to eliminate incentives that create price hikes, distorting the insulin market. Insulin has been around for 100 years. I realize there is fast-acting and slow-acting insulin, but there is no excuse for the skyrocketing price of insulin.

There is another bill that I cosponsored, introduced by Senators KLOBUCHAR and GRASSLEY, that would end pay-for-delay schemes.

We must come together on prescription drug legislation without further delay. Three committees have produced strong bipartisan bills, and we should proceed to act and pass this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in calling on this body to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020 in the next coronavirus relief bill so that we can finally address the high cost of prescription drugs.

The troubles caused by skyrocketing drug prices are a never-ending source of worry and hardship for Mississippians and people across this entire country. I hear about this issue from constituents more than just about any other issue when I go home. I hear this all the time. I go to church with people who have to decide whether they are going to buy their drugs or buy food. That is a reality we live with.

Let me highlight a few stories shared with me by some of my constituents.

Emily Quinn lives in Fulton, MS. Her husband, Brian, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 2 and continues to rely on insulin daily. Her son Dylan, who is now 16, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 6. The Quinn family pays more than \$2,700 each month for just Brian's and Dylan's insulin, not including other diabetic equipment and supplies that they have to have.

It is shocking that more than a century—a century, not a decade; a century, 100 years—after insulin was discovered, insulin prices continue to rise by staggering amounts, nearly 300 percent over the last 10 years.

Scott Crawford of Jackson, MS, is a volunteer advocate for multiple sclerosis. Scott was diagnosed with pri-

mary progressive MS in 2002. Only one drug, named OCREVUS, can help slow the advancement of this disabling disease. That drug costs a staggering \$65,000 a year—more than most Mississippians make. Even with good insurance coverage, Scott cannot afford the \$15,000 copay for OCREVUS, so he just goes without.

MS drugs have seen some of the most shocking price increases of all, with list prices rising nearly 450 percent over the last 10 years.

Two young neurologists in Mississippi told me about their Medicare patients who quickly move into the catastrophic phase of Medicare Part D early each year. Even though these patients face only a 5-percent out-of-pocket cost for their drugs in this phase, that small percentage can amount to thousands of dollars for the expensive neurology drugs these patients depend on. Because there is currently no Medicare Part D out-of-pocket cap, these patients will get no relief from high drug prices later in the year when they still have to have them.

These are just a few of the many stories that I have received from Mississippians. I have one of my own as well.

My mother, a Medicare beneficiary living in Monticello, MS—Hyde, Lorraine—faced \$454.50—right there—in out-of-pocket costs for her prescription eye drops earlier this year. A tiny bottle of eye drops cost \$454.50. The drug, RESTASIS, has been on the market well over a decade—more than enough time for Allergan, the pharmaceutical company that developed the drug, to recoup its investment. Yet the average wholesale price of this drug has increased almost 250 percent in 10 years. It was almost unbelievable when my mom called me and told me what she paid for eye drops.

This case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court because Allergan had undertaken what I consider one of the most blatantly anti-competitive schemes in the history of the pharmaceutical industry. Fearing competition after its RESTASIS patent expired in 2014, Allergan transferred the patents to a Native American Tribe in an attempt to use the Tribe's sovereign immunity to shield Allergan against competition from lower priced generic alternatives. As I said, this case went all the way to the Supreme Court in 2018.

Even though the Supreme Court ultimately ruled this scheme was illegal, the company's underhanded ploy successfully delayed competition while it continued to reap outrageous benefits from RESTASIS, costing the U.S. healthcare system over \$2 billion per year because of their monopoly pricing.

We want pharmaceutical companies to succeed. The great cures and treatments they discover improve the lives of many, many Americans. We recognize that fact. But these cures and therapeutics can only save lives if the patients can afford them. Too many Mississippians and individuals across

this country cannot afford their prescription drugs due to the anti-competitive prices of companies—like Allergan—that continue to increase their prices year after year.

Today, the threat of the coronavirus pandemic has only increased concerns about drug pricing. As new vaccines and treatments for COVID-19 are being tested and developed, the affordability of prescription drugs is more important than ever. Just as much as we need a vaccine or treatment to be discovered, we also need it to be affordable for Americans if we are going to get on the other side of this pandemic.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Finance Committee chairman's comprehensive Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act to bring affordability and fairness to the prescription drug market. This bill must be an immediate priority for us as leaders if we are serious—if we are serious—about helping patients afford the drugs they need.

This important legislation would create a true out-of-pocket cap for Medicare beneficiaries, reinforce the market forces that have supported the research and development of so many miracle cures, keep pharmaceutical companies from price gouging, prevent taxpayers from being on the hook for unlimited price hacks that have no basis in the free market, stop the hurtful tactics of pharmacy benefit managers that hurt patients and community pharmacies while enriching the middlemen.

These reforms could reduce out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs by \$72 billion, reduce premiums by \$1 billion, and save taxpayers \$95 billion. The Congressional Budget Office anticipates those savings will spill over into even more savings in the commercial health market.

This is a priority that should transcend party politics. Yet Democrats who had previously supported Chairman GRASSLEY's reform legislation have walked away from the drug pricing negotiation table altogether. They would rather deny President Trump a victory on this issue than help the millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet due to high drug costs. There is no doubt about it: They are putting election-year politics ahead of making prescription drugs affordable for the American people.

The American people can't wait. Every month they continue to block this vital legislation is another month of thousands of dollars in insulin expenses for the Quinn family in Fulton, MS. Every month delayed is another month that Scott Crawford's MS advances because he cannot afford his medications. Every month is another month that those neurologists in Jackson will continue to worry about their patients on Medicare who face unlimited expenses due to no out-of-pocket cap.

These patients, and millions more like them, cannot wait until next year

or until the coronavirus pandemic passes or until Democrats decide to put the American people over politics.

Mississippians and Americans need a solution now. My friend the Senator from Iowa has done the hard work of writing a bill over the past 18 months that can address the heart of the issue and garner bipartisan consensus. I call on my colleagues to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act in the next coronavirus relief package.

I have been very excited to work on this. This is one of the very reasons that I came to Washington, DC—to help Mississippians.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his tireless leadership on lowering the cost of prescription drugs for Americans. I am proud to join with him on the floor today and join him in his legislation that we must pass to help Americans and to help Arizonans.

Everywhere I go—and when I am hearing from Arizonans—I am constantly hearing about the rising costs of prescription drugs. It is among one of their top and most pressing concerns. From seniors who can't afford their medications to parents struggling to care for a child who suffers from chronic conditions, out-of-pocket drug costs are too high. Far too many seniors and hard-working individuals in our State either can't afford both their groceries and their medications or they have been forced to ration their prescriptions because of skyrocketing drug costs.

In 2017, AARP Arizona reported that a whopping 26 percent of our residents stopped taking their medications as prescribed due to cost.

Last fall, I heard from a constituent in her midsixties from Green Valley, AZ, who was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis and taking several medications to treat her condition. When she transitioned to Medicare Part D from her employer's health plan, her out-of-pocket costs for one of the drugs she was taking—Enbrel—went from \$10 per month to nearly \$6,000 per month. This is a 600-percent increase in her monthly out-of-pocket costs just for this drug alone. I don't know anybody who can afford \$6,000 a month for one drug as a senior—as anyone. This is insane. She had to switch to another medication twice, but because they were infusions, she now has to travel 84 miles round trip to get treated. The significant jump in drug costs have affected both her pocketbook even her quality of life.

This is unacceptable, and I have worked with my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle, with Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, over the past year and a half since I have been in the Senate to bring down the costs of drugs and help Americans save more of their money.

Senator GRASSLEY's bill, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor,

does just that by holding Big Pharma companies accountable for exploiting loopholes and keeping pricing high for seniors, families, and taxpayers. Our bill pulls back the curtain on drug pricing and negotiations. It ends the sticker shock at the pharmacy counter, and it caps out-of-pocket costs for seniors so that Arizonans can afford the medicines they need.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, our Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act would save taxpayers close to \$95 billion, reduce out-of-pocket spending by \$72 billion, and reduce premiums by \$1 billion.

This bill is even more important now that we are navigating a global pandemic and its subsequent economic challenges that are squeezing family and fixed-income senior budgets even more than in normal times. With over 17 million Americans unemployed—including many Arizonans—along with the ever-looming threat of the coronavirus, affording prescription medicine should be the least of their concerns. Our bill would give Americans and Arizonans one less thing to worry about during these extraordinarily difficult and unprecedented times.

Unfortunately, despite this bill receiving strong bipartisan support until just a few months ago, Democrats recently chose to walk away at the direction of their party's leadership, and they refused to join in on the reintroduction of this legislation that they co-authored. This happens only in DC.

Just to be clear: They were for it before they were against it. This is maddening. This is why people all over my State are so frustrated with the dysfunction in this place, where people are willing to put looking for power and electoral politics ahead of what people need right now. Right now they need relief. They need relief to lower their out-of-pocket costs for all of the issues that they are facing as seniors, as families—any of the diagnoses, any of the conditions. These lifesaving and quality-of-life-improving medicines—we have to lower the costs, and now is the time to do it. Arizona patients and taxpayers and families and seniors need Washington to act now.

I want to urge our Democratic colleagues to put politics aside. I know it is hard to do in an election year, but put it aside. Service before self—that is one of the core values I learned in the Air Force. I bring it here with me today.

Serving others first—that is why you are here. Put those politics aside. Let's act to lower the out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs in our upcoming coronavirus relief bill.

This is a pivotal moment for action. We have to come together as a Congress to ensure hard-working Americans, their families, and seniors can access the treatments they need at an affordable cost.

Let's pass this bill now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

S. 4049

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise, together with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to talk about the chairman's plan to conclude the deliberations of the legislation before us today.

As you well know from being in the committee, this was a process that was bipartisan, thoughtful, extremely well-orchestrated by the chairman, and we accomplished a great deal. As you know, the members of the committee—we considered literally hundreds of different amendments by the members as we marked up the legislation. Then we passed the bill out of committee, we brought it to the floor, and at that point, a total of 880 amendments were filed on the legislation—446 Republican amendments, 422 Democratic amendments, and 12 joint amendments. So we had a rich field to pick from in terms of trying to improve the legislation.

The first substitute that was introduced on the floor to begin formal deliberation included a total of 79 amendments—34 Republican amendments, 34 Democratic amendments, and 11 joint amendments. Then we proceeded forward. Last week we came up with another unanimous consent to allow the votes that took place this week on several very important amendments, but in addition to that, we incorporated another legislative proposal including 62 amendments.

So from the introduction of the bill to the floor and to this moment, we have adopted 141 amendments. They are bipartisan, both Democrats and Republicans. Now we are at the point—and the chairman, I believe, has a very thoughtful way to conclude the legislation—to consider another round of amendments and then be able to move to final passage very quickly.

Again, let me conclude by saying that the chairman has done a remarkable job. I commend him for his bipartisanship, his thoughtfulness, and his consideration, and I am completely supportive of his proposal to bring this bill to a conclusion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, can I say Senator REED has been incredibly great in this whole process. We have been working on this for a whole year now, and we are now to the point where tomorrow we should be able to pass it out of—it will not be passed at that time. We also have a conference we are going to have to be faced with and all that, but today and tomorrow morning are very important to us.

The point that is made by Senator REED—if you add up all the amendments, really, it is you guys in the Senate who have drafted this bill. Not only are there 141 amendments since we came out of the committee, but in

the committee, we had over 800 amendments that were part of the bill to start with.

One of the reasons—and I think I speak for Senator REED and myself at the same time. We have had some experiences in the past where, since the Senate operates with unanimous consent, we were unable to have any amendments at all on the floor. So in order to do that, to make sure—if that should happen again, we wanted to make sure we had all these amendments already in the bill. So that was our starting point.

Now, here is where we are today. We had a great vote on the NDAA, receiving an 87-to-13 vote in favor of ending debate on the substitute. That was great. That was today. That means we are at kind of the end of this process now. We have continued to work on another managers' package.

Last night we hotlined—a lot of the people who may be watching are not familiar with the terminology. We hotlined—we sent out to all the Democrats and all the Republicans for any objections they might have—another group of amendments. It was a large group, an equal number of amendments for Democrats and Republicans. It came back, and there were a lot of objections to it, so we have now taken that and started on one last managers' package that we are going to be—a modified version that we are going to hotline tonight.

It is very important that people are listening right now. A lot of times people aren't listening. Certainly, the staffs should let their Members know that they are going to get a hotline on actually 40 amendments—20 Democratic amendments, 20 Republican amendments—tonight. That is going to be the hotline they are going to look at. Some of your staff and some of the Members may not have read these amendments yet. It is likely that is the case. If you have objections to amendments in this package—that is what we are hotlining—we encourage you to lodge those objections with the Cloakroom. That is when you get these things. That is going to be tonight. We will note those objections and see what remains.

Tomorrow morning—let's say all the objections have come in. Tomorrow morning, at a time—we were hoping that time was going to be around 10:30 tomorrow, but we know a lot of people want to talk; a lot of people want to be heard. We can't control that, but we will ask for unanimous consent to pass the package with a balanced number of amendments from both Democrats and Republicans. This is tomorrow, hopefully at 10:30, but maybe that will not work.

We will require Members who want to object to this final package to come down to the floor in person and object. If you already have an objection to a specific amendment in this package registered with the Cloakroom, the amendment should have been pulled

from the package. It will not even appear at that time. Otherwise, you need to be here to object in person.

We use the term "balanced." This is how this works. We have 40 amendments that are going to be hotlined tonight. If the Republicans have eight of them that they object to and the Democrats have seven they object to, they have to find one more to object to so it ends up being eight and eight or so that the number will be equal. It sounds a little complicated and it sounds like something that might not work, but it will work. We have been doing this now for over a year. Actually, we started this process 2 years ago. So it is going to be the responsibility of the Democrats and the Republicans to make that even so that no one can say that it is biased to one side.

So all of that is what is going to happen, and it is very important that staff and Members be aware of that because what we don't want to happen is to have someone come along and say they were not aware of this process that is in place. So that is the process we are going to use, and that is one that is fair.

Again, I don't think—and this will be the 60th consecutive year. There has never been a year, in my memory, that has had more amendments considered than we have considered this year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### REINFORCING AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS ACT OF 2020

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, when Americans see a "Made in the U.S.A." label on a product, it is a source of great pride, and justifiably so. It represents the American virtues of entrepreneurialism and industriousness. It also alludes to the fact that, as Americans, we have a common sense of destiny and a common appreciation for the inherent dignity and eternal worth of the human soul. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs, for local communities, and for high-quality products. So it often spurs American consumers as well as foreign consumers to buy a particular product—a product lucky enough to have that label.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for all products that want to claim the "Made in the U.S.A." label. It requires that "all or virtually all" of a product be made in the United States, and it has issued a lengthy legal guidance document—or a series thereof—establishing rules for who may and may not claim that title.

However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a particular product are manufactured outside the United States—even if that means just a few

bolts or a few screws—that product cannot lawfully be labeled "Made in the U.S.A."

Because of the flow of interstate and international commerce, in which most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products all throughout the country, the other 49 States are forced to comply with this one—the most rigid definition—in order to avoid costly litigation.

For many practical purposes, this just means they can't use the label. It makes it impracticable as a business matter and not feasible as a legal matter for them to claim that label. Even though they could legally boast the "Made in the U.S.A." claim in every other State in the country, California makes it more or less impossible for them to do so. In other words, a single State is effectively dictating a country-of-origin label. Think about that for a minute.

If California or any other State in the Union, for that matter, would like to create a State-of-origin label, I have no issue with such a State doing that and wouldn't suggest that the Federal Government ought to undo those parameters. But as it currently stands, the California law undermines Congress's rightful authority to regulate interstate commerce and needlessly hurts American manufacturers.

This is one of the reasons we are our own country. This is one of the reasons we fly the Stars and Stripes. It is one of the reasons the Constitution came into existence to begin with—to give Congress the power to regulate commerce between the several States with foreign nations and with Indians Tribes. Our previous form of government, under the Articles of Confederation, didn't create a Congress that had that power. As a result, in the early days following the American Revolution, States were engaging in activities amounting to economic Balkanization. We saw economic Balkanization among and between the States. That is why our Founding Fathers gathered in that hot, fateful, and sweltering summer of 1787 in Philadelphia—for this very reason.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this very problem. It would simply ensure that the FTC has the exclusive authority to set the national standard for "Made in the U.S.A." labeling. The legislation would provide clarity and consistency, helping American companies to avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits that would otherwise deter them from using this coveted and justifiably enviable label of "Made in the U.S.A."

Now more than ever, in the midst of the economic turmoil associated with the global pandemic, we ought to be doing all we can to support American jobs and to strengthen our local communities. This legislation would help us accomplish just that. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4065 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4065) 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.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4065) was passed, as follows:

S. 4065

*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 “Reinforcing American-Made Products Act of 2020”.

#### SEC. 2. EXCLUSIVITY OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE LABELING OF PRODUCTS MADE IN THE UNITED STATES AND INTRODUCED IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “To the extent” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of this section shall supersede any provisions of the law of any State expressly relating to the extent to which a product is introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in interstate or foreign commerce with a ‘Made in the U.S.A.’ or ‘Made in America’ label, or the equivalent thereof, in order to represent that such product was in whole or substantial part of domestic origin.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the application of the law of any State to the use of a label not in compliance with subsection (a).”; and

(3) in the third sentence of subsection (a), as so designated by paragraph (1), by striking “Nothing in this section” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), nothing in this section”.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### DRIFTNET MODERNIZATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 316, S. 906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 906) to improve the management of driftnet fishing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment as follows: (The part of the bill to be inserted is shown in *italic*.)

S. 906

*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 “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

#### SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

#### SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(1) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-

scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

#### SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 6. FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KAINE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 906), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 906

*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 “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITION.**

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

**SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

**SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.**

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(i) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

**SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.**

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

**SEC. 6. FEES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

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

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

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

S. 4049

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act that would direct the renaming of military bases and facilities that are currently named for those who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War.

I thank Senator Warren for offering the amendment, and I particularly thank her for making adjustments to the amendment to accommodate concerns of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I was proud to cosponsor the revised amendment in committee and speak in favor of it today.

It is important to state clearly what this amendment will do. If it passes and survives a threatened Presidential veto, it will require the Department of Defense to initiate a 3-year process to change the name of any military base, barracks, or other facility named after a Confederate military leader. Why 3 years? The timing is designed to allow a full public process in each location so that the desires of the community leaders can be taken into account in choosing new names.

I state with clarity the substance of the amendment because one of my colleagues took the floor earlier this

month to oppose the amendment, and he obscured its purpose in describing it, only saying that it required that “some of the names of our Nation’s military bases must be removed.” He neglected to mention that the amendment specifically sought change only to facilities named for Confederates. In fact, he did not mention the Confederacy or the Civil War at all.

If you are unwilling to be plain about what is at stake, it portrays a weakness in your position. So let me be plain. I speak today because I am a Senator from the State with the most at stake in this discussion. Three of the ten bases whose names must be changed under this amendment are in Virginia. Virginia was the State whose people were most affected by the Civil War, and I served as its 70th Governor. My hometown of Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy, and I served as its 76th mayor. I have dealt with issues of Civil War names, statues, memorials, battlefields, and buildings throughout my 26 years in public life. Based on decades of grappling with this question, I want to describe a principle, explain an epiphany, and finally pose a question.

First, a principle: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This principle is nowhere stated in law because it need not be. It is a basic commonsense principle. The principle explains why we have no Fort Cornwallis, Fort Benedict Arnold, Fort Santa Ana, Fort Von Hindenburg, Fort Tojo, Fort Ho Chi Minh.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you, but we make an exception. Ten bases and many other military facilities are named after Confederate leaders who declared war on the United States, took up arms against it, and killed U.S. troops. Even further, they took these actions to destroy the United States, to tear our country in half so that the seceding Southern States could continue to own those of African descent as slaves—a species of property—rather than treating them as equal human beings. Is this worthy of honor? Does it justify an exception to the sound principle that I describe?

Why were these 10 bases so named when they were constructed in the years before and during the First and Second World Wars? The names were not chosen due to the military skill of the Confederate leaders. Some are revered for their prowess, but some are reviled. The names were not chosen to honor the character of the 10 leaders. Some are respected—excepting the blight on character that support for slavery confers—but others were not

distinguished in their behavior or their integrity. The record makes clear that the 10 bases were named for Confederate leaders upon their construction during the First and Second World Wars because of a lingering belief in their cause—dividing the Nation to uphold slavery and White supremacy.

In the days of mandated segregation, a vibrant Ku Klux Klan, popular culture painting a false picture of the war and its aftermath with films like “The Birth of a Nation” and “Gone with the Wind,” there was a powerful desire to hold up the Confederate cause, to sanitize the Confederate cause and deny the reality of African-American suffering. That desire even affected this very body during those years, as the Senate repeatedly used the filibuster to block Federal anti-lynching legislation.

It is clear now, as it has been clear for a very long time, that the cause of the Confederacy was not just but monstrous. Destroying the Nation to preserve slavery would have been a catastrophe.

History can't be rewritten, and it is important to tell it, but choosing who to honor is another matter entirely. I repeat a principle that I believe brooks no exception: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This wisdom was understood immediately in the aftermath of the Civil War by Robert E. Lee. He was asked about memorials to the Confederacy and stated: “I think it wiser not to keep open the sores of war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings engendered.” This amendment is consistent with Lee's wise observation.

Second, let me explain an epiphany that I have had just in the last few months. When I moved to Virginia to get married in 1984, I saw the Confederate statues in Richmond, and I was puzzled. As a Kansas-raised civil rights lawyer and then later as a local elected official in a city that was majority African American, I was struck by their continued prominence. But together with the leadership of my diverse city, we viewed these statues and other symbols of the Confederacy as painful symbols of an incomplete past—painful because of the reality of slavery and discrimination, which have warped our Commonwealth and country since 1619, and incomplete as well. Where were the statues to Richmond heroes from the revolution or the civil rights movement? Why did our city highlight 4 years out of a 250-year history and downplay everything else?

My generation of Richmond leaders endeavored to solve this problem by painting a more complete picture—statues of Arthur Ashe, Abraham Lincoln, Maggie Walker, a civil rights memorial on our capitol grounds, new mu-

nicipal buildings, courts, schools, many named after prominent African Americans, women leaders. Aging bridges that had been named for Confederate generals were eventually replaced and named for civil rights heroes.

In short, we viewed this problem as one that could be solved with a path of addition—not replacing the painful symbols of the past but instead adding to our built environment the recognition of people and eras that had not previously been honored. This was necessary and important work. I was proud to play my part in it during my 16 years in local and State service.

But in recent months, as I spent our extended April quarantine in Richmond and I talked to people about whether Confederate statues on our Monument Avenue should be removed, I learned something. When I refer to these statues as symbols of a painful past, again and again, I was told: Tim, you might see these statues as signifying a painful past, but we see them as signs of a painful present and even predictors of a difficult future.

This sort of stopped me in my tracks. I asked my friends to explain. Here is a composite of what they told me: If honoring these Confederates were just about the past, that would be one thing. But these statues are honored in the present by a city and State that maintain them, spotlight them, emphasize their beauty, and market their appeal to tourists. In the present, these statues become a rallying point for neo-Confederates and others who would take us back, just as occurred in Charlottesville in 2017.

The present is pretty frightening. African Americans are dying of COVID at disproportionate rates. The job losses in this economic collapse are falling so hard on African-American communities. We see scenes of police violence against African Americans playing endlessly on our televisions, and we don't see an immediate end to these disparities.

Do you really expect us to believe that a society that continues to honor those who tried to destroy our country to save slavery will be serious about ending the racial disparities that exist today? You either support the equality of all or you don't. If you honor those who opposed our equality—indeed, opposed the very notion of our humanity—what hope can we have about overcoming the real-time injustices that are manifest all around us?

I thank God I can still learn some new things at age 62. In my view, the statues and base names and the other Confederate honorifics that dot the American landscape have been about the past. But I now see that, for so many, they raise deep and troubling questions about the present and the future. Are we committed to the equality of all—the moral North Star announced by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and reconfirmed by Lincoln at Gettysburg? If we continue to honor men who fought to de-

prive those of African descent of their equality, we signal that we are not committed to our most fundamental American value.

Finally, there are questions for those, including the President, who attack those who want to remove Confederate names from military bases or take down Confederate statues.

When you saw young Germans in 1989 spray graffiti on the Berlin Wall and knock it down, how did you feel? I know how you felt. You felt good to see people standing up to leaders and saying: You will no longer divide us.

When you saw people throughout the Soviet bloc pulling down statues of Stalin and Lenin after the collapse of the Soviet Union or Iraqis pulling down statues of Saddam Hussein, how did you feel? I know how you felt. You felt good to see people standing and saying with their actions: We will no longer glorify tyrants who oppressed us.

When you see hundreds of thousands of Hongkongers in the streets protesting against the Chinese Government, how do you feel? I know how you feel because I heard you, even in this Chamber. You feel good seeing everyday people standing up against a government that would deprive them of their basic freedom.

Well, if you feel that way—and I believe virtually all Americans do—how can we feel otherwise about patriotic Americans who believe in a nation committed to the equality of all when they stand up and say: We will not be divided. We will not glorify those who oppressed us. We will not honor those who stood against our freedom. That is what our people, especially our young people, are saying to us now. Supporting this amendment will show them that we are listening.

In conclusion, we Americans have grown as a nation and as a people since the Civil War. And we have grown as a nation and as a people since the first half of the 20th century when, in very different circumstances, it was still seen as a good idea to honor the Confederacy.

One of the key areas of our growth—admittedly a progress of fits and starts—has been a greater acceptance of others, regardless of race or religion or sexual orientation or gender or nationality or physical ability. Thank God for that growth. Of course, the evidence all around shows that we still have a long way to go to reach full equality. It might be like the North Star. We can steer by it, but it is not in the capacity of mortal mankind to reach it.

But when we do steer by it and step in its direction, we become better. That is what this amendment will accomplish, and it is why I so strongly support it.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Iowa.

**PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS**

**Ms. ERNST.** Mr. President, Americans are facing extremely challenging



times, and, right now, folks are working hard just to make ends meet to put food on their table and to care for their families and their loved ones.

As our communities continue to grapple with the devastating impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, the crisis of rising drug costs in the United States has only worsened. Now, more than ever, folks are operating on very thin margins and simply don't have room in their budgets for expensive prescriptions.

No individual should have to make the decision between filling a life-saving prescription and feeding their family. The skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs have become a matter of life and death for so many. We have heard the heartbreaking stories of individuals who could not afford their insulin, who were forced to ration and skip doses, and, as a result, they lost their lives.

I remember quite vividly a conversation I had with an Iowa mother explaining how she lost her son who, as a young man, was rationing his insulin because he could not afford to do more. It was a heartbreaking discussion, and having that discussion with that mother, I could not help but think then of my own brother and sister who have been reliant on insulin as juvenile diabetics for nearly all of their lives. When we talk about the cost of prescription drugs, lives are literally on the line.

Iowans have been very clear with me where they stand on this issue. They want to see us come together to advance solutions that drive down those drug prices. Seniors, families, and children all need to be assured that when they go to the pharmacy, they will be able to afford their medications and not have to skip a meal—or more—to do so.

This is why I was proud to join my friend and my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, in introducing a piece of legislation that I know he has worked tirelessly on—the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020. This vital piece of legislation would root out unfair pricing shenanigans and perverse payment incentives that allow pharmaceutical companies to take advantage of the system at the expense of taxpayers and patients.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would save taxpayers \$95 billion with a “b,” reduce out-of-pocket expenses by \$72 billion with a “b,” and reduce premiums by \$1 billion with a “b.”

It needs to be said that Chairman GRASSLEY worked for months on end to craft this bill in a bipartisan manner with his Democratic counterparts. In fact, two-thirds of the Senate Finance Committee approved our bipartisan Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act a year ago this very month—two-thirds of the Senate Finance Committee. Yet, at a time when Americans are struggling to afford rent and groceries, my colleagues across the aisle

suddenly chose to drop their support for this bipartisan drug pricing reform bill that they helped write.

Let me make that clear. The Democrats helped write the bill with Senator GRASSLEY. Those who sat on the Finance Committee approved this bill last year.

This year, they are refusing to assist my senior Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, in moving forward a bill they helped write. That begs the question: What changed over the course of one year? Do you know what, folks? That is exactly what happened. It was the year: 2020 is an election year, and that means Washington is not focused on solutions; it is all about the political scoreboard.

We have seen it already this year with our friends across the aisle blocking us from even debating the JUSTICE Act, the police reform bill that contained about 70 percent of what our Democratic colleagues were asking for in police reform.

Iowans put their partisanship aside and came together and got a police reform package passed; that is, Iowans in our State legislature. I wish we could say the same for Washington, not only on the JUSTICE Act but also this prescription drug pricing bill. Lowering prescription drug costs shouldn't be about who gets the credit. It should be about working across the aisle to save lives, which is the very reason that Senator GRASSLEY worked hand in hand with Democrats on this bill.

Iowans should expect more from Washington. They want more, and they should get it.

Chairman GRASSLEY, President Trump, and I will not back down from this fight. We will press on and do everything in our power to provide relief to Americans who desperately need it. I will continue to call on my Democratic colleagues to come to the table to work on improving our Nation's healthcare system and drive down the costs for Americans. Whether it is lowering drug costs, expanding childcare options for families, ensuring protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, like my sister and my brother, or simply making sure that children have access to clean diapers—simple things. These are all issues that Americans want to see Congress take action on.

Just recently, I joined with my colleague Senator BRAUN of Indiana in introducing a bill that helps address yet another critical issue for Americans—increasing transparency and lowering healthcare costs.

Our Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act would implement the administration's rules requiring hospitals and insurers to reveal their low, discounted prices and negotiated rates to patients before they receive medical care. Iowans should be able to know the costs associated with their healthcare in advance so they can make the best decisions for themselves and for their families.

Folks, let's not forget that, outside the Halls of Congress, Americans are

facing hard times. They are mourning the loss of loved ones who have been taken by this virus. They are worried about how they will take care of their children at home while they work to provide. They are concerned for their health and the well-being of their loved ones. Many of them are considering skipping a dose of their medication or cutting a pill in half to try to make those prescriptions stretch just a little bit further until their next paychecks.

Let's put aside political interests. Let's work together on this. I will be standing at the ready, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort.

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. GARDNER. 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 GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, 6 weeks ago, I stood here as the Senate prepared to begin deliberating historic conservation legislation—the Great American Outdoors Act. I introduced this legislation with Senator MANCHIN, of West Virginia, along with so many other bipartisan champions for the outdoors and our public lands. Senators DAINES, PORTMAN, WARNER, ALEXANDER, KING, CANTWELL, BURR, and HEINRICH are just a few of the champions who helped to shepherd this historic legislation through this Chamber. I remarked on that day that it was not often the Senate had a chance to make history, but, indeed, history we made.

The Senate came together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and passed the Great American Outdoors Act 73 to 25, and just moments ago, the U.S. House of Representatives joined us in making history by passing the Great American Outdoors Act with a vote of 310 to 107.

This legislation is headed today to the desk of the President of the United States for his signature. The President has already supported the bill, noting the nature of this historic bill and the huge conservation victory that it is.

In the weeks since Senate passage, I have traveled all over the great State of Colorado and have visited with land management officials, professionals, stakeholders, and constituents to discuss what the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground on a personal, local level for Colorado and Colorado's public lands. I would like to share some of those stories with you today.

Here we have a picture of an amphitheater that is outside of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park. If you would just go a little bit further to the right, you would actually be in the canyon.

This is an amphitheater that was built, basically, in the 1960s. The park itself is now about 20 years old. It had over 430,000 people visit it last year. It has a deferred maintenance backlog of \$7.7 million, and this South Rim Amphitheater facility is part of that backlog. It is currently being used, but it needs significant upgrades. If you actually sat on one of those benches, you probably wouldn't be able to sit anywhere else for quite a long time because of the splinters and the gouges that you would receive from the shards of wood that are on those benches, and there are electrical outlets that are popping up from an old projection system.

This is supposed to be used for education and educational opportunities. With the right improvements, they will be able to restore this and get it back to its original purpose. New park benches and electrical work are among just a bit of this amphitheater's needs—a \$200,000 deferred maintenance project alone, this site for education for experiential learning. Within the rest of the park, there are millions more in maintenance projects like this one that need to be performed and carried out.

Our lands are busy. People are loving them. This is one example, and it is one example of a project that will be completed thanks to the Great American Outdoors Act. Yet it is not just national parks that have maintenance needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue joined me in Colorado in mid-June, and we toured the Mizpah Campground, which is in the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests, that has been closed for a decade. This is a beautiful river, and the campground is back here. There is only one problem: There is no bridge. This river wiped out the culvert and the bridge a decade ago. This is a campground without access because, 10 years ago—a decade ago—a flood came through—high water came through—and wiped out the access. You can't even use this public facility because of a decades-long maintenance backlog at this facility alone.

The Great American Outdoors Act will provide line-of-sight funding for projects like these, which will no longer have to compete for a small pool of funding with every other national forest in the country.

When I talk to these professionals—when I talk to the forest rangers and the park superintendents—they talk about how they are able to accomplish building structures in their parks, how they are able to build campgrounds in their parks, and how they are able to keep up with restroom facilities, but they have had no line-of-sight funding for additional help down the road. This means that, as the facilities age, they may just have to be closed or, in this case, as access gets wiped out, you will just never regain that access. What a loss to the American people that is, but what a benefit to the American people

the Great American Outdoors Act will become.

It is not just the national parks or the national forests or the Bureau of Land Management that will benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act. This is a picture of the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo, CO. This area has a number of ballparks from little leagues to adult leagues. In fact, they just had their first pitch of the season last week—a day that I was actually at the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo, CO, to kick off a tournament to celebrate the beginning of a season that had been much delayed thanks to COVID-19.

This area saw people like Pee Wee Reese play baseball and Babe Ruth visit this same area to play baseball. Now Coloradans of every generation are able to go to the Runyon Sports Complex and enjoy it. It has become a regional draw to help benefit the city economically and to teach kids about sports and teamwork. That is what this means.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, yes, helps forests and parks, but 40 percent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund's funding is dedicated to projects at the State and local levels. If you grew up on the Front Range of Colorado and played baseball, the odds are good that you will have spent some time on the field at Runyon or at any other number of places that have been funded by a Land and Water Conservation Fund project. Runyon has received over \$100,000 in LWCF funding over the years, and the complex continues to be a vital part of the community today.

The LWCF is not just about our public lands; it is about your local ballpark, about your local swimming pool, about playground facilities, and urban parks that otherwise wouldn't give minority communities access to recreation. That is what it is about.

Just up the road from Runyon Field, in El Paso County, CO, and the communities within them, they have benefited greatly from the LWCF. We visited a project in El Paso County that received hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is a county that has received \$5 million in funding over the years and has provided benefits for everything from building parks to tennis courts and trails. The State has received over \$2 million in funding to improve the Cheyenne Mountain State Park facilities within El Paso County, CO.

Local, regional, and State outdoor recreation projects will only further benefit when the Great American Outdoors Act is signed into law. With the Great American Outdoors Act, Congress is finally fulfilling its commitment to fully and permanently fund the LWCF, which will benefit every State in the Nation.

The passage of this historic legislation could not come at a more critical time. Our economy has suffered during the coronavirus pandemic, and stay-at-home orders have kept Americans

cooped up indoors for the last several months. Millions of people and families are facing uncertain futures. Will school return in the fall? Will my business survive this challenging time? Will I receive my next paycheck?

When the first waves of the virus hit and shutdown orders went into place, some of Colorado's mountain towns and rural areas were the hardest and first hit. Community restaurants closed; hotels emptied; and their stores' doors were closed to visitors. These are challenging times, no doubt, but one glimmer of hope will always be our public lands and the great outdoors.

This Nation does not have Republican or Democratic public lands. This is not a partisan issue. Preserving and taking care of our public lands provides a benefit to the entire country, and it will provide a benefit for generations to come.

Yet, not only is this legislation about preserving and protecting our lands, it is also about job creation and economic recovery—more hope for the people of this country. Passing the Great American Outdoors Act will create over 100,000 jobs by addressing the park maintenance backlog alone. In my home State of Colorado, it will create thousands of jobs across the State as the mission of the Great American Outdoors Act is fulfilled. There will be more jobs created as the work begins to address maintenance projects on other Federal lands. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, our National Wildlife Refuges, and the Bureau of Indian Education's schools all have needs that will be addressed by this legislation. These will be important opportunities to create jobs when the projects are finally and fully funded.

I mentioned this statistic quite a bit during the consideration of the Great American Outdoors Act here in the Senate. For every \$1 million we spend on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. That is a figure above and beyond the 100,000 jobs that we created by the parks' provisions of the legislation alone. This is a bill that will put people to work. It is a bill that will put people to work by building playgrounds, fixing trails, cleaning up ballparks, and protecting our iconic landscapes for generations to come.

This is a bill that reminds us that our communities and our shared, public outdoor spaces are worth investing in. It is a bill that reminds people that we have hope for America. It is a bill that reminds people that your public lands are waiting for you and that Congress was able to come together, during these trying times, in a bipartisan fashion that was so strong and so great that you will be able to enjoy the great American outdoors the way they were meant to be enjoyed.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives affirmed all of this by passing the Great American Outdoors

Act today with such a strong, bipartisan vote. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers for their hard work and dedication to passing this historic conservation legislation.

I look forward to the President's signing this bill in the days ahead. I look forward to getting out into the great outdoors, and I look forward to these lands as they continue to inspire the hopes and dreams of kids and adults alike for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Colorado leaves the floor, I offer to him my congratulations for his inspired leadership of the Great American Outdoors Act.

This is something that good people on both sides of the aisle have worked on, literally, for as much as a half a century. Now, people are used to politicians who exaggerate, but that is no exaggeration, because I have been around long enough to know and to understand that—first, with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was first enacted by Congress in 1964. I was the chairman of President Reagan's Commission on American Outdoors and reiterated support for that in 1986. Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator PORTMAN, Senator WARNER, Senator HEINRICH, Senator MANCHIN, Senator CANTWELL, and a whole parade of Senators on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard to make this happen.

And it would not have happened without President Trump's leadership, either. We would not have been able to spend the money the way that it is spent—energy exploration money for conservation purposes—unless the President's Office of Management and Budget had approved that.

So it is usually never true that an important piece of legislation is passed by a single Senator. It is usually a parade of Senators. But Senator GARDNER has been leading the parade, and I congratulate him for that and salute him on behalf of all of us who want to see our national parks—the 419 different places we have, from the Great Smokies to the Rocky Mountains, to Yellowstone, to Pearl Harbor, to the National Mall—protected, as well as our national forests, our national wildlife refuges, as well as the permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

So I wanted to have an opportunity to say that before he left the floor.

And I see my friend Senator PORTMAN from Ohio here, who really, along with Senator WARNER of Virginia, began the work on the other part of the bill—the bill that would take money from energy exploration and reduce the national park backlog by half over 5 years. That had the support, combined with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, of more than 800 different outdoor recreation, conservation, and en-

vironmental groups, as well as the President.

People will say: Well, that was easy to do with all that support.

It wasn't easy to do. If it had been easy to do, it would have happened 20 or 30 years ago. So it took support from the Senator from North Dakota and leadership from the Senator from Ohio and Senator WARNER from Virginia, especially.

I came to the floor also to talk about something else, but I see the Senator from Ohio so I think I will yield the floor and then speak on the other subject after he has a chance to speak, if he would like to.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for focusing on the American Great Outdoors Act. I had come to the floor to talk about the COVID-19 legislation we are considering, but I am very pleased to be here with my colleagues who helped to get this legislation across the finish line. It is incredibly important and truly historic for our national parks.

I have spent more than a dozen years on this. It is kind of embarrassing because I wasn't very successful for the first 11, but from my days as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, I have been focused on what really is a tragic situation—about a \$12 billion now maintenance backlog in our national parks, far more than the parks could ever afford to take care of based on our annual budgets that we provide them from this place and yet something that had to be done.

So it is not very exciting for some people to think about, gosh, fixing a visitor's center or making sure a trail isn't eroding into a river, making sure that our roads and bridges in our national parks are kept up to speed, so that when you go to a national park you can actually use the restroom facilities and the lodges. But we have had a huge problem with finding funding for that, and in this legislation, as was noted by my colleague from Tennessee, who has been at this for many years, as well, we are finally doing something to help our parks that is badly needed.

The priority projects—\$6.5 billion worth—will now be handled by legislation that passed the House today by a 310-to-107 vote and passed the Senate a few weeks ago. The President has agreed to sign it, and it will keep our promise, and it is a debt unpaid to our parks. Without it, future generations wouldn't have the opportunity to visit and enjoy these incredible treasures.

I spent the last few weeks at a couple of our national parks—one, the Charles Young home in Ohio, which is a beautiful historic home that is actually a station on the Underground Railroad and, therefore, has particular and very important historic significance for our State. Charles Young was the first Black colonel in the U.S. Army, the first Black superintendent of a national park, and his home needs to be preserved for future generations. And

yet the maintenance backlog is huge there, as you can imagine, and without this legislation, they would not be able to make progress.

I got to see specifically what the money is going for, which is making sure that house still stands years from now so that people, particularly young people in our community, can understand the history of our country—the good and the bad, the cooperation and the seeking for freedom that came from the Underground Railroad and the incredible leadership that Charles Young showed as an early African-American pioneer, both in the military and in our national park system.

And then I was at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, where I had the opportunity to see the 13th most visited park in America and a number of different needs that they have, adding up to about \$50 million. Their annual budget, by the way, is about \$11 million, and yet they have \$50 million worth of things that have to be fixed.

I saw trails literally falling into the river. I saw railroad tracks for the beautiful scenic railroad that runs through there where the tracks have to be replaced. I saw a bridge that is truly becoming dangerous and has to be fixed—an historic bridge. These are things that can't be done with their normal budget that funds the rangers and some programs. These are capital expenses, things that have to have a separate funding source, the way we budget around here, and we are doing that now.

So after many years of trying different efforts at this and finding some success over the years—the Centennial Act has helped a little bit and some other things to get private-public partnership money—we now have the ability to really say that the parks are going to be in good shape for our kids, our grandkids, and the future generations that can enjoy what LAMAR ALEXANDER has referred to—I think, paraphrasing Ken Burns—as America's best idea.

With that, I yield back. I would like some time in a moment to talk about the COVID-19 legislation, but I would like to yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy, as well as his leadership. I will not be long.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 4284 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation that Senator ALEXANDER is talking about probably is something we ought to look at in connection with this legislation that we are likely to pass here in the Congress in the next week or so regarding the COVID-19 crisis that we face. I am here on the floor

today to talk about that—to talk about what the next steps ought to be and how we should be responding as Congress to this unprecedented challenge we have of the pandemic.

We are now about 5 months into it, and for much of April and certainly in the month of May we were seeing pretty good progress on the coronavirus pandemic. The situation was improving, and many of us thought we were turning the corner. Unfortunately, as we have moved into June and July, we are now trending in the wrong direction in much of the country. Over the past week, the number of hospitalizations, for instance, has risen in many of our States, and there is concern that the situation could worsen when the weather begins to cool.

Today, in Ohio, our Governor announced a statewide mask mandate, as an example. We have not had that yet. He did so because he is concerned about some of the numbers. Ohio is not in as bad a shape as some of the States, but we are not seeing the progress we hoped for.

The past few months have been a somewhat better story for the economy. After the initial shocks of the self-imposed economic shutdown this past spring, a couple months ago, we have seen a steady rebound taking place in most parts of the country. New unemployment claims, put out just last week, while still far too high compared to where we were before this pandemic, are the lowest we have seen since the crisis began. Recent retail sales numbers are about where they were a year ago when there was no pandemic. So we are seeing better improvement in the economy as compared to the disappointing progress we were making recently on the pandemic.

Thanks to unprecedented Federal action, such as the Paycheck Protection Program which has allowed small businesses to keep their doors open and to retain employees, thanks to some of the targeted tax relief to help our families and also our businesses, we have been able to prevent an even more serious economic collapse that in my view would have had a devastating impact on all of us. However, we are not out of the woods yet. There are still, roughly, 17 million Americans out of work. That is a lot of Americans who have been furloughed through no fault of their own because businesses are not operating. This corresponds to about an 11-percent unemployment rate, more than three times higher than it was just 5 months ago.

You will recall that in February we had historically low unemployment. Now we are up to 11 percent. Of course, there are parts of the economy that have not seen the progress that other parts have.

So there is a lot for us to consider now that Congress is back in session and now that we are in the middle of negotiating this new what they call the phase 5 coronavirus rescue package. The new legislation will have a signifi-

cant impact on how we address these dual healthcare and economic crises. That is why it is important, and more important than ever, that we figure out how to work together, Republicans and Democrats alike, and make some smart bipartisan policy decisions.

Unfortunately, that is not the way the House of Representatives has proceeded to date. The House Democrats chose to construct their own proposal. It is called the Heroes Act. Rather than working constructively across the aisle to try to find some common ground to help Americans deal with this healthcare and economic crisis, Democrats chose and made and released an 1,800-page, \$3.5 trillion package that included some provisions that have nothing to do with COVID-19.

How big is \$3.5 trillion? Well, that makes it the biggest piece of legislation ever passed by either the House or Senate in the history of our country. Never have we had legislation that expensive. Also, \$3.5 trillion is just a lot of money. The budget last year was \$4.5 trillion—the entire budget for the entire year for our country. This one bill is \$3.5 trillion. So it is not only the most costly legislation ever to pass, but, again, it is not just about COVID-19. In fact, one Democratic leader called it “a tremendous opportunity to fix things to fit our vision,” which is why it passed by a nearly party-line vote.

If true, by the way, that vision entails raising taxes on some small businesses; it includes giving out tax breaks, largely to benefit very wealthy individuals on both coasts; it has direct payouts to illegal immigrants; it has immigration reforms related to ICE and other things; it has unprecedented mandates on the States to require mail-in voting and telling States, by the way, that they are required to have certain kinds of ID. This has always been within the province of the States to run their own election systems. That is in this legislation.

At the same time, out of \$3.5 trillion and 1,800 pages, there is nothing in it to provide liability protection to our schools, hospitals, and small businesses; no funding for the Paycheck Protection Program; no assistance for Americans trying to get back to work. It is \$3.5 trillion in taxpayer money being appropriated on a party-line vote. I don't think that is what people are looking for. I think they want us to get together, as we have already with four previous COVID-19 legislative packages, and work together to try to get it done. We have to find that common ground.

We have to be sure we pass something that is bipartisan, that supports our healthcare system, our schools, our local governments, our employers, our families, and that we do it in as targeted a way as possible given the fact that we have already the largest deficit in the history of our country this year, and, of course, all this adding to our national debt.

We need to do it based on good data on what has been spent and what remains to be done. We need to keep in mind what is the most important policy proposals to include in this legislation and not make it a catchall.

First, and most importantly in my view, we need to increase funding for the healthcare response and the safety efforts. This is the underlying problem: Until we focus on this pandemic and what the virus is doing, we can spend all the money we want around here, and it is not going to make much of a difference. So we have to be sure that we are focused on the actual problem. I think that means getting our healthcare professionals the resources they need to effectively respond to this crisis. They need more funding. We need more funding for testing, contact tracing, PPE—the personal protective gear that, unfortunately, we still don't have the stockpiles here that we need. We need to be sure we are doing everything we can do to get this antiviral medication up and going. We have one, Remdesivir, that is showing positive results. We need to make sure that we are doing everything we can to get this vaccine as fast as possible because with a vaccine, as we have with the common flu, we will be making tremendous progress in pushing back against the virus. Stopping the spread of the virus has to be our top priority in this next bill, as it has been in some of the other legislation.

It is clear from the recent resurgence in cases that we are still not where we need to be in testing. I know there has been a lot of discussion recently about testing and whether it is needed or not. I will tell you it is critical because we need to know where the disease is and how it may be spreading. It also gives us much greater context in taking steps toward reopening in a safe way, whether it is our schools or whether it is our businesses, going to restaurants, going to bowling allies, movie theaters. Testing is very important.

Last week, I was in Columbus, OH, at the Columbus Health Department, where officials told me what a huge difference the CARES grant that they received has made in being able to expand testing. They are building a track to monitor and maintain the virus in Franklin County that is needed right now, and they are doing a great job. They are providing testing that is driveby testing. It is easy to access. If you don't have insurance to pay for it, it is covered through CARES funding that passed in the Congress. We are being sure that the funding is providing the best information available as we fight this invisible enemy. We have to continue to do that to prioritize bolstering the ability of our healthcare officials at home and to be able to coordinate the response—State level, local and national levels, and testing, obviously, is key to that.

In addition, as more parts of our country are putting in place safe plans to reopen our economy, we want to

make sure that the individuals who went on the COVID-19 unemployment lines in the early days of this pandemic have the opportunity and the incentive to reenter the workforce. We have to be sure our workplaces are safe.

This week, I introduced legislation called the healthy workplace tax credit, a credit on payroll taxes to ensure employers can afford additional safety measures, from the Plexiglas you have probably seen in some places, the shields to be able to protect people, to the PPE that is needed, the gowns in some cases, the masks, the gloves, hand sanitizer, to be able to afford that, and to be sure that there is testing in place so employees and consumers feel safe reentering the economy. This tax credit will support our efforts to make our workplaces healthy and safe and to build consumer confidence that all appropriate measures are being taken.

It doesn't really matter what we say as elected officials. It doesn't matter what our Governors are saying or local health officials. If people don't feel safe or feel comfortable, they are not going to reengage in the economy and step forward. I think this kind of a tax credit should be something that both sides of the aisle can strongly support, and we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to get people back to a more normal life.

As we tackle this healthcare challenge head-on, we also can't afford to step back on our efforts to combat the drug epidemic. Remember the opioid crisis that we were facing over the last couple of years. It has devastated communities all around our country, including my home State of Ohio. Unfortunately, we are seeing, during the coronavirus pandemic, the number of additions, overdoses, and overdose deaths is growing. This is very concerning, particularly because, thanks to a lot of efforts, including efforts in this body, to provide more treatment and recovery and prevention services, we were finally making progress in 2018. In my State of Ohio we had a 22-percent decrease in opioid overdose deaths. Every single year for the previous dozen years we had seen increases, and, finally, we were making progress. Now, unfortunately, we seem to be backtracking because of the COVID-19 crisis.

People are isolated, and people are feeling anxiety. People are not being able to access the treatment they used to be able to access. So in this legislation, we should also be sure that we make permanent the progress we have made recently with coronavirus in providing more telehealth treatment, making that more accessible. I have introduced legislation called the TREAT Act that would do just that so we don't lose ground on this other deadly disease.

We also need to look forward to the fall and ensure that we have funding to support the schools so they are able to safely reopen their doors to students.

Keeping our children out of the classroom for a protracted period of time has already had a negative impact on many of them with regard to educational advancement.

We have heard this from the experts, the American Pediatric Society, and the pediatricians back home—the doctors who are looking at this situation are saying it is very helpful in terms of getting kids back to school for education but also for their mental health and for their social skills.

On top of that, many parents, of course, have been forced to make impossible decisions. Do they go to work to earn a paycheck or do they stay home to take care of their child. So reopening the schools will have the effect of having childcare, which is very important. We need to act fast to ensure children don't lose more progress.

Our phase 5 legislation should provide funding to help our schools safely reopen, whether it is providing additional masks, gloves or other protective gear or other resources we have talked about, I think that money is well spent.

Second, we have to get the economy moving again. To do that, I believe we need to remove the disincentive currently in place; whereby, interestingly, we tried to help on unemployment insurance, but we provided a flat \$600 payment that has actually disincentivized a lot of people from going back to work. Why? Because most individuals are making more on unemployment insurance than at their previous job. A University of Chicago study says that 60 to 70 percent of those who are on unemployment insurance are making more on UI than they did when working.

As part of this negotiation, I believe Congress should and will extend the additional Federal unemployment insurance benefit in some form, but you shouldn't get paid more not to work. I think that is a principle that we all agree with, I hope, on both sides of the aisle. We should fix this disincentive to work by making the benefit a percentage of your previous income.

By the way, a July 13 Yahoo Finance-Harris Poll found that 62 percent of Americans believed these enhanced UI benefits served as a disincentive to work. They are right. It doesn't have to be that way. We can help people to ensure they get the support they need but not have them being paid more than they would if they were going to work.

Depending on how high the Federal payment is, by the way, we ought to also consider a return-to-work bonus for individuals that they receive on top of their paycheck—in other words, take part of the Federal benefit with them back to work. I have been promoting this since May. We haven't been able to pass it yet around here, but I think this would help people—help those workers who do want to go back to work to be able to make that tough decision without having a financial disincentive. It would help our small busi-

nesses and others who need the workforce badly, and it would help our economy begin to be able to reopen properly.

This idea, by the way, has broad support across the country. That same poll I talked about found that 69 percent of respondents support a return-to-work bonus.

There are various ways we can accomplish this goal, but I believe it would be helpful if it is paired with an extension of the unemployment insurance.

So this is something we have to focus on and come up with a bipartisan consensus—a compromise—to ensure that we are not paying people more not to work but ensure we are taking care of people who are furloughed through no fault of their own.

I also think we should be considering provisions to help incentivize the hiring from the employer side, so it is also providing more of an incentive to bring people on board. A way to do this that makes a lot of sense to me because it is building on legislation we have already passed is to expand and repurpose the work opportunity tax credit to add a category for COVID-19 furloughed individuals. Also, the employee retention tax credit from the CARES Act we passed just a short while ago can be improved to make it more encompassing and a better hiring credit. Helping to subsidize the marginal cost of a new hire will allow businesses to ramp up operations more quickly as the economy reopens, while also bringing more individuals off of the unemployment rolls and into the workforce.

I hope these are part of whatever legislative package we end up with. Again, these two should be bipartisan. The work opportunity tax credit has always been bipartisan. The retention tax credit was bipartisan in the CARES Act. These are things we can do, and they should get done.

We should be sure to stick with what has worked to this point in our coronavirus response. One of the biggest successes, of course, has been the PPP loan program. However, one flaw in the original law creating the PPP program was that it put in place barriers to loans for those owners who had unrelated felony records.

This was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine. His name is Troy Parker. He is a person who has done everything you would expect and you would want someone to do who comes off of a felony conviction—a mistake that he made. He was given a second chance, and he took it. He started a small business. It is a cleaning business, and he hires a lot of other second-chance individuals—returning citizens. He gives them a chance, an opportunity, and he has been successful. But during the coronavirus pandemic, he lost a lot of his business, as you can imagine, so he applied for a PPP loan. He was told he couldn't get one. Why? Because he has a felony record. He has a conviction for a financial crime, and it was within the last 5

years. It was several years ago, but it was in the last 5 years, so he couldn't get a PPP loan. Well, he is just the kind of individual we would want to help.

Thanks to Troy, we engaged on this issue when we learned about it. We worked with the Treasury Department. We got some immediate relief in terms of a rule, but we now have to put that into law to provide the relief that is needed to provide certainty and to codify it. The Paycheck Protection Program Second Chance Act does that. It is bipartisan. Senator CARDIN and I introduced this legislation. It has to be part of the next bill because it makes so much sense.

We also need a plan to adapt our economy for a future where many individuals may be living more of their lives at home and online. This is easier in some urban areas where you have access to broadband, but it can be a huge hurdle in some other areas, particularly rural parts of our country, including parts of Ohio.

Think about it. We rely much more on telehealth, much more on telelearning, and much more on teleworking. Yet, in many parts of the country, there is no access to the kind of Wi-Fi, the kind of broadband that you need to do so effectively.

Earlier this month, I introduced bipartisan and bicameral legislation to accelerate broadband access across the country to help our economy. Rural America deserves the same level of access to broadband, and including this legislation in this phase 5 package would help them get it faster.

Third, we need to solve the growing problem of State and local governments running out of funding the longer this crisis continues. This has affected some critical public safety services like EMS, firefighters, and police departments, leaving more Americans vulnerable at the worst possible time.

Ohio is particularly vulnerable because many of our local governments are so reliant on income taxes. In fact, the Brookings Institute has determined that four of the top five cities of America that will feel the largest fiscal impact are probably cities in Ohio.

Back in April, Senator BROWN and I urged the Treasury to provide more flexibility so local governments can use the CARES funding that has been provided for critical services like police and fire. While the administration—thanks to Secretary Mnuchin understanding and acting on this—did so administratively, it now has to be codified to be sure we have the needed certainty.

When I was home the last few weeks, I heard a lot about this from our county commissioners, our municipalities, and our mayors saying: We don't know if we can use these funds this way or that way. We have to be sure we have some certainty here. We don't want to have to repay this money.

So this codification will also be very important.

The flexibility, I hope, is something that both sides of the aisle can agree to. Why shouldn't we have more flexibility with regard to the CARES funding?

By the way, some of it hasn't been spent yet. As an example, in Ohio we still have \$850 million that is slated to go to the local communities, to our commissioners, and to our mayors for our cities that are under 500,000. Yet we don't have the flexibility and certainty we need there. That is important to pass as part of this legislation.

These are just a few policy proposals, I believe, that can make an immediate and lasting impact in our response to the challenges we face with this coronavirus pandemic. I am sure that in the coming days, we will be discussing the next steps forward in-depth because I believe we all recognize how important it is to get this right and to move quickly on it.

Unemployment, by the way, expires—that \$600—on July 31, at the end of next week. That is a deadline we can't let pass.

We are facing a momentous test of our ability to come together once again to address a disease that has changed almost every aspect of our lives, seemingly overnight. It is our responsibility to do that. Now is the time to put aside partisanship, get away from our partisan corners, and work together on some of these constructive solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—my colleague from Washington State, my colleagues from North Dakota, and my colleagues who I know share my concern that we can't allow this opportunity to pass. We have to once again come together.

As we said tonight, there are many of these things that are bipartisan, where there can be a lot of consensus. We have to move forward to support our healthcare system, our schools, our employers, and our families as we work to overcome this crisis.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

#### THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the NDAA, but before I do, I want to join my colleagues and share their great enthusiasm tonight out here on the Senate floor in talking about the Senate-crafted bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, that took a step closer to getting to the President's desk today. That is the investment that we believe we should be making in open space and public lands passed the House of Representatives and we hope will be signed by the President very shortly.

This investment, as my colleagues were talking about tonight, has been a long time in coming on two fronts—obviously, coming from a State that represents a lot of National Parks and areas that need the investment in deferred maintenance projects—every-

thing from Olympic National Park that will get an upgrade for some aging water systems to new trails at Mt. Rainier, to other projects at Lake Roosevelt and even Fort Vancouver.

I want to thank all my colleagues, Senators GARDNER, MANCHIN, PORTMAN, KING, BURR, WARNER, ALEXANDER, DAINES, and HEINRICH, who made up the coalition who have been working on this issue in the more recent days to make sure that we got it out of the Senate and got it over to the House of Representatives. The important thing is that it has been a bipartisan coalition of people who believe in public lands and open space that has brought us to this point.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was something that Scoop Jackson led the charge on in the 1960s, based on the fact that he thought America was urbanizing and, with our highway system, he thought we would need open space and, boy, was he right. So everything from Gas Works Park in downtown Seattle that gives families a great view of Lake Union to the impressive things that have been done all over the State, being able to say now that the Land and Water Conservation Fund will receive \$900 million permanently means two to three times more money than we previously had to make investments in open space.

And we know that investments in open space are not only restorative to all of us who enjoy the outdoors, whether it is hunting or fishing or hiking, but it also is a big juggernaut for our economy. That over \$800 billion in revenue is generated from this industry, and it is an industry that is well worth putting more investment in.

So I thank all my colleagues that were here tonight and for their hard work. Particularly, I want to thank Senator MANCHIN. Senator MANCHIN has done an incredible job taking this issue as the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and understanding how important it was to get it over the goal line.

So I tell the Senator that I am going to give him a picture of myself hiking in the Dolly Sods in West Virginia as a great thank you for his perseverance of moving this effort to the final goal line. So I just want to thank Senator MANCHIN and, obviously, all my colleagues.

S. 4049

But, Mr. President, I wanted to come as we were wrapping up the final debate on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2021 to talk to my colleagues about this bill as it moves to conference.

I want to make sure we continue to pay particular attention to one provision, and that is that the NDAA bill, as reported out of the Armed Services Committee, I believe included some egregious provisions that would effectively wrestle away civilian control of spending on our nuclear arsenal and give it to the military, a provision that would allow the Department of Defense



to raid dollars out of the Department of Energy that are literally there specifically for us to meet our nuclear cleanup obligations and also to fund R&D at our national laboratories, places like the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado or other facilities in my State, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Specifically, the committee-reported bill would have stripped the Energy Secretary's power over his own budget and would have allowed subcommittee officials on the Nuclear Weapons Council to approve the budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

So I know the Presiding Officer knows this well. But it would have allowed the Pentagon to prioritize making nuclear weapons over the critical missions of the U.S. Department of Energy. And I believe it also would have reduced civilian control over spending on our country's nuclear weapons complex.

I am so glad that Energy Secretary Brouillette wrote to Senator INHOFE and talked about this and said: "These provisions eliminate a President's Cabinet Secretary from managing some of the most sensitive national security programs in the Department, most notably, assuring the viability of the Nation's nuclear deterrent."

I do want to thank Senators INHOFE and REED for hearing the concerns expressed by many Senators on both sides of the aisle and for hearing the concerns of the Secretary of Energy and accepting the Manchin-Cantwell amendment that stripped these troubling provisions out of the bill because I believe it was a radical change that did not have enough debate.

But I certainly appreciate the Presiding Officer's interest and determination as well. In particular, I want to thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senators HEINRICH, CASSIDY, WYDEN, BARRASSO, HIRONO, RISCH, and SANDERS who jointly sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing opposition to these provisions.

In a letter that stated, if these provisions would have remained in the bill, they would have "impeded accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation's nuclear weapons complex."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter, the Cantwell-Alexander letter, be printed into the RECORD.

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

JULY 1, 2020.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN INHOFE, AND RANKING MEMBER REED: As the Senate considers the Fiscal Year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), we write to

express our opposition to the inclusion of controversial and far reaching provisions that would fundamentally alter the Department of Energy's (DOE) responsibilities for the nuclear weapons budget.

As members of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, we write in support of Secretary Brouillette's June 29, 2020 letter to Chairman Inhofe and share his concerns that provisions in the Senate NDAA bill undermine DOE's ability to meet its mission goals and responsibility for maintaining the viability of the nation's nuclear deterrent.

As currently written, the Senate NDAA bill would strip the Secretary of Energy of the ability to manage some of the most sensitive national security programs that account for almost half of the Department's budget. Such changes could impede accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation's nuclear weapons complex.

Sweeping changes impacting civilian control of our nation's nuclear weapons programs should only be made in consultation and coordination with the committee of jurisdiction in an open and transparent manner. The changes included in the Senate NDAA bill have been met with opposition from the Trump Administration, former Secretaries of Energy, recent NNSA Administrators, and the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

We therefore request that the provisions be removed from the pending bill or that the Senate be allowed to vote on the relevant amendments filed by Ranking Member Manchin.

Sincerely,

Senator Maria Cantwell, Senator Lamar Alexander, Senator Martin Heinrich, Senator Bill Cassidy, Senator Ron Wyden, Senator John Barrasso, Senator Mazie Hirono, Senator Jim Risch, Senator Bernie Sanders.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the members of this year's NDAA conference committee—I am assuming there will be one—that they consider all these issues as they go to conference.

This is not just a bureaucratic budget dispute or some interagency accounting measure. This is, I believe, a very important issue, as it relates to civilian oversight of our nuclear weapons complex and, as written in the original bill, would have required the Nuclear Weapons Council to set the priorities for the NNSA budget and would have required the Department of Energy to get the Nuclear Weapons Council's approval before it could submit its Energy budget to OMB.

So, yes, there was a big takeover of the Department of Energy budget snuck into the NDAA. Well, let's just say some of us knew about it; some of us didn't know about it. But we objected, and now, we have taken this language out.

But I am sure this will continue, and I think it still continues. I think people who have a desire to have a larger National Nuclear Security Administration budget definitely are going to continue this effort. But people should

know that the National Nuclear Security Administration makes up about 45 percent of the Department of Energy's budget.

So, in other words, the Secretary of Energy would have lost control over almost half of his budget. And it would also mean that the Nuclear Weapons Council, which is comprised of five DOD subcommittee officials and one representative of the Department of Energy, that they would have effectively been dictating to members of the President's Cabinet what the budget should look like. So imagine that the Secretary of Energy has to come before Congress, and he says, 45 percent of my budget has already been determined by somebody else, and you really can't go talk to them.

This isn't just an issue of transparency. This is also an issue about the Department of Energy's obligations to clean up, specifically in Washington at Hanford. So I want to make sure people understand that nuclear waste cleanup is a Federal obligation. It is an obligation that we have as a nation, not just in Washington, but other States, and unfortunately, we haven't met all the milestones for nuclear waste cleanup. In fact, Idaho experienced this between 2012 and 2018 when DOE failed to meet cleanup milestones at the Idaho National Laboratory.

Taking away DOE's ability to control its own budget would make it harder to meet milestones, and now, some want more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

It is the duty of our Nation to clean up what was a national effort in World War II and the Cold War.

So I hope our colleagues won't forget history here, won't forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won't forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be \$323 billion at a best-case scenario and \$677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has after Social Security and Medicare. So it is no wonder people come and try to raid it.

Trust me, I could be going on all night over all the efforts that have been going on for decades, where people try to come up with a new way of either taking that money out of the budget or saying that they are going to find a quicker way to do cleanup. I am

all for speed, but I am also for meeting the obligations. But there is no magic here. It is a responsibility, and it is science, and it is an investment, and it belongs to the whole Nation. And we certainly don't deserve to have people coming to the Senate floor with a bill trying to take away 45 percent of the administration's budget and then say we don't have to meet that cleanup obligation because we are investing in nuclear weapons instead.

So, believe me, as this bill moves off the Senate floor, I am going to be watching the conference. I am not just going to watch this issue now or in conference. I am going to be keeping watch on this issue in a constant fashion, just like I always have on Hanford cleanup dollars. But I resent that people believe that Congress would fall for such a tactic to believe that the efforts of nuclear weapons development should be controlled by a small subcabinet council and that they shouldn't report to the Secretary of Energy on that budget, but make up their own budget and demand that it be met at the Presidential level.

Now, I just hope we don't reach this same dilemma again. I hope we have learned from it. I hope that people understand that these priorities of cleanup of our nuclear waste sites and what these parts of the country did for us in meeting our obligations in World War II and the Cold War.

We laud those efforts from a scientific perspective. We laud those efforts from the manpower that it took. We should now laud a budget that keeps the focus on cleanup and gets the job done and not lose track or sight because, from time to time, somebody else wants to make a larger investment in nuclear weapons.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT  
NO. 2457

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to ask: What does democracy look like in America? I have here a picture of what democracy looks like—people showing up presenting their opinions with their feet and their voices and their signs saying: We want change. And the change they want is to pursue the important value that public safety in America be a value that is applied equally to all citizens; that every single person in the community is viewed as a client for the public safety team; that the distribution of protection is equal and the treatment of citizens is equal, so that when public safety officers respond, they respond equally no matter what section of the city the call comes from; that they respond

the same no matter the color of a person's skin; that profiling is a thing of the past; that viewing two young Black men on the street is not viewed differently than viewing two young White men on the street. It is that goal of having everyone treated fairly that has led so many to come out and say: We need major reform in our country. We need to set behind us the time period when departments of public safety tend to look at the White community and say, "Those are our clients," and look at the Black community or the dark-skinned community and say, "Those are the threats." That is what people are trying to change by turning out in America in this fashion.

It is an important moment in which we need substantive change, real change—real change like the bill CORY BOOKER put together and led the battle on, and KAMALA HARRIS put together with him in partnership and led the battle on. That is the type of change we need in America. That is why people have been turning out in the streets.

But there is an unexpected twist on something we didn't anticipate, in which the President of the United States hasn't listened to this message about coming together so that everyone is treated equally. Instead, he is doubling down on a strategy of racism, a strategy of bigotry, a strategy of creating conflict in America with a determined new effort.

This is a picture of protesting in Oregon. I was at a demonstration much like this, where people chanted: "This is what democracy looks like. This is what democracy looks like."

This is what democracy looks like, colleagues—people coming together with their signs and their feet and their time, saying: We need change. It is as fundamental as free expression under the First Amendment. It is as fundamental to our Constitution as the right to assemble. This is as fundamental to the vision of "We the People" as anyone can imagine—that vision that Lincoln summarized as "government of the people, by the people, for the people," not of, by, and for some dictatorial force, not someone who wants to consolidate power in an imperial Presidency.

In fact, our Founders were really worried about authoritarianism. They were really worried about an imperial Presidency.

Once they launched that Constitution, what would happen with that first President? Would that first President say: I am now going to consolidate power in this young Republic, hold on to the Executive, ignore the balance of powers between the branches of government, and consolidate power in the Executive. I am going to take the forces that were the Revolutionary War forces, and I am going to turn them into a force to keep in power regardless of the constitutional requirement for elections.

They were very worried about this. One of the reasons they particularly

liked the idea of George Washington being the first President is that George Washington was very worried about that, and the example he set would mean a whole lot.

It is one thing to have a Constitution on paper. It is a whole other thing to hold onto it, to keep it. Coming out of the Constitutional Convention, the story goes that someone asked one of the convention policymakers: What do we have? And he replied: A republic, if we can keep it—if we can keep it.

This is what democracy looks like right here. There is another picture of what democracy looks like. This is the "wall of moms" in Portland, OR, coming out, standing side by side, creating a barrier between the police and the Federal forces that had been allocated to the city by President Trump and the people, creating that barrier, that "wall of moms," to say: Do not use flashbang on us or all the people behind us; do not use tear gas on us or all the people behind us; do not use impact munitions, a polite name for, essentially, rubber bullets—they say "non-lethal bullets"—we hope, right, because sometimes they do enormous damage—do not use your batons to knock us down and break our bones; do not pepper spray us in the face. We are the "wall of moms."

This is what democracy looks like, but this is a message lost on President Trump. We have something entirely different from the President. The President said: I am going to send some forces out to Portland to basically pour gasoline on the fire and turn it into, basically, a much more intense conflict.

So you already have the basics of a challenge in which you have had folks from the White extremists coming in camouflage to Portland to create trouble and looking for a fight, and you have antifa coming to Portland to look for a fight with the White extremists, the White nationalists.

Well, that had calmed down enormously to where there was only a small group left, coming in late at night and causing trouble. But Trump said: If I can recreate conflict in Portland, well, I can run a campaign on fear. Because what we have seen, in Presidential campaign after Presidential campaign, is a Republican candidate saying: If we run on fear, we will win because people think of us as stronger on national security.

Well, we have seen the different strategies. There was the Ebola run-on-fear strategy. There was the "immigrants, rapists, and murderers are going to run across the border and swarm America" run-on-fear strategy. There was the "ISIS is going to row across the Atlantic and invade America" run-on-fear strategy. There was the Willie Horton "you are going to be attacked by a dark-skinned person in an alley" run-on-fear strategy.

And all too often it has worked, this effort to gear up division in America, to play on racism in America.

But to that strategy of division and racism I say: No way. That is too low, too wrong for America. We should be coming together as a country. We should have a message of coming together as a people. We should be taking on the challenges of healthcare and housing and education.

Those are the bills we should have here on the floor of the Senate. We should be taking on the issue of fair labor, good-paying jobs. We should be working on rebuilding America's infrastructure.

We should be addressing the fact that, even today in States all across this country, you can be discriminated against for being a member of the LGBTQ community. You can get married in the morning, and you can proceed to be thrown out of your apartment. You can be told you cannot eat in this restaurant, you cannot sit in this movie theater, you cannot receive this government benefit.

The Supreme Court just took one step forward on the employment question, strengthening the ability to not be discriminated against in employment.

We passed a bill here in the Senate back in 2013 to do exactly that, to strengthen protections in employment, but the Republican-controlled House wouldn't take it up and treat LGBTQ Americans fairly.

If we were doing our job, we would have a debate on the Equality Act that would end discrimination in all of these areas because it is the right thing to do that no door should be slammed in the face of an American because of who they are or whom they love. Isn't that something we should be doing here?

Shouldn't we be taking on this challenge of carbon pollution and climate chaos? All the fossil fuel companies have worked hard to turn this into a partisan issue. It didn't used to be a partisan issue. Back when President Bush—not yet President but candidate Bush ran against candidate Dukakis, it was the Republican candidate who ran on climate change. It was the Democrat who ran on fossil fuels.

It is not so long ago, before Citizens United, that we had so many climate champions on both sides, but then dark money was introduced, and the fossil fuel community said: This is our chance to control the U.S. Senate. They put hundreds of millions—not thousands, millions—of dollars into the Senate campaigns 6 years ago, 2014.

I remember it well because I was one of the folks they were targeting, and I saw their strategy of taking that money and putting it into third-party campaigns and running tremendous numbers of assault ads, negative ads, attack ads—doing it on social media all across the board.

Since then, what happened? Well, all the voices that were on the Republican side of the aisle saying “We need to take on climate” disappeared. That is the corrupting power of Citizens United and dark money.

Then we had a bill here on the floor. We needed 60 votes, under our policy rules, to be able to pass it to close debate. It was disclosure—to say at least we should disclose where money comes from. But what happened? The fossil fuel lobby said no Republican can dare to vote for this bill if you want us to keep you in power, and every single Member across the aisle followed their lead and voted against disclosure.

They voted for darkness. They voted for hiding these massive contributions coming in from who knows where because they are hidden.

My point is that this is democracy here, people expressing their views, and here in this Chamber we should have democracy as well.

We had it almost over our entire history, of people being able to put virtually any issue on the floor and have it debated on and then to have it voted on and then to have voters know how their Senator voted so there was accountability.

But no more. We are in this incredible period in which there are a record number—low—of amendments, and the amendments we do have are basically not very significant to begin with or they are preprogrammed by leadership, not by each Senator having power. The idea of 100 Senators having that power—that sounds like something out of just another world, yet that was the Senate throughout its history until recently.

Why do I keep emphasizing this? Because this concentration of power where bills and amendments only go through the majority leader is an absolute fit with government by and for the powerful—the opposite of government by and for the people.

So if someone has a bill that says you can't gouge Americans on drug prices, they can't get that bill to the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and the drug companies don't want that bill on the floor, so they give a lot of money to that team.

If someone says we should have reasonable gun safety laws—not violating the Second Amendment—and we will make the world a little safer for our children, well, that bill can't get on the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and it is backed by massive spending of dark money and the NRA.

Or if we have a bill that says we should do a lot more about housing, I can't put that bill on the floor. How about we have a banking system that serves the cannabis industry so that we don't have huge bags of money opened up to the possibility of organized crime moving it around the country and doing bad things? We should extend that coverage, but we can't get that vote on this floor—which brings me to something more important than just basically anything I have just talked about, which is what President Trump is doing right now: deploying secret police across America, secret police here in America.

Now, we know that President Trump admires authoritarian leaders. He has spoken with admiration about Duterte in the Philippines. He seems to be in love with Erdogan in Turkey. He loves the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia, who assassinated an American-based journalist.

He can't find anything wrong with how Putin runs Russia, as basically an authoritarian-style dictator. But now he is doing something beyond just this affection: He is bringing the tactics of authoritarian governments to the streets of the United States of America.

This is what democracy looks like, but I am going to show you some pictures of what democracy doesn't look like—instead, what authoritarianism looks like, what paramilitary forces look like.

So let's take an exploration of the President's strategy. Well, first, authoritarians don't want identity about the organization on their police uniforms, and they want the police, in functioning, to look more like warriors in some other fight across the sea.

So you dress them in camouflage. Here are folks deployed by President Trump in the streets of Portland. What agency do these belong to? No shoulder patch, no identity on this front, no identity on the other shoulder, no identity on the helmet—no identity. Who are these people?

How about these people? Are these the same group here? These are White extremists, nationalists, who come to Portland to get in fights. So President Trump dresses up his Federal forces to look like White extremists on the streets of Portland.

How is there accountability if you don't know where they are from?

Who can tell me if these folks are from Customs and Border Protection? Are they from the Federal Protective Service? Are they U.S. Marshals? How do we know? We don't because they are deliberately not marked.

We are told that these are actually Customs and Border Protection. I called up the head of Customs and Border Protection, and I said: What is the story with this tactic of secret police on the streets? He said: Oh, no, no, no; we insist they have “CBP” on them. We insist they have a unique identifier.

In fact, he put this in a tweet. He told all of America: We don't do that. But America has pictures, and those pictures tell us there is no ID. They are being deployed as secret operators on the streets of Portland.

That is going to be terrifying because you don't know who they are. Is it just someone who wants to create trouble who puts “police” on their shirt? Is it one of these folks? These folks have badges on them that look a little more official. We see an American flag here. We see an American flag here.

Are these White extremists coming to the streets to beat people up, or are they Federal agents? And if so, who are they, and what is their mission? We found out their mission in short order.

Here we have a picture of a Navy vet. That Navy vet said he came down to say: What does it mean to honor your oath—your oath of office, your oath to the Constitution? He wants to know. He was a veteran who served in our forces to defend the Constitution.

How did President Trump's secret police respond? Here is a CBP agent with a baton right here, striking him. Here is another one with a baton coming around to strike him again. Here is another one spraying pepper spray into his face. This man, just standing here—his hands are basically hooked in his pocket, like this—he is just standing here saying: I came down here to see what people thought about honoring their oath to the Constitution. And he is attacked. He is attacked by multiple members of this secret force Trump puts on the streets of our Nation.

They had not just pepper spray and not just batons; they had other weapons, impact munitions—in this case, U.S. marshals.

Here is a young man who is holding a boom box over his head—that is what it looked like—and he is on one side of the street. On the other side of the street are the marshals. As he stands there in the video, you see him crumble and fall to the ground because from across the street, he was shot right between the eyes. Critical condition. Fractured skull.

Who in the world would expect a Federal officer to shoot a protester, who is either holding up a sign or a radio, between the eyes from across the street? Do you think that is accidental? They accidentally shot him in the head? It wasn't accidental; it was deliberate. They are sending a message. A lot of other people got shot with these munitions. I am told that he is no longer in critical condition. Thank goodness for that, but it could have been very, very different. We still don't know the ultimate outcome of this assault on a peaceful protester.

Pepper spray, using batons on veterans, shooting a peaceful protester in the head from a few yards away—that is not all that Trump's secret police were up to. They decided to go through the streets and grab people and throw them into unmarked vans.

Here is one of those vans on the streets of Portland. Here are President Trump's secret police, unmarked, throwing another protester into a van.

One of the individuals who was treated in this fashion said he was terrified because he thought these camouflaged folks were the White extremists who come to make trouble, and was he being kidnapped? They would not answer the question when they were asked "Who are you?" They didn't answer the question.

Secret police, unmarked, using pepper spray, batons, impact munitions, and tear gas on peaceful protesters, and then throwing people—grabbing them and throwing them into unmarked vans. What does that make you think of? What country are we talking

about here? Are we talking about Syria? Are we talking about Duterte in the Philippines? Are we talking about Erdogan in Turkey? Are we talking about the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia? Are we talking about Putin running Russia? We could be talking about any of those folks, as they use these tactics, but this is unacceptable and outrageous and unconstitutional in a democratic republic.

President Trump coordinated this deployment of secret police and attacks on peaceful protesters to create a big conflagration, a big explosion of protests in Portland. The protests had died down to just less than 100 actors and some bystanders in the late evening, and then I am told that on the days that followed these outrageous attacks, the protests multiplied—not one- or twofold but fivefold or more. That is exactly what Trump wanted because he wanted to say: There is this dissent and trouble in the streets of Portland. I am your law-and-order President; I will take care of that trouble.

You create the trouble. You escalate the conflict so you can say "I am the one who can deescalate it" later. This is a horrific strategy that no Member of this Senate should have the slightest sympathy for—a strongman in the Oval Office adopting the secret police tactics of the worst dictators from around the globe.

Some of the headlines that followed were things like this:

"Federal Law Enforcement Use Unmarked Vehicles To Grab Protesters Off Portland Streets."

"A Navy vet asked federal officers in Portland to remember their [constitutional] oaths. Then they broke his hand." You saw the pictures of them striking him with the batons.

"Federal Officers Deployed in Portland Didn't Have Proper Training, D.H.S. memo said." It says: Untrained, undisciplined folks, but they knew what the President wanted and that was to create an escalation of violence on the streets of our city.

You are probably wondering, didn't the President call and talk to the Governor before he decided to deploy these secret police on the streets of Portland? No, he didn't. Didn't the DHS Secretary? No. How about the Department of Justice? The Attorney General? No. Surely they called the mayor and said: Before we deploy folks to patrol the streets with tear gas and batons and impact bullets, rubber bullets, pepper spray; before we beat up peaceful protesters and shoot them in the head, we want to talk to you, Mayor, about what is going on. Did the President call? Did the Secretary call, the Secretary of Homeland Security? Did the Secretary or the Attorney General call? Did the head of Customs and Border Protection, CBP, call before they sent in their special operating group? Did the Marshals' lead director, commissioner call? The answer is no, no, no, no, and no. None of them called be-

cause they weren't coming to coordinate, to help; they were coming to disrupt. They knew that if they asked to come, asked whether they were wanted, the answer would be no, you are not wanted because you are coming to inflame the violence and disruption.

The President was giving speeches, saying "Look at what a wonderful President I am because I am sending help to quell violence in Portland" while he was sending secret police to create violence. This has to be one of the bigger lies he has told in his time as President. By various accounts, he tells a number of them every single day. But this lie to the American people is not just a little white lie; this is not just a little misrepresentation; this is something of constitutional input about who we are as a country. We don't do secret police in our country. We don't grab people off the streets and terrify them and throw them in unmarked vans in our country—at least not until now.

You see, the President has looked at the polls that say we are not very happy. Americans are not very happy with the way you have executed the Presidency. We are certainly not very happy with the way you have managed this really big crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic. When there is a crisis, you start to see someone—can they rise to the occasion? Can they bring forth the best in people? Can they facilitate cooperation? Can they mobilize resources? Can they make the case in an effective and persuasive fashion?

The American people have seen that President Trump could not rise to the occasion. He could not bring himself to bring people together. He could not make the case for a national strategy on how to tackle the coronavirus. He could not mobilize resources to address it in a timely fashion. Millions more are going to get sick as a result of his incompetence, and tens of thousands more will die because of the incompetence of President Trump.

What is a President running for reelection to do when his incompetence is revealed in its complete and total clarity to the Nation? You create a war. That is what you do. You create a war because a war might rally people to your side when we are being attacked. But in this case, the President couldn't come up with an overseas war. ISIS? Too weak. The scary Ebola? Too long ago. North Korea? A completely failed strategy by the President of expressing his love for yet another dictator and that love not being returned in any effective policy changes. So what is left? Immigration. Oh, wait—he already played the rapist and murderers at the border card. He already offended people throughout our Nation by snuffing out the lamp of Lady Liberty. What is left? You have to create a war inside the United States.

First came Washington, DC. He tried out the secret police strategy by deploying forces onto the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, unmarked, and nobody knew who the hell they were. Who

are these people who are on the Lincoln Memorial? Are they far-right extremists carrying guns? Are they Customs and Border Protection? Are they U.S. Marshals? Who are these people? Nobody knew. They were secret police at the Lincoln Monument.

And then he decided to test the strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters across from the White House. There they are gathered together. There is this great tradition in America. If you want to protest where the President can see you, you go to L'Enfant Plaza and you look up at the second story and you hold up your protest sign and you scream your position on something that you consider very important for America—the change you want to see or the man you object to. The President and his family look out those windows and say: I sure hate seeing those protesters.

But that is symbolic of the right to assemble and the freedom of speech in our beautiful Nation under our extraordinary Constitution. What did President Trump do? Well, he walked off L'Enfant Plaza across from the White House so people couldn't protest there. That is what this President thinks of protesters. He sees them as a threat to him. He doesn't like freedom of assembly, and he doesn't like freedom of speech, but what he does like is a good photo opportunity.

So the President decides to get the team together and we will go over and I will stand on the steps of the church and hold up a Bible. I still am a little confounded about what his message was to do that. The thing is, to get to the steps of the church, he would have to come near these protesters he hates because he hates protesters. He doesn't like Americans calling for change or criticizing his policies.

I am thinking back about this “wall of moms” that I showed you earlier—these moms coming down, forming a line, and saying: Don't tear gas us. Don't do shock grenades. Don't shoot us with rubber bullets. Don't pepper spray us.

And yet his forces did all those things.

Where did he try this out first? He tried it in that area behind L'Enfant Plaza where the church steps were. His forces went out and attacked those protesters. Nobody saw violence of any kind. This had nothing to do with quelling a riot. This had to do with one simple thing: The President hates protests and wanted to show what a strong man he is, like those dictators he admires all across the planet—like the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia, like Duterte with his extrajudicial executions in the Philippines, like Putin, whom he just can't say enough good things about who suppresses the civil rights of the Russian people. He wanted to show how strong he was so he sent his team out to tear gas, use impact munitions, rubber bullets on the protesters so he could stand at the church with a Bible.

I am still wondering what passage in the Bible he was there to talk about. You can think for yourselves. You can imagine. You can ask yourselves: What did the President want to say with the Good Book in his hand? Did he want to say this book talks about turning the other cheek, and I will show how much I admire that principle of turning the other cheek by coming out and telling my team to tear gas and shoot peaceful protesters? Is that what the President wanted to do, kind of somehow demonstrate support for turning the other cheek by having his team gas and shoot people in that area close to L'Enfant Plaza, close to the steps of the church, or did the President want to come out and say: This Good Book talks about beating swords into plowshares, and I want to come out and show just how I believe in the principle of beating swords into plowshares by having my team gas people and baton people and do these explosive flashbang grenades. Is that what the President was trying to do?

What message in the Bible was he trying to convey? Was he trying to convey the message that Jesus Christ talked about time and time and time again of helping the poor and the destitute, and he thought it was such an important message to carry to the United States that he would use force, tear gas, rubber bullets to clear the path so he could talk about how important it was to help the destitute and the poor in America and how his policies might help them? No. We don't know. I don't think the President knew. He has never indicated that he is actually familiar with the contents of that book he was holding up, which makes it a particularly bizarre photo op.

But this was his first trial run of this strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters, of using unmarked uniforms on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. He loved it so much. He loved that sense that he was so strong because he could clear the path with his Presidential team so he could get to those steps. He was such an awesome man, such an incredible President showing strength by attacking peaceful protesters so he could have his photo on. It filled him with such energy, he thought: Let's try this out elsewhere in the country—so he comes to Portland.

He comes to Portland, and he proceeds to say: Let's use that secret police strategy again, unmarked. Let's use those batons and pepper spray again against a peaceful protester. Let's use those impact munitions again against someone holding up a sign, shooting them from across the street, giving them a fractured skull and putting them in critical condition and into the hospital. Let's take it and even amplify it a little bit and put them into unmarked vans and sweep them away. This is what we have with the Trump secret police strategy.

As he did these things, he went out on the campaign stump and said: Look

what a mighty leader I am attacking these peaceful people with these weapons. I did it to the protesters in Washington, DC, and I did it to the protesters in Portland, OR, and now I am going to take my strategy of attacking protesters and spread it all across America.

What does he talk about? He says: I want to take this strategy to Baltimore. He says: I want to take this strategy to Philadelphia. He says: I want to take this strategy to New York. And then he said: I want to take it to Chicago and I want to take it to Detroit and I want to take it to Oakland, CA. What do those things have in common? And then he says: They are led by Democrats. I will take my strategy of inciting violence with secret police, unmarked van abductions, use of pepper spray, batons, and flashbangs—the whole arsenal—and I will take it to all these cities where there are Democratic mayors. Then I will say: Look at me. I am a law-and-order President, and I can quell all that trouble I created across this country.

You are probably thinking I made up this list of cities that the President talked about. Surely, the President wouldn't take this incredibly horrendous secret police strategy and express that he wanted to take it on a trial run all across America so he could create violence in Democratic cities, but in his own words:

Who's next? New York and Chicago and Philadelphia and Detroit and Baltimore and all of these—Oakland is a mess.

And he framed it as going to quell violence, but, instead, the strategy produces violence. It enflames. It accentuates. It outrages. It creates conflict.

I have here an article, and it is from FOX 32 News in Chicago: “Lightfoot confirms federal agents will help manage Chicago violence.” Chicago has a Democratic mayor. Let's go create trouble there.

Mayor Lori Lightfoot had a different tone Tuesday regarding President Donald Trump's decision to send agents to Chicago. “I'm hopeful that they will not be foolish enough to bring that kind of nonsense to Chicago,” the mayor said.

Well, what did she mean by “nonsense”? It is the polite word for attacking peaceful protesters with batons and flashbangs and tear gas.

I am certainly not saying that Portland didn't have some tensions. The extremist groups on the right have made a favorite trip out of coming to Portland to cause trouble and the anti-fascists have responded in kind, and that is what the local team has to manage and deescalate. They have succeeded in deescalating it to where it was a small group late at night. And then Trump came in and blew it all into a big crisis once again.

When I said that this is coordinated with his campaign, campaign ads went up. His strategy of creating chaos in America, then campaigning on it couldn't be more transparent.

As President Trump deploys Federal agents to Portland, Ore., and threatens to

dispatch to other cities, his re-election campaign is spending millions of dollars on ominous television ads that promote fear. . . . The influx of agents in Portland has led to scenes of confrontations and chaos that Mr. Trump and his aides have pointed to as they try to burnish a false narrative about Democratic elected officials allowing dangerous protesters to create widespread bedlam.

The Trump campaign is driving home that message with a new ad that tries to tie its dark portrayal of Democratic-led cities.

There it is—campaign ads to fit his dark portrayal of Democratic-led cities.

The idea that not only would the President bring those secret police tactics to America—to our streets—he would deploy them in his effort to create conflict so he can win reelection, so he can have something that scares the American people. Don't we have enough to be worried about already? Don't we have a pandemic to manage?

A number of us worked to say: Mr. President, you need to have a national strategy on producing protective equipment to help stop the spread of this contagion. Mr. President, that should probably include taking available factories and putting them to work making protective equipment and distributing it quickly. The President said, no, he's not doing it. He is not activating the Defense Production Act to have a national strategy to stop the spread of this disease.

I have two healthcare workers in my family. My son works in a doctor's office recording the computer code on the symptoms and so forth. He is a medical scribe. My wife goes house to house visiting folks who are in hospice. They are in the final chapter of their life, and she coaches them and their family on care and support during this final chapter of our journey here on this planet. A number of the people she sees are very high risk because they are fragile and sick in that final chapter, so they would be very affected if this disease were introduced. Some of them have the disease.

She has to be very careful that she doesn't pick it up and bring it home to my elderly mother who lives in our house. My elderly mother is in her nineties. She probably wouldn't want me to call her elderly in her nineties, but she is fragile, and she would be affected. My son doesn't want to bring it home or spread it. Both of them had trouble getting the protective equipment they needed early in this pandemic because we didn't have a national strategy. Trump failed the leadership test.

How about another critical piece of this, which is testing?

We needed to crank up all of the biological manufacturing capacity of America to produce the reagents so that people could be tested and get the results within hours or a day so that, if they were infected, even if they were asymptomatic—they didn't have the disease symptoms, but they had the disease, and they could spread it—that they would be quarantined, but the President said no.

So we put into the bill a requirement for the President to produce a national test strategy and produce a report with his test strategy. What did it read? It read our test strategy—our national strategy—was to leave it to the States. What kind of leadership is that to have no strategy on producing the reagents or the tests and getting them around the country?

One thing we have done here is we have funded a lot of money to help communities buy tests because they are expensive. We said they should be free to the victims—to the people who are getting tested, that is. Every health expert has said you have to crank up this testing so that there is no wait time. It doesn't help to get the results 7 or 10 days later.

I have been holding townhalls. I hold one in every county every year in Oregon, 36 counties. This year, I only got 21 in before the coronavirus made it impossible to hold them in person, but I have been holding them digitally, electronically. I keep hearing the report from the county health agents that now testing has increased to its taking 7 days to get a response, 9 days to get a response, 11 days to get a response. Why is that? It is because we didn't have any national strategy for producing tests. As the disease flares up and grows in magnitude in the Southern States, more and more resources are getting diverted to those Southern States. So there are not the testing supplies because there is no national strategy.

Then the experts said: Well, you should have a contact tracing strategy, so, when people test positive, you can immediately find out who they have been in touch with so those people get immediately quarantined before they can pass it on to other people.

Yet that doesn't work if you can't get test results quickly, and it doesn't work if you don't have contact tracers. A number of us have worked to provide funding for contact tracers. ELIZABETH WARREN and I have introduced a bill that calls for 100,000 contact tracers across this country. There is \$75 billion in the House's bill for testing and tracing across the country.

How did President Trump respond this last week? President Trump said: I don't want any money for testing in this bill—no money for testing. He wants this stripped out; yet it is an essential element for controlling the coronavirus.

I don't think he will win on that one. I think the Members of this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, care enough about their constituents that they want to help with testing and contact tracing, but the President wants the testing stripped out.

Why does he want it stripped out? It is because, if you test more people, then you get more positives, and if you get more positives, it doesn't look good. So he is choosing to have things look good rather than to contain the coronavirus.

If you proceed to offend people across the country by failing in leadership on protective equipment and failing in leadership on testing and failing in leadership on contact tracing, you need another plan, and we have the plan.

The President has made it clear he will test out his secret police and attacks on peaceful protesters in DC, magnify that experiment in Portland, and see if it creates more chaos. If it does, he will deploy that effort across the Nation. That is President Trump's plan, and it is as wrong as anything could be. Secret policing has no place in the United States of America.

I introduced a simple amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, which deals with security powers and things like Customs and Border Protection and deals with things like U.S. Marshals, and I said we are on that right now on the floor of the Senate. Let's have this debate about secret policing, and let's just ask a few simple things.

First, when the President sends agents anywhere in the country, they have to carry identification about who they work for. It is not that big of a request, and it is not expensive. Instead of putting a generic "police" or no marking at all, you put "CBP," or you put "U.S. Marshals," or you put "Federal Protective Service" or one of a dozen other Federal police units that play different roles. That way, the American people will know who they are. Then you put unique identifiers on them so that, if they do something terrible, like walk up and shoot a protester in the head, you would know who had done it. You could find out.

Now, some of my friends have said: Well, we are not sure we want to require names to be on the uniforms because there have been some cases in which people have been so outraged that they have harassed the families of the police officers or of these Federal agents. We don't want that. OK. A number would work that could be used to identify someone after an egregious act but would protect the families of our Federal agents who are doing a good job. That is pretty simple. Have an ID as to what agency you belong to and a unique identifier. You are no longer secret.

Then you can't be deployed on some expanded mission of sweeping the streets. Your legitimate mission should be to protect a Federal monument or a Federal building, and you have to be at that Federal building or in the near vicinity of it or of the monument. That is pretty simple. If you want a broader mission, you have to coordinate with the mayor and the Governor and get their permission.

It is pretty straightforward. Have a patch with the agency, a unique identifier, and pursue your mission in the near vicinity of the Federal property.

What else?

The President would have to tell the people of America how many people he is sending, from what agencies, and to what city for a little bit of transparency. That is it.



This amendment that I am proposing to stop secret policing is simple; yet my colleagues are blocking it from being considered in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in a moment, I will again ask for this important issue of deployment of secret police to be debated and voted on, on this floor. That is what the U.S. Senate is for, to address the issues facing Americans, but I didn't want to ask until my colleague was here to respond from the Republican Caucus. When he is ready, I will make that motion.

I make this motion to send a couple of different messages. One, most importantly, is that secret policing has no place in America, and all Americans must stand arm in arm and say no. The second is, when there is an important issue like this, this is the Chamber in which it should be debated and voted on so we can hear the conflicting views.

There may be clauses in the amendment that I will propose that people won't like, insight that they can provide, or modifications that they would like to propose to my amendment, but it can't happen unless this amendment is considered on the floor.

That is why, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment to stop secret policing in America, amendment No. 2457, an amendment to limit Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendment with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I, like the entire staff in the Chamber today and like the Presiding Officer for most of this time, has endured this for the last hour, an hour that has been very similar to the hour we had yesterday on the very same topic and with the very same motion to have the very same amendment passed in the Defense Authorization Act.

I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Prior to the Presiding Officer, I was presiding. I was honored to sit in that chair and watch the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Armed Services talk in glowing terms about each other and the bipartisan effort that has led to a National Defense Authorization Act that has considered 807 amendments to this point. As we sit here, 40 more amendments—20 by Republicans and 20 by Democrats—are being hotlined for further consideration for, hopefully, tomorrow's final passage.

The National Defense Authorization Act has been greatly debated. In fact,

it has been the most debated bill that I have been part of since I got here. Not only that, the amendments that are represented in this 807 are almost, nearly, equally divided among the two parties represented in this great Chamber.

What we have been witnessing tonight is a diatribe—in some cases, fantasy but, in every case, an exaggeration and, in many cases, a fabrication. The good Senator from Oregon has shown us pictures of what democracy looks like. I don't disagree. We are self-governed. The exceptionalism of America is that we are self-governed.

Democracy also demands protocol in this Chamber, the most deliberative body in this world. Yet, without any warning—without any heads-up—here we are, dealing with a unanimous consent motion on an amendment that has already failed to get unanimous consent just in the last 24 hours on a bill that has already been debated for weeks and months. It included bipartisan amendments across the board. Then we are confronted with this breach of not only protocol but of—well, let's just say—common decency and respect for each other.

I do agree with the Senator from Oregon on this point: He is right in that we should have the debate, and that is why it is too bad that his amendment wasn't allowed to be debated in Senator TIM SCOTT's JUSTICE Act.

And the reason it couldn't be debated there was because he and most every one of his colleagues on the Democrat side other than three filibustered against TIM SCOTT's police reform bill.

I don't think they want a solution. They want to have this crazy rhetoric, demagogue all day and all night, wherever they can have a demagogue, and they want to blame President Donald Trump for the actions of criminals.

Now, I have heard it all when I have heard, from the Senate floor, antifa referred to as the anti—what did he call them? The antifascists. The antifascists. That is the way to sugar-coat thugs.

So for these reasons—and I could think of dozens of others, but I will spare you all and the staff this late night, getting later—I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon's postcloture time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. And I would invite my colleague to stay if he would like to and yield to him if he wants to jump into the conversation.

Mr. CRAMER. I think we have had enough debate. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I don't object.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleague has said that the facts I have presented tonight are a fabrication, to use his exact word. He has called it a breach of protocol. He has called it a violation of common decency.

I think we are here as a Chamber to address difficult, important issues in America. This is a difficult and important mission.

This is a new use of force in a manner that doesn't belong in the streets of America. It is important that we debate it.

I would be happy to have it be a standalone bill, come up right after this National Defense Authorization Act, and have it debated for 2 hours and voted on, because then we actually have a conversation and we have to take a position, and our constituents can see where we stand, and folks could propose an amendment to it if they didn't like the way I have written it. It is so simple. It says: Do what we have always done. Put ID about where you come from. Have a unique identifier. And don't go sweeping through the streets if your mission is to protect a Federal property. Stay at that Federal property or work with the Governor or the mayor if you have a broader effort. Those are reasonable things.

I don't think that it was a breach of protocol to ask this Chamber to consider that on this bill because there is a connection. We are talking about a bill that involves the use of force and how we govern in America.

I don't think it is a violation of common decency. My colleague does, and I would prefer that we actually have that conversation about the facts and about the arguments, about the simple solution I proposed when we can actually take a vote or other people can offer amendments to it and modify it. That is this Chamber doing what it should be doing.

So I am disappointed that my colleague is blocking this from being considered before this body.

I do love this body, and I first came here when amendments were freely—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I am just going to reiterate my final point one final time, and I promise not to take more time than the Senator from Oregon.

He had his opportunity to have this amendment considered, debated, and voted on in the JUSTICE Act, introduced by Senator TIM SCOTT, a bill that dealt specifically with police reform.

It would have been the perfect place to have the debate, except that my colleague voted against cloture so we couldn't even proceed to the bill.

I don't know how we could have made it any easier or better. In fact, when we took up the JUSTICE Act, he and his side were provided at least 20 amendment opportunities. We could have had the debate he seeks tonight at the appropriate time on the appropriate bill, and I am sorry that we didn't do that.

Perhaps after tonight's episode, he and his colleagues will reconsider, and perhaps before we are done this year, Senator SCOTT's JUSTICE Act could be brought to the floor and we could have an adult discussion and debate on amendments and on the bill and on all kinds of great ideas right here in the most august body in the United States. I hope that can happen.

With that, I yield the floor and wish you a good night.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

Mr. GARDNER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Congress, our States, and the administration talk about ways to handle the immediate consequences of COVID-19. We must also talk about the aftermath, and Steve Case has written a provocative op-ed about the future.

Those of us in Congress should read and discuss it. It has to be considered in future planning.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 2020]

THERE'S NO GOING BACK TO THE PRE-PANDEMIC ECONOMY—CONGRESS SHOULD RESPOND ACCORDINGLY

(By Steve Case)

This week, Congress will likely take up the next steps in the economic response to the covid-19 pandemic. If the package is like previous efforts, it will focus on trying to turn back the clock to February 2020: treating the economy as if it were Sleeping Beauty, merely needing to be awakened to be fully restored. This strategy is a mistake: Congress needs to stop solely backing efforts to restore the old economic reality and focus on how to develop a new one.

Most of the \$1 trillion that Congress has put into business support so far during the pandemic has been directed to preserving existing firms through the Paycheck Protection Program and the Main Street Relief Fund. Helping those businesses and their workers is vital, but that alone won't fuel the economic recovery the country needs.

The problem is that many of the businesses backed by PPP or Main Street are going to wind up shutting down. Even when they aren't facing a global pandemic or economic crisis, about 100,000 small and medium-size businesses fail in the United States every year. New businesses will be needed to re-

place the ones that permanently close. Moreover, the failure rate is likely to be higher, as many firms were on the wrong side of trends—such as the move to online shopping, convenient food delivery or watching streaming content at home—that the pandemic lockdown has accelerated.

Another consideration: The protests stirred by the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis police custody have made clear how many Americans were left behind in the pre-coronavirus economy; restoring the way things were before the virus hit won't address these needs.

Here are three ways Congress can help launch a new, more equitable era of entrepreneurship.

First: Make it easier for the earliest-stage start-ups to receive PPP dollars and for all start-ups to access the Main Street Relief Fund. PPP loans go to existing businesses to maintain jobs but not to new businesses that want to create them. Main Street loans go only to companies that are already profitable; most start-ups are not. That approach is backward: Studies show that nearly all net new job creation comes from start-ups, not established businesses.

A PPP revision should allow start-ups to obtain loans based on their plans to create jobs—with loan forgiveness granted only if those jobs materialize. If they don't, the start-ups should be required to repay the loans before any other obligations. And the barrier in the Main Street lending program that makes businesses ineligible for aid if they were not profitable in 2019 should be removed.

Second, the government needs to be a counterweight to private capital that exacerbates geographic disparities in opportunity as the country responds to the crisis. The pandemic is a devastating tragedy, but adversity tends to be met by the creation of new industries and new businesses. This crisis will stir innovations in medicine, goods and services delivered at home, remote work and learning, and more. Where will these new firms grow? If the decision is left to the private sector alone, almost all of them will be in three states: New York, California and Massachusetts, which attract 75 percent of all venture capital.

Great ideas to respond to this crisis are spread widely across the country—but capital is not. Business assistance programs created by Congress should have a special focus on getting startups off the ground in places that have lacked venture capital backing in the past. Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) and others have already proposed such legislation; members of Congress from these neglected areas should insist it is part of any Phase 4 bill.

Finally, lawmakers should step in to address unintended inequalities of opportunity for female and minority entrepreneurs caused by the earlier relief bills. Because these programs fund only existing businesses, they reinforce opportunity gaps. Communities with thriving businesses get more PPP and Main Street aid; those that have lacked capital to get businesses off the ground in the past see little help now.

The solution would be for Congress to direct unused PPP funds to start-ups led by female entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs of color, creating opportunities where they have not existed before. The Main Street Lending program could be modified to extend special debt options to community development groups and minority-focused accelerators to back a new wave of startups founded by historically underrepresented entrepreneurs.

There's no going back to the pre-pandemic U.S. economy. Too much has changed; too many new needs exist. This is a rare oppor-

tunity to break with the past and create a better future. Congress should grab it.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I voted in support of S. Amdt. 1788, which would reduce defense spending by 10 percent and invest that money into healthcare, education, and poverty reduction in communities with a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. To govern is to choose, and as we face unprecedented challenges at home, this defense budget is out of step with the values, priorities, and needs of the American people.

The unchecked growth in the defense budget is unsustainable, and the Trump administration has exacerbated these challenges. We have a duty to ensure the readiness of our forces, and I have supported efforts to rebuild our Armed Forces after years of costly overseas engagements. But massive spending increases without clear strategic direction do not make us safer. We need to be thoughtful about our spending choices, recognizing that every dollar spent on defense is a dollar not spent on healthcare, education, workforce training, and other critical areas of need.

The National Defense Authorization Act as it is currently written would spend \$740.5 billion on defense. This represents 53 percent of total Federal discretionary spending and exceeds the defense budgets of the next 11 nations combined, including our allies in Australia, South Korea, Germany, Japan, France, and the United Kingdom. It is more than twice the combined defense expenditures of China and Russia. Topline defense spending has risen by more than \$100 billion since President Trump took office; after the \$74 billion cut proposed in this amendment, defense spending would still be above the fiscal year 2017 level.

Some of my colleagues have expressed unease about the across-the-board nature of these cuts, and I agree that a targeted approach is preferable. But I have seen the consequences of delaying difficult decisions and believe we can no longer wait to have difficult conversations about our defense budget. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act is not an appropriations bill, and this amendment simply reduces the total amount of money authorized to be spent on defense in the upcoming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, will still have the task of making thoughtful, targeted reductions in areas of lower priority, while preserving funding for high-priority items. I encourage my colleagues to confront these challenges for the good of our country and make adjustments as needed during conference negotiations with the House while remaining under the cap set by this amendment.

I am glad that this amendment protects salaries and healthcare from cuts, and would have preferred that it go further in making targeted cuts in order

to reduce the impact elsewhere in the defense budget. In particular, we should have taken this opportunity to scale back our country's trillion-dollar nuclear modernization efforts. Modernizing our nuclear weapons in a manner that makes them easier to use in more scenarios while abrogating our treaty responsibilities and doing nothing to bring Russia back to the nuclear negotiating table is a recipe for disaster.

However, my concerns with the particulars of this amendment do not change the plain fact that our national defense budget has grown out of control. In the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, a pandemic that has taken the lives of more than 143,000 of our fellow Americans and shows no signs of slowing down, and the impending crises of homelessness and joblessness that we face if the Congress fails to provide relief, we simply cannot afford to continue this level of overinvestment in defense at the expense of other critical national priorities. For that reason, I supported this amendment.

#### REMEMBERING LORNE CRANER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to someone many of my colleagues knew and admired, Lorne Craner, who passed away on July 2 at the too young age of 61, a victim of cancer.

Lorne dedicated his professional life to advancing freedom and justice in the world. He served that cause faithfully as the longest tenured president of the International Republican Institute, IRI, as the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor in the George W. Bush administration, as Director of Asian Affairs on President George H.W. Bush's National Security Council, and as an advisor to Members of Congress, including his service as foreign affairs aide to a newly elected Senator from Arizona, our late colleague, John McCain. He continued to advance American values abroad as president of the American Councils for International Education, as a board member of several distinguished organizations, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

I got to know Lorne when Senator McCain, who was IRI's chairman, asked me to serve on its board. I saw the Institute thrive in size and reach under Lorne's leadership, becoming one of the world's most effective agencies for democratic development, respected by human rights advocates around the world and in both U.S. political parties.

Like John, Lorne was a tireless defender of the dignity of all human beings, the bedrock value that democracies are instituted to respect. Like John, Lorne fought the bad guys to defend the little guys. Toward that end, he usually exercised a little more skill at diplomacy than John sometimes possessed, but they shared an equal de-

votion to mankind's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Secretary of State Colin Powell awarded Lorne the Distinguished Service Medal, the State Department's highest decoration.

Lorne and John shared, too, a dedication to the peaceful conduct of international relations. Both knew that our interests and values sometimes had to be defended by force of arms, but they were both so personally familiar with the costs of war that they worked hard to resolve international conflicts peacefully where possible and to make new friends of former enemies.

Lorne went to work for John in his last term as a Member of the House and his first term in the Senate, but their relationship began earlier than that. Lorne's father, Air Force Colonel Bob Craner, resided for more than 2 years in the cell next to John's in a Hanoi prison the POWs called, "the Plantation." John described Colonel Craner to me as one of the finest officers he had ever served with and "probably the person I was closest too in my life that I wasn't related to." John was held in solitary confinement at the time, the hardest period of his imprisonment, and he credited Bob Craner, whom he constantly communicated with by tap code, "with keeping me sane."

Despite the mistreatment of the POWs, John resolved early in his Senate career to help America reconcile with Vietnam, recognizing that the U.S. and Vietnam had shared interests in Southeast Asia, and that the cause of human dignity in the country where he had resided involuntarily for over 5 years could be served through friendly rather than hostile relations. The normalization of relations between the U.S. and Vietnam wouldn't have happened when it did if not for John's efforts to help bring it about. I think it is one of his greatest achievements. And Lorne Craner, the son who was deprived of his father for 5 years by the Vietnam war, provided invaluable help in that effort.

Lorne travelled to Vietnam with John in 1990, where he helped John build productive partnerships with Vietnamese officials who would help resolve issues that were in the way of better relations. And from his positions in government and at the IRI, he continued to advance American interests and ideals in Southeast Asia. Today, growing security and commercial ties between the two former enemies, symbolized by the port calls in Vietnam by U.S. Navy ships, including the USS *John S. McCain*, are a testament to both John and Lorne's vision and effectiveness. They imagined a better future out of the resentments and rubble of war, and, with others, made it a reality. They were both men who believed to do good in the world was why we were put on this earth.

Lorne was deeply committed to his cause, a cause he never strayed from, for a day in his life, and we are all bet-

ter for it. He was, too, as all who knew him will testify, a devoted father and husband, and his family's loss is the most profound. He was a hard man to lose at such a young age, for his family and friends, and for the country and the world.

Lorne Craner, son of Robert and Audrey Craner, husband of Anne Craner, father to three beloved children, Isabelle, Alexander, and Charles, brother of Charys, an American patriot, a man of justice, a peacemaker, and a friend to many, is gone. But his memory is a blessing to all who had the good fortune to have known him.

To his wife and children, the people who loved him most, as much as you hurt today, time will assuage your grief, and you will still feel his presence in your hearts. I lost my parents when I was a young man. I can say with confidence that the day will come when you will recall, without heartache, the good and honorable man who loved you so and with whom you will one day be reunited. God bless you.

Thank you.

#### 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF MINOT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Minot Air Force Base on the 65th anniversary of its beginning.

On July 12, 1955, Minot, ND, community leaders and area residents gathered to break ground on land north of the city for what would become the Minot Air Force Base. One and a half years later, operations commenced at the base, and personnel and aircraft made their way to Minot, where they have enhanced our State and defended our Nation ever since. By the mid-1960s, it was recognized as one of the Nation's largest military installations, with a population of nearly 19,000 military and civilian men and women and their families. It was also recognized as having the largest housing village on a military base in the continental United States, with more than 2,450 homes.

The mission, aircraft, and staff have changed over these past seven decades. Today, the Minot Air Force Base supports two legs of the Nation's nuclear triad and provides vital defense to our security. It is the only dual-wing nuclear-capable installation in the Nation, with the 5th Bomb Wing and its B-52 bombers and the 91st Missile Wing, along with Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

During these 65 years, the Minot community and State of North Dakota have remained constant in their support for the thousands of people who have been stationed at the Minot Air Force Base. We take pride in all they have done and continue to do to ensure peace throughout our world. We will continue to stand by them in the years ahead.

To the men and women of the Minot Air Force Base, you and all who came before you have faithfully served our

country and lived up to your motto, "Only The Best Come North." Every day, you go to work carrying the weight of the world on your shoulders, willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedoms and keep us safe. Thank you for all you do to make America great.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING TECHNICAL SERGEANT RALPH H. RAY

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Technical Sergeant Ralph H. Ray, who was a dedicated West Virginia serviceman in our U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. T SGT Ralph H. Ray is being honored by the renaming of a bridge on U.S. Route 60 that spans the Greenbrier River in his native Greenbrier County, WV.

T SGT Ralph H. Ray graduated from Frankford High School at the age of 17 in 1940. He left his home in West Virginia to complete his enlisted physical for the U.S. Army Corps on January 7, 1943, and subsequently earned the rank of technical sergeant. He earned his airplane mechanic diploma at the Ford Factory in Michigan the spring of 1943 and then completed gunnery school in Laredo, TX.

During his service, T SGT Ralph H. Ray was assigned to a top-notch flight crew with whom he trained for 3 months. He and his crew traveled to Trinidad, Brazil, Africa, Morocco, and Wales before reaching the Tibenham Base in East England. While serving as a flight engineer during World War II, he and his crew flew 30 successful missions before returning to the United States and spending the last 10 months of his enlistment at the Air Transport Corps in Miami, FL. This dedicated and diverse military service is certainly worthy of admiration.

After his release from the U.S. Army Air Corps, T SGT Ralph H. Ray worked as an airplane mechanic for Bollinger Airport in Davis Creek, WV, and while there, he earned his civilian pilot's license. T SGT Ralph H. Ray began working as a chemical technician for Westvaco in South Charleston, WV, in 1948. He married his wife Mary Madeline Hudson on April 16, 1948, and established a beautiful and loving family with four daughters: Valerie Ann Lyons, Angela Sue Ray, Verna Ray-Breaux, and Anita Ray-Kirk.

T SGT Ralph H. Ray retired in 1984 and passed away on August 8, 2019. It is fitting that an enduring monument will be established to commemorate Technical Sergeant Ray and his contributions to our State and our country. As resolved by legislature of West Virginia, the locally known Caldwell Bridge, will henceforth be named the "U.S. Army Air Corps T SGT Ralph H. Ray Memorial Bridge." I hope it provokes thought and appreciation for all of our military heroes and may the bridge be an enduring reminder of the

life of dedicated serviceman, husband, father, and lifelong West Virginian.●

##### TRIBUTE TO JEANNINE ABADIE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jeannine Abadie, the Walton County Teacher of the Year at Emerald Coast Middle School in Santa Rosa Beach, FL.

Jeannine is always working to help her students better understand mathematics and to improve her classroom to better suite their needs. She recently created a video app that provides tutorials for students. She specializes in curriculum design and assessment analysis for her math classes.

Jeannine also mentors her colleagues in lesson planning and student achievement. She provides support and professional development for her colleagues to ensure their students are well equipped for high school and their future educational careers.

Jeannine is a math instructor at Emerald Coast Middle School and has taught there for 7 years. Previously, Jeannine taught algebra at Northwest Florida State College. She received her master's degree from the University of West Florida in mathematics and statistics and will soon graduate with her second master's degree in instructional design and technology.

I convey my best wishes to Jeannine for her outstanding work as an educator. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

##### TRIBUTE TO FAITH BENCH

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Faith Bench, the Manatee County Teacher of the Year at Braden River Middle School in Bradenton, FL.

Faith has a special bond with her students who struggle with math. That is because she struggled with the subject when she was in school. She understands those who hate the subject at the beginning of the year and finds it deeply fulfilling to help grow each student's problem-solving skills by the time they leave her class with greater confidence and appreciation for the subject.

Faith's colleagues note that she works hard to make learning fun and engaging for her students each year. She is committed to tailoring her lesson plans to suit the individual needs of every student. In turn, Faith is inspired by her colleagues and believes that their work together is the key to an educator's best work.

Faith teaches mathematics to seventh grade students at Braden River Middle School. Teaching is her passion, and she wants to help her students accomplish their dreams.

I thank Faith for the good work she has done for her students over the years. I look forward to learning of her continued good work in the coming years.●

##### TRIBUTE TO KATHY HAMILTON-BROWN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathy Hamilton-Brown, the Brevard County Teacher of the Year at Endeavor Elementary School in Cocoa, FL.

Kathy credits her success to her fellow teachers in Brevard County. She notes that her school is like her family: a home away from home. To Kathy, teaching is more than just a job. She believes her students are our Nation's future leaders, and she is committed to making a difference in each of their lives.

Kathy's life experiences influenced her to become a teacher and care for her students. She feels indebted to the support system of family and friends who guided her at a young age. She hopes to inspire her students to do something great with their lives after they leave her classroom.

Colleagues note that Kathy is a fierce advocate for students, working to ensure they succeed both socially and academically. Due in large part to her innovative efforts, Kathy's school saw a 61-percent reduction in disciplinary referrals, as well as an increase in overall student attendance.

Kathy is a prekindergarten through sixth grade teacher at Endeavor Elementary School. She has been with Brevard Public Schools for 21 years. Outside of the classroom, she serves on the community partnership school operations team and works with Endeavor's business partners throughout the community.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Kathy for her commitment to the education of her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the coming years.●

##### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FURIOSI

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor William Furiosi, the Seminole County Teacher of the Year at Oviedo High School in Oviedo, FL.

William has taught AP biology, chemistry, and experimental research at Oviedo High School for the past 17 years. William aims to create a positive environment for students to think critically while studying science. He enjoys breaking down complex scientific theories to help them better understand the component ideas behind what they are learning.

At the Seminole County Science Fair this year, 12 of his student's science projects placed, with six first places, four second places, and two third places. His students say they benefit from his teaching style, finding it relatable and exciting during their classes.

I thank William for the good work he has done for his students over the years. I wish him all the best and look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JAE GLASS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jae Glass, the Gulf County Teacher of the Year at Port St. Joe High School in Port St. Joe, FL.

Jae teaches seventh grade English language arts and a ninth grade intensive reading class at her alma mater, Port St. Joe High School, where she has taught for 8 years.

Jae dedicates her time to being a positive role model for her students by engaging with them each day in her classroom. Throughout the school year, her students participate in more than traditional learning lectures. An example of an alternative activity includes her "book tasting day," which allows students to snack at picnic tables while sampling from an array of books.

Jae believes it is important to make English relatable and fun to her students. She encourages them to use reading and writing as a creative means of expression. She also works to help students that do not speak English as a first language by securing additional materials for her school.

I convey my sincere gratitude to Jae for her devotion to helping her students succeed in their future endeavors. I look forward to hearing of her continued success.●

#### TRIBUTE TO EVAN GOULD

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Evan Gould, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL.

Evan felt honored and humbled to represent Clay County as he considers himself just one of the many high-quality educators teaching in the region. He relishes opportunities for his students to participate at district and State competitions as he takes great pride in their superior and award-winning performances. His music and drama programs are highly regarded in Florida and generate great interest throughout the county.

Evan has been a teacher for 30 years, with 22 years in Clay County. Outside of the classroom, Evan dedicates his time and talents to giving back to his community. He cofounded the Clay All-County Elementary Chorus, as well as The 5 & Dime Theatre Company. Evan also serves as the chair of District 1 Junior Thespians, which hosts an annual festival that brings in more than 500 drama students from across the region.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Evan for his many years working as a teacher and helping countless students fulfill their drama and musical ambitions. I look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JOLI HARTZOG

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Joli Hartzog, the Washington

County Teacher of the Year at Florida Panhandle Technical College in Chipley, FL.

Joli has been a teacher for more than 26 years. She is the adult education director and instructor for the Florida Panhandle Technical College and offers instruction for several programs at the school. Joli teaches all levels of students, including those seeking high school equivalency, professional testing preparation, personal enrichment, or other specialized certification.

Enrollment at Florida Panhandle Technical College remains open throughout the year so the environment and format of Joli's class is ever-changing. She works with students ranging from 16 to 66 years old who are working towards their GED, and she is able to modify her teaching style to match the composition of the current class. She is willing to meet with her students anytime, whether when they arrive in her classroom, after class, or by appointment.

Joli finds the best part of teaching to be the family she has found at the school. She enjoys working with her fellow instructors and faculty and says they all work as a team. Joli considers this family to extend to her students and loves that she is able to help them achieve their life dreams.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Joli for her dedication to her students and extend my best wishes on her continued success in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO KERI HEMRICK

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Keri Hemrick, the Collier County Teacher of the Year at Gulf Coast High School in Naples, FL.

Keri believes motivating her students to impact their community is one of the most important commitments she makes as a teacher. She aims to lead each student, whether they have a disability or a gift, towards increasing their achievements in school. She works to ensure their success upon leaving her classroom.

Keri's students were excited to learn that she had received this award. They were proud to see her recognized for representing the family-like environment she cultivated in their classroom. Many students have credited her for helping them to understand the new subjects throughout the school year.

Keri is an exceptional education co-teacher, case manager, and chair of the exceptional student education department at Gulf Coast High School. She dedicates her life to making a difference by engaging her students with special instruction and services.

I extend my best wishes to Keri for her dedication to her students and her community and congratulate her on this award.●

#### TRIBUTE TO EUAN HUNTER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Euan Hunter, the Marion County

Teacher of the Year at Vanguard High School in Ocala, FL.

Euan believes that learning is a lifelong endeavor not only for his students, but also for himself. He enjoys working with other teachers in the school district and works to utilize the teaching experience to make the learning of chemistry as real, enjoyable, and successful as he can for his students.

Euan believes he is fortunate to have taught chemistry to students of different age groups under a variety of curricula in England, Scotland, New York City, and now in Ocala. He looks forward to bringing chemistry to life so students can enjoy the learning process.

Euan currently teaches chemistry at Vanguard High School and has taught students around the world for 16 years. He received his degree in chemistry from the University of Edinburgh and studied to be a chemistry teacher at a university in England. Euan taught chemistry and general science in England and Scotland for 10 years and was an adviser to the Scottish Government on chemistry curriculum and assessment qualifications for students. After marrying his wife, they moved to New York City, where he taught at a middle school, before moving to Ocala.

I am grateful for Euan's hard work in educating students and enabling them to succeed. I wish all the best to him and look forward to learning of his continued good work in the coming years.●

#### TRIBUTE TO WHITNEY JONES

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Whitney Jones, the Nassau County Teacher of the Year from Wildlight Elementary School in Yulee, FL.

Whitney became a teacher to make a difference in the lives of students by helping them to develop a passion for learning. Her teaching philosophy is that students will work hard when they are shown love and respect. She finds it humbling to watch her students grow and successfully learn new class subjects throughout the school year.

Whitney considers her role in her students' lives to be one that offers encouragement, guidance, and compassion. She works with her colleagues to implement new teaching strategies and plans standards-based lessons to ensure students are prepared for the third grade when they leave her classroom.

Whitney began her teaching career at Yulee Primary School, teaching there for 5 years before becoming a second grade teacher at Wildlight Elementary School, where she has taught for the past 2 years as a team leader and grade level chair. She is also on her school's action plan team, which works to create plans to help the lowest quartile students improve in school.

I extend my best wishes to Whitney for her good work as a teacher and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DEVON LAMONICA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Devon LaMonica, the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year at Fort Walton Beach High School in Fort Walton Beach, FL.

Teaching was not the career Devon imagined for herself when studying forensic science biochemistry at the University of Central Florida, but now she cannot imagine any other career for herself. Devon loves the opportunity to ignite a passion for science in her students and views teaching as a joy. She launched the biomedical science program at Fort Walton Beach High School and continues to teach the entire program.

Devon earned her master's degree in education at the University of West Florida and returned to work as an educator at Fort Walton Beach High School, her own alma mater. She is nationally recognized as a Biomedical Science Master Teacher and trains new teachers in this field across our Nation. She has been a teacher for 13 years.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Devon for her work to teach her students. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

#### TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH MANN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth Mann, the Santa Rosa County Teacher of the Year at Oriole Beach Elementary School in Oriole Beach, FL.

Elizabeth believes children learn best when they are working together. She provides opportunities throughout the school year for her students to team up with one another to accomplish a goal. She accepts each student for who they are and holds high expectations, viewing their small victories as the most rewarding part of her work. Whether it is their first time counting to 20 or helping a friend, she believes these moments make her job fulfilling.

Elizabeth comes from a family of educators. Both her parents were teachers and instilled in her the drive to help others. Her colleagues consider her to be every parent's dream teacher for their child because of her dedication to the children's success.

Elizabeth is a student education inclusion teacher for first grade at Oriole Beach Elementary School. She works with special needs students throughout the school year and offers group and one-on-one instruction across all subject areas.

I am grateful for Elizabeth's great work with her students. I extend my best wishes to her and look forward to learning of her continued good work in her future endeavors.●

#### TRIBUTE TO KELLI McGAHEY

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kelli McGahey, the Putnam County Teacher of the Year at James

A. Long Elementary School in Palatka, FL.

Kelli's colleagues note that she has an innate ability to connect with students struggling academically or developmentally. She often spends extra time helping those students better understand assignments. Kelli seeks to impart her love for reading to her students and is passionate about inspiring the next generation of avid readers.

Kelli has taught first grade at James A. Long Elementary School for 6 years. While Kelli was surprised to learn that she received this prestigious recognition, her students and colleagues consider her an inspiration and know it was well deserved.

I would like to thank Kelli for the good work she has done for her students and extend my best wishes to her. I look forward to hearing of her continued success.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN MOTTA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jonathan Motta, the Osceola County Teacher of the Year at NeoCity Academy in Kissimmee, FL.

Jonathan believes it is important that his students be prepared for life after high school and challenges them to apply the principles they learn after they leave his classroom. He works to incorporate upper level math into practical business models, technology, and other areas that are important to students. He considers this integration to be the most rewarding part of his work.

Jonathan also seeks to fill what he views as a gap in the traditional teaching format by teaching his students other life skills, such as organization and public speaking.

Jonathan finds the unique environment and approach to learning at NeoCity Academy to be a great place for his teaching style. He teaches mathematics and has incorporated a variety of concepts to students in Osceola County for the past 7 years. During his tenure, he developed a project-based learning curriculum that creates assignments involving real-world scenarios such as architecture, finance, design and manufacturing, and health.

I thank Jonathan for his passion and creative efforts to implement a lifelong approach to learning. I wish him all the best in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO KAREN NEADS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Karen Neads, the DeSoto County Teacher of the Year from Memorial Elementary School in Arcadia, FL.

At Memorial Elementary School, Karen strives to develop a positive environment in which she is able to motivate her students. As she prefers to teach in a way where she is more behind the scenes than upfront, Karen was shocked to receive this important recognition. She credits her colleagues and administrators on their work to

help teach the school's youngest students to her success.

Karen was named Teacher of the Year in her 25th year of teaching, all of which she has taught kindergarten and in DeSoto County. Her favorite aspect of teaching is watching her students grow throughout the year. She notes they enter her classroom with a blank slate and, by the end of the school year, are able to read and write.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Karen for her dedication to her students, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JACOB POELMA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Jacob Poelma, the Monroe County Teacher of the Year from Coral Shores High School in Tavernier, FL.

Jacob believes that, as a teacher, his impact is greater than the sum of his students' test scores and homework grades. He strives to honor a student's individuality while fostering a sense of community in the classroom. He knows that every student has a unique story and focuses on tailoring his teaching to engage each student in the best way they are able to learn. Jacob works to provide real-time language translations of his lectures so all of his students can master the material in their native language.

Jacob has taught biology in Monroe County for 4 years. He works with students in and out of the classroom by offering personalized teaching and mentorship opportunities, sponsors Coral Shores High School's Gaming Club, announces sporting events, and volunteers at extracurricular and other community activities.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Jacob for his dedication to his students and efforts to improve the learning experience. I look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO KATHLEEN RULING

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathleen Ruling, the Union County Teacher of the Year from Lake Butler Elementary School in Lake Butler, FL.

Kathy believes that every child is worthy of respect, as they have a unique story to tell. She views her job not as a line of work, but a place where she is preparing each student for their future. Her colleagues describe her as having a natural gift for teaching and working with children.

Whether by creating hands-on classroom experiences or diligently tracking each child's progress, Kathy supports her student's educational careers and is always willing to help, even after they leave her classroom.

As an elementary special education teacher for 38 years, Kathy has left a lasting legacy in Union County. In 1985,



she implemented the staggered start program for kindergarteners. In 1990, she founded the Tiger Cubs, a club that recognizes students for their positive attitude and encouragement to peers. Both of these programs are still in effect in the county.

I express my sincere appreciation to Kathy for her many accomplishments and years of service to her students. I wish her continued success in the years to come.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JOSIE STUMPF

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Josie Stumpf, the Volusia County Teacher of the Year at Holly Hill School in Holly Hill, FL.

Josie teaches fifth grade and has taught in Volusia County for nearly 20 years. She credits her success to Daytona Beach mayor Derrick Henry, who was her 11th grade teacher. She says Mayor Henry changed the course of her life, as it was not until she was in his class, where music and energy were incorporated into his lessons, that she realized learning could be fun. This motivated her to inspire others in the same way that he inspired her.

Josie strives to keep learning fun. An example of her creative teaching includes transforming her classroom to mimic a campground, a cafe, and many other different environments to better engage her students in the learning process.

Josie's colleagues admire her seemingly natural ability to relate to students, which has inspired them to follow her lead. Josie's enthusiasm for education extends beyond her own classroom, where she has been known to develop curriculum modules for language arts and regularly helps other teachers.

I extend my best wishes and gratitude to Josie for her dedication to students for nearly two decades, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13581 ON JULY 24, 2011—PM 55

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2020.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

##### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 5:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to mod-

ernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 22, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5072. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3235-AM70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5073. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Relief for Taxpayers Affected by Ongoing Coronavirus Disease Pandemic, Related to Sport Fishing Equipment and Bows and Arrows Excise Tax Filing and Payment Deadlines" (Notice 2020-48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5074. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice: COVID-19 Relief and Other Guidance on Mid-Year Reductions or Suspensions of Contributions to Safe Harbor statute 401(k) and statute 401(m) Plans" (Notice 2020-52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5075. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Carryback of Consolidated Net Operating Losses" ((RIN1545-BP84) (TD 9900)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5076. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard A. Brown, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5077. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Terrence J.

O'Shaughnessy, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5078. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James L. Lengyel, Air National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5079. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James C. Vechery, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5080. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James M. Holmes, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5081. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seamands, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5082. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce T. Crawford, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5083. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph L. Osterman, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5084. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5085. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Thomas J. Moore, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5086. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonite, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5087. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas W. Bergeson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5088. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David H.

Lewis, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5089. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Major General Timothy J. Kadavy, Army National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5090. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John J. Broadmeadow, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5091. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5092. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5093. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5094. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5095. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of five (5) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5096. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5097. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5098. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of fifteen (15)

officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5099. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5100. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5101. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5102. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty (20) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5103. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5104. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of six (6) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5105. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5106. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Procedures with Respect to Applications Under the Investment Company Act of 1940" (RIN3235-AM51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5107. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to extending and amending the agreement between the Government of the United

States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5108. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012-2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012-2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5110. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5111. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-217, "Comprehensive Plan Framework Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5112. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-323, "COVID-19 Response Supplemental Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5113. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-333, "Medical Marijuana Program Patient Employment Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5114. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-334, "Coronavirus Support Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5115. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry" (RIN1218-ADZ0) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2525. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct a study of personal protec-

tive equipment worn by firefighters to determine the prevalence and concentration of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

\*Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2019.

\*Joel Szabat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

\*Mary A. Toman, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs.

\*Michael J. Walsh, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 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 reprinting on 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.

\*Coast Guard nomination of Peter H. Imbriale, to be Lieutenant.

\*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Nicholas C. Custer and ending with Nicole L. Blanchard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

\*Elizabeth J. Shapiro, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

\*Mark A. Robbins, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

\*Carl Ezekiel Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

\*Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

\*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.

## 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. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4258. A bill to establish a grant program for small live venue operators and talent representatives; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4259. A bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 4260. A bill to promote access to mortgage credit during the COVID-19 pandemic by preventing restrictions on providing Federal backing for single-family mortgage loans in forbearance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 4261. A bill to establish a grant program to assist elementary and secondary schools with reopening after closures related to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4262. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop an action plan, make targeted grants, and develop public awareness campaigns with respect to COVID-19 and the disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on racial and ethnic minorities and other vulnerable populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4263. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4264. A bill to require personal protective equipment to be acquired from domestic producers for the Strategic National Stockpile; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4265. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the submission of certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4266. A bill to provide civil liability for injuries in law enforcement free zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4267. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Euclid Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Oswaldo Paya Way"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. 4268. A bill to improve coordination between the paycheck protection program and employee retention tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 4270. A bill to amend the CARES Act to ensure that the temporary relief from CECL standards does not terminate in the middle of a company's fiscal year; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4271. A bill to reform Federal firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4272. A bill to advance a policy for managed strategic competition with the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4273. A bill to amend the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park Establishment Act of 2000 to provide for additional areas to be added to the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4274. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to exclude discounts for covered part D drugs from the anti-kickback prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 4275. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 4276. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4277. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize healthy high-performance schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4278. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a grant program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4279. A bill to require the disclosure to Congress of presidential emergency action documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4280. A bill to reduce the health risks of heat by authorizing the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Interagency Committee to improve extreme heat preparedness and response, requiring a study, and establishing a grant program to address heat effects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 4281. A bill to require a report to Congress on certain efforts in connection with the financial management systems of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 4282. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Service Block Grant to authorize a set-aside for crisis care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4283. A bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment insurance technology systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program through which the Institute of Museum and Library Services shall allocate funds to States for the provision of Internet-connected devices to libraries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations for offsetting the costs related to reductions in research productivity resulting from the coronavirus pandemic; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service-connection for members of the Armed Forces who contract Coronavirus Disease 2019 under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Cultural Heritage Area in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. KING):

S. 4289. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to collect, analyze, and report qualitative and quantitative data on the use of telehealth during the COVID-19 public health emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 655. A resolution declaring racism a public health crisis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 656. A resolution recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2020 as "National Blueberry Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 92

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 159

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 159, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

S. 549

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 549, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 1067

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes.

S. 1197

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for construction of new all-electric homes.

S. 1210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1964

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1964, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes.

S. 2579

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2882

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2882, a bill to establish a community wildfire defense grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit the use of animal testing for cosmetics and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assist-

ance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3328

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3328, a bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Biliteracy programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language.

S. 3559

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3559, a bill to provide emergency financial assistance to rural health care facilities and providers impacted by the COVID-19 emergency.

S. 3606

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3606, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Health Force and a Resilience Force to respond to public health emergencies and meet public health needs.

S. 3693

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3693, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to foster efficient markets and increase competition and transparency among packers that purchase livestock from producers.

S. 3745

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3745, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to provide relief to borrowers of student loans for whom the Department of Education found misrepresentation by the institution of higher education or a State attorney general has asserted a right to borrower defense discharge.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3819

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 3819, a bill to encourage the protection and promotion of internationally recognized human rights during the novel coronavirus pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 3840

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3840, a bill to protect the continuity of the food supply chain of the United States in response to COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 3855

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3855, a bill to ensure ethical and accountable use of COVID-19 relief funds, to prevent corruption and bias in the disbursement and supervision of those funds, and for other purposes.

S. 3886

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3886, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for an explosive nuclear weapons test.

S. 3995

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3995, a bill to limit the authority of States or other taxing jurisdictions to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States or taxing jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

S. 3997

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3997, a bill to strengthen the security and integrity of the United States scientific and research enterprise.

S. 4014

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to provide for supplemental loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

S. 4019

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) 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.

S. 4084

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4084, a bill to prohibit biometric surveillance by the Federal Government without explicit statutory authorization and to withhold certain Federal public safety grants from State and local governments that engage in biometric surveillance.

S. 4089

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4089, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

S. 4158

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4158, a bill to examine the extent of the reliance of the United States on foreign producers for personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic and produce recommendations to secure the supply chain of personal protective equipment.

S. 4162

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4162, a bill to provide certainty for airport funding.

S. 4172

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4182

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4182, a bill to provide nursing homes with resources for responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency to protect the health and safety of residents and workers, to reauthorize funding for programs under the Elder Justice Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 4190

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4190, a bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a regional program to assess, monitor, and benefit the hydrology of saline lakes in the Great Basin and the migratory birds and other wildlife dependent on those habitats, and for other purposes.

S. 4193

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4193, a bill to develop and nationally disseminate accurate, relevant, and accessible resources to promote understanding about African-American history.

S. 4204

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4204, a bill to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, and for other purposes.

S. 4220

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4220, a bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes.

S. 4230

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4230, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to mental health services and certain evaluation and management services furnished through telehealth under the Medicare program.

S. 4233

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4233, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 4248

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4248, a bill to establish a grant program to provide funds for health care entities to establish or improve bias and anti-racism training to help reduce racial and ethnic disparities in COVID-19 testing, treatment, health outcomes, and vaccine access.

S. 4252

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4252, a bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1885

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1885 intended to be proposed to 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2051

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2051 intended to be proposed to 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2328

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2328 intended to be proposed to 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2352

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2352 intended to be proposed to 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2433

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2433 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2435

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2435 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2441

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2441 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2451

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2451 intended to be proposed to 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.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2457

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2457 intended to be proposed to 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.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. There are significant racial and ethnic inequities in maternal and infant mortality rates in the U.S. According to the CDC, the maternal mortality rate for non-Hispanic Black women in 2018 is more than 2.5 times higher than the maternal mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women, and the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic Black women is more than 2.3 times higher than the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women. Any pregnant woman choosing to have a child should be able to do so safely without regard to income, race, ethnicity, employment status, or any other socio-economic factor.

This is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing the Mothers and Newborns Success Act, which aims to reduce maternal and infant mortality, ensure that all infants can grow up healthy and safe, and protect women's health before, during, and after pregnancy. Our legislation supports innovation in maternal health delivery and improves data collection on maternal mortality and maternal deaths. The bill will help ensure that women are matched with birthing facilities that are risk-appropriate for their particular needs to improve maternal and neonatal care and outcomes. The legislation strengthens support for women during the critical postpartum period, the year after birth, and will help ensure pregnant women get the vaccinations they need and are aware of maternal health warning signs. The bill promotes maternal health research and the use of telehealth to help high-risk expectant mothers in geographically isolated areas. The Mothers and Newborns Success Act is a significant step toward reducing racial, ethnic, and geographic inequities in maternal and infant health. I am glad that my colleague Rep. Terri Sewell will be introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

Given COVID-19's disproportionate impact on communities of color and recent research from the CDC which finds that pregnant women with COVID-19 are more likely to be hospitalized and admitted to the ICU, this legislation is especially timely.

No woman should fear for her or her child's health because of her race. We need to ensure more women of color and their children, particularly Black women and children, receive equitable care. COVID-19 and its impact on pregnant women has only underscored the need for urgent action. By advancing evidence-based policies to improve maternal and infant health outcomes, this bill will work to reduce and eliminate

preventable maternal and infant mortality in the United States. I'm calling on my Senate colleagues to support this bill and include it in the next coronavirus relief package so we can enact positive systemic changes to make sure more women and newborns thrive and have the maximum chance for success.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 4275. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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. 4275

*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 "Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Integrity Act".

## SEC. 2. PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2102(a) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "and" at the end; and

(ii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(iii) provides documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment not later than 21 days after the date on which the individual submits an application for assistance under this section or is directed by the State Agency to submit such documentation or has shown good cause under the applicable State law for failing to submit such documentation by the deadline, in accordance with section 625.6(e) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, except that such documentation shall not be required if the individual previously submitted such information to the State agency for the purpose of obtaining regular or other unemployment compensation; and"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "or" at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) in accordance with section 625.6(e)(2) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, an individual who does not provide documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment under subparagraph (A)(iii).";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) DOCUMENTATION SUBSTANTIATING EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT OR THE PLANNED COMMENCEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—The term 'documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of

employment or self-employment' means documentation provided by the individual substantiating employment or self-employment and wages earned or paid for such employment or self-employment, or such information related to the planned commencement of employment or self-employment.'".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each State shall require that documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment (as defined in section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) be submitted by any individual who applies for pandemic unemployment assistance under section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PRIOR APPLICANTS.—Any individual who applied for pandemic unemployment assistance under section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) before the date of enactment of this Act and receives such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall submit documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment (as defined in such section 2102) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act or the individual will be ineligible to receive pandemic unemployment assistance under such section 2102.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina  
(for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER,  
and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today, Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina and I have introduced the School Choice Now Act, which does two things: It protects students who have been attending private schools from the heartbreaking loss of scholarships, and it gives families more options for their children's education at a time that school is more important than ever.

I have been working to find ways to help parents pursue the education that best meets their child's needs for a long time, since 1979, when I began to be the Governor of Tennessee.

In 1986, we Governors got together in something called Time for Results. I was chairman of the National Governors Association. The vice chairman was the Arkansas Governor, Bill Clinton, and we devoted the Governors' attention for an entire year to one subject—education.

There were six points. One of those points way back then was to find ways to give parents more choices of schools for their children.

Then, later on, in 1992, when President George H.W. Bush was in office and I was Education Secretary, I helped the President develop something we called the GI Bill for Kids, which was Federal funds for a \$1,000 scholarship to work with cities and States, like Milwaukee in Wisconsin, that were trying to give low-income families more choices of good schools for their children.

Then, my last act as Education Secretary was to notice what they call start-from-scratch schools in Minnesota, created by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. There were about a dozen of them, as I remember, and I wrote every school district in the country and asked them to start one of these start-from-scratch schools, which were the forerunners of today's public charter schools. Today, we have 7,500 public charter schools.

Then, in 2004, I tried something I called the Pell Grant for Kids, a \$500 scholarship that would follow every middle- and low-income child in America to an accredited program of their choosing.

Some people said: Wait a minute. You can't call the Pell grant a voucher.

I said: That is precisely what the Pell grant is. The Pell grant is a voucher that a college student can take to any accredited college—public, private, or religious. Why can't we do that for elementary and secondary schools?

In 2005, we had a hurricane named Katrina, creating devastation on the gulf coast, and Senator Ted Kennedy and I and Senator Landrieu and others worked together to provide 1.2 billion Federal dollars in one-time emergency assistance for the 2005-2006 school year so students enrolled in public or non-public schools—children who were displaced by the hurricane—could enroll in public or private schools while their families recovered. They got scholarships of up to \$6,000.

And, more recently, I suggested a Scholarship for Kids Act. I said: Why don't we give a State like Tennessee, Ohio, or North Dakota, the opportunity to take most of the Federal dollars and turn them into scholarships for the lowest income students in their State? That scholarship would amount to \$2,100 if we just took the existing money we had and spent it that way.

So that is the strategy that we followed in this country for many, many years, ever since 1944, with the GI bill for veterans.

We all remember what that was. The veterans came home and a grateful nation gave them a scholarship and said: Take it anywhere you want, to any college or accredited school. Take it to Notre Dame, take it to Yeshiva, take it to a historically Black college, take it to Ohio State, take it to Tennessee, take it to the Presbyterian school.

And they have done that, and the GI bill may be one of the most certainly successful pieces of legislation ever enacted.

Last year, there were over \$28 billion in Federal Pell grants and more than

\$91 billion in Federal loans that followed students to public and private colleges of their choice.

Now, the Federal Government also provides vouchers to help pay for childcare. The Child Care and Development Block Grant was negotiated by John Sununu when he was Chief of Staff for H.W. Bush in 1990, and what that does is basically give money to States, and States then give vouchers, just like Pell grants for college, but they give them to working moms, and they can go pick the childcare center that is best for their child.

The Federal Government, in 2019, provided \$8.7 billion and States another \$1.2 to provide vouchers to 1.3 million children.

So I think you can see where I am going with this. It is that the idea of giving parents choices of schools is not a new idea. We have done it in colleges since 1944. We do it with childcare. We do it in community colleges. Why not do it for elementary and secondary education? Why not give low-income families more of the same choices of good schools that wealthy families have?

Now, during COVID-19, children in all K-12 schools have been affected by the disease. There are 100,000 public schools across our country serving 50 million students. That are another 35,000 private schools serving 5 million students. Many of those schools, public and private, are choosing not to reopen in person this fall.

Many schools are failing to provide high-quality distance learning. The students who will suffer the most from this are the low-income children—the children from families where both parents work away from home every day or where the only parent works away from home every day, children with no internet, families who can't afford to put a child in a private school if the public school is not open.

These are the parents who have the greatest need and the children who have the greatest need. We should address that need as we think about how to deal with COVID-19.

Just as more families need more options, there are fewer scholarships available to help them choose private schools because there has been less charitable giving as a result of the pandemic.

So for low-income students attending private schools on a scholarship, that can mean a heartbreaking end to their time at school and a transfer to a new school that may not meet their needs at all.

That is why Senator SCOTT and I and others of us recommend that Congress first provide sufficient funding for all of our schools—100,000 public schools and 35,000 private—so they can safely open this fall with as many students physically present as possible.

I have suggested that the cost of this to the taxpayers could be as much as \$70 billion. The House of Representatives has appropriated \$58 billion.

If Congress were to agree on the higher number, \$70 billion, that would be about \$1,200 for every one of the 55 million public and private school students in the country.

The School Choice Now Act that Senator SCOTT and I are offering is about the 5.7 million of those 55 million children who attend the 35,000 nonpublic, private, or religious schools. It provides scholarships to students to have the opportunity to return to the private school they attended before the pandemic and gives other students a new opportunity to attend private school by doing two things: One, providing one-time emergency funding for scholarship-granting organizations. These are nonprofits that do the important work of helping students attend private schools in each State. These scholarship-granting organizations will use this one-time funding to provide families with direct educational assistance, including private school tuition as well as homeschooling expenses.

No. 2, this act would provide permanent dollar-for-dollar Federal tax credits for contributions to those scholarship-granting organizations. What this means is that any American taxpayer who makes a charitable donation to one of these nonprofits that provide scholarships to students will receive a credit on their Federal taxes equal to the amount the taxpayer donated. The same goes for private companies that make donations to these organizations.

The School Choice Now Act is not a Federal mandate. States are free to create their own tax credit scholarship programs that work for the unique needs of students in their States. States that don't want to support scholarships to private schools are not required to accept these funds. They can be returned to the Secretary, and the funds will be redistributed to States that want the funds.

This bill is about one of the great principles of what it means to be an American: the principle of equal opportunity. For me, equal opportunity means creating an environment in which the largest number of people can begin at the starting line. When everyone is at the starting line in America, anything is possible. Giving children more opportunity to attend a better school is the real answer to inequality in America.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 655—DECLARING RACISM A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs.

MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 655

Whereas the United States ratified over 350 treaties with sovereign indigenous communities, has broken the promises made in such treaties, and has historically failed to carry out its trust responsibilities to Native Americans, including American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, as made evident by the chronic and pervasive underfunding of the Indian Health Service and Tribal, Urban Indian, and Native Hawaiian health care, the vast health and socioeconomic disparities faced by Native American people, and the inaccessibility of many Federal public health and social programs in Native American communities;

Whereas people of Mexican and Puerto Rican descent, who became Americans through conquest, were subject to, but never full members of the polity of the United States and experienced widespread discrimination in employment, housing, education, and health care;

Whereas the immoral paradox of slavery and freedom is an indelible wrong traced throughout the Nation's history, as African Americans lived under the oppressive institution of slavery from 1619 through 1865, endured the practices and laws of segregation during the Jim Crow Era, and continue to face the ramifications of systemic racism through unjust and discriminatory structures and policies;

Whereas, before the enactment of the Medicare program, the United States' health care system was highly segregated, and, as late as the mid-1960s, hospitals, clinics, and doctors' offices throughout Northern and Southern States complied with Jim Crow laws and were completely segregated by race—leaving Black communities with little to no access to health care services;

Whereas, between 1956 and 1967, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Education Fund litigated a series of court cases to eliminate discrimination in hospitals and professional associations;

Whereas the landmark case *Simkins v. Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital*, 323 F.2d 959 (1963), challenged the Federal Government's use of public funds to expand, support, and sustain segregated hospital care, and provided justification for title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Medicare hospital certification program—establishing Medicare hospital racial integration guidelines that applied to every hospital that participated in the Federal program;

Whereas, in 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, which concluded that white racism is responsible for the pervasive discrimination and segregation in employment, education, and housing, resulting in deepened racial division and continued exclusion of Black communities from the benefits of economic progress;

Whereas language minorities, including Latinos, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders, were not assured non-discriminatory access to Federally-funded services, including health services, until the signing of Executive Order 13166 in 2000;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act included provisions to expand the Medicaid program and—for the first time in the United States—established a Federal prohibition against discrimination

on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability in certain health programs, building on other Federal civil rights laws;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act required reporting to Congress on health disparities based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability;

Whereas several Federal programs have been established to address some, but not all, of the health outcomes that are disproportionately experienced by communities of color, including sickle cell disease, tuberculosis, infant mortality, and HIV/AIDS;

Whereas the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion works to raise awareness of health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as Native Americans, Asian Americans, Black Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the United States' health care system and other economic and social structures remain fraught with racism and racial, ethnic, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and class biases that lead to health inequity and health disparities;

Whereas life expectancy rates for Black and Native American people in the United States are significantly lower than those of white people in the United States;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated for LGBTQIA+ people of color;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;

Whereas several States with higher percentages of Black, Latino, and Native American populations have not expanded their Medicaid programs—continuing to disenfranchise minority communities from access to health care to this day;

Whereas 16 States have failed to take advantage of the Federal option to expand access to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program to lawfully-residing immigrant children within the first 5 years of lawful status, and 26 States have failed to do so for similarly-situated pregnant women;

Whereas, between 2016 and 2018, the child uninsured rate increased from 4.7 percent to 5.2 percent and the Latino child uninsured rate increased from 7.7 percent to 8.1 percent, and children of color are far more likely to be uninsured than white children;

Whereas a climate of fear and confusion for immigrant families due to the public charge rule discourages such families from enrolling eligible children in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program;

Whereas Pacific Islanders from the Freely Associated States experience unique health disparities resulting from United States nuclear weapons tests on their home islands, but such people have been categorically denied access to Medicaid and other Federal health benefits;

Whereas the United States has historically facilitated outsider status toward Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as the authorization of the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, which resulted in profound economic, social, and psychological burdens for the people impacted;

Whereas the history and persistence of racist and non-scientific medical beliefs are associated with ongoing racial disparities in treatment and health outcomes;

Whereas implicit racial and ethnic biases within the health care system have an impact on the quality of care experienced by communities of color, such as the undertreatment of pain in Black patients;

Whereas the historical context of unethical practices and abuses experienced by Black

patients and research participants, such as the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, serve as symbols of the Black community's mistrust of the medical system;

Whereas women of color continue to face attacks, documented throughout history, on their prenatal, maternal, and reproductive health and rights;

Whereas enslaved Black women were forced to endure egregiously unethical and cruel treatment, as subjects of insidious medical experiments, to advance modern gynecology;

Whereas, through the late 1960s and early 1980s, physicians routinely sterilized people of color, performing excessive and medically unnecessary procedures on patients of color without their informed consent;

Whereas Black and Native American women are 2 to 4 times more likely than white women to suffer severe maternal morbidity or die of pregnancy-related complications, and implicit racial biases and lower quality care are contributing factors to the health care disparities that lead to these outcomes;

Whereas Black and Native American infants are twice as likely to die as white infants, and the Black infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than in 97 countries worldwide;

Whereas researchers have developed the analytical framework of "weathering" to describe how the constant stress of racism leads to poor health outcomes for Black Americans;

Whereas the daily experience of racism is associated with stress, depression, and anxiety, and may cause physiological reactivity or contribute to chronic health conditions;

Whereas racism is linked to mental health challenges for children and adolescents;

Whereas children of color are overrepresented in the United States child welfare system, and up to 80 percent of children in foster care enter State custody with significant mental health challenges;

Whereas disparities in educational access and attainment, along with racism experienced in the educational setting, affect the trajectory of academic achievement for children and adolescents, and ultimately impact health and racial inequities in school discipline, which has long-term consequences for children;

Whereas racism and segregation in the United States contribute to poor health outcomes by segregating Black, Latino, and Native American communities from opportunity;

Whereas, for decades, discriminatory housing practices, such as redlining, systemically excluded people of color from housing, robbing them of capital in the form of low-cost, stable mortgages and opportunities to build wealth, and the Federal government used its financial power to segregate renters in newly-built public housing;

Whereas environmental injustices, such as proximity and exposure to toxic waste or hazardous air pollutants, continue to harm the health of communities of color, low-income communities, and Indigenous communities around the Nation;

Whereas social inequities such as differing access to quality health care, healthy food and safe drinking water, safe neighborhoods, education, job security, and reliable transportation affect health risks and outcomes;

Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the effects of racism and discrimination are seen in COVID-19 infection, hospitalization, and mortality rates—disproportionately high among Black, Latino, and Native American populations compared to the overall population—exacerbating health disparities and highlighting barriers to care for Black,

Latino, and Native American patients across the United States;

Whereas, because of racial and ethnic disparities, people of color are more likely to have pre-existing, preventable, and chronic conditions, which lead to higher COVID-19 morbidity and mortality rates;

Whereas people of color are overrepresented in the number of people in the United States living under poor air quality conditions, which can increase the likelihood of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality;

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened barriers for Black, Latino, and Native American households that suffer from disproportionately higher rates of food insecurity;

Whereas Black and Latino workers make up a disproportionate number of frontline workers, are less likely to receive paid sick leave or have the ability to work from home, and have been excluded from many forms of relief readily available to other groups;

Whereas people of color are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice and immigration enforcement systems and face a higher risk of contracting COVID-19 within prison populations and detention centers due to the over-incarceration of people of color;

Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, an increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the pandemic;

Whereas communities of color continue to bear the burdens of inequitable social, economic, and criminal justice policies, practices, and investments that cause deep disparities, hurt, harm, danger, and mistrust;

Whereas over 40 percent of Latinos report being discriminated against or harassed because they are Hispanic;

Whereas approximately 24 percent of the Latino population in the United States identifies as "Afro-Latino" and is thus potentially subject to both race and national origin discrimination;

Whereas, because of racism, Black people in the United States share a unique set of challenges and experiences that require heightened levels of awareness and risk while performing everyday tasks—such as jogging in neighborhoods, driving while Black, or playing in a park—that are not experienced by other populations;

Whereas Black people in the United States are 3 times more likely to be killed by police than white people in the United States, and police violence is the 6th leading cause of death for young Black men;

Whereas the police brutality and violence experienced by Black people in the United States adversely impacts mental health among Black communities;

Whereas Black communities led the Nation in mourning the killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Elijah McClain, and countless other Black Americans—calling for justice and long-term changes to dismantle systems of oppression;

Whereas throughout our Nation's history, people of color have been at the forefront of civil rights movements for essential freedoms, human rights, and equal protection for marginalized groups and continue to fight for racial and economic justice today;

Whereas a public health issue is defined as meeting the following 4 criteria:

(1) The condition affects many people, is seen as a threat to the public, and is continuing to increase.

(2) The condition is distributed unfairly.

(3) Preventive measures could reduce the effects of the condition.

(4) Those preventive measures are not yet in place;

Whereas racism meets the criteria of a public health crisis, and public health experts agree;

Whereas a Federal public health crisis declaration defines racism as a pervasive health issue and alerts the Nation to the need to enact immediate and effective cross-governmental efforts to address the root causes of institutional racism and their downstream impacts; and

Whereas such declaration requires the response of the Government to engage significant resources to empower those communities that are impacted: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the resolutions drafted, introduced, and adopted by cities and localities across the Nation declaring racism a public health crisis;

(2) declares racism a public health crisis in the United States;

(3) commits to—

(A) establishing a nationwide strategy to address health disparities and inequity across all sectors in society;

(B) dismantling systemic practices and policies that perpetuate racism;

(C) advancing reforms to address years of neglectful and apathetic policies that have led to poor health outcomes for communities of color; and

(D) promoting efforts to address the social determinants of health—especially for Black, Latino, and Native American people in the United States, and other people of color; and

(4) places a charge on the Nation to move forward with urgency to ensure that the United States stands firmly in honoring its moral purpose of advancing the self-evident truths that all people are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 656—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BLUEBERRY INDUSTRY TO THE UNITED STATES AND DESIGNATING JULY 2020 AS "NATIONAL BLUEBERRY MONTH"

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 656

Whereas the blueberry is a fruit native to North America;

Whereas blueberries were first—

(1) managed and harvested as wild blueberries by the native Wabanaki through specialized burning practices that are still used in 2020; and

(2) used fresh and dried in food and medicines by Native Americans, who introduced blueberries to early colonists, which led to new uses and forms of blueberries, including frozen, establishing traditions still observed in 2020;

Whereas the pioneering work conducted in New Jersey in the early 1900s by Elizabeth White and Dr. Frederick Coville, a botanist at the Department of Agriculture, to domesticate wild lowbush blueberries resulted in the development of the hybrid for cultivated highbush blueberries;

Whereas, because of those early efforts, highbush blueberries are large, sweet, juicy berries that can be commercially produced and shipped;

Whereas wild blueberries—

(1) are small and sweet; and

(2) are not planted, but still grow and are harvested where they have naturally occurred for thousands of years;

Whereas the blueberry industry in the United States, including both highbush and wild blueberries, is an important agricultural industry with an annual economic impact of \$4,700,000,000;

Whereas highbush and wild blueberries—

(1) have a total harvested area estimated at more than 140,000 acres; and

(2) are produced in 48 States by more than 15,000 growers and their families;

Whereas highbush and wild blueberry production in the United States has continually increased, with particular growth during the first 2 decades of the 21st century, reaching a total harvest of 700,000,000 pounds in 2019;

Whereas blueberries are—

(1) low in fat; and

(2) a source of fiber, vitamins, and minerals;

Whereas blueberries are being studied to examine the role that the berries may play in promoting good health in areas such as cardiovascular health, brain health, exercise, insulin response, and gut health; and

Whereas blueberries are harvested in the United States from March through early September, with the peak of the harvest occurring in July: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 2020 as “National Blueberry Month”;;

(2) recognizes the contributions of blueberry growers in the United States and their families; and

(3) recognizes that purchasing blueberries grown in the United States supports farmers, jobs, and the economy of the United States.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2487. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 2488. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2489. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2490. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 2487.** Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 F of title XXXI, add the following:

#### SEC. 3168. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPORTANCE OF EXTRACTING AND PROCESSING URANIUM IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is the sense of Congress that extracting and processing uranium in the United States increases the resiliency of the United States to counter uranium producers owned or controlled by hostile foreign governments.

**SA 2488.** Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 VII, add the following:

#### SEC. 708. MANDATORY REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION.

Section 1090a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **PROCESS APPLICABLE TO MEMBER DISCLOSURE.**—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) establish a phrase that enables a member of the armed forces to trigger a referral of the member by a commanding officer or supervisor for a mental health evaluation;

“(2) require a commanding officer or supervisor to make such referral as soon as practicable following disclosure by the member to the commanding officer or supervisor of the phrase established under paragraph (1); and

“(3) ensure that the referral process protects the confidentiality of the member in a manner similar to the confidentiality provided for members making restricted reports under section 1565b(b) of this title.”.

**SA 2489.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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:

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XII the following:

#### SEC. 1287. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of Cuba Broadcasting should—

(1) remain an independent entity of the United States Agency for Global Media; and

(2) continue taking steps to ensure that the Office is fulfilling its core mission of promoting freedom and democracy by providing the people of Cuba with objective news and information programming.

(c) **AUTHORITIES OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER; LIMITATION ON CORPORATE LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEEES.**—Section 305 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (20), by inserting “in accordance with subsection (c)” before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (21)—

(i) by striking “including with Federal officials,”; and

(ii) by inserting “in accordance with subsection (c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) To—

“(A) require semi-annual content reviews of each language service of each surrogate network, consisting of a review of at least 10 percent of available weekly content, by fluent language speakers and experts without direct affiliation to the language service being reviewed, who are seeking any evidence of unprofessional content, which shall be submitted to the Office of Policy and Research, the head and Board of the respective service, and the Chief Executive Officer; and

“(B) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of anomalous reports, including status updates on anomalous services during the 3-year period commencing on the date of receipt of the first report of unprofessional content.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **LIMITATION ON CORPORATE LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEEES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Executive Officer may not award any grant under subsection (a) to RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Open Technology Fund, or any other grantee authorized under this title (collectively referred to as ‘Agency Grantee Networks’) unless the incorporation documents of any such grantee require that the corporate leadership and Board of Directors of such grantee be selected in accordance with this Act.

“(2) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—

“(A) **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.**—The Chief Executive Officer may not serve on any of the corporate boards of any grantee under subsection (a).

“(B) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—A full-time employee of a Federal agency may not serve on a corporate board of any grantee under subsection (a).

“(3) **QUALIFICATIONS OF GRANTEE BOARD MEMBERS.**—Individuals appointed under subsection (a) to the Board of Directors of any of the Agency Grantee Networks shall have requisite expertise in journalism, technology, broadcasting, or diplomacy, or appropriate language or cultural understanding relevant to the grantee’s mission.”.

(d) **INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ADVISORY BOARD.**—Section 306 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6205) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The International Broadcasting Advisory Board (referred to in this section as the ‘Advisory Board’) shall advise the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, as appropriate. The Advisory Board as established shall exist within the Executive branch of Government as an entity described in section 104 of title 5.

“(b) **COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Board shall consist of 7 members, of whom—

“(A) 6 shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with subsection (c); and

“(B) 1 shall be the Secretary of State.

“(2) **CHAIR.**—The President shall designate, with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1

of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) as Chair of the Advisory Board.

“(3) **PARTY LIMITATION.**—Not more than 3 members of the Advisory Board appointed under paragraph (1)(A) may be affiliated with the same political party.

“(4) **TERMS OF OFFICE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members of the Advisory Board shall serve for a single term of 4 years, except that, of the first group of members appointed under paragraph (1)(A)—

“(i) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act;

“(ii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act; and

“(iii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 6 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act.

“(B) **SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board for the duration of his or her tenure as Secretary of State.

“(5) **VACANCIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, additional members to fill vacancies on the Advisory Board occurring before the expiration of a term.

“(B) **TERM.**—Any members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall serve for the remainder of such term.

“(C) **SERVICE BEYOND TERM.**—Any member whose term has expired shall continue to serve as a member of the Advisory Board until a qualified successor has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate.

“(D) **SECRETARY OF STATE.**—When there is a vacancy in the office of Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board until a new Secretary of State is appointed.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

(3) by amending subsection (c), as redesignated—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “ADVISORY” before “BOARD”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “who are” before “distinguished”; and

(4) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(d) **FUNCTIONS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.**—The members of the Advisory Board shall—

“(1) provide the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media with advice and recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Agency and its programming;

“(2) meet with the Chief Executive Officer at least 4 times annually, including twice in person as practicable, and at additional meetings at the request of the Chief Executive Officer or the Chair of the Advisory Board;

“(3) report periodically, or upon request, to the congressional committees specified in subsection (c)(2) regarding its advice and recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the United States Agency for Global Media and its programming;

“(4) obtain information from the Chief Executive Officer, as needed, for the purposes of fulfilling the functions described in this subsection;

“(5) consult with the Chief Executive Officer regarding budget submissions and strategic plans before they are submitted to the

Office of Management and Budget or to Congress;

“(6) advise the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that—

“(A) the Chief Executive Officer fully respects the professional integrity and editorial independence of United States Agency for Global Media broadcasters, networks, and grantees; and

“(B) agency networks, broadcasters, and grantees adhere to the highest professional standards and ethics of journalism, including taking necessary actions to uphold professional standards to produce consistently reliable and authoritative, accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information; and

“(7) provide other strategic input to the Chief Executive Officer.

“(e) **APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF NETWORKS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The heads of Voice of America, the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Open Technology Fund, or of any other grantee authorized under this title may only be appointed or removed if such action has been approved by a majority vote of the Advisory Board.

“(2) **REMOVAL.**—After consulting with the Chief Executive Officer, 5 or more members of the Advisory Board may unilaterally remove any such head of network or grantee network described in paragraph (1).

“(3) **QUORUM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A quorum shall consist of 4 members of the Advisory Board (excluding the Secretary of State).

“(B) **DECISIONS.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), decisions of the Advisory Board shall be made by majority vote, a quorum being present.

“(C) **CLOSED SESSIONS.**—The Advisory Board may meet in closed sessions in accordance with section 552b of title 5, United States Code.”.

(e) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 304—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS” and inserting “UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”;

(C) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(2) in section 305—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (6), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(ii) in paragraph (13), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(iii) in paragraph (20), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(iv) in paragraph (22), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(3) in section 308—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(C) in subsection (d), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(D) in subsection (g), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(E) in subsection (h)(5), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(F) in subsection (i), in the first sentence, by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(4) in section 309—

(A) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(B) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(C) in subsection (f), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(D) in subsection (g), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(5) in section 310(d), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(6) in section 310A(a), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”;

(7) in section 310B, by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(8) by striking section 312;

(9) in section 313(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(10) in section 314—

(A) by striking “(4) the terms ‘Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Board’ means the Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting the following:

“(2) the terms ‘Agency’ and ‘Chief Executive Officer of the Agency’ mean the United States Agency for Global Media and the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, respectively,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “includes—” and inserting “means the corporation having the corporate title described in section 308”;

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(11) in section 316—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”.

(f) **RULEMAKING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Agency for Global Media may not revise part 531 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, which took effect on June 11, 2020, without explicit authorization by an Act of Congress.

(g) **SAVINGS PROVISIONS.**—Section 310 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6209) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) **MAINTENANCE OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—No consolidation of grantees authorized under subsection (a) involving any grantee shall result in any legal transfer of ownership of any proprietary information or intellectual property to the United States Agency for Global Media or any other Federal entity.

“(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—No consolidation of grantees authorized under subsection (a) shall result in the consolidation of the Open Technology Fund or any successor entity with any other grantee.”.

(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 or any other provision of law may be construed to make the Open Technology Fund an entity authorized under such Act until the effective date of legislation authorizing the establishment of the Open Technology Fund.

**SA 2490.** Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to



amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE 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 XII, insert the following:

**SEC. 1242. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON INCREASED ROTATIONAL DEPLOYMENTS TO GREECE AND ENHANCEMENT OF UNITED STATES-GREECE DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.**

(a) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility of increased rotational deployments of members of the Armed Forces to Greece, including to Souda Bay, Alexandroupoli, Larissa, Volos, and Stefanoviko.

(2) ELEMENT.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include an evaluation of any infrastructure investment necessary to support such increased rotational deployments.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1) that includes the estimated costs associated with such increased rotational deployments.

(b) DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.—The Secretary of State is encouraged to pursue persistent United States diplomatic engagement with respect to the Greece-Cyprus-Israel and Greece-Cyprus-Egypt trilateral agreements beyond the occasional participation of United States diplomats in the regular summits of the countries party to such agreements.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 8 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 9:30 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, July 22, 2020, at 9:45 p.m. to conduct a hearing on nominations.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

**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, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.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, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION**

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER**

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

**GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY**

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 617.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 617) designating July 22, 2020, as "Glioblastoma Awareness Day".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 15, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2020**

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 483, S. 4049; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on substitute amendment No. 2301, as amended.

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

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW**

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.