



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 21, 2020

No. 128

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 God, thank You for the gift of this day. Open the minds of our lawmakers and give them a vision of the unlimited possibilities available to those who trust You as their guide. May our Senators embrace a humility that seeks first to understand rather than to be understood. Inspire them to seek Your wisdom as You sustain them with Your grace, mercy, and peace. Lord, remind them that You will judge their fruits, productivity, and faithfulness.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement entered into force on July 1, and I am eager to see the modernized agreement deliver on its promises to spur job growth for American farmers, workers, and businesses, and even help our innovators. Also, at the same time, it will create new opportunities with our North American trading partners.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement fixes many problems we had for 30 years under NAFTA, and it also creates several new, modern trade provisions for our 21st century economy—things that were negotiated that weren't even thought of 30 years ago when NAFTA was negotiated. However, even with this agreement going into effect and being a tough agreement to negotiate, it isn't going to be simple from here on out. There is plenty of work remaining to ensure the agreement is implemented fully and properly.

I urge the administration to be expeditious in addressing any enforcement issues or noncompliance from our trading partners under the dispute settlement mechanism. I also encourage close consultation between Congress and the administration so we may continue to be successful in the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement implementation efforts—allowing Americans to reap the benefits of this agreement.

I raised questions with the administration, but I have no doubt that they are going to be on top of it. I remember President Trump as a candidate, 2015 to 2016, running on a platform to get rid of NAFTA. Trump was elected. By May of his first year in office, Trump started negotiations. They were successful negotiations. NAFTA is now gone. Now USMCA is going into effect.

Trump delivered on his campaign promise. I have no doubt that he will see that the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement is properly implemented.

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.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, our Nation stands at a crucial midway point in our battle against this terrible virus. The heroism of healthcare professionals, essential workers, and families from coast to coast got our Nation through a springtime like no other. Communities across America put normal life on pause to buy breathing room for our medical system. We essentially had to winterize the world's largest economy for weeks on end and spare our people as much of the resulting pain as possible. The task was historic, and so was the Senate's response. We wrote and passed the CARES Act—the largest rescue package in American history. Our legislation helped pull both our health system and our economy back from the brink. Tens of millions of jobs were saved. The hallways of our hospitals did not become Italy. The Senate's leadership helped the Nation endure the first phase of this, but this crisis is far from over.

The virus that has claimed 140,000 American lives has not gone anywhere. As some places step back toward normalcy, infections are climbing again in hotspots across our country. The start of our economic recovery has been sharp and impressive, but in absolute terms, we still have just begun to pick up the pieces. Our progress so far has been encouraging, but it remains fragile and far from sufficient. I would argue that our country's job now is even more complex than it was back in March.

Now, as then, we need to keep our health system robust, but now, instead of locking down the country to do it, we want to stand up a society that functions somewhat more normally at the same time.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4309

The American people cannot completely stop building their lives until the vaccine is available. The United States of America was not built for a defensive crouch. We need to stand up an educational system and an economy that works for workers and families in the meantime. We need to find the right sort of middle ground—middle ground that is smart and safe but also more sustainable. It is another historic set of challenges and another opportunity for the U.S. Senate to deliver.

For weeks now, I have made it clear that further legislation out of the Senate will be a serious response to the crisis. We will not be wasting the American people's time like the House Democrats, with their multimillion-dollar proposal for high taxes on small businesses, cut taxes for blue-State millionaires, and send diversity detectives into the cannabis industry.

I have said we will start with the facts and develop real, targeted solutions on the subjects that matter most to American families. It turns out that means three things: kids, jobs, and healthcare—kids, jobs, and healthcare.

Surveys show the American people's top priorities for reopening are childcare and K–12 schools. This country wants its kids back in the classroom this fall—learning, exploring, making friends. Their educations depend on it. In some cases, their safety depends on it, and so do the livelihoods of working parents.

The American Academy of Pediatrics stated unambiguously that our goal must be in-person—in-person instruction. But of course, parents, teachers, and doctors all agree it has to be as safe as possible. That is where the Senate comes in.

This majority is preparing legislation that will send \$105 billion so educators have the resources they need to safely reopen. That is more money than the House Democrats set aside for a similar fund, by the way, and that is in addition to support for childcare needs. It is amazing how you can find room to fund serious priorities when you take a pass on the far-left daydreams.

Second, the economic slowdown has hurt millions and millions of Americans. Before this crisis, we had never had 7 million Americans receiving unemployment at the same time. Today, we have 17 million. More than a million people have filed new unemployment claims every single week for more than 4 months now.

The American job market needs another shot of adrenaline. Senate Republicans are laser-focused on getting American workers their jobs back. Our bill takes several specific incentives to hire and retain workers and turn the dials on those policies way up. The legislation will help reimburse for safe workplaces so Main Street can afford the PPE, testing, cleaning, or remodeling to protect workers and entice customers.

The ingenuity and spirit of America's small business isn't possible to over-

state, but they still face a tough road. With the majority of businesses expected to exhaust their initial Paychecks Protection Funding this summer, we will also be proposing a targeted second round of the PPP with a special eye toward hard-hit businesses.

Speaking of building on what worked in the CARES Act, we want another round of direct payments—direct payments to help American families keep driving our national comeback. Helping to create more Americans jobs is an urgent, moral priority, and these are just some of the policies we are discussing that will help that happen.

In addition to kids and jobs, our third major focus is healthcare. The reason is obvious. The reason is obvious. If we lose control of the virus or if research stalls, then everything else will be window dressing.

Our proposal will dedicate even more resources to the fastest race for a new vaccine in human history, along with diagnostics and treatments. Our bill will also protect seniors from a potential spike in premiums. And the Federal Government will continue to support hospitals, providers, and testing.

These are just some of the elements that Senate Republicans are discussing among ourselves and with the administration. There is one more central proposal that ties kids, jobs, and healthcare all together.

As I have said for months, the next recovery package will include strong legal protections for the healthcare workers who save strangers' lives and the schools, colleges, charities, and businesses that want to reopen. The American people will not see their historic recovery gobbled up by trial lawyers who are itching to follow this pandemic with a second epidemic of frivolous lawsuits.

Gross negligence will still be actionable, but we are creating a safe harbor for institutions that make good-faith efforts to follow the guidelines available to them. Doctors and nurses clearly deserve this protection, and school districts, universities, nonprofits, and small businesses will need it, as well, if we want any genuine reopening at all.

The legislation that I have begun to sketch out is neither another CARES Act to float the entire economy nor a typical stimulus bill for a nation that is ready to get back to normal. Our country is in a complex middle ground between those two things. We can't go back to April, and we can't snap our fingers and finish the vaccine overnight. We need to carve out a new normal.

Senate Republicans are continuing to discuss these and other ideas among our conference and with the administration. The majority will be laying down another historic proposal very soon. Here in the Senate, an outcome will require bipartisan discussions.

I do not believe there will be anything in our bill that our Democratic colleagues should not happily support, but we will stand ready and eager to

work together and produce a bipartisan outcome.

As I said yesterday, in March the Senate gave a historic master class in how to pass major bipartisan legislation. The CARES Act, the largest rescue package ever, was drafted by Republicans, promptly negotiated across the aisle with Democrats, and then passed urgently without a single dissenting vote.

Last month, in June, we recorded a master class in how not to make a law. Instead of amending Senator TIM SCOTT's JUSTICE Act, our Democratic colleagues flat-out blocked him. They filibustered the issue of police reform altogether. Well, for the sake of America's kids, jobs, and healthcare, let's hope our Democratic friends bring their bipartisan urgency and good faith to the process and leave the partisan poses behind.

The Senate has led every step of this crisis. We need to rise to the task one more time.

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, our country faces the greatest health threat in 100 years and the greatest economic crisis in 70 years, but here in the Republican-led Senate, you would

hardly know it. Over the past several months, even as COVID-19 surged through the country once again, even as our States hit new records of infections and hospitalizations, the Republican majority in the Senate dithered and delayed on the next phase of major emergency relief.

In April, May, and June, Democrats tried to jolt the Senate into action, but almost every time we tried to pass much needed legislation by average Americans, our Republican colleagues objected. Unemployment claims reached 50 million. The number of cases topped 3.8 million as the virus resurged over the past several weeks, and more than 140,000 Americans have died. Still, Senate Republicans wanted to, in the words of their leader, “hit the pause button” and “assess the conditions” in the country before providing any more relief. The country was burning, and Senate Republicans, led by Leader McCONNELL, said: “Let’s wait a little longer and see how this goes.”

Like President Trump, they were hoping it would go away, ignoring all of the scientific evidence but paying obeisance to the hard right, which didn’t want to spend money no matter what the cost to America.

Now it seems our Republican friends have finally found the motivation to do another emergency relief bill. Even they, with their heads still half in the sand, have to see the crisis the country is in. But instead of working with Democrats in either the Senate or the House, Leader McCONNELL has decided to write the bill behind the closed doors of his office—the same partisan, one-side-only process that has failed time and again to produce successful legislation in the Senate.

McCONNELL talked about how the Senate led in the last three bills. I would add a word to that. It was Senate Democrats that led. Republicans put a small, stingy, corporate-oriented proposal before the Senate. We said no, and they were forced to add provisions friendly to workers and average American families. That is what happened. History knows that.

Yesterday, Leader McCONNELL, once again, called for the same spirited bipartisanship that helped us pass the CARES Act. Well, Leader McCONNELL, writing a bill in your own office without any input from Democrats, dropping it on the floor, and demanding that Democrats support it is no one’s idea of bipartisanship. You can’t fool the American people with these facile words that just don’t ring true.

Even worse, the Republican proposal appears destined to fall drastically short of what is required. From all indications, the bill will prioritize corporate special interests over workers and Main Street businesses. It will not provide hazard pay for essential workers. It will not provide new funding to State, local, and Tribal governments or enough investments in communities of color that have been ravaged by the virus.

Enhanced unemployment benefits will expire at the end of the month. According to reports, the Republican bill will not do nearly enough to aid the 20 to 30 million Americans currently unemployed. We have heard Republicans debate a credit for Americans who are going back to work, but those are the very same Americans who will be getting a salary again. What about Americans who remain unemployed and actually need the help?

The moratorium on evictions expires this week. According to reports, the Republican bill will not do anything for the millions of Americans who can’t afford the rent and could get kicked out of their apartments. After all the hemming and hawing and the delay, which cost America so much—months of delay—it appears the next Republican proposal on COVID will not even come close to meeting the moment.

It has become clear over the last few weeks that the reason our Republican colleagues have taken so long to put even this inadequate proposal together is because they are paralyzed by internal divisions among themselves and by division with the President.

According to reports in the press, even after all these months that our Republican colleagues spent “assessing” the conditions in the country, the White House and Senate Republicans are starkly divided about what to do. The Trump administration is fixated on a payroll tax cut, an idea that will not only harm those who rely on Social Security but will do nothing for the tens of millions of Americans who lost their jobs during the crisis. Many of my Republican colleagues aren’t too keen on that idea, with good reason. Yet it may still be in McCONNELL’s proposal because he and the other Republicans are afraid to tell President Trump no, even when they know he is wrong.

Recent reports also suggest that the administration is trying to block billions of dollars from going to the States in order to improve their testing and contact tracing capabilities. Can you imagine? Republicans are arguing about whether to block funds for testing and tracing, the two most important tools in our arsenal to manage this crisis right now. It is amazing.

Americans are hanging their heads in some degree of shame at the President’s actions because every other developed country—just about every other one in Europe and East Asia—is doing much better than us because they have leadership and their leadership provided, above all, testing and tracing. This President refuses to do it, and the Republicans say nothing. They are so afraid of President Trump, even when they know he is wrong. Even when millions of lives are at stake, even when the economy is at stake, they just are deathly silent.

What do they end up doing? Well, the one thing that unites Trump and all the Republicans is pleasing corporate

interests. So if reports are accurate, the Republicans are doing just that. They are pleasing corporate interests, not workers and families and small businesses, and that will not get the job done.

For 60 days, Senate Democrats have been clear about where we should start the negotiations. The Heroes Act passed by the House provides crucial relief for education funding, for hospitals and medical workers, for essential workers on the frontlines, and for State and local governments.

Right now Republicans seem to want to play chicken with pandemic relief and string everyone along with a bill and a process we all know is doomed to fail.

I urge all of my Republican colleagues to abandon their one-party, one-Chamber approach before it is too late and immediately begin bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the next round of COVID legislation.

The problems, of course, don’t end with the Republican Senate. We are living through one of the greatest failures of Presidential leadership in our country’s history.

Do you hear that, Donald Trump? You have created one of the greatest failures of Presidential leadership in our country’s entire history and the history books will record it that way. President Trump cannot even model good behavior and consistently encourage Americans to wear a mask.

When the White House coronavirus briefings resume, President Trump should not take the podium. Every time President Trump takes the podium at one of these briefings, he is a threat to public health. Even after 140,000 lives were lost to COVID, the President claimed again on Sunday that this disease will disappear. It has been over 6 months since the start of the virus, and this Trump administration still lacks a national testing strategy. The administration ordered hospitals to hide their coronavirus data from the CDC.

The President is pressuring schools to reopen this fall without the necessary resources or guidance to keep our kids safe.

Remember, President Trump, you pushed Republican Governors to open their States too early, and look at what happened. You are now making the same mistake with schools. COVID surged through those States that reopened too quickly, and many now are being forced to reimpose restrictions. We cannot repeat those mistakes when it comes to the schools and safety of our kids and our families.

The question looms over this Chamber: When will our Republican friends stand up to President Trump and tell him to get his act together—when push comes to shove, when people’s health and even lives are at stake? It seems that Senate Republicans are always too timid, too afraid to buck the President.

Will they stand up and tell him he is wrong to block more funding for testing and tracing? Will they tell him to stop ignoring the signs, trying to hide the data, and undermining medical experts like Dr. Fauci? Most of all, most importantly, will our Republican colleagues finally step up to the plate and do what is right—work with us in a bipartisan way to provide desperately needed relief to the American people?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, John Lewis was a great American, but there was a humility in his heart that showed his greatness even more, and he gave speeches that stirred a nation. Who among us can forget his trademark speech of explaining how, as a young man, growing up on a farm, he practiced public speaking to an audience of chickens? He told that story over and over again.

John Lewis used to say, “People come up to me in the airport, and they say, ‘I’m going to cry. I’m going to pass out.’”

John’s reply was, “Please, don’t pass out; I’m not a doctor.”

John Lewis was a healer and a balm for troubled souls. I was struck by an article in the Atlanta newspaper that talked about an incident that occurred in January of 2009.

A former Ku Klux Klan member, Elwin Wilson, confessed to being part of the White mob that had bloodied John Lewis and other Freedom Riders in Rock Hill, SC, nearly 48 years before. Lewis noted in his 2012 book “Across That Bridge” that Wilson was the first of his attackers to apologize for his actions. Wilson traveled to Washington a short while later to meet Lewis face-to-face and ask for forgiveness.

“Without a moment of hesitation, I looked back at him and said, ‘I accept your apology,’” John Lewis wrote.

This was a great testament to the power of love to overcome hatred.

John Lewis had another incident that I thought was worth mentioning this morning, as well, that was another example of the forgiveness.

Kevin Murphy wasn’t born until a year after John Lewis was knocked unconscious by a blow from a wooden Coca-Cola crate in 1961 after the Freedom Riders pulled into the bus station in Montgomery, AL. As the city’s police chief in 2013, Mr. Murphy wanted to issue an apology for the officers who declined to step in as a White mob descended on Lewis and his bus-riding colleagues. So, when Lewis and other dignitaries assembled at Montgomery’s First Baptist Church to commemorate the event, Murphy walked to the microphone and offered Lewis what was long a symbol of oppression for many African Americans—his police badge. Murphy told Lewis he hoped it would serve as a token of reconciliation.

“I often said, when I started going up through the ranks, that if I had a chance—if I ever became police chief—that I was going to try to right that wrong,” said Murphy during an interview—now the deputy sheriff for Montgomery County, AL. He went on to say: “A lot of my peers didn’t want to talk about it. They didn’t want to face the truth.”

Because of that gesture, John Lewis and Kevin Murphy struck up a friendship, and John Lewis invited Murphy to the White House to meet President Barack Obama. Then the two of them, both Lewis and Murphy, traveled to Ireland and Northern Ireland to talk with Catholics and Protestants about bridging the religious divide.

Murphy said he was awed by Lewis’s capacity to walk through the world with an open heart. You can just tell, with everything he had been through, that he wasn’t a bitter man. He truly had tried to put a lot of what happened—the injustices—behind him. That was John Lewis.

It is a miracle that he didn’t die when angry Klansmen and their sympathizers torched the bus that carried a young John Lewis and other Freedom Riders near Anniston, AL, in 1961. It is amazing that he survived the Edmund Pettus Bridge, on Bloody Sunday in 1965, when the Alabama State troopers nearly beat him to death. Clearly, there was a purpose in his life that had to be served.

I had the honor to serve with Congressman Lewis in the House for 10 years, and I called him my friend for nearly 40 years. For a man who had witnessed the depths of hatred and despair, John Lewis was one of the most hopeful people I had ever met. He once said the only time he came close to giving up was after the murder of Robert Kennedy in 1968. Martin Luther King had been assassinated 2 months earlier. So when Bobby Kennedy died, it seemed for a few weeks that any hope for justice and equality had died too. That is what John Lewis said. Yet he didn’t allow despair to overcome him. He didn’t spend his life hoping for better; he spent his life making the world better. He still had hope, and he had a profound belief in the future of this Nation.

I was reminded this weekend of a story that captured so well John Lewis’s humility and his enormous redemptive influence on America. It was January 20, 2009—a day I will never forget. Barack Obama was sworn in to be the first African-American President of the United States. As he was leaving the podium, John Lewis stepped forward to the new President and asked him to sign his inauguration program. The President hesitated, pulled out a pen, and wrote the following inscription: “Because of you, John. Barack Obama.”

John Lewis was an icon of the American civil rights movement. If he had confined his life’s work to only ending racial injustice, he would have still

been in the pantheon of heroes, but his vision and faith were bigger than justice for just one group. His commitment was to genuine democracy and equality. He said so many times: “You cannot build a wall when it comes to equality; it must be equality for all and not for some.” He told us: “We must be headlights, not taillights.” For John, being a headlight meant going out ahead and shining a light so that we could see the people living in the cold shadows of discrimination and bring them into the warmth of America’s promise.

He challenged us always to expand our concepts of justice and equality—as he said, “to respect the dignity and worth of every human being, Black or White, Latino or Asian, immigrant to Native American, gay, straight, Muslims, Christians, Jews.” John spoke for all of them. How many times did he tell us: “We are one people, one family; we live in one house”?

One of the great injustices for our times was overly harsh drug laws. It was a measure passed in the 1980s and 1990s that disproportionately harmed people and communities of color. Many of us worked for years to replace those biased laws. John Lewis was deeply committed to our cause.

About 2 years ago, a proposal was offered that would have shifted the focus of our efforts and really walked away from a commitment to criminal sentencing reform. It was John Lewis who stepped up. His steadfast insistence made a difference, and it resulted in having the FIRST STEP Act being signed into law.

Rosa Parks was one of John Lewis’s heroes. When she died in October 2005, her body lay in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. Tens of thousands of people filed past to pay their respects to this great heroine of justice who had the courage to refuse to sit in the segregated portion of that bus. They came all night and all the next morning.

Late at night, John Lewis walked quietly into the Rotunda. He waited in line with every other mourner. Accompanying him were a handful of blind men and women who were using white canes. That was John Lewis, showing the way by quiet and powerful example. He showed us that the promise of America is the promise of dignity for everyone. In John’s eyes, none of us is free until all of us are free.

Born in rural Troy, AL, the son and grandson of sharecroppers, he saw the injustice of Jim Crow even when he was a young boy. When he was 15, he discovered a man who became an iconic leader and his personal mentor. At that age, John bought a comic book entitled “Martin Luther King and the Montgomery Story.” It was 14 pages long, and it cost him a dime, but it touched his heart and inspired his life. That thin dime had yielded arguably the greatest return on investment of any purchase in the history of our Nation.

Now we are asked, how should we honor this man?

It was a little over 10 years ago that I joined the Faith & Politics pilgrimage and made a trip to Alabama. It was a weekend that John had led for so many years wherein we visited the shrines of the American civil rights movements. We saw the monument and tribute to Rosa Parks, and we went to the church where those little girls were killed in Birmingham. Unfortunately, my schedule was such that I had to leave before we actually visited Selma, which was to occur at 12 noon on Sunday.

I went to John and said: I am sorry I can't be there, as I have always wanted to be on that Selma bridge and to hear your story in your own words.

He said: You have got to come. We will make a special trip. I will meet you in the lobby of the hotel at 6:30 in the morning, and we will drive over and see it. I will take you on that tour.

How could I possibly say no?

I said: I will be there in the lobby. Let's go.

And off we went.

We talked all the way over about his memories of what led to that march in Selma. He was the one who told me personally how Federal Judge Frank Johnson had often been overlooked but that if it were not for his rulings that had allowed that march to go forward, it might never have happened.

It was an inspirational visit for me to be there in the early Sunday morning hours on that misty day, standing at the end of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, right next to John Lewis. He pointed down, just at the foot of the bridge, and said:

That's where I fell. That's where they hit me.

There is a lot of talk about what to do next to honor John Lewis. There has been talk of renaming the Edmund Pettus Bridge in his honor. I am not opposed to that. I think that humble bridge is becoming a defining piece of American history. Yet John Lewis did not risk his life on Bloody Sunday for the right to rename a bridge; he risked his life for the right of every man and woman in America to vote and to have a voice in our democracy. John said so many times that the right to vote is precious, that it is almost sacred, and that it is the most powerful, non-violent tool we have.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been weakened and whittled down by recent Supreme Court and other court decisions and by the actions of this Department of Justice. In December, the House of Representatives voted to restore the Voting Rights Act. John Lewis presided over the U.S. House of Representatives on the day of that important vote. That bill to restore the Voting Rights Act has been sitting on Senator McCONNELL's desk for more than 225 days.

Words of praise for John Lewis are fine, but they are not enough. This Senate should honor the life and the sacrifice of John Lewis by voting to restore the Voting Rights Act. There are

some who are trying mightily to diminish American's faith in our democracy and our elections. We can honor John Lewis by protecting the right to vote. Let's do it and do it now.

Let me close with another story I learned about John Lewis this weekend. We have seen those iconic photos of the 23-year-old John Lewis as he led those marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in 1965—a young man, dressed in a tan trench coat, with a backpack. John Lewis had been arrested before for nonviolent protests. He just had a hunch that he was going to be arrested again that day and jailed, so in his backpack he had his toothbrush, toothpaste, an apple, an orange, and two books.

One book was "The Seven Storey Mountain" by the Catholic monk and mystic Thomas Merton. That book spoke about the power of hope to transform abstract principles into realities that, one day, if necessary, we would be willing to sacrifice and even die for.

On that day, the other book in John Lewis's backpack was entitled "The American Political Tradition." It opened with a quote from the writer John Dos Passos. Here is what it read: "In times of change and danger when there is quicksand of fear under men's reasoning, a sense of continuity with generations gone before can stretch like a lifeline across the scary present."

John Lewis was the bridge that connected the civil rights generation with what we see today in the streets of America—again, a common effort to make sure we fulfill the promise of equality for everyone. John Lewis was heartened by the Black Lives Matter movement. His last public appearance was here in Washington in the area they have reserved for speaking their minds about this important issue.

In this time of change and loss, may we honor the legacy of John Lewis and find within us the hope and courage to continue his work, as he reminded us that the cause of justice and equality is the cause of a lifetime.

PROTESTS

Madam President, let me start by saying that there is no place for violence or vandalism in the exercise of any constitutional right. The use of force against peaceful protesters or members of law enforcement in the reasonable exercise of their responsibilities is unacceptable.

In recent days, President Trump has indicated that he wants to send Federal agents into cities, including Chicago, to conduct policing activities that are traditionally handled by local law enforcement.

The Chicago Tribune has reported that the Department of Homeland Security is developing a plan to send an additional 150 agents to Chicago as soon as this weekend, although details have not been made public as to what they are going to do.

I join Governor J.B. Pritzker of Illinois and Chicago Mayor Lightfoot in

strongly urging the Trump administration to refrain from taking any action that resembles what has occurred in Portland, OR. Any involvement by Federal law enforcement in community policing activity must be conducted in coordination with and with the approval of local law enforcement officials. In this time of heightened tension, we cannot have Federal law enforcement operating at cross-purposes with local leaders.

In recent days, the Trump administration has deployed Federal law enforcement agents in the streets of Portland, OR. They have arrived without any visible identifying information. These Federal agents have reportedly used excessive force against peaceful protesters and detained residents in unmarked vehicles. Such conduct is unacceptable anywhere in the United States and certainly unacceptable in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

I am joining Senator JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon this week in introducing legislation to prevent President Trump from taking this action in Chicago or any other American city. The bill we jointly are offering would require Federal officers to wear identifying insignia. There is no place in America for secret police.

The bill also would limit Federal forces to the immediate vicinity of Federal property unless there has been a written request by local leadership or the Insurrection Act has been invoked. There is no question that the Federal Protective Service and other Federal law enforcement does have the responsibility for Federal facilities, but what we have seen in Portland has gone far beyond that location and into the community at large.

Our bill would also prohibit arrests or apprehensions in unmarked vehicles and render any arrests made in violation of this act unlawful.

How in the world can we explain that in the year 2020, the Trump administration would follow the example of Vladimir Putin in his invasion of Ukraine with these so-called green monsters, who would arrive without any insignia or any indication of whom they were fighting for? These little green men turned out to be agents of the Russian Government. We don't need anything like that—even close to it—in the United States.

Finally, the bill would require notice to the public in the event of crowd control-related deployments that includes information about the agencies involved, the number of personnel, and information related to requests and other details. That is what you come to expect in a democracy.

In February 2017, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I sent President Trump a letter suggesting how he could help, how the Federal Government could come forward to give us assistance in fighting crime and gun violence in the city of Chicago. The letter noted that public safety is primarily a

local responsibility, but the Federal Government can be a partner in public safety efforts alongside local officials, law enforcement, and community stakeholders.

We recommended the administration take steps to assist local violence-prevention efforts, including enhancing Department of Justice programs that improve community policing; directing the Department of Justice to promote mentoring and job-training programs for youth and the formerly incarcerated; improving mentoring and violence-prevention initiatives and boosting funding for recidivism-reduction programs; directing the Department of Justice to abide by its commitment to help implement policing reforms recommended by the Department's Civil Rights Division; closing the gaps in the FBI gun background check system and in Federal firearm laws that enable straw purchasers and gun traffickers to flood Chicago's streets with illicit guns; prioritizing career and youth training programs to address lack of economic opportunity; and redirecting resources that are devoted to the construction of his border wall to making our cities and communities across the United States safer. That is the way the Trump administration can show that it really cares about law enforcement in the city of Chicago and across this Nation and can help us move forward in reducing the incidence of violence.

I join Mayor Lightfoot in making it clear to President Trump that we have no need and will not tolerate tyranny by the Federal Government on the streets of Chicago.

If the President truly wants to cooperate with law enforcement efforts, we can find ways to find common ground and make it a safer city together, but sending in secret police with unmarked vehicles to snatch people off the streets is not only unacceptable, it is un-American.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, I listened carefully to Senator MCCONNELL this morning as he came to the floor and talked about the situation we currently face.

Make no mistake—we are still in the midst of this pandemic. COVID-19 is taking its toll on many parts of America. In the last week, more than 40 different States that decided to open their economies early have found that it was not a wise decision; that, in fact, many more people are becoming infected and dying. Over 140,000 have died in the United States so far, and over 3 million have been infected. I am afraid that there will be more to follow. I wish that were not the case. The question is, What can we do?

First, what can we do when it comes to COVID-19?

I listened the other day when Dr. Anthony Fauci of the National Institutes of Health was interviewed, and he and Dr. Collins have both been asked, why does it take so long to get results when people go in for testing for COVID-19?

Well, there is no explanation, and there is no good reason, and, sadly, that delay is causing a problem. People are uncertain of their status as to whether they are positive or otherwise for days on end, waiting for the results of the test.

It is time for us to develop a test that is timely in its results and widely available to Americans. We cannot realistically open the economy or even conceivably get our schools back to normal until we have that testing.

Why, then, does the White House resist putting money in the next COVID-19 bill for the additional testing that is fundamental to the question of dealing with the future of this COVID-19 virus?

In addition, I am joining with a number of my colleagues—KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, MICHAEL BENNET, CHRIS COONS, and others—in an effort to try to expand the medical and healthcare personnel necessary to make sure that we finally bring this virus to bay. We are going to try to include this in the COVID-19 legislation.

I have legislation that Senator RUBIO—a Republican from Florida—and I have cosponsored that would enhance the training of National Health Service doctors, nurses, and dentists and medical professionals, mental health counselors and the like. I think our bill is a step forward because it provides scholarship assistance to those who will pledge years of service to the National Health Service Corps once they have graduated and are licensed. We need that.

CHRIS COONS is talking about expanding the opportunity for Americans to step forward and serve their Nation doing contact tracing and other things that are essential. It would create thousands and thousands of jobs across the United States at a time when we desperately need them for a cause that we must conquer ultimately.

These are good things to include in this legislation, but there are more immediate things on the economic side.

Do you realize that this coming Saturday will be the last day we will be sending out unemployment checks with the Federal supplement that we voted on on March 26 in the CARES Act? Yes, this week—before next Sunday—the last check will be mailed because, you see, our effort under the CARES Act expires on July 31.

The last payment will be made on Saturday, and then what? And then what? For the millions of Americans who depend on this Federal supplement to feed their families, pay their rent, pay their mortgage, pay the utilities, pay their health insurance premiums—what are they going to do next?

I listened to Senator MCCONNELL say: Well, we are going to have to take a look at what that is going to be in the future. Well, let's do it, Senator, but let's do it quickly. Why have we waited? It has been since March 26 that we have taken up any legislation on the subject, and we knew this day would come. Why did we wait until the last minute?

Eight weeks ago, the House of Representatives did their measure, the Heroes Act—one which I think is sound and principled and I would have supported. Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor regularly to say it is so bad, it is inadequate, it is wrong. Yet we still don't have a proposal from the Republicans, who are the majority in the Senate, about what they would do to move forward from this point in the next COVID-19 bill.

One of the areas that I want to address specifically is the fact that almost 3 months ago—maybe longer—Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said: There is a redline here. If the COVID-19 bill that we are considering in the future does not include a provision giving immunity—legal immunity—to businesses across the United States, it has no chance. We are not going to consider it.

Well, many of us have a lot of questions about this legal immunity that Senator MCCONNELL is asking for. What is it? How far does it go? Well, it turns out there was a memo describing it that was leaked to K Street. That is where the lobbyists' offices are for special interest groups in Washington. That memo found its way into a newspaper, and we have read it, and there are still many unanswered questions.

We have been waiting for months for the language—this redline immunity language that Senator MCCONNELL insists on. He has described the number of lawsuits and litigation that have been filed under COVID-19 as being a tsunami, overwhelming in number. Completely false. The number of claims that have been filed is few across the United States, with more than 3 million people who have so far been infected.

Should we have a standard of conduct? Of course we should. The Senate Judiciary Committee, almost 3 weeks ago, had a hearing where a Texas businessman came forward and said: I want to do the right thing, but what standard should I be following here? Something local? Something State? Something Federal? Give me the standard, and I will do my very best to live up to it.

Well, that sounded like a good-faith effort by a businessperson who wants customers and employees to be safe when they come into his establishment. He has every right to ask for that standard, and we have every responsibility to provide it based not on the politics of the moment but on public health, on medical certainty, and on science. That is what the standard should be drawn to, and the notion that any standard published by anyone—whether by a town, a city, a township, a county, a State, whatever it might be—is sufficient to absolve any business from any liability goes way too far. Unfortunately, it is going to be misused, I am afraid, by those who do not—as this businessman clearly was not going to do—want to live up to their responsibility.

What that Texas businessman said in the Senate Judiciary Committee gave me a good belief and strong faith that the business community wants to do the right thing but just wants guidance. It would be amazing if the CDC and OSHA stepped forward and provided clear, enforceable standards so that businesses and others across the United States knew exactly what to do in terms of social distancing and masks and the like. We need that, but first we need the language from Senator MCCONNELL. This so-called redline has been promised now for months. Let's see the details. Let's move forward from there.

The notion of immunity for businesses by any standard that will not protect employees and customers is unacceptable. It would not make America safe; it would make the situation even worse.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4049

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have three groups of speakers having to do with the vote that will take place at 11:45 a.m., and during that time I will take the first 15 minutes, and then other Members will have amendments. The first two amendments will be the Schatz amendment and then my amendment.

I did have the intention of having more time and was going to kind of rejoice a little bit because, right now, I understand we are about to get the information on suggestions that the Secretary of Defense has after working over a realignment of some of our resources, particularly in Europe. This is kind of interesting because this is something that 18 years ago this year I tried to do unsuccessfully when Jim Jones was the Supreme Allied Commander, and we were not able to get it done. After 18 years, we are going to try it again. I will be speaking about that issue at 4 p.m. today, and it is a significant one.

Today we are considering amendments to our national defense authorization bill. We are still working on a managers' package, but as I previously noted, we have already agreed to more than 140 bipartisan amendments.

Let me be more specific than that. This is the first time we have done this. We have had amendments to a lesser degree in the past. This is the first time that the entire bill has been put together by Members of the U.S. Senate.

To demonstrate that, the total number of amendments to date, on July 21—including our request prior to com-

ing to the floor—are 818 amendments, of which 440 are Republican and 428 are Democratic. Then there was the adoption of the substitute amendment. We all remember what happened then. We had 79 amendments. Those amendments were 34 Democrat and 34 Republican, and 11 were joint. Then the amendments we adopted with the managers' package included 34 amendments, 15 from Republicans and 18 from Democrats, as amendments on the second managers' package numbering 28 and the third package of 34. What I am saying is that we have had many amendments, and this is the first time there has been a bill that was entirely written by the Members. That is why we are at a point now where we can introduce our amendments.

It was important to both Senator REED and me to try to vote on at least a few individual amendments. This is something we haven't been able to do in the last several years. We made this arrangement 2 weeks ago when we set up some six amendments to be voted on. We will start in just a few minutes voting on the first two, which will be Senator SCHATZ's and mine. I am glad we are doing this within the hour.

The first two amendments will be in relation to Senator SCHATZ regarding the 1033 Program. I am strongly opposed to the Schatz amendment to end the 1033 Program. I hear people talking about this, and I guess they don't realize what we have done in the State of Oklahoma. Our sheriffs and law enforcement officers were quite upset when they heard that it might be in jeopardy. The 1033 Program is an effective use of the taxpayers' money, taking equipment that is not being used by the military and allowing it to go into the law enforcement sector. All kinds of precautions have already been taken, but we are talking about adding a few more precautions.

The 1033 Program is an effective use of taxpayers' money. In fact, since the program's creation in 1990, more than \$7 billion worth of vehicles, desks, boots, computers, and more have been responsibly recycled into law enforcement. This is military equipment that the military no longer needs and that these agencies would be purchasing anyway. The equipment is always demilitarized so that it is appropriate for public safety use.

For years, local law enforcement has been asked to do more with less. Now they face the liberal cause to defund the police. We need to continue this transparent, responsive program.

There are a lot of us who have a hard time believing that this is going on today—that people are trying to play down law enforcement, trying to say that it is acceptable to break the law. This has never happened before in America, but that is what we are seeing right now. That makes this program one that is even more valuable.

Senator SCHATZ's amendment would place such stringent limitations on the 1033 Program that it would make the

program virtually impossible to use. It adds only burdensome certification and reporting requirements.

Now, I don't say this critically of Senator SCHATZ, but he doesn't like the program, and he wants to kill the program. We are not going to allow this to happen.

As an example, let's say that a sheriff's office in my State of Oklahoma or any other State decides that they want to receive sleeping bags that the Department of Defense no longer needs. Under the Schatz amendment, that sheriff's office would need to, No. 1, put the request for sleeping bags out for public comment 30 days prior; second, they would have to receive approval from local and State authorities; and third, they would have to file reports on how the sleeping bags would be used and the kind of training officers will have to receive in order for them to have these sleeping bags.

Sheriff's offices are too busy working to keep our communities safe to file numerous reports on sleeping bags that they receive from DOD. To put it bluntly, I think this amendment would kill the 1033 Program. Again, this is allowing trained law enforcement officers to use surplus equipment that is not going to be used and has no value to the military. This is why both the National Sheriffs' Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police strongly oppose Senator SCHATZ's amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the recommendations from the National Sheriffs' Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police.

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

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 14, 2020.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Armed
Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write today to lend the voice of 3,068 sheriffs in support of your amendment #2411 to the National Defense Authorization Act and in opposition to Senator Schatz' amendment #2252. The National Sheriffs' Association has studied this issue thoroughly and determine that your amendment to prohibit the transfer of bayonets, grenades (other than flashbang and stun), weaponized tracked combat vehicles and armed drones is a more thoughtful approach. Senator Schatz, on the other hand, would stop the 1033 completely thru bureaucratic recordkeeping and reporting requirements that make it all but impossible to legally comply. It seems to us that, since taxpayers have bought this equipment once, to simply throw the equipment away or let it rust in warehouses is an incredibly wasteful approach to taxpayers' dollars. The sheriffs implore you to let us continue to use this equipment to save lives in high water rescues, deep snow rescues, and hostage situations, which we do many times a year.

Best regards,

JONATHAN THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2020.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our opposition to S. Amdt. 2252, which will be offered to S. 4049, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021." The FOP urges members of the Senate to vote against this amendment, which would impose sweeping restrictions on an important surplus equipment program for State and local law enforcement agencies.

The FOP has long supported the 1033 program, which is a surplus equipment program administered by the Defense Logistics Agencies (DLA) and the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO) at the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). The media is constructing an inaccurate narrative that State and local law enforcement agencies are becoming too "militarized" simply because this program is administered by the DoD.

It is important for Senators to understand that equipment received through the 1033 program is demilitarized and repurposed for public safety use. Simply because a piece of equipment was originally purchased—with our tax dollars—by the DoD does not make it military equipment. A tool is defined by its use. The equipment is used to defend and protect officers and civilians from threats and to carry out law enforcement and public safety objectives.

There is no data, studies, or other information to support the contention that State and local law enforcement agencies are misusing equipment obtained through these Federal grant programs. For this reason, on behalf of the more than 354,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we urge members of the Senate to vote against this amendment. If I can provide any additional information on this issue, please feel free to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I support strong oversight of the 1033 Program, and I understand the intent behind my colleague's amendment. We want to make sure that the wrong kind of equipment doesn't get into the hands of people who cannot properly use it, so we have actually put those modifications into an amendment that will be voted on—the Inhofe amendment—right after the Schatz amendment, in another 30 minutes from now.

We are offering an alternative to the Schatz amendment. It would place a more narrow limitation on the transfer of Department of Defense equipment, including weapons that cannot be used by State and local enforcement. We are talking about weapons such as weaponized tracking vehicles, drones, and lethal grenades. They are not being used anyway, so let's put them on a list so that they can't be used. That should satisfy a lot of people's concerns.

It also makes sure that those who receive this equipment get necessary training on how to protect citizens' constitutional rights and enhanced training on deescalation techniques.

Defunding and deequipping our law enforcement agencies simply will not fix anything. Making sure they have the right equipment and right training will. So I would request that my colleagues vote no on the Schatz amendment and recognize the value of this program, and vote yes on my amendment putting new safeguards into the 1033 Program.

With that, Madam President, having used the first 10 minutes of my time, I yield the next 5 minutes to Senator CRAMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I thank Chairman INHOFE for his leadership and eloquence. I rise today in defense of the heroes on the thin blue line and in opposition to amendment No. 2252 to the National Defense Authorization Act, which Chairman INHOFE just spoke to.

Over the past few months, America has watched as we have seen a rise in civil unrest turn into violence in cities all across our country. Anarchists and domestic terrorists have exploited the peaceful protests of millions of well-intentioned Americans in order to inflict chaos and instill fear in our communities. Standing on the frontlines as a shield from absolute anarchy are our local law enforcement officers who, by and large, have applied the appropriate force required to protect American families as well as First Amendment rights.

Unfortunately, some have made the political calculation that they would benefit more from chaos than from peace. They believe defunding and abolishing police departments and restricting their access to protective gear are politically better than an honest look at what our justice system really needs to succeed.

The 1033 Program has been utilized for years to provide State and local law enforcement with valuable tools already purchased by the Federal Government to promote public safety. It would be the epitome of waste to gut this program and let these valuable tools rust in a pile or a closet someplace.

As the chairman stated, the police and sheriffs associations oppose amendment No. 2252, and for good reason. Patrick Yoes of the Fraternal Order of Police says:

It is important for Senators to understand that equipment received through the 1033 program is demilitarized and repurposed for public safety use. Simply because a piece of equipment was originally purchased with our tax dollars by the Department of Defense does not make it military equipment. A tool is defined by its use. The equipment is used to defend and protect officers and civilians from threats and to carry out law enforcement and public safety objectives.

It is stunning to me that some of my colleagues are more appalled at where law enforcement gets some of their tools and equipment than they are at the violence that our police officers have to endure every day. The amend-

ment offered today would bury law enforcement, especially those from poor communities, in unnecessary bureaucracy, effectively preventing them from procuring the equipment needed to keep our communities and citizens safe. This unworkable messaging ploy is born out of Democrats' belief that vilifying the police will somehow help them win the election in November.

Thankfully, there is an alternative, amendment No. 2411, offered by the chairman from Oklahoma. It is a thoughtful, commonsense approach with a focus on trained prevention and deescalation. It puts the right equipment in the right hands and places commonsense restrictions on what transfers can occur, all while saving the taxpayers' money.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 2411 and call on the Members of this body to reject any attempts to prevent these brave men and women from doing their jobs to safely secure our communities.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 2252 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2301

(Purpose: To reform Department of Defense transfers of personal property to law enforcement agencies.)

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 2252, as provided for under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. SCHATZ] proposes an amendment numbered 2252 to amendment No. 2301.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, Senators MURKOWSKI, HARRIS, PAUL, and I are offering a bipartisan amendment that proposes reasonable, commonsense reforms to the 1033 Program. Groups on the left and the right support it, including the NAACP, the National Urban League, OurStreets, FreedomWorks, Concerned Veterans for America, the American Conservative Union, Campaign for Liberty, Americans for Tax Reform, and the Faith and Freedom Coalition.

People on the left and the right agree that it is time to start to demilitarize the police.

Our amendment will permanently prohibit the transfer of lethal military weapons to police departments. This includes heavy ammunition, bayonets, grenade launchers, explosives, stripped-down tanks, tear gas, and weaponized drones, among other things. Now, think about that list—weaponized drones and bayonets. Is anybody under the impression that a police department needs a weaponized drone or a bayonet?

Our amendment also ensures the police departments can still get access to

the equipment that actually helps them to protect the public under the 1033 Program, like first-aid kits, cold-weather gear, flash lights, and high-water vehicles to respond to flood disasters.

The last month has made clear that weapons of war don't belong in police departments. Weapons of war have no place in police departments. We saw the terrifying images of police in military gear storming the streets, combat vehicles rumbling down city blocks, rounds and rounds of tear gas shot at peaceful protesters, frequently without warning and often unprovoked. None of this helps anyone deescalate a crisis.

Our communities are not battlefields. The American people are not enemy combatants. If our troops can't use tear gas while overseas, police departments shouldn't use it on American citizens. It is really that simple.

Across the country, more than 8,000 police departments are stockpiling weapons of war at no cost. The research plainly shows that outfitting our police for war does not help to keep the peace. Militarized equipment actually leads to more violence, disproportionately impacting communities of color. More militarized law enforcement is associated with more civilians killed each year by police.

One study found that when a county goes from having no military equipment to receiving about \$2.5 million worth of weaponry, civilian deaths at the hands of police are likely to double. To make matters worse, some police departments are misusing this program by selling, trading, or pawning equipment. Often, county and city officials don't even know what weapons and equipment police departments are acquiring because equipment like armored track vehicles are very expensive to store and maintain. This program is actually blowing up local budgets across the country because these tanks are tearing up the streets.

Today, we have an opportunity to fix it. It is not to repeal the 1033 Program outright, which, frankly, I would favor, but this amendment is the result of a bipartisan compromise wherein we worked with each Member who was willing to engage—former Governors who served in the Senate, former prosecutors who served in the Senate, Members of both parties—and they specifically came to our office and said: You know, that specific item has an important civilian use, could you exempt it from the list of prohibited transfers? We worked and we worked and we worked, and this is the compromise measure. By passing this amendment, we can prevent the abuse of a 1033 Program, and we can limit the amount of dangerous weapons in local precincts.

To be clear, reforming this program is not the only thing we need to do. No single amendment will end police brutality and violence, and alleviating the deep mistrust between police and the communities they are sworn to protect

is not easy work, and it will not be solved by one vote. This amendment is meaningful, and it is bipartisan.

There is simply no evidence to support the idea that police are outgunned. Criminals are not rolling around with IEDs and armored vehicles. This is an opportunity, given the failure of us to do anything about the relationship between police and communities—anything at all in this Congress, in this historic moment—this amendment is an opportunity to actually get something done. We have bipartisan cosponsors. This will be a bipartisan vote. We have organizations, frankly, on the far left and the far right supporting this amendment. This is an opportunity for the Senate to actually get something done. So I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I appreciate the words of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii. Those of us who served in law enforcement know the temptation to seek out this kind of military hardware and the basic uselessness and cost of it when that is done.

I will just be very brief in mentioning that we had a small, very safe, and very quiet community. The police chief was in my office when I was State's attorney, and the chief law enforcement officer of the county was all excited because he was going to get an armored personnel carrier. I said: What are you going to do with it?

Well, just in case there is an uprising.

I said: An uprising is whether somebody is shouting too much on your Fourth of July parades. I said: If you get that, I can assure you that if it is used, I will have an inquiry into why it was used, and no cases from your jurisdiction will be allowed in the court. He decided he could find better uses of their other things.

I said: Besides, you are going to get laughed out of town if you get it.

CORONAVIRUS

I have spoken many times about the need for another COVID-19 supplemental. We see the frightening trajectory of this virus. The terrible human suffering, loss, and economic devastation that is causing families, businesses, and public services in every State and municipality in this country have greatly accentuated the urgency of that need.

As the coronavirus continues to outpace the White House's appallingly belated, I would say, incompetent, inadequate, and incoherent efforts to contain it, and while they keep trying to make a sound bite, the number of Americans becoming sick and dying continues to rise.

They ought to be worried, first and foremost, about Americans and Americans' health and Americans' safety far more than what might be a political sound bite for this fall's election. I re-

mind those who are running this fall, if you want to make sound bites about this and not do anything, as of yesterday, the virus has infected more than 3.8 million Americans. It has killed more than 143,000. Those are not numbers. Those are people. There have been 30,000 more Americans who have been killed by this virus in the past 5 months than died in Vietnam, Korea, Iraq, and Afghanistan combined.

What is the President's response? Well, the virus will soon just go away. After dismissing the virus as nothing to worry about and predicting that the U.S. economy would come roaring back in June, our self-proclaimed wartime President has, for all intents and purposes, left the battlefield.

Unfortunately, the people who are fighting COVID have not left the battlefield. These are friends of mine. I have known people who have died from this. We all do. Hopefully, we all know doctors and nurses and others who work on the frontlines of this.

After months of the President belittling those who wear masks to protect themselves and others, almost nothing he has said about this pandemic has turned out to be accurate or, worse yet, helpful. At this point, his priority appears to be keeping the Confederate flag flying and honoring those who fought to defend slavery and destroy the Union. This is appalling, even for this divisive President who wants to protect the names of people who are traitors to the United States and fought against the United States. Why not put names of people on those forts and those military bases who actually defended the United States and fought for us?

Back to COVID-19. We know the virus toll in this country is staggering, and unlike many countries where governments quickly put in place effective controls, and the virus has receded in those countries that put the controls in and their economies have largely reopened, here, it is getting worse.

We also need to be aware of what the virus is doing in other parts of the world because that will determine how long it is going to take to defeat this pandemic and how long before life returns to normal in our own country. Any virus is only an airplane trip away from our shores, but that has been ignored by the White House.

Last week, the World Health Organization, which the White House blames for favoring China—at the same time, incidentally, President Trump was praising Xi Jinping for China's response to the virus—reported more than 14 million confirmed infections and more than 600,000 deaths worldwide. The virus has spread to 216 countries and territories. It affected the entire world. Countries with the most advanced healthcare systems in the world are struggling to cope with the flood of sick people. As bad as that is, the situation is far worse in developing countries, where billions of people have no access to quality medical services, and,

for that matter, even safe water and sanitation.

Their governments have minimal ability to stop the spread of the virus or to shore up their failing economies and to stop the virus from going elsewhere. Without aid from the United States and other donors, the virus spreads out of control. You know, we are not isolated from the rest of the world. We have already seen this happening in our hemisphere.

According to USAID; the World Food Programme; the Vaccine Alliance, GAVI; the Global Fund; and other public health and humanitarian organizations, COVID-related needs around the world are spiking in every area. USAID said that whatever amount of resources the Congress provides is not going to be enough.

They describe massive gaps in meeting what they foresee as a tidal wave of need in the making, at the same time that they and others are trying to stop the backsliding in other infectious disease programs, which, because we are all on one globe, ultimately affect us.

If the current trend continues, 270 million people will be without adequate food by the end of this year, an increase of 150 million due to the pandemic alone. U.S. Food for Peace Program, known as P.L. 480 Title II, has been a lifesaver for over 60 years. More than 3 billion people in 150 countries have received P.L. 480 food aid, and it has been backed strongly by both Republicans and Democrats in this body. It is absolutely vital to the COVID-19 response.

The World Food Programme is undertaking the biggest humanitarian response in its history. Does that affect us in the United States? Of course, it does because we are interrelated, and because if these problems continue in other parts of the world, ultimately, they do affect us very, very much.

In the United States, we see that our agriculture economy is continuing to suffer. The Trump trade wars have hurt our farmers. The pandemic has accelerated their decline. Actually, additional funding for P.L. 480 will help address immediate global hunger needs, while it would also support America's farm community suffering from the economic crisis caused by COVID-19.

The U.N. believes the number of COVID-19 infections are massively underreported and is running out of funds to support the hundreds of passengers and cargo flights carrying international aid and workers' food and medical supplies, and, of course, many of these humanitarian workers are themselves becoming ill.

Both USAID and the U.N. have stated that you have to have U.S. leadership to get other countries to help. It is a practice widely understood, apparently everywhere except at the White House. The less prepared we and other countries are for what lies ahead, the worse it is going to be for them and for us.

You know, this is not just being good humanitarians on our part; we have an

interest in this, too—in the world being healthy. It is not a problem that is going to be solved by an “America First” policy or by building a wall and saying somebody else will pay for it or by blaming others.

Americans can't safely resume normal international travel and commerce without a successful global strategy to reduce the number and rate of infections. As long as the virus is spreading in this hemisphere and beyond, Americans will continue to become infected and die, and the U.S. economy will suffer, no matter how many tweets and sound bites come from the White House.

The amount appropriated for the international response to the virus in previous COVID-19 supplementals totals \$2.4 billion, including less than \$1 billion for food and other humanitarian aid. That is about one-half of 1 percent of the sum total of those emergency supplementals.

I will put much of these numbers in the RECORD, but there are billions needed for the cost of purchasing and distributing billions of doses of a coronavirus vaccine, as soon as one is available. GAVI will play an essential role in that, protecting the world and protecting us because that distribution is going to be immensely difficult and costly, and we have to be prepared as soon as the vaccine is proven to be safe and effective.

The longer Congress delays, then the more costly—in lives and dollars—an effective international response to COVID-19 becomes.

The President does not want to be the leader we need at this critical time. So it is up to Congress—an independent branch of government—to actually stand up and do our work.

On July 10, the House Appropriations Committee marked up its fiscal year 2021 bill for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which includes \$10 million in emergency funding to respond to COVID-19. That is a good start, but we have a lot more to do. I hope the proposal that will finally be unveiled by the majority leader will include funds for an international response.

Senator GRAHAM—a Republican—and I have worked together on this Foreign Ops bill. We are in agreement that we need strong U.S. leadership at this critical time. I am going to be making recommendations to other members of the Appropriations Committee on this.

I will close on an entirely different matter.

When I see a Navy veteran come and ask masked, unidentified soldiers, police officers—nobody really said who they were—dispersing a crowd in Portland, and he just stands there and says: Look, who are you? What are you doing? He was not being in any way threatening. What is their response to him? They start beating him and beating him and firing tear gas at him. He simply asked: Who are you? Why are you in our town? What are you doing?

Will you please tell me who you are. They start beating him, and they break his hand. This is a Navy veteran who has served our country.

This is as out of control as anything else. And to hear smug comments from members of the administration saying that we have to do this—no, everybody knows they are doing that hoping that somehow it will help the President's reelection.

I want to help the United States of America.

I have spoken many times about the need for another COVID-19 supplemental. The frightening trajectory of this virus and the terrible human suffering, loss, and economic devastation it is causing families, businesses, and public services in every State and municipality in this country, have greatly accentuated the urgency of that need.

As the coronavirus continues to outpace the White House's appallingly belated, incompetent, inadequate, and incoherent efforts to contain it, the number of Americans becoming sick and dying continues to rise.

As of yesterday, the virus has infected more than 3.8 million Americans and has killed more than 143,000.

Those are not numbers. They are people. Thirty thousand more Americans have been killed by this virus in the past 5 months than died in Vietnam, Korea, Iraq, and Afghanistan combined.

The President's response? That the virus will “soon just go away”. After dismissing the virus as nothing to worry about and predicting that the U.S. economy would come “roaring back” in June, our self-proclaimed “war time President” has for all intents and purposes left the battlefield.

After months of belittling those who wear masks to protect themselves and others, almost nothing he has said about this pandemic has turned out to be accurate or helpful.

At this point, his priority appears to be keeping the confederate flag flying and honoring those who fought to defend slavery and destroy the Union. That is appalling, even for this divisive President.

The virus's toll in this country is staggering, and unlike many countries where governments quickly put in place effective controls and the virus has receded and economies have largely reopened, here it is getting worse.

But we also need to be aware of what the virus is doing in other parts of the world because that will determine how long it will take to defeat this pandemic and how long before life returns to normal in our own country. This, too, has been all but ignored by the White House.

Last week, the World Health Organization—which the White House blames for favoring China at the same time President Trump was praising Xi Jinping for China's response to the virus—reported more than 14 million confirmed infections and more than 600,000 deaths worldwide. The virus has

spread to 216 countries and territories—in effect, the entire world.

Countries with the most advanced health care systems in the world are struggling to cope with the flood of sick people. As bad as that is, the situation is far worse in developing countries, where billions of people have no access to quality medical services or even safe water and sanitation.

Their governments have minimal ability to stop the spread of the virus or to shore up their failing economies. Without aid from the United States and other donors, the virus will spread out of control. In fact, that is already happening in this hemisphere.

According to USAID, the World Food Programme, WFP; The Vaccine Alliance, GAVI; the Global Fund; and other public health and humanitarian organizations, COVID-related needs around the world are spiking “in every area” and USAID says that whatever amount of resources the Congress provides “will not be enough.”

They describe “massive gaps” in meeting what they fore see as a “tidal wave of need” in the making, at the same time that they and others are trying to stop the backsliding in other infectious disease programs.

According to WFP, if current trends continue, 270 million people will be without adequate food by the end of this year, an increase of 150 million due to the pandemic alone.

The U.S. Food for Peace Program, known as P.L. 480—Title II, has been a life-saver for over 60 years. More than three billion people in 150 countries have received P.L. 480 food aid.

This program is absolutely vital to the COVID-19 response. As countries restrict international travel to slow the spread of the virus, it is disrupting the transport and movement of food.

WFP is undertaking the biggest humanitarian response in its history. According to David Beasley, “[t]his unprecedented crisis requires an unprecedented response. If we do not respond rapidly and effectively to this viral threat, the outcome will be measured in an unconscionable loss of life, and efforts to roll back the tide of hunger will be undone.”

In the United States, the agriculture economy is continuing to suffer. Not only have the Trump trade wars hurt our farmers, the pandemic has accelerated their decline. Additional funding for P.L. 480 would help address immediate global hunger needs, while also supporting America’s farm community suffering from the economic crisis caused by COVID-19.

The United Nations believes the number of COVID-19 infections is “massively under-reported,” and is running out of funds to support the hundreds of passenger and cargo flights carrying international aid workers, food, and medical supplies. Their efforts are also threatened by the fact that many health and humanitarian workers are getting sick.

All of this requires large infusions of money, and USAID and the U.N. both

say that U.S. leadership is crucial to obtaining contributions from other donors. It is widely understood—at least everywhere except inside the White House—that the less prepared we and other countries are for what lies ahead the worse it will be for them and for us.

This is not a problem that will be solved by an “America First” policy or by building a wall or by blaming others.

Americans cannot safely resume normal international travel and commerce without a successful global strategy to sustainably reduce the number and rate of infections. As long as the virus is spreading in this hemisphere and beyond, Americans will continue to become infected and die and the U.S. economy will suffer.

The amount appropriated for the international response to the virus in previous COVID-19 supplementals totals \$2.4 billion, including less than \$1 billion for food and other humanitarian aid. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of the sum total of those emergency supplementals.

Today’s appeals from just the Global Fund, WFP, and GAVI total \$10 billion, and that doesn’t include the needs of agencies like the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, UNICEF, or our own programs administered by USAID and the State Department.

Several billion dollars are needed just for the cost of purchasing and distributing billions of doses of a coronavirus vaccine as soon as one is available, in which GAVI will play a central role. The distribution will be immensely difficult and costly, and we have to be prepared as soon as a vaccine is proven to be safe and effective.

The longer Congress delays, the more costly—in lives and dollars—an effective international response to COVID-19 becomes. Controlling the outbreak here at home is ultimately a lost cause if we do not act aggressively to assist other countries in the global fight against this pandemic.

President Trump has shown that he cannot and will not be the leader we need at this critical time. It is up to Congress. The longer we delay, the more difficult and costly it will be to defeat this virus.

On July 10, the House Appropriations Committee marked up its fiscal year 2021 bill for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which includes \$10 billion in emergency funding for the international response to COVID-19. That is a good start, but it is too little. The virus is racing around the world and the costs of stopping it are increasing every day.

I hope the proposal about to be unveiled by the majority leader includes the necessary funds for the international response because, to repeat, controlling the outbreak here at home is ultimately a lost cause if we do not act aggressively to assist other countries against this pandemic.

I believe Senator GRAHAM and I are in agreement about the need for strong

U.S. leadership at this critical time. I will be making my own recommendation to the other members of the Appropriations Committee for the necessary funding to combat the virus overseas, and I urge other Senators to support it.

S. 4049

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, there is a Cold War-era quote, attributed to Winston Churchill, that “in a democracy, a knock on the door in the early morning is the milkman.”

In the United States, we are not supposed to fear a knock on our front door. If the police do knock on our door, we expect them to come at a reasonable hour and to respond to criminal activity with the professionalism befitting the peace officers they are.

Those are the expectations of a free people, proud of its history and tradition of separating the roles between civilian law enforcement agencies and the Armed Forces—one is to keep the peace within its community, the other is to destroy foreign adversaries.

By keeping those roles separate, Americans have historically built and sustained a strong bond of trust with their police officers. But, for years, the war on crime and the misguided war on drugs has looked a lot like the war on terror.

Throughout our country, due to the Department of Defense’s 1033 Program, law enforcement is equipped with the tools of the U.S. military, which has predictably resulted in the continued decline of the relationship between the police and those they serve.

Perhaps we should discuss the kinds of machinery provided to local police departments.

The 1033 Program provided to the sleepy New England town of Keene, NH, a Ballistic Engineered Armored Response Counter Attack Truck, otherwise known as a Bearcat.

That might sound menacing, but it is nothing compared to what the Department of Defense provided to Columbia, SC: a mine-resistant war truck, equipped with a machine gun.

These examples are by no means unique. Between 2006 and 2014, the Department of Defense transferred over \$1.5 billion worth of equipment, including over 600 mine-resistant ambush protected vehicles, 79,288 assault rifles, 205 grenade launchers, and 11,959 bayonets to civilian police departments. These are not the tools of peace officers. These are weapons uniquely designed to crush an enemy army.

Mr. President, there has emerged a consensus that we have turned our back on our own principles and blurred the lines between civilian law enforcement and soldiers of war.

And we know that because the Inhofe amendment concedes as much. By limiting the types of weapons that can be transferred, such as bayonets and grenades, the Inhofe amendment acknowledges that there are at least some military-grade weapons that should not be turned on the streets of America’s communities.

But, despite that major and very welcome concession, the Inhofe amendment contains a very telling blind spot. It focuses almost exclusively on weaponry and not the true issue here, the importance of trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The Inhofe amendment takes as a given that the transfers of military surplus equipment are between the law enforcement agencies, the DOD, and no one else.

The Schatz-Paul amendment takes a different approach by ensuring that communities are notified of requests and transfers, by posting notices throughout the community and on a public website, as well as community participation by ensuring that a jurisdiction's governing body approves of the transfers. And the Schatz-Paul amendment provides enforcement mechanisms to combat police militarization.

Mr. President, the police have a very difficult job and serve a critical function. Without the rule of law, a civilized society cannot exist. We cannot take the police for granted. They are brave citizens, and they deserve our gratitude.

That is the core of the Schatz-Paul amendment. Our amendment takes seriously the idea that the cops on the beat can only do their job well when they are well known to their neighbors and trusted by their communities.

By providing the Federal Government and local citizens a role in evaluating what tools should be available to civilian police forces, the Schatz-Paul amendment will help build the relationship between law enforcement, their communities, and, in turn, make our citizens, our police, and our neighborhoods safer.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Schatz-Paul amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Schatz amendment. The Schatz amendment would make changes to one of the Defense Department's surplus property programs, known as the 1033 Program, which allows the Defense Department to disperse excess military equipment to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

The 1033 Program has provided the Defense Department a way to reuse taxpayer-funded equipment it no longer needs by providing it to law enforcement agencies. This, in turn, saves State and local governments from having to buy new equipment. This program is almost 25 years old, and it has been the subject of continued scrutiny and modifications.

I would first like to review what is in place. DOD requires that all requests for equipment from law enforcement agencies include a justification of how the property will be used. This justification is a key factor in determining if a requisition is to be approved.

Next, according to the Defense Department, 92 percent of the equipment transferred during fiscal year 2019 was in the category of uncontrolled property—things like office equipment, first aid kits, hand tools, computers, and digital cameras. After 1 year from transfer, items in this category become the property of the law enforcement agency and are no longer subject to annual inventory requirements. The rest of the property transferred under the 1033 Program is considered controlled property and is given to law enforcement agencies on a conditional or "loan" basis. This includes things like small arms, demilitarized vehicles, and night vision equipment.

Typically, small arms weapons only make up about 5 percent of the property transferred in the 1033 Program. When a law enforcement agency no longer wants or needs this controlled property, it must be returned to the Department of Defense.

To ensure that this program is run responsibly and effectively, the Government Accountability Office has provided several reviews of this program that have been helpful in past years to tighten the requirements on participants in the 1033 Program. The committee report accompanying the bill before us requires another GAO review of DOD's disposal of military vehicles, which could inform additional reforms when we receive the results of the review.

I also know that the Defense Logistics Agency requires annual audits of participating agencies to ensure they are accountable for the equipment they have received. If an agency is delinquent or doesn't meet the requirements, then they can be suspended or terminated from the 1033 Program.

While this Program is an effective way of reusing equipment that taxpayers have already paid for, we continually need to ensure that our civilian law enforcement agencies do not end up looking like or acting like our military when they patrol the streets. Given some of the incidents that have occurred in recent months, I believe that additional modifications are necessary.

The Schatz amendment adds some reasonable requirements and limitations to the 1033 Program. For one thing, it would codify the prohibition of certain items from being transferred under the 1033 Program, things like certain kinds of ammunition, grenades, and drones. This amendment would also prohibit the use of transferred equipment against First Amendment-protected activities, such as the right to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

I know that the Defense Department has some concerns about how this amendment would be implemented, but I believe these concerns can be addressed during conference with the House. I believe it is important and timely to make such changes to the 1033 Program today.

I support the Schatz amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 2411, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, and oppose amendment No. 2252, offered by the Senator from Hawaii.

I have heard from law enforcement in my State. They use this program to get critical search-and-rescue equipment that saves lives. In Sweetwater County, the sheriff used equipment from the 1033 Program to rescue 22 people in just 5 months. In Big Horn County, equipment from the program rescued a family who was kayaking when 6-foot waves arose. A boat from this program was the only equipment that could break through the waves to rescue the family. Without the 1033 Program, they would not be able to afford this life-saving equipment.

Sometimes the equipment is not used, in which case we are pleased that there is no need for a search and rescue that year, or some of it is converted to fire protection equipment.

The burdensome paperwork required by the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii would effectively end access to the program for the local law enforcement in my State whose departments are small. Our towns are small. The activities have to be combined between fire and police protection.

Senator INHOFE has attempted to find the middle ground. His amendment requires reforms and training without an egregious paperwork burden that could end this important program.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of amendment 2411 offered by Senator INHOFE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, just by way of rebuttal to the Senator from Wyoming, to make clear what the Schatz-Murkowski-Harris-Paul amendment does, we were very thoughtful and deliberative and collaborative with Members of the Senate to ensure that the problem he is describing would not occur under this new statute. So let me just be specific. Search-and-rescue equipment, boats, things like that which clearly have a virtuous civilian use are not prohibited transfers under my amendment.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2252

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the Schatz amendment No. 2252.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'YEAS' for amendment No. 2411. Includes names like Baldwin, Harris, Peters, Bennet, Hassan, Reed, Blumenthal, Heinrich, Rosen, Booker, Hirono, Sanders, Brown, Jones, Schatz, Cantwell, Kaine, Schumer, Cardin, King, Shaheen, Carper, Klobuchar, Sinema, Casey, Leahy, Smith, Coons, Manchin, Stabenow, Cortez Masto, Markey, Tester, Daines, Menendez, Udall, Duckworth, Merkley, Van Hollen, Durbin, Murkowski, Warner, Feinstein, Murphy, Warren, Gardner, Murray, Whitehouse, Gillibrand, Paul, Wyden.

NAYS—49

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'NAYS' for amendment No. 2411. Includes names like Alexander, Fischer, Risch, Barrasso, Graham, Roberts, Blackburn, Grassley, Romney, Blunt, Hawley, Rounds, Boozman, Hoeven, Rubio, Braun, Hyde-Smith, Sasse, Burr, Inhofe, Scott (FL), Capito, Johnson, Scott (SC), Cassidy, Kennedy, Shelby, Collins, Lankford, Sullivan, Cornyn, Lee, Thune, Cotton, Loeffler, Tillis, Cramer, McConnell, Toomey, Crapo, McSally, Wicker, Cruz, Moran, Young, Enzi, Perdue, Ernst, Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 49.

Under the previous order, the 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2411

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2411 and ask that it be reported by number.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 2411 to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose additional conditions and limitations on the transfer of Department of Defense property for law enforcement activities)

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1052. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) ADDITIONAL TRAINING OF RECIPIENT AGENCY PERSONNEL REQUIRED.—Subsection (b)(6) of section 2576a of title 10, United

States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including respect for the rights of citizens under the Constitution of the United States and de-escalation of force”.

(b) CERTAIN PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(d) PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.—The Secretary may not transfer to a Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency under this section the following:

“(1) Bayonets.

“(2) Grenades (other than stun and flash-bang grenades).

“(3) Weaponized tracked combat vehicles.

“(4) Weaponized drones.”.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2411

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on Inhofe amendment No. 2411.

Mr. INHOFE. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'YEAS' for amendment No. 2411. Includes names like Alexander, Gardner, Portman, Baldwin, Gillibrand, Reed, Barrasso, Graham, Risch, Bennet, Grassley, Roberts, Blumenthal, Hassan, Romney, Blunt, Heinrich, Rosen, Boozman, Hirono, Rounds, Braun, Hoeven, Rubio, Brown, Hyde-Smith, Sasse, Burr, Inhofe, Schatz, Cantwell, Johnson, Schumer, Capito, Jones, Scott (FL), Cruz, Kaine, Scott (SC), Cardin, King, Shaheen, Carper, Klobuchar, Shelby, Casey, Lankford, Sinema, Cassidy, Leahy, Smith, Collins, Lee, Stabenow, Cornyn, Manchin, Sullivan, Cortez Masto, McConnell, Tester, Cramer, McSally, Thune, Crapo, Menendez, Tillis, Cruz, Merkley, Toomey, Daines, Moran, Udall, Duckworth, Murkowski, Van Hollen, Durbin, Murphy, Warner, Enzi, Murray, Whitehouse, Ernst, Paul, Wicker, Feinstein, Perdue, Wyden, Fischer, Peters, Young.

NAYS—10

Table listing names of Senators who voted 'NAYS' for amendment No. 2411. Includes names like Blackburn, Hawley, Sanders, Booker, Kennedy, Warren, Cotton, Loeffler, Harris, Markey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 10.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled

when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to discuss our Federal finances and the need to address our unsustainable fiscal debt and deficit.

The Federal budget has already been on an unsustainable path before COVID-19 reached our shores and before the pandemic and our government’s response to it, which has accelerated what I believe is a coming day of reckoning.

I recognize the unprecedented crisis presented by COVID-19. I support the necessary response. Together, Congress has passed and the President has signed five separate pieces of legislation responding to the pandemic and its economic fallout that together will cost more than \$2 trillion.

I never would have supported trillions in new spending unless I truly believed that it was necessary to combat the virus and prevent economic catastrophe resulting from the government shuttering the economy. I know many of my colleagues feel that same way.

When this crisis abates—and it will—the Federal Government cannot afford to return to the status quo of unsustainable budgets and surging debt that jeopardizes the prosperity of future generations. We have to start serious conversation about how we are going to pay our bills and put our finances on a more sustainable path. We can justify aggressive borrowing and spending as necessary during times of crisis, but that can’t be the default.

So far this fiscal year, we have already run up a deficit of \$2.7 trillion in 1 year, more than triple the size of the deficit we ran at the same time last year. The Congressional Budget Office says that we are on track to spend \$3.7 trillion more than we take in this year, and that is assuming we don’t pass new COVID legislation. By the end of the fiscal year, our publicly held debt will exceed the size of our economy and, by the end of next year, debt as a percentage of the economy will be higher than it has ever been in our history. I have a little chart here that demonstrates that.

We have been fortunate the interest rates on our debt are currently low, and the government has been able to borrow the funds necessary to address the crisis caused by the pandemic. The dollar has remained relatively strong, helping to keep inflation low. The U.S. dollar remains the world’s reserve currency and the safe haven for investments in the current time of crisis.

But how long will that be the case if we continue to run trillion-dollar deficits each year? Future Congresses will not have the same flexibility to deal

with their own crises if we leave them saddled with an enormous national debt. They will not be able to fund new emergency programs without cutting other spending or raising revenues.

That is why it is so critical that we get a hold of our debt and deficits once we emerge from this pandemic. Regardless of what some people far outside of the economic mainstream are saying, there are constraints on how much government can borrow and spend without triggering higher interest rates or inflation. If we just start printing money to pay for over-spending, our country could face the curse of stagflation, a combination of high inflation and low to no economic growth. We haven't had to think about this type of devastating combination since the late seventies, and that is economic history we should not repeat.

Even if we have the capacity for significant, one-time emergency spending, we should bear in mind the fact that the Federal Government doesn't have a good track record of reducing spending after it has ratcheted it up during a crisis.

I would remind my colleagues of the old adage: There is nothing so permanent as a temporary government program. We are already hearing calls to extend or make permanent many of the temporary entitlement expansions enacted in previous bills.

More legislation may be needed to combat the virus and help the economy, but we cannot use the crisis to justify opening the spending floodgates and borrowing from future generations to fund nonemergency priorities. Low interest rates do not mean that government spending is free or that we don't need to spend it wisely.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill that the Congressional Budget Office says will cost nearly \$3.5 trillion. That is more than the cost of all the COVID-19 legislation we have already enacted combined. Are we to believe every penny of that is absolutely necessary?

A \$60 billion bailout for union pensions? A massive giveaway for wealthy individuals living in high-tax States? Billions in student loan forgiveness for all borrowers, regardless of income and ability to pay?

We should not view this crisis—a crisis that claimed over 130,000 American lives and left millions out of work—as an opportunity to enact things that have nothing to do with the pandemic.

And it is not just the lower Chamber. The Senate recently approved \$17 billion in new mandatory spending for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and park and public lands maintenance. We refused to consider an amendment to even try to pay for that bill, an attempt that would have mostly charged foreigners visiting our parks. As I said, if we don't try to pay for that bill, what will we pay for?

We are just adding to an already long list of unfunded mandatory spending programs that we allow to operate on

autopilot without ever being voted on or ever being evaluated again. Nobody runs a business like that. Even though these programs are allowed to bypass the annual appropriations process, most of them don't have any dedicated revenue to pay for the spending. And those that do collect their own revenue often spend more than they take in—with no vote. It just happens. Even before the pandemic, the Congressional Budget Office projected that Social Security spending over the next 10 years would total \$15.2 trillion. But listen to this: The program's dedicated tax revenues would only cover \$12.5 trillion of that—\$15.2 trillion cost; \$12.5 trillion revenue. Medicare's taxes and premiums were projected to cover only half of the program's \$12.6 trillion spending over the next 10 years. We put the rest of it on the Nation's credit card left to be paid for by future generations. What kind of a crisis are they going to have?

This chart shows again that this is the revenue coming in for Social Security, and this is the additional we have to borrow. This is the money coming in from Medicare, and this is the additional we have to borrow. Medicaid, we borrow every bit of it. The total revenue that we receive will not cover these deficits, so everything else that we do we will have to borrow for it.

If the interest rate were to go up to its norm of 5 percent, we wouldn't be able to do defense; we wouldn't be able to do education; we wouldn't be able to do anything else, infrastructure or otherwise, that we expect the Federal Government to do for us. We have to start getting control of it. It isn't an unlimited source of money. We are putting it on the Nation's credit card, and the future generations will have to pay for it.

There are a couple of ways you can pay for it. One is to eliminate the services. The other one is to increase revenues. Another one, of course, is to eliminate a lot of duplication that we have, but we don't even have an appetite for that.

We have over 100 housing programs. Tell me there is no duplication in 100 housing programs, but we don't look at them. Most of them are mandatory. So we can just ignore the impacts of them and the fact that we have multiple administrators doing the same job, and we don't even know if it is effective.

I have been trying for a long time through the Budget Committee to get a list of the programs we fund. Now, you would think, if we are writing checks, that we would have a list of programs, wouldn't you? We don't have a list of programs. We don't know what we own. We don't know when it is going to wear out. We don't know what the cost of replacement would be. All are very basic business decisions, but we just keep sliding everything over to mandatory so it has to be paid for regardless of whether we have any money or not, and we don't even look at them. That has to change, and it has to change rapidly or our kids and our grandkids

will find that all of their money has been spent, and all they can do is pay more taxes.

I am frustrated that we are spending billions without so much as a discussion about how to pay for things. Yes, we needed a strong response to the COVID virus, but I am disappointed that we can't work together on responsible solutions, even modest efforts like a paid-for fix for our parks and public lands maintenance that I mentioned would already be paid for by foreign visitors. I am dismayed that we keep digging the hole deeper for future generations. We all owe it to them to do better, and I hope we start to do it soon.

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.

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

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

S. 4049

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of Senate amendment No. 1729, which I hope will be added today to the National Defense Authorization Act. The goal of this amendment is to finish—what I hope is to finish a public health study that we began with legislation in 2017 to address the contaminant known as PFAS. I know the Presiding Officer knows about this because she has that chemical in her State as well.

I want to begin by commending the work of the Armed Services Committee—both Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for working with me to establish the first ever human health study of PFAS and to institute policies that will phase out the Defense Department's use of these chemicals over the next several years.

We began this journey in 2017 when we put \$10 million into a health study—the first of its kind in the country—to look at the impacts of PFAS on humans. At that time, we authorized \$10 million for 3 years. Unfortunately, because of the coronavirus pandemic, it is taking longer to complete the study than we had hoped, so we are going to need some additional funding.

There is real urgency in addressing PFAS. As many of us know, PFAS chemicals have emerged as widespread pollutants in the drinking water sources of military bases across this country. The main reason is because PFAS chemicals were used in firefighting foam that was used by the armed services.

The number of military installations with known or suspected contamination from PFAS continues to rise. In March, DOD updated its count of military installations impacted by these materials from 401 across the country to 651—651 military installations—

which means that they are in almost every State in the United States, and other studies have reported that this is actually a conservative estimate.

We don't yet know what the long-term risks of exposure to PFAS are because we are still trying to get research into that, but studies have already linked these chemicals—and there are hundreds of chemicals in the PFAS category—to a number of adverse health effects.

The potential ties between PFAS and various forms of cancer are of particular concern to firefighters who may have experienced exposure during firefighting and fire-training exercises.

On June 11, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, ATSDR—works as part of the Centers for Disease Control—issued a statement expressing concern about how PFAS exposure can impact the risk of COVID-19 infections. Now, for all of us who have constituents who have been exposed to PFAS, we know this has caused a lot of sleepless nights for countless American families both in New Hampshire and across the country who have been living and working near sites contaminated by these materials.

In my State of New Hampshire, the city of Portsmouth, which was the home of the former Pease Air Force Base, closed a major water supply well located at that airbase after the Air Force found PFAS in the drinking water at levels 12½ times higher than the provisional health advisory from the Environmental Protection Agency at that time. That number has changed since then.

Moreover, State health officials determined that more than 1,500 people, including children who attended daycare centers near the site, have elevated levels of PFAS in their blood from drinking contaminated groundwater at Pease. I have heard from so many parents who are terrified of what this contamination means for the health of their children.

One woman, who has been a real leader in responding to the PFAS emergency, Andrea Amico of Portsmouth, remembers feeling like her world was crashing down when tests showed that her two children, exposed to PFAS in drinking water at Pease, had elevated levels of these materials in their blood. She said: “[T]o actually see it on paper, to know it was true, was very devastating for me, and the wide range of emotions I experienced with those results ranged from anger to fear, frustration and guilt.” Andrea’s children attended the childcare center—one of the two childcare centers at Pease.

I also heard from Alayna Davis of Dover and Michelle Dalton of Durham, both of whom are mothers with children at a daycare center near the former base at Portsmouth. Alayna said that she was exposed to PFAS at Pease when she was pregnant with her son. She and her husband were devastated when they learned that their son had high levels of PFAS in his

blood. Michelle was exposed to the contaminated water in January of 2011 when she started working on the base. Her youngest child has attended daycare at Pease since he was 12 weeks old, but, of course, he was exposed to contamination since conception.

Stories like Andrea’s, Alayna’s, and Michelle’s are not limited to Portsmouth, sadly. Contamination from PFAS is not limited to military bases and airports. That is why this long-term health study is so important, and it is so critical that we complete it. We need to know what the research says are the dangers of PFAS.

Since Congress authorized the study in 2017, the ATSDR and Centers for Disease Control have been working to identify the health effects of PFAS exposure, starting with the former Pease airbase in Portsmouth. There are other—I believe there are seven other sites around the country that have been designated as part of this study. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19, as I said earlier, the agencies expect additional costs associated with continuing the study, as well as a 1-year delay in finalizing the results.

I think we could all agree that families who have been exposed to these chemicals deserve answers. What my amendment would do is provide additional funding for the PFAS health study to ensure that ATSDR and CDC can complete their work and do it without delay.

The safety of our drinking water is essential, and it is nonnegotiable. The potential serious health effects associated with exposure to PFAS chemicals demand moving forward with policies that will protect our communities, especially our men and women in uniform. Senate amendment 1729 would help to do just that.

Of course, this is just the beginning. This gives us a baseline study to tell us what the health effects are. Once we get that study and as we continue to move forward, we have a lot of work to do to ensure that PFAS—not just on military bases but in communities across this country, which appear in so many different products—that we can address that in a way that provides some sort of insurance and protection to families across this country so they know what they are dealing with and so they know they can get help. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. The cars we drive, the planes we fly, and the smartphones we have in our pockets are all powered by computer chips—or semiconductors—a technology that is key to modern society and that may determine whether America or China leads the world in the decades to come.

Computer chips were, of course, pioneered in America. Cold War-era initiatives like the Apollo Program, DARPA, and SEMATECH created the break-

throughs and steady demand for this high-tech industry. Storied American companies like Intel, IBM, Texas Instruments, Micron, and others commercialized and then perfected this technology. Brilliant American entrepreneurs and engineers kick-started the digital revolution that shaped the modern world. That was then. Today, sadly, most semiconductors are not made in the U.S.A.

We have learned during this pandemic how dangerous it is to rely on distant factories and overstretched supply chains that can be compromised by emergencies or enemies. Well, almost three-quarters of the world’s capacity to make computer chips is located in just a handful of countries in East Asia—closer to Communist China than our shores and all within range of the missiles of the People’s Liberation Army.

China is investing huge sums—possibly \$150 billion—in its semiconductor industry. This investment is paying off. For the first time ever, last year China surpassed the United States in its capacity for manufacturing advanced chips. China is projected to surpass Japan and South Korea in the next 2 years, which would put it behind only Taiwan, an island just 80 miles off its shore, which, I must remind you, the PLA regularly trains to invade.

We cannot allow China to dominate production of computer chips. Doing so would be a grave threat that could allow a corrupt clique of Communists to impose a high-tech tyranny on the rest of the world. That is why I am offering a bipartisan amendment, along with Senators CORNYN, SCHUMER, WARNER, and others, to ensure American leadership in computer chips in the face of this Chinese threat. Our proposal calls for key investments in advanced factories and research and development so that America discovers and then produces the next generation of semiconductor technology. It also requires the Department of Defense and the intelligence community to work with trusted industry partners to secure the supply chain for computer chips for our military and other national security needs.

This bill is a moonshot investment, and such investments don’t come cheap. So I regret that the question of funding this bill has been postponed to another time, but I look forward to having and winning that debate because, make no mistake, robust support is needed to ensure the future of the American semiconductor industry. At the very least, it is necessary to level the playing field so that American companies can compete against the coercive, anti-competitive, and mercantilist policies of Communist China and others. It will provide a surge of support and demand for advanced technology, just as the Federal Government has always provided.

We offer this amendment so that the next digital revolution is also made in the U.S.A., not in Communist China. I

urge my colleagues to support it and to support America's continued technological primacy in the world.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to express my support for the Cornyn amendment, which would, among other things, authorize a Federal grant program to enable the leading global chip companies to manufacture in the United States.

I want to commend a bipartisan group of Senators who have worked so hard on this issue: Senators COTTON, CORNYN, SCHUMER, and WARNER. The semiconductor manufacturing story is similar to many other industries in America. The United States invented the technology and still leads in research and development, but the manufacture of the product itself has steadily migrated to Asia.

Over time, not just the manufacturing expertise and capacity are lost but also the science and engineering necessary to invent the next generation of products. While this has happened to too many industries, the impact is particularly acute in electronics because electronics power the modern economy, fueling all the critical technologies on which our future prosperity depend.

Asian nations—and, in particular, China, Taiwan, and South Korea—have for decades pursued aggressive industrial policies to gain control of the electronics industry. These policies directed large subsidies and protections for fledgling companies that have now become global giants.

While South Korea is an ally, and Taiwan is a partner, the plants in those countries that make the world's most advanced logic and memory semiconductors are highly vulnerable to disruption or destruction by China and/or North Korea. In a confrontation in this region, China could threaten to bring the western economy to its knees by halting the flow of semiconductors.

China itself is investing hundreds of billions of dollars in new semiconductor fabrication plants in a relentless bid to dominate this industry. In 10 years, Chinese companies may dominate the production of the chips that power 5G wireless networks, artificial intelligence, cloud computing, the Internet of Things, and autonomous vehicles.

In America, there is one remaining company that is globally competitive in logic chips—Intel Corporation—but Intel is at least a generation behind its main competitors and historically has designed and produced chips only for its own product line. Its major global

competitors—the Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Corporation, or TSMC, and Samsung—provide manufacturing services for chips designed by other companies. These are typically so-called fabless chips companies, and they include the names of some of our most famous tech companies: Qualcomm, Xilinx, Nvidia, and Microsoft. TSMC and Samsung, together, have close to a monopoly on the manufacturing of leading-edge semiconductors for fabless chip companies.

Recently, there was the good news that Intel announced in a letter to the Defense Department its intent to compete with its Asian rivals in manufacturing chips designed by fabless companies. Again, these are companies that would design the chips and the electronic processor but would not produce the chips. That would be left to these other major companies.

In addition, TSMC and the administration announced an agreement to bring TSMC to America to produce leading edge chips. It is suspected that Samsung can be persuaded to set up a major manufacturing facility in the United States, as well.

The Defense Department has two major studies nearing completion, one by the Defense Science Board and one conducted in partnership with industry by the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Ellen Lord. They are both expected to plead for urgent and large-scale action to revive U.S. semiconductor manufacturing, but none of this is going to happen without funding and without a plan.

We did not lose chip manufacturing to Asia simply due to cheap labor, especially in the chip industry, which is not manpower intensive. We lost this market sector because the investments required are massive and constant and because foreign governments heavily subsidize them.

We all prefer to let markets govern where competition is fair and mutually beneficial, but relentless actions by foreign governments to dominate specific industries regardless of economics and where they succeed, like in the semiconductor industry, must be countered by U.S. government action because of the threat to our national security and prosperity.

While this amendment does not include funding authorizations, it is an important first step. This amendment will serve notice that the U.S. Senate recognizes this very serious issue and intends to take corrective action.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to commit to finding funding solutions. Our economic well-being and our national security depend upon it.

Madam President, I would now also like to speak about Senator Shaheen's amendment, which will be considered this afternoon, with your permission.

I rise in support of Senator Shaheen's amendment to increase fiscal year 2021 funding by \$5 million for the ongoing CDC human health study on the effects

of PFAS substances in drinking water sources.

As most of you are aware, PFOS and PFOA are chemicals that are very effective for extinguishing fires and have been used in firefighting foam in the Defense Department since the 1970s. Unfortunately, the fluorine bonds never break, and environmental problems are presented, which are very dangerous to people.

The lifetime health advisory for PFAS is the equivalent of one grain of sand in an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The WHO found that these chemicals are likely carcinogenic, especially in children and pregnant women, and that they can decrease the effectiveness of vaccines, and they are known to cause cancer in animals.

PFAS has been found in the drinking water at over 650 military installations in almost every State in the United States and overseas. Thousands of Americans in many States across the United States have already found elevated levels of PFAS in their blood.

Beginning with the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, the Department of Defense has been authorized to transfer funds to the CDC for a human health study on the effects of all PFAS substances in drinking water sources for people. Specifically, it seeks to determine the exact types of cancers and other toxic effects drinking water with PFAS has on human beings.

For example, years ago, the CDC determined precisely how much lead can be ingested before cognitive impacts can occur in children. They can and should do the same thing with respect to PFAS.

The study should take 7 years to complete. So this fiscal year 2021 NDAA will fund year 4.

The CDC study received \$7 million in fiscal year 2018, \$10 million in fiscal year 2019, \$10 million in fiscal year 2020, and there is \$10 million currently in the fiscal year 2021 NDAA amendment. Senator SHAHEEN's amendment would increase it to \$15 million. It would accelerate our ability to find these critical answers that affect the health and safety of the American people and are particularly associated with military bases all across the country, which means in every one of our States.

We all recognize the urgent need for the CDC to better understand the toxic effects of PFAS chemicals on the human body, and supporting this amendment will accomplish just that.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Once again, I commend Senator SHAHEEN for her work in developing this amendment with respect to PFAS, and I commend Senator CORNYN and his colleagues for working very, very diligently and perceptively about building up our industrial base in order to produce microchips so we will be the leader in the world and not the follower.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as the Senate knows, this week we will complete our work on the 60th National Defense Authorization Act—actually, 60 years in a row. For decades, this legislation has provided the opportunity for us to take stock of the evolving threat landscape and ensure that our national defense is prepared to meet the challenges on the horizon.

As technological advancements have changed battlefield tactics, each year's NDAA has allowed us to invest in a modernized force and advanced weapons. As risks in cyber space emerged as a new vector for warfare, this legislation has allowed us to invest in resilient networks and a talented workforce.

As the global order has shifted, this annual bill has given us the opportunity to identify the greatest threats to our country and to take strategic action. This year's national defense authorization bill is no exception. It continues to invest in a modernized national defense that is critical to maintaining peace through strength.

That is something we need to remember, which Ronald Reagan taught all of us. Weakness is provocative. Bullies look for opportunities to take advantage of weakness. It is strength in our leadership, particularly with our military, that helps us maintain the peace.

This bill also devotes resources to regain our competitive advantage over our greatest opponents to freedom and democracy today, including China and the Communist Party. In my lifetime, China has gone from a poor and isolated country to now accounting for nearly 20 percent of the global gross domestic product. But China's economic muscle isn't the reason it tops America's watch list. The Chinese Communist Party's ruling strategy can best be described as "win at all costs," and, sadly, the victims of that strategy are often the Chinese people themselves.

On the Senate floor yesterday, I spoke about some of the latest human rights violations by the Communist Party in China—their recent move to erode the freedoms and autonomy of Hong Kong, their efforts to silence and punish protesters who dare to speak out against the Chinese Communist Party, their ongoing ethnic cleansing campaign targeted at the Uighur people.

China continues to demonstrate a complete lack of respect for basic human rights and dignities, and I remain concerned by the growing threat they pose to the world order, including the United States of America.

Attorney General Bill Barr recently gave a speech about the challenges posed by an increasingly powerful, wealthy, and relentless China. It is a great speech, which I commend to you. It provides an impressive overview of how the Communist Party manipulates American businesses and industries, steals intellectual property, surveils and censors its own people, and seeks to exert its power and influence in the United States.

For those who are unfamiliar with the modern relationship between the United States and China and the risks and vulnerability this creates, I highly recommend reading the speech of the Attorney General. In that speech, he discusses the threats posed by the Communist Party's Made in China 2025 initiative, which seeks to achieve Chinese dominance in high-tech manufacturing. For everything from electric cars to advanced robotics, to artificial intelligence, China wants to lead global production.

While this is framed as a way to reduce the dependence on foreign technology and strengthen domestic manufacturing, these ambitions paint an alarming picture for the United States and our allies.

As the Attorney General noted, it is clear that the People's Republic of China seeks not merely to join the ranks of other advanced industrial economies but to replace them altogether.

Before any piece of technology becomes usable for its audience, it includes parts, pieces, and materials that come from, literally, all over the world. Regardless of where that final product is assembled and packaged, each of those individual pieces are the key to protecting the supply chain that creates our most valuable assets.

If the COVID-19 virus taught us anything, it has given us a clear picture of how vulnerable our unsecured supply chains are. We lean heavily on China—too heavily—for things like masks, gloves, gowns, ventilators—all the equipment for which the need was skyrocketing earlier this year.

As a result of the fact that the world was dependent on China to produce this critical equipment, hospitals reached dangerously low levels of personal protective equipment. In the meantime, China refused to disclose to the rest of the world that the virus had indeed broken out in its country so that it could, in fact, hoard the personal protective equipment they knew the rest of the world would need.

As a result of the lack of a secure supply chain, healthcare workers were using a single mask throughout an entire shift, putting both themselves and patients at risk. This has been a wake-up call—or should have been a wake-up call—on supply chain vulnerabilities and a reminder that we need to take action today to secure our supply chains for tomorrow.

One of the biggest of these vulnerabilities we are facing today is a lack of

domestic semiconductor manufacturing. These chips are everywhere in almost every product. They are the underlying technology in everything from our cell phones and towers to computers, to precision agriculture, to missile defense systems.

As you can imagine, as technologies have become more sophisticated in recent years, the demand for high-end semiconductors has skyrocketed. In fact, U.S. companies command 47 percent of the global market of these integrated circuit chips. But when it comes to manufacturing, we are falling further and further behind.

Since 2000, the United States has dropped from producing roughly a quarter of the world's semiconductors to only 12 percent, and you need only one guess as to which country stepped up to manufacture these critical devices. You guessed right. It is China.

In the same period, China has gone from manufacturing zero chips to 16 percent of the world's supply and plans on investing another \$1.4 trillion in semiconductor technologies.

America has lost ground to our global competitors, and unless we take action, it is estimated that by 2030, 83 percent of the global semiconductor manufacturing capacity will be not here but in Asia.

We need to bring those manufacturing jobs back to the United States and provide end-to-end security in our semiconductor supply chain.

Of course, that is much easier said than done. Building a new foundry, which is where these semiconductors are manufactured, is very expensive and, quite frankly, will not happen without an investment from the Federal Government. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development estimates that 21 major semiconductor firms across a number of countries receive more than \$50 billion in government support between 2014 and 2018.

Some of these countries investing in manufacturing of these technologies were South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Ireland, Germany, and, you guessed it, China. If we are going to regain lost ground in semiconductor manufacturing and secure one of our most critical supply chains, it is going to take a strategic investment, and that is exactly where the CHIPS for America Act will deliver.

Senator WARNER, the distinguished Democratic Senator from Virginia, and I have introduced legislation to restore American leadership in semiconductor manufacturing and ensure long-term national security and economic competitiveness. We worked hand in hand with our colleagues, Senator COTTON from Arkansas and Senator SCHUMER from New York, in drafting the amendment before the Senate that we will vote on this evening. It is truly a bipartisan product.

It achieves that goal by creating a Federal incentive program through the Department of Commerce to encourage

semiconductor manufacturing right here in the good old USA. In short, it would stimulate domestic advanced semiconductor manufacturing and boost both our national security and global competitiveness. It will enable us to bring manufacturing of these critical devices back onto American soil and eliminate this critical national security and economic vulnerability.

As I mentioned, these chips are literally everywhere. Many of you have them in your pockets right now or on your wrists. Semiconductors are the foundational technology for our military systems, our critical infrastructure, our telecommunications, healthcare, agriculture, and manufacturing. We want these devices to run on made-in-America semiconductors.

As we conclude our work on the National defense authorization bill, I am glad the Senate has the opportunity to vote on this legislation as an amendment. I am grateful to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman INHOFE, and Ranking Member REED for making sure that happens. This legislation supports a critical goal of the National Defense Authorization Act and our national defense strategy, which is strategic competition with China. That is where we are right now.

It prioritizes advancements in the critical technologies that will modernize our national defense and restore our competitive edge, all while allowing us to secure our most critical supply chains.

I hope our colleagues will all join me in supporting this legislation so that we can reclaim American leadership in semiconductor manufacturing, so we can support American jobs, and so we can invest in both a strong national security and our economy.

AMENDMENT NO. 2244

(Purpose: To restore American leadership in semiconductor manufacturing by increasing federal incentives in order to enable advanced research and development, secure the supply chain, and ensure long-term national security and economic competitiveness.)

Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 2244 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2244.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today with deep sorrow and strong determination.

I am feeling deep sorrow over the loss of one of our Nation's great moral leaders and a dear friend of mine, Congressman John Lewis.

As anyone who had ever met John knows, he was incredibly kind. He was a man who had seen so much of our Nation's history and written so much of our Nation's history, and yet he still treated everybody with dignity and respect. I have been honored to serve alongside him in the House and to become his friend.

He was so supportive of me when I decided to run for the U.S. Senate. In fact, I will never forget how knowing that he believed in me helped give me the courage to jump into a race against an incumbent Senator.

I am grieving the loss of my friend.

I am also determined. Congressman Lewis dedicated his entire life to the fight for justice and equality. I am determined to do everything I can to do my part to ensure that his life's work continues.

John Lewis came from very humble beginnings. He was one of 10 children of Willie Mae and Eddie Lewis, who worked as sharecroppers. Making a living off the land has always been hard, but it was even harder in the 1940s in the Deep South, where racism and discrimination were as relentless as the Alabama Sun.

Faith in God was essential, and John had that faith in abundance. As a child, he wanted to be a preacher, and he certainly could have been. From reading Bible verses to the family chickens as a child to speaking alongside Dr. King at the March on Washington at just 23 years old, to his message at the 55th anniversary of Selma earlier this year, John had a preacher's ability to inspire all of us.

Like a preacher, John knew that words alone aren't enough. When words come from the pulpit on Sunday and then they show up on the street on Tuesday, that is when the change really happens. John Lewis certainly showed up over and over and over again. He sat down at lunch counters. He sat in the front of buses. He spent his 21st birthday in jail after blocking the entrance to a theater that refused to sell tickets to people who look like him.

He was arrested more than 40 times, beaten by Klansmen, and nearly killed marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

He never stopped showing up and causing "good trouble." Just 6 weeks before he died, he stopped by the Black Lives Matter Plaza here in Washington, DC. It was the last time he was seen in public.

Time and again, John Lewis put his life on the line in order to protect people's fundamental rights, including the right to vote. John knew that words alone can never be enough, and we have to be willing to take action.

Late last year, the House passed the Voting Rights Advancement Act. It would restore section 5 of the Voting Rights Act that was overturned by the Supreme Court in 2013. For 228 days, this important bill has been gathering dust on Leader MCCONNELL's desk—228 days of inaction.

Senator LEAHY is reintroducing the bill in the Senate as the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill. It is time to pass it and get it signed into law in Congressman Lewis's honor.

At the 55th anniversary of Selma in March, John reminded us what is at stake. He said this:

We were beaten, we were tear-gassed. I thought I was going to die on this bridge. But somehow and some way, God almighty helped me here.

He added this:

I'm not going to give up. I'm not going to give in. We're going to continue to fight. . . . We must use the vote as a nonviolent instrument or tool to redeem the soul of America.

I have seen the soul of America, and that soul looks a lot like my friend, John Lewis. I urge us to take up the Voting Rights Act in John's name and to pass it as soon as possible and ensure that his legacy lives on.

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. DURBIN. Madam 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—H.R. 1044

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, a few steps from the Senate Chamber, at my whip's office, on the credenza behind my desk, is a framed government document. It is my mother's naturalization certificate. She was an immigrant to this country. She was brought here at the age of 2 from Lithuania. She lived long enough to see me being sworn in to the U.S. Senate. I am proud of the fact that I stand here today as the son of an immigrant. That is my story. It is my family's story. It is America's story.

I believe immigration has made America the Nation that it is today. Immigrants are an integral part of our economy, our culture, and our soul.

In the midst of this deadly coronavirus pandemic, we should never forget that 1 in 6 healthcare and social service workers—that is 3.1 million people out of 18.7 million—is an immigrant. They risk their lives every day in the midst of this pandemic for the good of this Nation. Immigrants are playing this critical role in the battle against COVID-19. Yet our broken immigration laws do not allow many of them to fulfill their dreams of finally becoming Americans.

Thousands of immigrant workers, including many health workers, are suffering because of a serious problem in our immigration system—the green card backlog. What is a green card? A green card is our immigration ticket. If you are here as a temporary worker, a green card or legal permanent resident status allows you to remain in the United States without having fear of

deportation and to be on a path toward permanent citizenship in the United States.

Green cards are critical in the lives of so many who are here on temporary and work visas. The backlog in this system puts families at risk of losing their immigration status, as they wait year after weary year to finally make it through this green card backlog, and it stops their ability, many times, to participate in the fight against COVID-19 and to work toward building our economy.

Under the current law, there are not nearly enough immigrant visas—also known as green cards—available each year. The current numbers for 140,000 EB immigrant visas were established in 1990—30 years ago. The American economy has doubled, but the number of green cards has remained the same. As a result, immigrants are stuck in a crippling backlog year after year after year. Close to 5 million future Americans are in line, waiting for these green cards. Many are working in the United States on temporary visas while many are waiting overseas and are separated from their families. Only 226,000 family green cards and 140,000 employment green cards are available each year.

The backlogs are a real hardship on these families who are caught in this immigration limbo. For example, the children in many of these families age out and face deportation. How does this happen? Well, those applying for the green cards also list their spouses and children. If they have to wait a long period of time and the children reach the age of 21, they are no longer protected by the parent's efforts to obtain the green cards, and they can be deported at any time. For many children who age out and face deportation as they reach the age of 21, it is a family disaster.

The solution to this green card backlog is eminently clear to anyone who looks at it: Increase the number of green cards. The number that might have made sense 30 years ago makes no sense today.

The senior Senator from Utah, Senator LEE, with whom I have worked on previous legislation, has introduced S. 386, known as the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, to address this issue. I have a basic concern with this bill, and I have told Senator LEE. S. 386 adds no additional green cards, and without additional green cards, S. 386 will not reduce the backlog or the wait.

Here is what the Congressional Research Service says about Senator LEE's legislation. To all of those following this debate, don't take my word for it; read the Congressional Research Service's study that was released on March 26, 2020, entitled the "Employment-Based Immigration Backlog." What does it write about Senator LEE's bill? It writes:

S. 386 would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law. . . . The total backlog for all three categories [of employ-

ment visas] would increase from an estimated 915,497 individuals currently to an estimated 2,195,795 individuals by FY2030. These outcomes would occur whether or not S. 386 is enacted [and here are the operative words] because the bill maintains the current limit on the number of green cards issued.

That is the bottom line. If you don't change the number of green cards and 5 million people are in the queue, waiting for 140,000 employment green cards and 226,000 family green cards, you understand the math.

Despite my concerns that S. 386 would not work as intended, I agreed to sit down with Senator LEE and work in good faith to resolve our differences. Last December, we reached an agreement on an amendment to his bill that addressed many of these concerns.

I want to be clear. This amendment was far from perfect and not what I would have written. The biggest problem is that it still does not increase the number of green cards. As a result, it would not eliminate the backlog. But it has made a substantial improvement to his original bill.

Here is how it reads:

It protects immigrants and their families who are stuck in the backlog. Immigrant workers and their immediate family members would be allowed to "early file" [a provision that Senator LEE suggested and I accepted] for their green cards. They would not receive their green cards early, but they would be able to switch jobs and travel without losing immigration status.

I thought that was fair. Early filing adds a critical protection that was not in the original Lee S. 386. It prevents the children of immigrant workers from aging out of green card eligibility so that they will not face deportation while they are waiting for green cards.

Our agreement also included a green card set-aside for immigrant workers who were stuck in the backlog overseas. The amendment would reserve 4,600 green cards on an annual basis for immigrant workers who would not be eligible for early filing because they would be outside the United States. This number is based on the approximate number of people who apply for employment green cards from overseas each year.

Finally, our agreement would crack down on the abuse of H-1B temporary work visas. I thought this was going to be an easy provision. It has turned out to be the real problem in this bill, and let me tell you why. The amendment prohibits companies from hiring additional H-1B workers if the companies' workforces have more than 50 employees and if more than 50 percent are temporary workers. This 50-50 rule is from the bipartisan H-1B reform bill that I offered with Senator GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa. This provision was included in the comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I voted for and which passed in the Senate. Senator LEE has said, "This is a common-sense reform to root out abuse."

When most people think of the H-1B visa, they think of well-known compa-

nies—Microsoft, Google—that hire top-notch professionals at top dollar when no American is available. That is how the program was supposed to work, but the reality is different. In fact, the top recipients of H-1B visas are outsourcing companies that use loopholes in the law to exploit immigrant workers and even 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. The vice president of one of them, Tata—one of the leading firms—candidly acknowledged that it uses H-1Bs to exploit immigrant workers.

He said:

Our wage per employee is 20-25 percent lesser than the U.S. wage for a similar employee. . . . The issue is that of getting workers in the U.S. on wages far lower than local wage.

It is important to understand that the vast majority of immigrant workers in the backlog in the United States is on an H-1B temporary work visa. So if we want to stop the future exploitation of immigrant workers and the displacement of American workers, we have to stop the abuse of H-1B visas.

Back in December, I asked my Democratic colleagues to support this bipartisan agreement that Senator LEE and I reached. They all agreed. I told Senator LEE that I wanted to move immediately to solve this problem. There were so many people whose lives were tied up in this debate. However, Senator LEE asked me for more time to discuss it with his colleagues. I agreed.

In March, 3 months later, Senator LEE told me he wanted to make significant changes in the agreement, and he said that without these changes he could no longer support it.

Some of the changes were made at the request of the Trump administration, which I will note is not exactly the most reliable or objective source on advice on immigration. Let me briefly explain the changes Senator LEE demanded.

The original version of Senator LEE's bill provides that no individual who had already been approved for a green card would receive the green card at a later time than they otherwise would have. This provision, known as a hold harmless clause, is a critical protection that assures immigrants who have been waiting years, patiently, in line that nothing we do on the floor will change the number of years they have to wait—perhaps improve them but not make them worse.

Now, at the request of the Trump administration, Senator LEE wants to delete this hold harmless provision which was in his original bill. That would jeopardize many people who are innocently waiting patiently for their opportunity.

Second, Senator LEE wants to delay for 3 years the effective date of the 50-50 rule to crack down on outsourcing companies.

Why on Earth would we give companies that are outsourcing American

jobs and exploiting immigrant workers a free pass for 3 more years?

Third, at the request of the Trump administration, Senator LEE wanted to make two changes that would allow early filing for people who are stuck in the green card backlog. He would delay early filing for 1 year—1 more year for children to age out; 1 more year for them to wait. Why?

That means that any children who age out in the meantime lose their chance for a green card and will be subject to deportation.

He would also require that immigrant workers could only “early file” after their green card petition had been approved for 2 years—a 2-year delay on top of a 3-year delay. Any children who had aged out during this new 2-year waiting period would not be protected and would also be subject to deportation.

Why is Senator LEE—or at least those in the Trump administration advising him—so afraid that these children might have a future in America?

When we met in March, I told Senator LEE these changes were not acceptable. It has now been 7 months since Senator LEE and I reached our original agreement and more than 4 months since we met in March. Immigrants who are stuck in the backlog and their children have waited long enough.

I am now going to ask unanimous consent on my agreement with Senator LEE from December 2019—the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, as amended by the Lee substitute amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044, Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, and 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?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I am a little flabbergasted at this moment, when I find myself in a rare circumstance of disagreeing with literally every word uttered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois. He is my friend. He and I have worked together on a number of issues—criminal justice reform, protecting the civil liberties of Americans when it comes to domestic surveillance, all kinds of things on the Judiciary Committee.

I disagree with nearly every single word, every syllable he just uttered. I find myself wondering whether we experienced alternate universes in recent months.

I have worked nearly the entire time I have been in the U.S. Senate on this issue—for years, nearly 9½ years, on

discrete pieces of legislation, trying to fix immigration. Immigration is a big issue. It is a contentious issue. It is an issue as to which, to put it mildly, there is not always bipartisan consensus. It is one of the areas that I have concluded remains open and possible for bipartisan agreement, is on taking discrete, individual problem areas within our immigration code and updating them and modernizing them.

So what we are talking here today about is a bill that I have long championed, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. My sole purpose for championing that legislation—frankly, at great personal expense to myself, at great political expense—was to bring some equity to a system that unduly burdens some immigrants based on their country of origin and based, specifically, on the arbitrary factor of the population of the nation of origin of the immigrant in question.

There has been a lot of misinformation at both ends of the political spectrum, at every point in between, about this legislation. It has been attacked from the right, from the left, from everywhere else. A lot of people claim falsely that it would change the total number of green cards available. It wouldn't, as Senator DURBIN just acknowledged. That is one of the few things that he said just now with which I think I can agree.

But over the years, we have had a number of Senators objecting to this for different reasons. Every time we resolve one objection—sometimes we will resolve two objections, and then one other will pop up. Then we will resolve that one, and three others will pop up. We have been doing this for years and years, and I have worked in good faith with colleagues on both sides of the aisle in order to resolve those concerns.

Now, most recently, Senator DURBIN objected to it. Just as I have with each objector before him, I worked with Senator DURBIN last fall in order to resolve some of his concerns with the legislation.

In December, as he states, we came to an agreement. We came to an agreement on a way that we could move forward. We set some objectives, and he accurately characterized many of those objectives. What I told Senator DURBIN at the time was that I was reluctant to announce that publicly because we hadn't yet made or received a request or a response to our request for technical assistance and input from the affected agencies—most importantly, from the State Department and from USCIS.

At the time, Senator DURBIN requested that we go to the floor; that we introduce it. I, reluctantly, and perhaps against my better judgment, agreed to do that, in part based on the fact that Senator DURBIN was taking a lot of heat at the time. People were saying that he was opposed to the idea categorically, and I wanted to work with him in good faith to do it.

At the time we had that discussion—at the time the Senator and I made

that agreement—I made absolutely abundantly clear we still needed to get technical input, and we still needed to get the input of cosponsors of the legislation.

But out of consideration for the Senator and a lot of the political heat you were taking at the time, I agreed, with that understanding, to go to the floor and announce that we had reached an agreement in principle.

I have honored every single piece of that agreement in principle, and I strongly resent your suggestion to the contrary—every single piece of it. There is not one substantive piece of this as to which I have changed—not one of them, not the 50–50 rule, not the 4,600 set-aside, not the early filing.

The changes that we made were in response to the technical assistance request that we made to USCIS and a couple from the State Department. They had almost entirely to do with what was feasible, what was administratively possible to implement the legislation. After all, we don't want to enact legislation that cannot be implemented without compromising the other responsibilities that that agency has.

So after seeking this feedback, we understood that the language, as written, was, in some respects, technically not feasible for USCIS to implement as we had written it. But, here again, I told him: We inevitably will have to make some modifications based on the feasibility of this.

So I went back to Senator DURBIN, and in light of the USCIS comments and the response to our request for technical assistance from USCIS, we made some changes. I went back to Senator DURBIN. My recollection is that it was in February. You say March. I believe it was February. But regardless, I came back to you, and I told you: We are honoring the agreement. We are going to have to delay the implementation of some of it so as to make it technically feasible.

Some of these provisions were modified somewhat as to the timing of their implementation, but we honored the spirit and the letter of our agreement.

And yet, when we presented these changes to Senator DURBIN, he flatout rejected them, almost without any discussion at all and almost without any discussion about how these materially departed from the agreement we had reached in December in good faith that we announced the existence of on the Senate floor, against my better judgment, out of the goodness of my heart, given the amount of political pressure Senator DURBIN was getting on this. And he refused, at that point, to continue negotiations.

This, by the way, was after months and months of trying to get him to negotiate; months and months of trying to get him to the table that we reached, finally, in December.

So I find it astounding. If the Senator is, once again, feeling the political expediency to do so, I am happy to continue these discussions with him, but

don't come here and suggest falsely, as he just has, that I have materially departed from the agreement we reached because I did not.

Now, I hope that he is as willing as I am to allow businesses a window of time to come into compliance with the new 50-50 rule so that we don't unnecessarily burden the H1-B workers who are already here. That is what my changes do, is make it so we don't unduly burden those.

I hope the Senator is as willing as I am to extend the transition period before the per-country caps are fully lifted to allow immigrants from around the world the opportunity to ease into the process.

I hope he is willing, as I am, to tackle one major immigration problem at a time in the hope of improving the condition of immigrants in our country without insisting on poison pills.

If there is one thing we have learned about immigration reform in recent years is that if you try to reform everything at once, you will guarantee the failure of the bill. I hope that is not what you are trying to do here, but that is the effect it has when you try to add in other extraneous points.

Never, by the way, was there ever a discussion about increasing the total number of visas in this. That was never the objective. I never hinted at that. You acknowledged that in every one of our discussions.

If you are interested in these principles, as I am, we should be able to find a path forward because all of these changes—all the changes we made to our agreement—were simply made out of expediency in order to be able to ensure that the legislation could, in fact, move forward; that it was feasible to implement; that it could resolve the concerns that you expressed to me and could do so in a manner to ensure the best possible outcome.

If Senator DURBIN can agree on these changes, we can pass this legislation. We can pass it not just today, we can pass it right now, this very moment. I call on him to do so.

If the Senator feels he can work with these changes, I am happy to do that as well.

As I said in February, my door is open, and I am always willing to talk about these things with the Senator if he is willing to work with me.

So I ask that the Senator modify his request to withdraw the amendment at the desk and include my new amendment, which is at the desk, the amendment be considered and 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. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me say to Senator LEE, the changes he came back with were significant.

Removing the hold harmless provision, to me, is fundamentally unfair to

anyone who has been waiting patiently for a green card. Why would the Senator jeopardize anyone and make them wait even longer for a green card? That was one of the modifications he suggested.

The two other modifications the Senator suggested delayed protection for children that left them subject to deportation for 2 to 3 years. Why would we do that? We both agree that is a terrible outcome. That was one of his modifications as well.

As far as the 50-50 rule, listen, I believe that is what is driving this conversation. These outsourcing companies make a bundle of money, and there are people who want to keep them in business and making money, even at the expense of American workers, and I think that is wrong. I really do.

I can't believe that that is what is really going to stop us now at this point, to try to protect these outsourcing companies for 3 years before this provision affects them.

As far as what we can do here today, I think what I am going to offer next is going to be the simplest thing we can achieve and maybe more at a later date. But let us protect the children. That is the next thing I am going to offer.

Let us protect the children and make sure that as they are waiting in line, they can't age out and be deported. That is not an unreasonable request.

So I am going to refuse to agree to the modification, but I will offer protection for the children next, and I hope—let's agree on that today and continue the rest of the discussion beyond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, look, the hold harmless issue was taken care of with the 3- to 9-year transition. That is why we made the 3- to 9-year transition, was to take care of the hold harmless provision.

Now, if the Senator wants to negotiate the terms of that, we can talk about that right now. We can resolve that right now. But make no mistake, the Senator is fundamentally changing and altering the terms of what we agreed to, and he is accusing me of, fundamentally, materially, changing the terms of the agreement, when all I have done is what we agreed to in December.

What the Senator is suggesting here is a deviation from what is possible. I can't agree to what is not possible, to what contravenes what USCIS has said it is capable of implementing. On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have a few minutes more to close this debate. I ask forbearance of those who are prepared for the 4 p.m. vote. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am sorry we were unable to reach an agreement today.

The proposal which I am about to make, called the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, simply ensures that children will not age out in this process.

How many times do parents come to me with tears in their eyes saying: Don't hurt my child.

Here is our chance, as we work out all the other issues, to take care of this one provision. It would not increase the number of green cards. It does not get into the other issues we have debated. I ask the Senator to please, for the sake of these children, give them the protections, and let us continue to try and negotiate the other provisions.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill, the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, which is at the desk; that the bill be considered read three times and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it should have been brought forward. We would have loved to have considered it. I haven't seen it yet. My staff saw it for the first time earlier today. I would love to have a look at it.

This is something that could have been brought up at any moment in the last six or seven months, or the last year. I would be happy to look at it now, but I can't agree to pass something that I have not seen. So, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the interest of the moment, I cannot offer my third amendment, but I will say this: It will be back. This is a chance to do something for the children. It is very simple. You know what it is. Let's do this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I could not agree more. We should do this. I could not agree more that we need to eliminate the outdated, outmoded Elvis Presley era immigration provision that discriminates against individuals on the basis of their country of origin, on the basis of the population of the country in which they were born.

There are reasons why immigration policy is a contentious one. There were reasons why previous efforts have

failed, and it always has to do with the fact that people tend to pile on. They get desperate. It is hard for us to reform the immigration code. When somebody suggests 1 reform, others suggest 10 more, and, before long, it chokes the horse. You can't move forward with it.

This one is focused on a very simple concept, that regardless of how many visas we issue, regardless of how many green cards we issue, there are a lot of ways to allocate the number that we have. Let's start with the number we have and figure out whatever reasons ought to influence that decision. Among them should not be the country in which you were born.

Imagine two hypothetical would-be employment-based green card recipients who are otherwise eligible. Immigrant A and B are identical in all respects—in their employment qualifications, their education, proficiency in English, and every meaningful characteristic except one. Immigrant A happens to be born in Luxembourg and immigrant B happens to have been born in India. Because India has a large population and Luxembourg has a small population, the immigrant from India is going to be discriminated against.

It is senseless and based on a bygone era in which immigration policy didn't make sense by today's standards. We ought to be able to get around that.

I agree with Mr. DURBIN that we should pass this right now. There is no reason not to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 1729

Mr. INHOFE. I call up amendment No. 1729 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 1729 to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention relating to perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substance contamination in drinking water)

At the end of subtitle B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . . . INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR STUDY BY CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION RELATING TO PERFLUOROALKYL AND POLYFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCE CONTAMINATION IN DRINKING WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCREASE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense Wide for SAG 4GTN for the study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under section 316(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91; 131 Stat. 1350) is hereby increased by \$5,000,000.

(2) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2021 for Operation and Maintenance, Army for

SAG 421, Servicewide Transportation is hereby reduced by \$5,000,000.

(b) INCREASE IN TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Section 316(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91; 131 Stat. 1350), as amended by section 315(a) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232; 132 Stat. 1713), is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 60-affirmative vote threshold with respect to the Shaheen amendment No. 1729 be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. For the information of all Senators, it is my understanding that we should be able to adopt the amendment by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1729) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2244

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—96

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

NAYS—4

Lee
Paul
Shelby
Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 4.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

S. 4049

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, right now, we are in the middle of what I have referred to several times as what I consider to be the most significant bill of the year, the National Defense Authorization Act—one that you can almost be sure will pass. This will be the 60th consecutive year it has passed. That is a pretty good indication it is going to pass.

That comes with problems, however. People know that a bill is going to pass, so you get a lot of pieces of legislation that had not been able to get passed, and it may be a whole year, and it becomes a part of this bill. It is more than just the Defense authorization bill, but it is the most significant one.

Before we even came to the floor, we did something that we have been working on now—at least I know personally—for 4 years, and that is to put ourselves in a position where just in case we find ourselves where we can't get amendments—all it takes is one person to object, and there will be no amendments if this happens. We decided to go ahead and put this bill together and do it in such a way that the Members are actually drafting the bill. We have 700 Member items.

You might remember that back in January, we started talking about this, saying: If you want to have an amendment in the Defense authorization bill, even though it is not going to become effective until a year from December, you better get down there and do it because now is the time you can get that done. Well, we ended up with 700 Member items, and that was before we even got to the floor, and then more were added. We added another 140 amendments after that.

You can say that this bill was passed by you—I am talking about the Members, Democrats and Republicans—in the Chamber because these items all came out of it. We didn't do it the way it used to be done. We kind of eased into this, but it has worked very well. I commend Liz and John for the work they do in holding everyone together in making this a reality.

Where we are right now is, we have had a lot of our Members coming to the floor. My staff and I are continuing to work on the inclusion of additional amendments. If you will recall, 2 weeks ago, when we took a break for the Fourth of July, we agreed upon some legislation, some amendments that would be a part of this. They are all structured right now. We have already passed two—actually, passed four today. We have another bunch of amendments, including a managers' package. It was hotlined today, just today. We don't have the results of that yet. People may have objected to it, and I am just not aware—apparently, there have been some objections. I don't know what the count is. We will

keep trying to get as many amendments as possible. My experience is that this means we are nearing the end of the road.

I would have to say this about my partner in this effort—he has been my partner for a number of years, JACK REED, on the minority side. We have both worked hand in glove in trying to get as many amendments as possible, and we have set a record this year with either amendments or letters from Members.

I am going to do something that will make a bunch of people mad, but I don't really care. You hear so much negative stuff. I have said several times that when this President came in, up to the moment that we had the virus, we had the best economy we have had in my lifetime. All indications show that was true.

He did this in a way that was thought out, and it wasn't all a Republican idea. Back when John Kennedy was President of the United States, that is when they were expanding the Great Society. This is a quote. He said: We are going to have to have a lot more revenue to take care of the Great Society programs. The best way to increase revenue is to decrease marginal rates—marginal tax rates. And it worked. Unfortunately, he died right after that and could not see the benefits of the efforts of this great idea.

This was done again during the Bush administration. It was the first thing that was done by the Trump administration. But he did something different this time, and this is the reason that it produced much more revenue than the others had produced in years past. He said: We also need to reduce the regulations at the same time.

I am very sensitive to this because I chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee during the time the Republicans were in the minority. During the Obama administration, we had so many regulations, and that had to be changed.

Even the Chair is probably not aware that this is a regulation that was passed during the Obama administration, but it is one which said that if you are a domestic oil or gas company and you are in competition with China or somebody else, you have to give them your playbook—how you calculated your rates. That put them at a decided advantage.

When I was fortunate enough to get to know this President, prior to the time he took office, I was suggesting and he was saying: What would be a good place to start in reducing regulations?

I said: A good one would be to do away with that regulation that was passed.

I think it was only a week after he took office that we passed the first regulation. That is just one example. But then regulation after regulation after regulation—those of us who have grown up in the business world know that is what costs money. And liberals have never figured that out.

Anyway, this has happened. As a result of this, we have had really great benefits. I bring this up now because—put the Johnson family up. This is a family in Oklahoma. It is the Johnson family, Charlie Johnson. He has several brothers, and he has a son named Andrew. They are in the tree business. They find people who want to get rid of dead trees, unwanted trees, and they get rid of the trees. They are the best there are. They have been doing it now very competitively and doing it for years.

When he came to take a tree out during the 2 weeks—I am talking about less than 2 weeks ago—he said: We can do this, but I want to tell you that we are really busy now. In fact, our business is better than it has ever been in the history of our country. It is all because of what has happened with the President.

These are his words. He said: I know everybody hates the President. The media hates the President. But we love him, and let me tell you why. We are now doing better than we have ever done before. Our business is better than it ever has been.

He has a brother who specialized—when you are in the tree business, you specialize. If you look, you can't see the bucket, but the son is in the bucket. Another one is the guy who has developed a way of grinding stumps. Almost anyone can take a tree out, but to grind a stump, you have to have very expensive equipment.

A few days after I had seen these people, I got a visit by a guy named Brad Johnson. Brad is the one who specializes in stump grinding. He said: Our business is so good now—and they all credit the President with this—our business is so good that I decided I would go off on my own and buy a stump grinder. It is very, very expensive. No one ever thought it would be, but it is. Now I think he owns the only stump grinder in Delaware County in Oklahoma.

He said: I want you to do something. I know you will be going back to Washington. I am going to give you this, and I want you to give this to the President of the United States.

It says: "Brad's stump grinding." I am going to give this to the President of the United States and take his picture.

I only say all this to mention that good things are happening around here. Things had not been this good, except for the virus problem. No one had any control over that in terms of the President. When I stop and think about how good our economy was right before the virus hit, I think: If we had an average economy, where would we be today?

Anyway, that was the good news, and I was excited to tell them I was going to share this with a few other people.

Earlier today, I mentioned I would be coming down to the floor to talk about our troop basing in Germany. Those of us on the committee know we have been working on this for a long time.

Secretary of Defense Mark Esper was putting something together where he was going around and reevaluating our troop and asset distribution around the world. I disagree with some of the things he came up with.

Africa, for example, is an area where they are starting to have some very serious problems. If anything, it is going to end up taking more activity. Along with other Members, I will be receiving detailed briefings from the Department of Defense on plans to carry out the President's decision in the coming days and weeks.

Based on my conversation with Secretary Esper and the briefings I have received so far, the goal is to optimize our force posture in Europe, in part by moving some of our forces along NATO's eastern flank. It has always been in Western Europe. Going forward, as I think about the plan to realign our posture in Europe, I am thinking about the three guiding principles that I call the "3 Fs."

First is the forward presence—maintaining a strong presence in Europe that gives our troops what they need to deter Russia and, if necessary, to fight and win and defeat Russia. I like the idea of rotational forces in southeast Europe.

The second one is force protection. Really, force projection is more accurate. It is keeping strong, established bases for staging, air capacity, and more. For example, at Ramstein Air Force Base, we have invested quite a lot of money in that. It is going to work for any future use in readjustments that take place in Europe. What I am saying is a lot of things are going on in Europe that are going to be enhanced, as opposed to being transferred.

The third is families. This is kind of interesting. Take our Air Force in Tinker Air Force Base. There is a young lady who is the wife of a worker at Tinker Air Force Base. Her name is Janna Driver. This was 2 years ago. She told me that we have a problem at Tinker. When we privatized our housing, it worked out fine for a long period of time, but then it seemed to be that people got greedy in the housing. They talked about deplorable conditions in housing. I thought: My gosh, this is my home State of Oklahoma. Thank goodness it is just one military establishment.

Then I found out it was in all five of our military establishments. Then I found out it wasn't just in Oklahoma. It was around the world.

This is something that is very significant because when you look at the problems that they have with so many people—and I will be addressing this in a little more detail in a minute because of the amendment that will be before us tomorrow—the problem is that we do something different than other countries do. I have heard this over and over, and I am sure the Presiding Officer has also heard.

We talk about all the money we spend on defense in the United States,

and yet we spend more money than Russia and China put together. They are our strategic oppositions out there.

That is true because the most expensive part of the military is the people. People don't understand that. We want housing, and we want to make sure there are schools for the kids. We want to make sure all these things are going on. That is what costs the money. That is the reason.

If you are in a communist country, they give you a gun and say: Go out and kill people—and the problem is solved.

We are concerned about our families. They make a lot of sacrifices. Every few years, our families have to move, change locations, and the kids have to change schools. They move to another area. Then, if the spouse has a job, they have to try to get a job.

By the way, in this bill we have some help. We get relief from some of the regulations that normally take a long period of time, so that spouses are able to get a job at a new location. That is something a lot of people are not aware of that is in this great bill.

They have to change hometowns, change houses, change doctors, and the kids change schools. Of course, they live with the reality that their servicemember is putting their life on the line to defend our country. We have to be grateful and never take that sacrifice for granted. That is why we should be trying to ease the burden of our military families in everything we do.

When it comes to this plan we are talking about, which is changing the forces around, primarily in Europe, that is what you hear more about. It is important that we do it right and we do it right away. It is going to take some time to do, but we need to get started.

The reason I am really excited about this program is that this is not something new. If I have good memories, you might remember back when Gen. Jim Jones was the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO at that time. I had gone to him and said: You know, one thing we really need to be doing is to start readjusting where we have our troops.

At that time, we had a lot of troops, as we do today, in Germany and a lot of training was taking place there. But because of the environmental movement in Germany, they were giving us restrictions, saying you can only train with live ordnance maybe every 4 days a week and not past sunset and all of that.

We were thinking that we were really doing a great thing for Germany by stationing all our people over there because of all the money they spend and all that. Yet they are not really trying to help us.

We did some surveying. This is kind of funny because John Bonsell, the staff director of my committee on the Republican side, and I went over to the different countries—Bulgaria, Poland, and other different countries in that

part of the world, in the eastern part of Europe. We said: Are you willing to help us out? They said: Not only can you use your ordnances as much as you want, but at the same time, we will help billet you and all that.

The program was good and strongly supported by Gen. Jim Jones at that time.

We did all we could to put that together, and we were visiting our allies about it. We already had Ukraine, Bulgaria and Romania lined up. They call that the lily pad approach to basic. It was something that would work. There is no reason not to do that.

Unfortunately, President Bush decided he didn't want to do it. We were unsuccessful getting that done. I have been fighting about that with other Presidents since that time. I have not gotten any of them to look at that and the great values that would make for us.

Anyway, that is something that is taking place right now. We don't know, but we are going to get a Member briefing tomorrow that is going to give us a lot of details on what is going to happen and what the President is proposing in that area of Europe.

I want to speak about one of the amendments that is next up. Senator SANDERS' amendment would cut defense spending by 10 percent. I happen to be very close with Senator SANDERS, but we have areas where we disagree with each other. This is one of those areas. I looked at this, and I thought: He has an amendment that would cut defense spending by 10 percent.

First of all, this amendment would break the bipartisan budget agreement of 2019 that we passed. Congress passed this agreement last December with a bipartisan support, and the President signed it into law. The fiscal year 2021 NDAA, or National Defense Authorization Act—the bill that we are working on right now, as we speak—fulfills this agreement and provides a total of \$740.5 billion for our national defense. I would have preferred to see a higher number at that time, but it is now the law of the land.

Even though the amount is lower than ideal, having budgetary certainty is critical. It is what our military leaders ask for every time they come before the committee that I chair and before Senator SHELBY's committee. They need on-time, predictable, and stable funding to do their job. And their jobs are only getting harder right now. Our adversaries are investing in their militaries and building new and advanced weapons systems and acting more aggressively than we have ever seen before in any of our adversaries.

The national defense strategy describes this. This is a document, by the way, that we adhered to. This is put together by six Republicans and six Democrats. It is one of these things where it was bipartisan. Everyone agreed on it. People who put this together were experts, and we have followed it to the letter ever since that time.

This is the National Defense Strategy Commission report, which is a bipartisan document written by six Democrats and six Republicans. They tell us that we need to increase our defense budget each year. We already know we need to be increasing our budget just to stay competitive. We have already agreed to this total.

Now, one of the criticisms I hear of our defense budget is that we pay much more than other countries. As I have already explained, we are the ones who have to pay to take care of our people—our troops, their families, their kids. Here is the problem with that argument: Other countries don't have to do that.

Beyond the troops, we also take care of the families and all that, while others don't do that.

This is significant. China and Russia are rapidly modernizing their militaries. When I say this in public and I talk to groups, I don't have credibility. It doesn't sound like it is possible.

I don't say this critically of the Obama administration. The Obama administration, by his own admission, had other priorities. One of them wasn't a strong military. During the last 5 years—and I am talking about 2010 to 2015, during those last 5 years of using the President's budget, he decreased the amount of money for our military by 25 percent. In 5 years, he decreased it by 25 percent. At the same time, Russia increased theirs by 34 percent, and China increased theirs by 83 percent.

Stop and think about that. Our adversaries were out there building and getting ahead of us in different areas. It is important to note that the bill exempts military pay and the defense health program, which means this amendment is actually the equivalent to a 14-percent cut. I am talking about cuts in airplanes and equipment and assets that are military assets. This means the nuclear modernization and key research that help us stay competitive with Russia. This is something that arguably cannot be done.

It means cuts to military construction, including schools for military kids, programs that support military families, and programs that support our troops' morale and welfare. It is just plain wrong.

Our military combat commanders tell me and the committee that they need on-time, predictable, and stable funding to do their jobs. This amendment would actually cut that by 14 percent in the areas that concern people. In the strongest possible terms, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

All this is going to happen while we continue to face the burden that a pandemic has placed on our military. Our military is a key part of the whole-of-government response to the virus.

Our competitors haven't given us a free pass while this is all happening. In fact, we have seen China and Russia take advantage of this situation, and

they have been acting more aggressively. At the same time, the Department of Defense is working to protect our troops and the civilian workforce from the virus, and this needs to continue to be a top priority. Everyone understands that. In fact, rather than cutting the defense budget, we actually need to support the military COVID response with additional funding.

Take this one example. The defense industrial companies have done a great job to ensure that their suppliers—primarily thousands of small businesses—stay open and keep employees paid.

In the CARES Act, we gave the DOD the authority and the tools to reimburse these companies to keep the defense workforce strong, but the DOD needs money to use these tools. If we don't help these companies, defense weapons programs and maintenance will suffer more cost overruns, and the defense industrial base will lose experienced and trained workers, which means schedule delays will be more likely. These will be primarily the small companies. These will not be the giants that are out there.

This would be a good investment for our national defense and a good investment for the American taxpayer. Now is simply not the time to be cutting our defense budget when we should be doing more. I know the author of the bill who would cut defense spending by 10 percent is very sincere and really believes in his bill, but it is not the time to do it.

I hope people understand that we are now in a position wherein there are actually different resources that are in Russia and in China that are better than ours. Hypersonic weapons are a good example. Hypersonic weapons are kind of state-of-the-art in both offense and defense, and they are ahead of us. They are ahead of us right now.

With this budget we are going to be passing, I think that we are going to be making broad steps to recapture those areas in which we had previously been the leaders but now are not the leaders any longer.

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

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

STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT AND FAFSA
SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in March, Congress and the President said to 43 million student loan borrowers that, because of COVID-19, your student loan payments will be deferred until October 1—no monthly payments for 6 months for student loan borrowers.

October 1 is just around the corner. So what do we say to those 43 million student loan borrowers today? I propose that we say this:

No. 1, if there is no income, there is no monthly payment. In other words, if you have a student loan, your monthly payment is zero—if you don't have any income for whatever reason.

No. 2, when you do begin earning income, your monthly payment will never be more than 10 percent of your income after you deduct the necessities of life, such as the cost of housing—rent or mortgage—and food.

No. 3, the same generous loan forgiveness that exists today for student loan borrowers will still exist. After 20 years of payments for undergraduate loans and 25 years of payments for graduate loans, if you still have an outstanding loan balance, your loan will be forgiven, and that will include all of the months your payment was zero because you didn't have any income.

These same policies—no income, no monthly payment—will be offered to students who take out new loans in addition to these policies being offered to existing student loan borrowers.

Under my proposal, new and existing student loan borrowers will be offered one other option for paying back their loans. This option would be like a 10-year mortgage: Make equal principal and interest monthly payments over 10 years until the loan is paid off. Some borrowers may prefer this option because it could mean paying less interest. Every borrower would be eligible to switch from one option—the income-based payment—to the other option.

The remaining good news in this proposal is that the concurrent bewildering system of nine different ways of paying off your student loan would be thrown in the trash heap and replaced by these two straightforward proposals: No. 1, the income-based repayment option, and No. 2, the 10-year, mortgage-like option. These changes will give some peace of mind to the 43 million current borrowers and the tens of millions of Americans who are expected to sign up for new student loans over the next 10 years.

These ideas are neither new nor my ideas. They have been recommended by higher education experts numerous times when having testified before the Senate Education Committee during the past 6 years while we have considered reauthorizing the Higher Education Act. The concepts have also been suggested by many Senators on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, including Senators KING, BURR, RUBIO, MERKLEY, PORTMAN, WARNER, WICKER, MANCHIN, SHAHEEN, and COLLINS. All of them have suggested these concepts.

While we are simplifying the student loan repayment system, I propose that we also finish the job of reducing the Federal loan application of grants and loans—which everyone calls FAFSA—from about 108 questions to 20 to 33 questions. This is an enterprise that a number of us, both Democrats and Republicans, have been working on for years, including Senators MURRAY, BENNET, JONES, KING, COLLINS, WHITE-

HOUSE, GARDNER, CORNYN, STABENOW, TILLIS, and HASSAN. So, you see, there is an unusual amount of bipartisan support for both of these ideas.

Experts before the Senate Education Committee have testified that simplifying the FAFSA in this way would remove obstacles and would make it easier for more low-income Americans to attend college and would increase the number of Pell grants each year.

Last fall, Congress and the President took the first step in simplifying the FAFSA by allowing the Internal Revenue Service to answer 22 questions that applicants for grants and loans had already answered on their tax returns.

There are 20 million American families who struggle to fill out this essential but unnecessarily complex form each year who will be grateful to Congress if we will complete the job of simplifying the Federal aid application system at the same time we will make it simpler for 43 million Americans to pay back their student loans.

There is one more piece of good news in this proposal, and this news is for the American taxpayer. Simplifying the student loan repayment system, as well as the system for applying for student grants and loans, will save taxpayers about \$10 billion over 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. This is because the simpler system will also provide more certainty in the repayment of loans.

On October 1, 43 million Americans with student loans are going to have to restart making their monthly student loan repayments. Congress deferred student loan payments in March, as I said earlier, when the CARES Act—the COVID-19 relief bill—was signed into law, but that deferment expires on September 30. There has never been a more important time to end the maddening complexity of student loan repayment and make it simpler for Americans to pay off their student loans.

Let me briefly review how the Student Loan Repayment and FAFSA Simplification Act will work. It offers student loan borrowers just two options: the standard 10-year repayment plan, just like a mortgage, or the income-based plan that I have described. For borrowers with no income, if they choose an income-based repayment plan, their monthly payments would be zero. If borrowers in an income-based repayment plan earn income, the borrowers' monthly payments would be based on the amounts of those incomes.

Let's take an example. The average student loan for a 4-year college graduate today is about \$30,000. So someone with \$30,000 in student loan debt who makes \$52,000 each year would be expected to pay 10 percent of that borrower's discretionary income, which is about \$274 per month. So if you have a \$30,000 loan debt and you make \$52,000 a year, your monthly payment is going to be about \$274 under this plan. Borrowers under the plan would never have to pay more than 10 percent of

their income that is not needed for necessities.

If we don't pass this legislation before October 1, here is what will happen: Because of the confusing repayment system we have today, too many borrowers will end up in an unaffordable, standard 10-year repayment, mortgage-type plan and will have payments so high that they will find themselves in default. When we are through with this pandemic—when the economy improves and when these borrowers are ready to tackle their debts—they will find that their student loan debts may have soared out of control.

I and Senator MURRAY of Washington State, who is the ranking Democrat on our committee, have been working on reauthorizing the Higher Education Act for nearly 6 years. We have held 19 hearings over that time. We are making good progress. In fact, I was hopeful we could mark up the bill this spring, but between impeachment and COVID, that just didn't work out.

In January, I saw a consensus emerging. It was for simpler, effective regulations to make it easier for students to pay for college and to pay back their loans. We discussed the complexity of the Federal financial aid system. We heard from many experts. At one roundtable, the president of the University of Tennessee told me it took him months to figure out how to pay off his daughter's Federal student loan—this was from a college president—even with the money in his hand.

So this is not a new problem, and the solution I am proposing has been discussed by our committee and many Senators outside the committee for nearly 6 years. It will help both those who face loan payments starting on October 1 and the millions of students who will be graduating with student debt.

When it comes time to start repaying those loans, students will have to navigate through a complicated number of options today—nine in total. I don't want to go through them in detail because it would stagger the imagination. For example, there is the 10-year standard repayment. There is the graduated standard repayment. There are two extended repayment options. There are five different programs based on your income: the income-contingent repayment, the original income-based repayment, the revised income-based repayment, the pay-as-you-earn plan, and the revised pay-as-you-earn repayment. Those are all of the different ways you can pay off your student loans, which has confused the 43 million borrowers who have them.

Now, if I lost you wandering through that, you can get a sense of how those 43 million borrowers must feel.

The Student Loan Repayment and FAFSA Simplification Act ends that confusion. It will reduce those nine repayment plans down to two—one standard payment, like a mortgage, and one payment based on income.

In addition, the bill reduces the complexity for borrowers who wish to participate in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program, which creates an incentive for borrowers to pursue jobs in public service.

Today, not all of the nine current repayment plans are eligible for public loan forgiveness, and borrowers can have a hard time figuring out which plan to choose. Under this legislation, a borrower who wants loan forgiveness can't choose the wrong plan because there are only two and either applies, whether you choose the standard 10-year repayment plan or the income-based repayment plan.

By the end of September, in less than 3 months, 43 million student loan borrowers will be required by law to begin monthly payments again on their loans. Many of these borrowers won't be able to afford these payments.

I propose that we say to those borrowers: We have a better option for you. No income, no monthly payment—whether because of COVID-19 or for any other reason. In other words, if you have a student loan, you may defer your monthly payment if you do not have any income. When you do begin earning income, your monthly payment will never be more than 10 percent of your income after you deduct the necessities of life, such as the cost of housing—rent or mortgage—and food.

Now is the time to reduce the complexity of student loan debt and finish the job of simplifying the FAFSA and at the same time save the taxpayers money.

I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO S. 4220

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators CASEY, UDALL, SHAHEEN, KAIN, SMITH, SCHUMER, FEINSTEIN, CARDIN, WHITEHOUSE, LEAHY, TESTER, SCHATZ, CORTEZ MASTO, WARNER, and MENENDEZ be added as cosponsors to S. 4220, the Preventing Authoritarian Policing Tactics on America's Streets Act.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO AMENDMENT NO. 2457 TO S. 4049

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators STABENOW, CASEY, UDALL, SHAHEEN, KAIN, SMITH, SCHUMER, FEINSTEIN, CARDIN, WHITEHOUSE, LEAHY, TESTER, SCHATZ, CORTEZ MASTO, WARNER, and MENENDEZ be added as cosponsors to Senate amendment 2457 to reform the Department of Defense to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control to S. 4049, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 2457

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, when, in the course of time, America

should find a President in the Oval Office who chooses to bring the police tactics of dictators around the world to the streets of America, then that is the moment it is incumbent on every Member of this Chamber, who has sworn an oath to our Constitution, who is determined to practice civil rights of America, to stand up and say: Not now, not here, not ever, and we put an end to it.

That is why I brought forth this amendment—the Stop Secret Policing in America amendment—and ask for it to be debated on this bill, because it involves police powers, military powers of the United States of America, and it is happening right now.

What am I talking about? Well, let me give you some sense of what we have seen on the streets of America in the past few days—as I note here, authoritarian governments, not democratic republics, and unmarked authorities at the protests. Well, this is what we saw: Customs and Border Protection in military uniform, in combat camouflage, in the streets, no marking what the organization is and no unique identifier.

The head of the CBP said: No, no. They had markings and unique identifiers. But here they are. And to make it even worse, they look a whole lot like protesters from the far right who come to make trouble, dressed in camouflage, and they actually have things that look more like badges than the actual representatives of Customs and Border Protection.

What else did we see? Here is a Navy veteran standing in the street, who said he came down to the protest to simply say: Are you honoring your oath to the Constitution?

Here we have CBP officers beating him. Here is one baton. Here is another. They broke one of his bones, while this man here is pepper-sprayed in the face—a peaceful protester standing, being attacked by unmarked, war-prepared, dressed-in-camouflage forces deployed by the President of the United States.

What else happened? Well, they decided to not consult with the city and not consult with the State and not think carefully about what weapons they were carrying and how they use them, so impact munitions.

This protestor right here in the silhouette is standing, and he is holding what appears to be a sign above his head, or maybe it is a radio. Moments later in the video that shows this, he is shot down. You see him collapse on the street. A peaceful protestor, standing, making his case as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America, and he is shot square between the eyes by President Trump's forces deployed without permission and no coordination with the local representatives or the Governor of the State of Oregon. This young man, struck down, shot in the head, in the hospital in critical condition. He is doing better now, thankfully.

Then these forces deploy away from the Federal buildings and go into the

streets and start snatching protestors and throwing them into unmarked vans—vans like this one right here.

One young man said: I was terrified. He said: I didn't know who these people were. They wouldn't identify themselves. There is a video of people saying: Who are you all? And they won't answer. They grab him. He thinks they might be those folks from the right-wing protestors who come in camouflage. He may be being kidnapped. He doesn't know. Even after he is thrown into a jail cell, it is not explained why they grabbed him off the street.

Secret police—unmarked—patrolling streets, throwing people into unmarked vehicles, and sweeping them away—that is what you get from authoritarian dictators, not a country, a republic where we have a constitution and we have rights.

That is what is going on here. That is what has to stop here in America.

Some of the headlines: Federal law enforcement use unmarked vehicles to grab protestors off the streets. A Navy vet asked Federal officers in Portland to remember their oaths; they broke his hand.

That is the Navy vet in the white sweatshirt who is being attacked, with two officers batoning him while another sprays him with pepper spray for standing in a peaceful protest.

Federal officers deployed in Portland didn't have proper training, DHS says. Well, they shouldn't have been there.

We need a bill to stop secret police in America. We need a bill done as an amendment on this bill right now, on this bill we are considering about military force, a bill that says that your organization has to be identified on a uniform; that says there has to be a unique identifier so you don't think you can just get away with anything and abuse people and never be held accountable; a bill that says that if you are there on a mission to defend monuments or buildings, you defend monuments or buildings; you don't go out through the streets—if you want to become crowd control in the streets and take over a city, you have to have the permission of the mayor or the permission of the Governor; and that the Federal Government, in transparency, in our democracy, has to tell us all, as participants, as this we-the-people government, that they are disclosing how many people, from where, are being sent to what city.

This isn't just some small issue. This is the President saying yesterday—after bragging about what he has done in Portland to violate the rights of people—saying he is looking at New York and Chicago and Philadelphia and Detroit and Baltimore and Oakland—deploying these secret police tactics all over this country.

All I do right now is stand here and say: I want a vote on ending these secret police practices in America. I say to every Republican colleague and every Democratic colleague: I want a vote, and I am here in full partnership

with my colleague from Oregon who shares this indignation, this outrage over the violation of the Constitution, who will share those thoughts, and then we will, together, ask to have a vote.

What is this Chamber if it cannot take on and hold a debate and a discussion over authoritarian, secret policing strategies brought to the streets of America?

My colleague.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I thank my colleague this afternoon because he speaks today with passion and facts and clearly outlines what our constituents told us at home this past week, and I thank him for this partnership that Oregonians are seeing again on the floor of this great Senate.

Madam President, Donald Trump has deployed a paramilitary squad to our hometown in Portland. His secret police are terrorizing my friends and neighbors. People across the country need to understand that yesterday Donald Trump announced to America that your friends and your neighbors are next.

There are unmarked vans full of armed men in military gear snatching people off the streets. They take people away. They hold them. They interrogate them without justification and ultimately without charges.

Over the weekend, a very close personal friend, Sharon Meieran, an ER doctor and a mom, was protesting peacefully and was tear-gassed without provocation. She felt like she was seeing democracy pass right in front of her eyes.

Millions of Americans have seen the video of that local Navy veteran who was repeatedly beaten and pepper-sprayed and left with broken bones. People ask me: RON, what was his offense?

I am sure Senator MERKLEY gets exactly the same question: What did he do wrong?

He was standing motionless, hands by his side, speaking up for the liberty that he served to protect. People are stunned that this is happening on the streets of our hometowns. We have seen reports of agents ripping a mask off of a protester who is obeying commands, with hands in the air, only to pepper spray the protester's face. The secret police even threw flash bombs and tear gas at a "wall of moms." Here they are. Here they are in our hometown. You can see them, over the last couple of days: Moms and dads and now their kids are going to peacefully sing songs and protest for justice.

Oregonians are just standing up for what is right. Only the cowards of the Trump administration would try to convince America that these peaceful protesters, the "wall of moms," represent some kind of anarchist threat. It is nonsense.

I condemn violence by anybody—always—and I spent much of last week working for nonviolent solutions in my hometown and fresh approaches to re-

duce tensions on our streets. The fact is, the protests in Portland have been overwhelmingly peaceful. Crime in Portland and across Oregon was down before Donald Trump sent in his secret police.

Donald Trump did not send that paramilitary force to keep people safe. Donald Trump is doing it to create an image of chaos, to air it on far-right television, scare the country, turn them into campaign ads, but these are the people Senator MERKLEY and I are honored to represent. These are the people Donald Trump's paramilitary forces attacked and terrorized. He calls it a "great success." As we have indicated, he has a game plan to basically make Portland an experiment and to do it in other cities, especially, by his accounts, those with Democratic leadership and voters.

This kind of abusive exercise of power by a rogue President would have horrified our Founding Fathers. They wrote a wonderful Constitution to prevent exactly this behavior because democracy cannot survive in a nation that tolerates it. These tactics were used throughout the world a century ago to turn elected politicians into tyrants.

The President's first and most important job is to keep Americans safe. Residents of Portland are less safe and less secure since Donald Trump deployed the secret police to our streets. The same thing—and I say this to colleagues wherever you are from—the same things will happen in your communities where Donald Trump will send his paramilitary forces.

Frankly, when Donald Trump always talks about targeting Portland and other cities, I say to Senator MERKLEY, I wish he would target the coronavirus. I wish he would put a fraction of his passion for going after our cities into dealing with the coronavirus because while Donald Trump's secret police are out terrorizing Portland's moms and doctors and other peaceful protesters, we face a raging pandemic and record-high unemployment.

I want us to renew the supercharged unemployment benefits that people are going to lose this weekend. Donald Trump isn't doing any of that work. What he is doing is making Americans in cities less safe and not dealing with the coronavirus on top of it. He is attempting to cut resources for COVID testing and treatment. His administration is covering up data that the public health professionals rely on to do their job. He does it repeatedly, anxious to cut the lifelines of 30 million jobless Americans, sending them tumbling off an economic cliff right in the middle of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

He is not doing his job. He is ignoring his responsibilities. Both on the streets of Portland and in Washington, DC, when he walks away from dealing with the coronavirus, he isn't keeping Americans safe. He is putting them in more danger.

As I have said repeatedly, Donald Trump ought to attack the coronavirus pandemic and not the people of Portland. So that is why, very shortly, Senator MERKLEY and I will offer an amendment that will block Donald Trump from using these paramilitary forces in Portland or other cities where they are unwanted.

What we are seeing in our hometowns is these paramilitary squads brutally unleashed against peaceful protesters—moms and veterans, doctors and activists. All they want to do is speak out for liberty and justice.

What Donald Trump is now doing is incompatible with the fundamental principles of democracy laid out by our Founders and expanded throughout the generations. I believe what Donald Trump is doing, in light of his statement yesterday, to America, that he is going to go after one city after another, is totally out of control. The Senate cannot allow this to happen. That is why Senator MERKLEY and I are calling for the Senate to act.

I thank my friend and colleague for his leadership. He has made it clear that 100 percent of Oregon's U.S. Senators are going to keep pushing and fighting until this changes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. The support is felt strongly throughout Oregon to stop the secret police in America, but it is a coast-to-coast feeling, and I yield to my colleague from Connecticut to speak for the other side of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I want to thank from my heart our two colleagues from Oregon who are standing up and championing not just their hometowns, not just the constituents of their State, but they are speaking for every hometown and every citizen of our country from every party, from every corner of our great Nation.

Let me just say very simply, these pictures of heavily armed, unidentified individuals in camouflage fatigues driving unmarked vehicles, grabbing individuals and throwing them into their car, would be something we would associate with the worst nightmare of a two-bit dictatorship. Here we see it in the United States of America.

I spent almost my whole career in law enforcement before I came to this body, and I am embarrassed and ashamed that this kind of sadistic, cruel, hate-filled coup was done in the name of law enforcement. What we witnessed in Oregon was in no way law enforcement. It was a violation of the law and of individual rights, and it is coming to your hometown as well. The President has specifically named Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, and Oakland. It will come to Hartford and my hometown Stanford and other cities in Connecticut. Have no fear, if the President will go to these abusive

extremes on the other coast of America, he will come to the east coast as well.

Let me just state the requirements of this amendment: identification of each officer, limiting Federal agents to their proper role in protecting Federal property, transparency and deployment of these officers, identification of them, and accountability are basic tenets of law enforcement.

We should not have to address this issue on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and we are doing it only because the President has broken the norms. He has disrespected the law. Every Senator in this body, regardless of party, should be standing up and speaking out in support of this amendment. I thank my colleague for speaking our truth to power.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. On behalf of two Oregon Senators and my colleague from Connecticut and the 34 other Senators who are standing up for democracy, rights, and against secret police, I ask unanimous consent to call up 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; that upon disposition of the Tester amendment, the Senate vote in relation to the amendment, with no amendments in order prior to the vote and with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Well, first of all, I don't know how long I have sat and listened to this—a long time—probably not as long as it seems. "Secret police, sadistic, cruel." I am beginning to come to the conclusion that they are not going to be supporting Donald Trump for reelection.

I rise to object to my colleagues' request for unanimous consent. This body has worked together to carefully consider each and every one of the 739 amendments filed on the NDAA. It never happened before. We adopted those amendments that have broad-based, bipartisan support. The majority and minority have worked together to determine which amendments would be brought up for a vote. Senator MERKLEY's request for a UC circumvents that process.

Further, this morning, the Senate adopted my commonsense amendment that will ensure that law enforcement has the right equipment and the right training. Senator MERKLEY's amendment flies in the face of that responsible approach.

His amendment would hamstring Federal and civilian law enforcement and our military, even when operating

in a title 32 status under the control of the State government. This would hinder their ability to keep our communities safe. For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I say to my colleague from Oklahoma, that if these secret police were released on the streets of Tulsa, you would be down here defending your constituents, but you have a responsibility to defend all constituents across the country, the rights of all citizens in the United States of America.

I am not asking you to support my bill. I am not asking you to make the argument for it. I am asking for the simple courtesy that this Chamber do the job it is vested with under the Constitution, which is to take up serious issues that arise in America, hold a dialogue about them on this floor, and take a vote to show the American people where we stand in the hopes to solve the problem.

I have no doubt that I wouldn't get 100 votes. You raise some interesting points. You note that my request to debate a very serious issue in America circumvents process. I can state that for 200 years this Chamber believed it was here to address serious issues, and they didn't raise process issues to keep serious issues from being debated. You didn't need unanimous consent. Just a few decades ago, I was here watching this Chamber working the Tax Reform Act and watching each amendment completed, and as soon as it was done, the next Senator asked for the recognition of the Chair. In fact, normally there would be about 10 Senators saying—and it was always "Mr. President." Now it is often "Madam President." But they were getting attention because the next person who spoke got the next amendment.

This system has taken away the fundamental responsibility of Senators to be able to introduce important issues in America, have them debated, and voted on. My colleague says: Well, we have a new process where the majority leader and the ranking member of the committee consult and decide what should be considered. That concentration of power is totally at odds with the vision of this Chamber developed by our Founders.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MERKLEY. I will not yield until I am done. That was one of his arguments; that it circumvents process.

The second is, he said it takes equipment away and training away, and yet my bill doesn't deal with equipment or training. So, clearly, that argument doesn't stand.

Then he noted title 32 status under the control of the Governor, but this bill says an expanded role of crowd control occurs under the permission of the Governor, not without it.

So this is why these issues should be debated on this floor. I call on all my

colleagues to return the Senate to a place where serious and important issues regarding the rights of Americans can be considered and not shoved aside because one Member doesn't want them addressed. That is a challenge for this Chamber, but we have a bigger challenge, which is how do we defend the rights of our citizens if we can't put an amendment on the floor and have it debated and voted on?

So, to all my colleagues who believe the secret police have no role in America; that unidentified officers, delegated without proper training, without consultation, without coordination, who are beating up peaceful protesters have no place in America; that they are being thrown into a van, and you don't even know what that van is or who those people are has no place in America; that the tactics of Duterte in the Philippines and Putin in Russia and Erdogan in Turkey have no place in America; who believe in a "we the people" government; those colleagues I thank, and let's bring this issue to the floor and have the debate and have the vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—AMENDMENT NO. 2457

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators ROSEN and HASSAN be added as cosponsors to Senate amendment No. 2457, to reform Department of Defense to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and to S. 4049, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. My apologies to my colleague from Wyoming. I think we are not in quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You are not.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—S. 4220

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators ROSEN and HASSAN be added as cosponsors to S. 4220, the Preventing Authoritarian Policing Tactics on America's Streets Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss our economic recovery. Let me be clear. Our economy will not shut down again. Government will not forcibly close businesses for a second time.

Yes, America is coming back from the coronavirus. The prepandemic economy was strong; it was healthy; and it was growing. Every part of the economy had record job growth. Unemployment was at a 50-year low. Shutting down the economy slowed the spread of the virus, but it did not eliminate it. It saved lives, and it bought us time.

Reopening was never conditioned on having a vaccine, nor was it conditioned on eliminating the virus entirely. Businesses, large and small, are today continuing to reopen, and they are opening in a safe, scientific, and sensible way. I saw it all across Wyoming the last 2 weeks as I traveled the State.

In Casper and Cheyenne, Main Street is busy again. Mom-and-pop businesses are bringing back workers. Cody was full of activity over the Fourth of July. Yellowstone is welcoming thousands of visitors, and people are heading to all of the activities in Thermopolis. The rodeos have been a huge success. Wyoming is literally back in the saddle again.

Businesses all over the country are bouncing back and bringing back workers. In June, the economy added nearly 5 million jobs. It shattered all forecasts. This was by far the largest ever monthly jobs gain in U.S. history. More than 7 million people have been hired back in the last 2 months. May and June job creation set records.

The recent rise in new COVID-19 cases, to me, as a doctor, is troubling. Still, it is no reason to stop reopening, as long as we open in a responsible way.

Now, people have made great sacrifices. We all did what the experts said we needed to do. Now Americans are ready to get back to business and get back to work. People don't want another shutdown, and you know that. You have seen that in your own home State, and they most assuredly don't want laws coming out of Congress that make it easier to stay closed and harder to reopen. As a doctor, I know we can flatten the virus curve without flattening or flatlining the economy. People can resume normal life and stay healthy.

The key, of course, is for all of us to do our part and take the proper precautions, and we know what they are: Social distancing, good hygiene, and, of course, wearing masks. As a doctor, I know masks help lower the infection spread, especially indoors when we can't socially distance. Together, we can manage the risk, and, as a nation, we can move forward.

Millions of Americans are returning to work and doing it safely. Congress's rapid response to the pandemic back in March set this recovery in motion. Medical workers now have better tools for virus testing, for treating the disease, and for developing a vaccine. Americans are doing everything they can to protect the most vulnerable. We are taking care of seniors and people

with chronic medical conditions. The country is conducting a record number of tests. More than 45 million people have been tested. I think the number is now close to 50 million. There are well over 700,000 tests each day.

Widespread testing allows us to pinpoint virus hotspots so we are able to surge aid where it is most needed. Hospitals now have more effective COVID-19 treatments. I talked to doctors around the State of Wyoming and around the country. We are seeing incredible progress in vaccine trials. A successful vaccine is vital to beating the virus.

Now, it is key to the economic comeback as well. Scientists hope to have a vaccine ready in record time—actually, before the end of this calendar year. All this progress has given businesses the confidence to reopen and to put people back to work. A solid majority of Americans now will tell you that they see their finances as being stable.

Consumer spending the last 2 months has been way up. Manufacturing has started to take off again. Simply put, the pro-health, pro-jobs policies that this Senate has put in place, those policies are working. We are only getting started.

Now Congress must build on the CARES Act successes. The next bill, the one that we are working on now, cannot be a bloated bailout bonanza. We will not pass Speaker PELOSI's bill from Handout Heaven. No, the next aid measure must be focused. It must be focused on healthcare and safety and schools and jobs.

Here is my three-part test for the next pandemic package. Will it save lives? Will it save lives with testing, treatment, and vaccines? I am very optimistic of what I have seen about the research with the new vaccine. Will it protect our medical community and small businesses and schools from frivolous lawsuits? There are 3,500 that have already been filed across the country by sue-and-settle lawyers focused on coronavirus. And will it get people back to work and children back to school safely?

We must help schools reopen in a safe way. Children need to get back to school. It is essential for their well-being. That is why the Nation's pediatricians—the American Academy of Pediatrics—is urging schools to reopen, and they say with the children physically present—with the children physically present. Remote learning, we know, for very young people, has not worked. Children cannot lose another year of school. To lose a full year of school for these young people would be devastating. It would be a learning loss, as well as a loss of the ability to learn and making it that much harder to pick up further down the line. And if kids aren't in school, many parents can't go back to work. Most people with their jobs cannot work from home.

So I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, my Democratic colleagues, to join us, to join our effort to

reopen our economy and reopen our schools.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 4049

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam President, I am proud to talk about the National Defense Authorization Act, which has come to this body with a strong bipartisan vote from the Armed Services Committee where I serve. I am proud to have helped to craft this legislation, and I am proud to be voting for some of the amendments that have been permitted votes on the floor.

One that has not been permitted relates to the Insurrection Act, a 213-year-old law that has been invoked at various points in our history to protect civil rights as it was during the era of desegregation, but President Trump has threatened to use this slavery-era law to silence calls for justice from Americans protesting centuries of racist oppression.

In effect, he has threatened to invert the Insurrection Act to deprive Americans of their First Amendment right. So I introduced a bill called the CIVIL Act that would preserve Presidential accountability to Congress whenever the Insurrection Act is invoked. It would require the President to consult with Congress prior to invoking the act and provide certification to Congress to justify the use of this authority. It has other provisions.

It was voted down in the markup of the Armed Services Committee, but I sought a vote on the floor. Apparently, it will not happen.

If the President uses force against Americans at home, Congress should demand at least the same check that applied to his use of force against adversaries abroad.

I offered this act as an amendment, and I am grateful to all my Democratic colleagues on the committee for supporting it. I am also grateful to the House of Representatives, which, just yesterday, passed an NDAA amendment to its bill modifying the CIVIL Act, which I introduced. It is called the Curtailing Insurrection Act Violations of Individuals' Liberties. I would like to thank my colleagues on the House side who supported this amendment, particularly Congresswoman ESCOBAR, who led the charge in the House Armed Services Committee and on the House floor.

I urge our colleagues, whether it is now in the course of considering the NDAA or at some point in the future, to hold the President, any President—we are talking not only about this President but any President—accountable when he uses military force

against Americans. When the American military and troops of our country are used against Americans, there ought to be at least the same accountability as when American troops are used abroad, with the same kind of checks—maybe not identical, but the same kinds of checks—because the President using troops against our own citizens denies, potentially, fundamental freedoms, and the need for accountability is even more urgent. Our military should defend liberties, not endanger them, misdirected by a misguided President.

Despite my disappointment in the Senate's lack of action to curtail the President's unaccountable use and abuse of military power, I am proud of a number of provisions that I also authored in this bill that invest in our most valuable military asset, our servicemembers and their families.

I am grateful to all of the military spouses and advocates from across the country who shared their challenges with me and my office. Their stories, their voice, and their faces made an immensely impactful difference. We used their experience to craft these overdue policies.

I want to say to those families—to the spouses and loved ones—that they serve as much as the men and women they support in uniform.

The NDAA includes important provisions that I championed to hold commanders accountable to military families, make childcare more affordable, expand support for military moms, and prevent mental health discrimination. These measures are profoundly important.

Provisions I authored with Senator KAINE will make childcare more affordable by authorizing hardship waivers, requiring fee reductions for families with more than one child. And the NDAA will support those military moms by extending TRICARE to include other kinds of services.

The Connecticut military industrial base will benefit from the increased expenditure and the robust investment in two Virginia-class submarines. My priority during the negotiations on the conference committee will be to advance this cause.

These provisions for expanding our production of submarines and other military platforms must also focus on our supply base, on the workforce that keeps us safe, and on men and women who comprise, indeed, the most talented workforce, using and building unmatched military technology to keep our countries secure.

We should keep in mind the families of our military and continue fighting for even more provisions that enable them to continue their great work, but these military platforms assure that our troops will never have a fair fight—that they will always be superior, no matter what the terrain or arena or the fight.

I am pleased that the NDAA makes robust investments in Connecticut's industrial base. I will make as my top

priority during negotiations of the conference committee to restore full funding for two submarines, even beyond the commitment in this NDAA, to a second Virginia-class submarine in this budget authorization.

I was pleased, again, to see action by the House, which provides for two fully funded Virginia-class submarines in the House Armed Services Committee version of the NDAA.

In addition to fully funding the first Columbia-class submarine—a historic milestone for this program—the Senate version added an additional \$175 million for Columbia-class supplier development. The heroes in this story are not only the big contractors. They are the supply chains—not only the companies with hundreds of employees but the components makers and the parts manufacturers that may make tiny pieces of the submarine by comparison to its massive length. They are all heroes of our defense industrial production.

People are the foundation of the submarine industrial base, and this bill authorizes an additional \$20 million in workforce development funding. I will seek to expand the supplier development program, which provides the kind of support that the supply chain needs.

We must ensure that the final bill preserves not only the necessary levels of funding for the Virginia-class and the Columbia-class submarines but also for continued growth of our fifth generation fighter fleet. It is a key component of our national defense. The Senate version of the NDAA authorizes the growth of the F-35 fleet by 93 aircraft, including 14 aircraft above the President's budget request.

I remain a staunch advocate of the CH-53K program. I was happy to see the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee fund nine CH-53K helicopters. I am going to work to ensure that the final NDAA also authorizes nine helicopters.

I want to congratulate and thank Sikorsky, Pratt & Whitney, Raytheon Technologies, and, again, the many suppliers throughout Connecticut that contribute to an aerospace program second to none in the world.

Finally, let me talk a little bit about the Fair Care for Vietnam Veterans Act of 2020. Later this week, we will vote on an amendment to the NDAA based on a bicameral Fair Care for Veterans Act of 2020.

In March, I, along with Senator TESTER and 30 Senate colleagues, introduced this legislation to require the VA to provide benefits for veterans suffering from bladder cancer, hypothyroidism, Parkinsonism, and hypertension.

The National Academy recognizes that these illnesses have an association with herbicide exposure. It reached that conclusion in 2016. Since then, I have been fighting, along with many of my colleagues, to get the VA to include these four conditions as presumptive conditions linked to Agent Orange,

only to have this administration's officials block us at every turn.

Despite the scientific proof—the incontrovertible science that these conditions are linked to Agent Orange—and despite more than 83,000 veterans who suffer from these conditions, the Trump administration's VA resisted and refused to acknowledge the connection.

I look forward to voting to add bladder cancer, hypothyroidism, and Parkinsonism to the list of Agent Orange presumptives. One condition in our bill, hypertension, was not included in this NDAA amendment, but I am committed to adding it during conference. It is supported by the science as a condition linked to Agent Orange.

The Trump administration says it doesn't want to spend the money to cover the four conditions in this bill, but when we send people to war, we make a commitment. We make a commitment, and we accept an obligation to treat them, no matter what the cost, no matter what the cause of their service-related injuries are when the science and the facts support it. Facts are stubborn things, as many have said. To the veterans in Connecticut and nationwide, I will never stop fighting to get good healthcare for our veterans. I know this issue is bipartisan in its support.

I look forward to voting in favor of the fiscal year 2021 NDAA, but I also think our colleagues must recognize that military spending alone does not guarantee our national security. These weapons platforms and the hardware that we produce does not constitute, alone, our national defense. It is the quality of our people, whether they are in the supply chain or the defense establishment or our troops on the ground or in the air or at sea. To recruit and train the best possible military, we need to have a strong non-military infrastructure. Education, healthcare, housing—our national defense includes those essential components.

So I believe that we must scrutinize this budget with a view to reducing any expenditures that are unnecessary.

I will state as a matter of principle that when we vote on this NDAA, I will be supportive of amendments that might potentially achieve more equity and effectiveness in the way we make commitments in support of our national defense. We must interpret as broadly as is necessary how that defense must be supported.

It is not alone the money in this NDAA; it is also what we commit to racial justice in this country; the quality of our policing and our education, which should not depend on a young person's ZIP Code; the quality of our healthcare, which right now has racial disparities that are inexcusable; housing that often results from redlining; and protections in the workplace, which could be achieved by a fairer, more effective use of OSHA.

The quality of our society and our projection of power abroad depend on

our quality of life and the quality of services that we provide on education, healthcare, housing, and all of the other infrastructure, including transportation. We need to consider those factors and do what is necessary to assure that our warfighters and our military never have a fair fight, that they always predominate on the battlefield. We must protect our veterans to whom we make the commitment that we will always have their backs when they come home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 643.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Scott Hardy, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Scott Hardy, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Michael B. Enzi, Tim Scott, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James E. Risch, David Perdue, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

COMMANDER JOHN SCOTT HANNON VETERANS MENTAL HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am here this evening to discuss a tragic issue that is affecting way too many Americans across the country. This tragedy is mental health and suicide. A majority of Americans are encountering an unprecedented amount of stress due to COVID-19, and resources previously used to help individuals cope are even more limited. What is more concerning is that compounding

stressors and depleted resources increase the likelihood of public health disparities like the one I am discussing today. If there ever were a time to invest in mental health, it is now.

In a recent article from the Journal of the American Medical Association, researchers discussed several risk factors that put our Nation collectively at a higher risk for suicide. These risk factors include economic stress, decreased access to community and religious support systems, lack of access to adequate mental health and suicide prevention services, and social isolation. This has unfortunately caused a severe lack of personal and social connection, which we know to be a protective factor against suicide.

This evening I want to specifically highlight veterans as they face unique risk factors for suicide, in addition to the increased stress around COVID-19. Research illustrates that veterans have a higher rate of suicide and certain mental health conditions than their civilian peers. We know there is not one single explanation or reason for suicide, and there is no one single treatment or prevention strategy.

While post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injuries are prominent among veterans and are known as an invisible wound of war, we now realize other conditions, such as depression, anxiety, and substance use disorder, also contribute to suicide among veterans and all Americans.

Our veterans are fighting new battles, and the stress caused by COVID-19 has only exacerbated these issues. Just recently, two veterans from different generations, who lived on different coasts and fought in different wars decades apart, died by suicide. One was a 74-year-old veteran who died on the campus of a VA facility in San Diego, and the other was a former Green Beret in Washington, DC. They are two of the 20 veterans who are lost each day to suicide—a number we know as far too great.

The Army recently lost a respected soldier known as “Captain America.” Master Sergeant Marckesano fought in Afghanistan, and according to news reports, 30 soldiers from his former unit have died by suicide since their 2009 deployment. Until the end, Master Sergeant Marckesano was encouraging members of his old unit to reach out and talk if they found themselves struggling, telling them “Don't let the valley win.” Even soldiers who try to be strong for others find themselves in a circumstance where they don't see another option, and they lose their battle.

Another veteran I want to highlight today who fought a battle with his mental health was Commander John Scott Hannon. Commander Hannon's DD-214 illustrates that he was a decorated Navy SEAL, but he was much more than his service history and the wounds he bore as a result. His family and friends remember him as a passionate mental health advocate for veterans with a gentle heart and a fierce

belief in taking tangible actions to tackle big challenges.

Sadly, Commander Hannon lost his courageous fight with post-traumatic stress, bipolar disorder, and the effects of a traumatic brain injury in February 2018. However, he lives on in the memories of his friends and family and as the namesake of pivotal legislation in the Senate that I am pleased to lead with the Senator from Montana, Mr. TESTER.

For several months now, our committee has been working closely with the VA and the White House to improve upon and advance the Commander John Scott Hannon Veterans Mental Health Care Improvement Act, S. 785, which will make necessary investments in suicide prevention services, innovative research, and improvements to mental healthcare.

This bill will establish a grant program that requires the VA and the Department of Veterans Affairs to better collaborate with community organizations across the country already serving veterans. This collaboration will result in earlier identification of veterans who are at risk of suicide and will provide the ability to intervene with preventive services. This is a provision championed by my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BOOZMAN. Additionally, this legislation requires the VA to bolster research efforts around brain and mental health conditions, expand upon telehealth partnerships to deliver better care to our veterans in rural areas, allow veterans to take advantage of emerging complimentary and integrative treatments, and so much more.

This bipartisan legislation received a unanimous 17-to-0 vote in the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs earlier this year, and the time to act by the full Senate is now. We should not wait.

The increased risk factors coupled with the negative effects of the pandemic could be a perfect storm for our veterans, as researchers from the American Psychological Association noted in a recent article. With this in mind, I am calling on my colleagues to do our part to make certain that every veteran has access to the lifesaving care and support they need. We need to ensure that every VA medical center is equipped with the proper personnel, evidence-based treatment options, and best research-informed care to fit the needs of each veteran who walks through that hospital door.

For veterans and servicemembers like Commander John Scott Hannon and Master Sergeant Marckesano, we in Congress have the opportunity to take action to let them know they don't have to struggle alone. This legislation will help connect these veterans and our servicemembers to more resources and provide them tools to address challenges related to their service. To my colleagues, we have a significant role and responsibility to combat this struggle, and here, today, we can do our part to make certain that in the end the valley does not win.

In the spirit of this bill's namesake, we must take real and urgent action to tackle this challenge together. As we seek swift action on S. 785 on the Senate floor, I ask my colleagues to join us in our fight against suicide.

Lastly, to the veterans across the country who may hear this message today, who are experiencing thoughts of suicide, I ask you to reach out for help. Call a trusted friend, family member, or reach out to the Veterans Crisis Line. That number is 1-800-273-8255, and then press 1. Again, 1-800-273-8255, followed by pressing 1.

I am pleased to know that in the future, this crisis line will be updated to 9-8-8. This is because the Senate acted on my legislation, along with Senator GARDNER, to designate 9-8-8 as the new national suicide and mental health crisis hotline earlier this year. Last week, the FCC announced they will make this designation operational by July 16, 2022.

Suicide is preventable, and now is the time we take the stand necessary to protect the lives of people who have given so much for our Nation. They have protected us; we need to protect them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, in downtown Atlanta at the corner of Auburn Avenue and Jesse Hill Jr Drive, there is a 65-foot mural of Congressman John Lewis with the lone caption: "Hero."

I personally got to see it yesterday from the Downtown Connector, the major interstate that runs through the heart of Atlanta, as I drove to Hartsfield-Jackson airport. I was struck by the void left by his passing, not only in Georgia, but across our entire country.

When parents teach their children about courage and the fight for freedom and equality, the story of Congressman John Lewis will be told. He dedicated his entire life to pushing America to live up to its promises. He championed nonviolent protests. He stood for community, justice, and love.

Congressman Lewis's story has inspired millions. At just 18, he wrote to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., when he sought to attend the all-White Troy State University. He went on to become a leader in the civil rights movement. He organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters in Nashville. He was on the buses during the 1961 Freedom Rides. He was the youngest speaker at the 1963 March on Washington. He was brutally beaten while leading peaceful demonstrators across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL.

For the last 33 years, he served Georgia in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he was known as "the conscience of Congress." He was also known for his many bipartisan friendships. One of them was with my predecessor, Senator Johnny Isakson, a true

statesman. They shared a powerful moment last year on the House floor when Congressman Lewis embraced him during farewell speeches to the Senator, one of the most touching moments in Congress's recent history.

Sadly, Congressman Lewis was not the only civil rights icon we lost last week. Georgia also lost Reverend C.T. Vivian. Both he and Congressman Lewis were champions of peaceful, non-violent protest. I hope we can honor their legacy by using nonviolent means as we strive toward equality and a more perfect union.

Georgians cannot think of our beloved State without thinking of these and so many other civil rights icons and leaders like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Our Nation is better because of their leadership and their courage. Their legacy will never be forgotten.

May God comfort the Lewis and Vivian families during this incredibly difficult time.

(The remarks of Mrs. LOEFFLER pertaining to the introduction of S. 4238 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. LOEFFLER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAGGIE BLACK

● Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Maggie for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Maggie is a native of Cheyenne. She is a student at Christendom College, where she is studying political science and economics. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Maggie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO DELANEY BOWERS

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Delaney for her hard work as an intern in my Rock Springs office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Delaney is a native of Green River. She is a student at Western Wyoming Community College, where she is studying biology and mathematics. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Delaney for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO SYDNEY DE VAULT-GARVEY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Sydney for her hard work as an intern in my Sheridan office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Sydney is a native of Colorado. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Sydney for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO VINCHINZO HINOJOS-CASTLE

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Vinny for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Vinny is a native of Thermopolis. He is a graduate student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying business administration and mechanical engineering. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Vinny for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all

of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO BROOKE HORNBERGER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brooke for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brooke is a native of Pinedale. She is a student at Stevenson University, where she is studying biochemistry. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brooke for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO KARRYN MACDONALD

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Karryn for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Karryn is a native of Carpenter. She is a student at the University of Wyoming, where she is studying political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Karryn for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO MALACHI MILLER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Malachi for his hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Malachi is a native of Casper. He is a student at the University of Wyoming, where he is studying economics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Malachi for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all

of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO MIRANDA OLSON

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Miranda for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Miranda is a native of Casper. She is a student at Brigham Young University, where she is studying international relations. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Miranda for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO KIARA SIMS

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Kiara for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Kiara is a native of Casper. She is a student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, where she is studying accounting and finance. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Kiara for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO PAIGE THOMPSON

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Paige for her hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Paige is a native of New Mexico. She is a student at New Mexico State University, where she is studying chemical engineering. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Paige for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to

have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

REMEMBERING MARCOS GIL

● Mr. RISC. Madam President, I rise in memory of Marcos Gil of Arimo, ID, who gave his life on April 28, 2018 rescuing a young woman from drowning.

When 17-year-old Marcos Gil saw his girlfriend caught in a circular current downriver from a waterfall, he rushed to her aid. Despite being a poor swimmer, Marcos jumped into the Portneuf River to save the 14-year-old girl as she called for help, submerging himself in the powerful current and pushing her toward the bank of the river. With Marcos' help, the young woman was able to grab hold of a branch at the edge of the riverbank and swim to safety. Tragically, Marcos was unable to extricate himself from that same current, drowning in the process of saving the young woman's life.

Those who knew Marcos described him as friendly, deeply caring and eager to serve, and the story of his courage and sacrifice continues to resonate throughout eastern Idaho and beyond. Members of the community have rallied around the Gil family, including the Bannock County Sheriff's Office, which honored Marcos posthumously with the first ever lifesaving award presented to a civilian, and the Red Cross of Greater Idaho, which recognized Marcos with its East Idaho Real Heroes award. This year, Marcos was posthumously awarded the Carnegie Medal by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. The award, which is given to recognize those who have risked their lives to save others, will be presented to his parents, Margarito and Silvia Gil.

At just 17 years old, Marcos Gil left the world far too soon. He is deeply missed by his family and all who were fortunate enough to know him, and his bravery and heroism will not be forgotten.●

REMEMBERING MARTHA FLORES

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor the life and legacy of Cuban-American radio legend and pioneer, Martha Flores from Miami, FL.

As South Floridians grieve the loss of Martha Flores, an exemplary woman and radio trailblazer, let us honor her memory. For more than 60 years, Martha dedicated her life to her beloved audience and to her South Florida community. Martha, more commonly known as Miami radio's own "Queen of the Night," or la "Reina de la Noche" in Spanish, was the voice of Cuban exiles and is remembered as the first Cuban female to conduct her own radio show in Florida.

More than just a radio legend, commentator, philanthropist, actress, and singer, Martha Flores was a Cuban-American patriot who tirelessly spoke

out against the horrors of communism and advocated for liberty and freedom of speech worldwide. Although we are left without the Queen of the Night, her legacy and memory will live in the hearts of many Floridians for generations to come. May she rest in peace.●

TRIBUTE TO BRITTANY BROWN

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Brittany Brown, the Holmes County Teacher of the Year at Ponce de Leon High School in Ponce de Leon, FL.

Brittany believes her work as an educator is to help her students grow and succeed not only in her classroom, but also in their lives. She finds the most rewarding part of her work hearing of her students' newfound love of science.

Brittany believes students lose excitement and fascination for science by the time they reach high school, making one of her primary goals to rekindle the subject with them. She incorporates modern scientific equipment and technology in her curriculum to make science fun and interesting for her students.

Brittany teaches biology, agriculture, and aerospace at Ponce de Leon High School and has been a science educator for 8 years. She enjoys teaching and hopes to pass on her passion for the subject to her students.

I congratulate Brittany for receiving this important recognition. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO BELINDA FRIES

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today it is my privilege to honor Belinda Fries, the Suwannee County Teacher of the Year from Suwannee High School in Live Oak, FL.

When named the district's Teacher of the Year, Belinda noted she was humbled and proud to be one of Suwannee County's top educators. She is an experienced technology professional and has been teaching computer science and information technology to students at Suwannee High School since 2016.

Belinda said her favorite part of each day is being with her students in the classroom, and she considers teaching to be a gift. She believes that her students have the ability to fulfill their dreams, and she loves encouraging each of them to do and be their best.

I extend my sincere thanks and best wishes to Belinda for her inspiring work to educate her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALAN GATZKE

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize Alan Gatzke, the Columbia County Teacher of the Year from Fort White Elementary School in Fort White, FL.

Alan cherishes the opportunities to connect with students and his fellow teachers. For four decades, he has continually brought his passion for teaching and learning to schools and believes that it is the positive teaching relationships with his students and peers that has allowed him to succeed.

Alan teaches mathematics and science to students in fifth grade at Fort White Elementary School. During his more than 40-year teaching career, he has served as an elementary and middle school teacher, a bus driver, a custodian, and a school administrator. His experience in these jobs taught him that every job title at a school plays vital roles in the education of children.

Alan holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, a specialist's degree from the University of Florida, and a master's degree from Florida International University.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Alan for his decades of work teaching countless students. I look forward to hearing of his continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DAPHNE HAYES

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Daphne Hayes, the Hardee County Teacher of the Year at Hardee Senior High School in Wauchula, FL.

Daphne believes in her students and teaches them to believe in themselves. She encourages them to apply to multiple colleges and universities to broaden their options after they graduate from high school. She takes pride in knowing one of her students last year received acceptance letters from more than two dozen schools and received several scholarships.

Daphne is a science and Advancement Via Individual Determination—AVID—teacher and has taught in Hardee County for 8 years. She sponsors the AVID program, which helps students identify and focus on their goals, improves their academic performance, and establishes a plan for their future. Daphne also dedicates her spare time to serving youth at the First Baptist Church of Bowling Green.

I extend my best wishes and gratitude for Daphne for her dedication to her students and her community. I look forward to learning of her continued success in coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO BRITTINIE JOHNSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to honor Brittinie Johnson, the Baker County Teacher of the Year at Baker County High School in St. Mary, FL.

Each day, Brittinie looks for opportunities to teach her students to be leaders and to grow in character. She believes these skills will serve them not only in school, but also translate to their lives outside of the classroom. Her students are the inspiration for her career as an educator.

Brittinie teaches culinary arts, one of the most requested courses at Baker County High School. She aims to connect her class lessons to real life and the workforce and strives to teach more than just academics. She is known for impacting not only the lives of her students and their families, but also her community.

Brittinie's love for her students is her reason to maintain high expectations for their excellence in school. Over the course of each year, her students learn how to operate a cafe within the high school, provide meals for the faculty and students, and cater for various community events.

I offer my best wishes to Brittinie for her commitment to helping her students succeed in school and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALLISON JONES

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Allison Jones, the Bradford County Teacher of the Year at Bradford Middle School in Starke, FL.

Allison's work towards improving her students' testing performance has yielded positive results over the years, collaborating with her colleagues to improve math and writing scores for students.

Allison's goal has always been to help students reach their maximum potential, and she takes every opportunity to celebrate each student's success, no matter how large or small. She is motivated by compassion and believes in establishing and maintaining deep relationships with her students and their families.

Allison teaches sixth grade science at Bradford Middle School and has worked as an educator in Florida for 20 years. She also designs various curricula for the State that is driven not just by data, but also assessments of individual student needs.

I express my deepest gratitude to Allison for her commitment to her students, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AMANDA JONES-CARLSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Amanda Jones-Carlson, the Gilchrist County Teacher of the Year at Trenton Elementary School in Trenton, FL.

Amanda considers it an absolute honor to be named Teacher of the Year for her school district. She views her students as her inspiration, believing that making a difference in just one of their lives motivates her to be the best teacher she can be.

To her, seeing one of her students grasp a difficult or complex concept is what makes Amanda's job worthwhile. She believes the best part about teaching students is not just the chance to see them learn, but to watch their ex-

citement grow for the entire learning process.

Amanda teaches first grade at Trenton Elementary School and has taught in Gilchrist County for 8 years.

I offer my sincere thanks and appreciation to Amanda for her dedication to her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID MARTINEZ-COOLEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize David Martinez-Cooley, the Pinellas County Teacher of the Year from Leila G. Davis Elementary School in Clearwater, FL.

David is known for finding creative ways of engaging his students to pass on his passion and love for music. He considers himself to be just one of many teachers of the year across Pinellas County who dedicates their time to inspiring their students every day.

David's colleagues are enthralled by his enthusiasm and the drive he brings to his classroom each day. He is viewed as a role model among his peers, and many of his students throughout the years note the positive influence he has implanted in their lives.

David is a music education teacher at Leila G. Davis Elementary School and has taught in Pinellas County for 13 years. He received his master's degrees in music education and mathematics education from the University of Florida. David also serves on the district's textbook adoption committee, helping to select new digital resources for elementary music students. He has also helped in leading other music educators by presenting at district and State training events and assisted in the revision and refinement of the district's grade level key learnings.

I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to David and extend my best wishes on his continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHEYENNA NOVOTNY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to honor Cheyenna Novotny, the Escambia County Teacher of the Year at West Florida High School in Pensacola, FL.

Cheyenna teaches chemistry and environmental science at West Florida High School and has been a teacher for 16 years. Outside of the classroom, Cheyenna leads the student environmental club and helped to launch a full-scale recycling program for the entire school last year.

For Cheyenna, it is important to know how her students are learning as they progress throughout the year. Each of her students receives an individual whiteboard to use as they work to solve math or chemistry problems on their own. Having students show their work on the whiteboards helps

them and Cheyenna to see firsthand how well they grasp a concept.

Cheyenna believes in celebrating every learning victory for her students throughout the year, no matter how big or small. Her students view her not only as their teacher, but also as someone who is their friend who works to prepare them for their educational careers. She considers it a privilege to work with her students, to encourage their dreams, and to share their passions.

I express my best wishes and gratitude to Cheyenna, and I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANGELA ROBERTS

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize Angela Roberts, the Martin County Teacher of the Year from Felix A. Williams Elementary School in Stuart, FL.

Angela is a third grade English language arts and social studies teacher at Felix A. Williams Elementary School. She has taught for 28 years, with 21 years in the Martin County School District. She leads workshops during her school's literacy nights, serves as a youth life coach and soloist at her church, moderates as a high school debate team judge, volunteers as a member of the Keep Martin Beautiful beach clean-up crew, and spends her time as an advanced choir parent volunteer for both Jensen Beach and Martin County high schools.

Angela believes that children deserve a champion in their life, and she wholeheartedly embraces this responsibility. Before she works to educate her students' minds, she connects with their hearts, learning who they are individually to design lessons that bring them to the core of her subject matter. She understands that what some students need most is not necessarily what is found in lesson plans, but what is found in a teacher's heart.

Angela knows that educators hold the high honor and responsibility of influencing future generations. Time spent in grade school encompasses a student's most formative years, sometimes spent more with teachers than with parents. In consideration of this, at the beginning of each school year, Angela invites parents to download an app that provides them with access to communicate with the classroom, following the lesson plan alongside students each day.

I thank Angela for all the great work she has done for her students over the years. I extend my best wishes to her and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO CARI RODRIGUEZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Cari Rodriguez, the Broward County Teacher of the Year from Harbordale Elementary School in Fort Lauderdale, FL.

Cari believes that the student experience should never be boring. Each day, she works to create a space where students can truly enjoy what they are learning in her classroom. From composing a new song that helps with memorizing multiplication facts, to building igloo prototypes showing a better understanding of life in the Arctic regions, Cari goes to creative lengths to make both teaching and learning fun.

Cari is a literacy coach at Harbordale Elementary and has taught for 21 years. The success of her students serves as her inspiration, and she encourages them to make the learning process fun, not only in her class, but also in their future endeavors.

I extend my best wishes and sincere gratitude to Cari for her dedication to teaching. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO KRISTA STANLEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Krista Stanley, the Okeechobee County Teacher of the year from Yearling Middle School in Okeechobee, FL.

Krista is a sixth grade teacher and has taught at Yearling Middle School for the past 4 years. She serves as the school math representative, a mentor for new teachers, and facilitates professional development focusing on standards based instruction. Krista was previously named the Project One New Teacher of the Year for Okeechobee County in 2016.

Krista believes that all students can learn if they are given the opportunity to do so in the classroom. She is appreciative of her students and cares for them, considering them to be the reason for her success as a teacher.

Throughout the school year, Krista provides her students with the tools they need to be successful and dedicates each day to helping them in any way she can. Reflecting her commitment, in 2019, 86 percent of Krista's students earned a proficient score on the Florida State Assessment.

I extend my best wishes to Krista for her tireless efforts and care she gives to her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING SERGIO'S FAMILY RESTAURANT

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a family-owned small business known for its community leadership and authentic Cuban cuisine. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Sergio's Family Restaurant of Miami, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1975, Blanca Cabrera opened what would become Sergio's Family Res-

taurant as a small sandwich shop off of Bird Road in Miami. Equipped with generations of family recipes, Blanca sought to honor her Cuban heritage. Her shop provided employment for several refugees, providing dignified work as they built new lives. She offered a fresh take on Cuban and American cuisine, and her sandwich shop became a local hit.

Today, Sergio's Family Restaurant has expanded to 13 locations in South Florida. Carlos Gazitua, the chief executive officer, is the third generation family member to lead Sergio's. Under his leadership, the business has expanded its community involvement and emphasized healthy living while retaining its signature flavor. Sergio's has been recognized by the Florida Department of Health as the first certified restaurant to take part in the Healthy Happens Here restaurant initiative, incorporating low-calorie versions of traditional Cuban eats on their menu.

At the local and State level and among its industry peers, Sergio's has been recognized for its outstanding cuisine. They were named Best Drive-Thru of 2015 by the Miami New Times, recognized as the 2017 Restaurant of the Year by the South Florida Tourism Professional Awards, and their traditional empanadas were featured in "Florida's Best Cheap Eats" by Travel & Leisure Magazine. Additionally, the city of Miami and Miami-Dade County mayors honored Sergio's with Croqueta Day on October 2, 2018. On this day, Sergio's served its 20 millionth croqueta—croquette.

As a community leader, Sergio's has advocated for several nonprofit organizations and local small businesses. In 2015, Sergio's donated food to a Live Like Bella Childhood Cancer Foundation event. Then-Governor RICK SCOTT recognized Sergio's service in 2017, when they collected and shipped food and supplies to Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria devastated the island. When Super Bowl LIV was held in Miami in 2020, Sergio's partnered with The Women's Fund of Miami-Dade to raise funds for its mission to create awareness and preventing sex trafficking. Additionally, Carlos has advocated for small business in local and industry events, including the "Bring Small Business Back" initiative.

Like many Floridian small businesses, Sergio's Family Restaurant stepped up to help its community during the coronavirus pandemic. They participated in several social media, radio, and video initiatives encouraging support for local, family-owned small businesses. Partnering with the Miami Heat and the Miami Dade County Public School Superintendent, Sergio's Restaurant provided meals for more than 500 people in the Liberty City area. Sergio's collaborated with Meals for Heroes Miami to feed local healthcare workers and first responders, including donating approximately 1,400 meals to the Miami-Dade Fire

Rescue teams. Additionally, Carlos worked with U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Florida Restaurant Lodging Association to provide more than 350,000 reusable masks for hospitality workers in South Florida.

When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, it provided a much needed lifeline to small businesses, including Sergio's Restaurant. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and non-profits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. Thanks to a PPP loan, Sergio's was able to keep their employees paid until Miami reopened. Their community leadership and advocacy was recognized by Governor Ron DeSantis who visited Sergio's in early June.

Through their service and leadership, Sergio's Family Restaurant is an outstanding example of how small businesses uplift their communities. I commend their support for local small businesses. Congratulations to Carlos and the entire team at Sergio's restaurant. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success throughout South Florida.●

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST FINALISTS

● Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the 10th annual "State of the Union" essay contest conducted by my office.

The material follows:

MADELYN TRIMPI, WOODSTOCK UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

Plastic is destroying the earth and a federal law to restrict single-use plastics must be developed. Plastic is a huge contributor to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions that are warming the atmosphere. An article called "How Plastics Contribute to Climate Change" by Brooke Bauman from Yale Climate Connections states "plastic originates as fossil fuels and emits greenhouse gasses from cradle to grave." At the beginning of its life cycle, gas and oil are fracked from the ground, then made into plastic releasing harmful pollutants like CO2 and nitrogen oxide that get stuck in the atmosphere and warm the earth. Along with greenhouse gas emissions, plastic pollutes the ecosystems by simply entering and never leaving. In the same article by Yale, scientists state "plastics can break down into smaller pieces called microplastics through biodegradation or exposure to the sun, heat or water. These microplastics scatter to all corners of the globe and even to the depths of the oceans. Toxic chemicals can bind microplastics and create poison pills that marine animals eat" When a foreign substance enters the ecosystem, it threatens all aspects of the life cycle; Including humans.

Biodiversity is the root of life on earth and when exposed to something like plastic, everything feels an effect. For example, research shows that plastic has entered into the human body most likely through food like fish and other meats. Animals eat the microplastics thinking they are nutrients; we eat the fish, therefore consuming the plastic in them. This can lead to many

health issues. Studies show that an average of 20 particles of microplastic has been found in 10 grams of human stool. "If our findings are remotely representative, annual microplastic consumption could exceed several hundred thousand [particles]," authors of the Environmental Science and Technology concludes. Even in cases when physical plastics pose little to no risk to human health, potentially harmful chemicals are added to plastics to modify appearance or functionality. Some of these chemicals include BPA and phthalates which have each been found to disrupt hormones in humans. BPA has been linked to increasing the risk of birth defects, metabolic diseases, and other health problems. Among other health risks, phthalate exposure has been found to reduce testosterone levels in male fetuses.

Already, states including California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, New York, Oregon and Vermont—have successfully banned single-use plastic bags. In addition to banning plastic bags, Vermont's SB 113 will place restrictions on single-use straws and polystyrene containers. These few states are leading the initiative in a fight against an indestructible material. When it comes to plastic, there are plenty of realistic alternatives that we should be enforcing instead of fighting against it. Developing and making these alternative products affordable and more readily available is a necessary focus in working toward a more healthy environment. Plastic is a major contributor to climate change. A national ban on single-use plastic is a simple start and necessary step toward saving the future of our planet.

GRIFFIN WARYAS, BELLOWS FALLS UNION HIGH SCHOOL, SENIOR

Ninety-Seven years ago, Frederick Banting discovered insulin. However, he decided not to put his name on the patent; he believed it was against the Hippocratic Oath to profit at the expense of patients. So, his team sold the patent to the University of Toronto for a dollar, in hopes that anyone who needed the medicine could afford it. Yet, today, ninety-seven years since the patent was sold for one dollar, people are dying because they cannot afford the insulin they need to survive.

Nicole Smith-Holt's son Alec died because of this. When his 26th birthday hit, he was no longer covered by his parent's insurance, and his monthly insulin costs skyrocketed to a staggering \$1,300 a month. Alec could no longer afford his medicine and passed away shortly after.

Unfortunately, this isn't an incredibly rare case. The costs of the most popular types of insulin have tripled over the past decade, the average cost per month has risen to \$450 a month, and 1 in 4 diabetes patients now either is forced to take partial doses or skip over their life-saving medicine. Unfortunately, Insulin is not the only drug being used as a profit machine by corporate monsters.

In 2007, Mylan bought the rights to the EpiPen device. At that time, the cost of a set of two injectors was \$94. A little over a decade later, the cost is over \$700. And with 3.6 million prescriptions being written last year, and the net price to make a set being \$60, Mylan made about 2.3 BILLION dollars in profit. They know people will buy it regardless of price because they have to. This leaves the life of uninsured, poor individuals in the balance.

To fix this, these large pharmaceutical companies need to be trust busted. They are buying off competition and abusing the broken American health care system to pad their pockets at the expense of the working class. Not to mention, they have teamed up with the insurance companies to ensure prof-

it at every corner. While these companies are businesses and should be allowed to operate as such, there comes a time when the government must protect us from them. As the great Teddy Roosevelt once said, "We draw the line against misconduct, not against wealth."

We need to employ the trust-busting laws set up in this nation to prevent these monopolies from preying on our citizens. To do this, we need to take the corruption out of Washington. In the time between January 1st, 2017 and October 16th, 2018, 34 lawmakers received at least \$100,000 including the House Republican majority leader. Drug companies should be banned from funding campaigns to prevent the purchasing of their economic safety. Another law that should be employed is a Sensible Drug Pricing Act. This would allow the companies to continue to make money but also allow poor Americans access to drugs that are relatively cheap to make, with a control on the pricing.

KYLE WILKIN, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

Every day people experience struggle of some sort; they struggle in a class or have to work harder than anticipated to complete a goal, but some people struggle more than others. Working hard, people may find it impossible to improve; there may be something blocking their way or restricting their ability to complete a task. In situations like that people search for help; they turn to the people around them hoping to find support, so oftentimes people either find support, or they find indifference. When people's basic needs aren't met, they are left to fend for themselves. In the United States there are a total of 552,830 people were experiencing homelessness on a single night in 2018. People who are homeless are in need of people to support them.

The first potential solution could be to allocate more money to fund social workers to help homeless people. Working with people who are homeless, social workers will be able to help them find housing. According to the Congressional Budget Office, in 2018 \$623 billion were spent on defense; if some amount of that money was given to the comparatively low amount of \$93 billion spent on education, training, employment, and social services combined, more people could work with those who are homeless to find housing. By making more social workers available, people who are homeless will be able to more easily access support.

The second solution would be to support Housing First. Housing First is centered on the belief that everyone can achieve stability in permanent housing directly from homelessness and that stable housing is the foundation for pursuing other health and social services goals. Housing First is a way to find people, who are in need of it, permanent housing while giving them the support they need. By helping people find permanent housing, they are able to continue their lives and pursue goals that will not be available if they did not have housing.

The third potential solution is making mental health facilities more available for homeless people. According to a survey done in 2015 by The Department of Housing and Urban Development, 25 percent of the American homeless—140,000 individuals—were seriously mentally ill at any given point in time. Forty-five percent of the homeless—250,000 individuals—had any mental illness. A serious mental illness is defined as a disruption in normal thinking, feeling, mood, behavior, interpersonal interactions, or daily functioning by Merriam-Webster. By making mental health facilities more available and destigmatized for homeless people, they will be better equipped to live and be successful

on their own. Homeless people need thy help and support of those around them; by giving people who are homeless options and the support they need they will be able to start to support themselves and find permanent.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:44 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 3607. An act to extend public safety officer death benefits to public safety officers whose death is caused by COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 3637. An act to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend lease protections for servicemembers under stop movement orders in response to a local, national, or global emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 1054. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable John Lewis, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 886) to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program and educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4920) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an exception to certain small business contracting requirements applicable to the Department of Veterans Affairs procurement of certain goods and services covered under the Ability One program, and for other purposes.

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-5068. A communication from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Affirmative Action and Non-discrimination Obligations of Federal Contractors and Subcontractors: TRICARE Providers" (RIN1250-AA08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5069. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asylum Application, Interview, and Employment Authorization for Applicants" (RIN1615-AC27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5070. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-17, V-18, V-62, V-94, V-163, and V-568 in the Vicinity of Glen Rose, Texas" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2020-0006)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 2, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5071. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order with respect to the recent actions taken by the People's Republic of China to fundamentally undermine Hong Kong's autonomy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2693. A bill to improve oversight by the Federal Communications Commission of the wireless and broadcast emergency alert systems (Rept. No. 116-240).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Judy Shelton, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2010.

*Christopher Waller, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2016.

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on the Budget.

*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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

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; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4234. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to identify a certain amount of Federal spectrum to be reallocated for mobile and fixed wireless broadband use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 4235. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture as a member of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 4236. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the creation and expansion of employee stock ownership plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4237. A bill to extend zero interest rate benefits and payment suspension to all Federal student loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to criminal street gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 4239. A bill to promote workforce recovery through the provision of additional training services and workforce investment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 4240. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to withdraw the United States from the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4241. A bill to require certain businesses to disclose the use of forced labor in their direct supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4242. A bill to establish programs related to prevention of prescription opioid misuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4243. A bill to protect children of certain immigrant workers from detention and re-

moval and aging out of lawful status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 4244. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to provide for improvements to State unemployment systems and to strengthen program integrity; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4245. A bill to develop and deploy firewall circumvention tools for the people of Hong Kong after the People's Republic of China violated its agreement under the Joint Declaration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KING, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 4246. A bill to provide that the rules entitled "Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" and "Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventive Services Under the Affordable Care Act" shall have no force or effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 4247. A bill to simplify loan repayment for Federal student loans under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, to make it easier to apply for Federal aid and making that aid predictable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

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; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 4249. A bill to ensure the protection of human genetic information collected as a result of diagnostic testing for COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4250. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 4251. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a mentor-protégé program, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4252. A bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4253. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the listing of patents in the Orange Book; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4254. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to encourage voting by students and to establish emergency procedures for institutions of higher education to assist students in exercising their right to vote; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 4255. A bill to amend the CARES Act to establish community investment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4256. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to purchase goods or services from Communist Chinese military companies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4257. A bill to repeal the temporary exemption to the certification requirement under section 5323 of title 49, United States Code, for contracts between public transportation agencies and rolling stock manufacturers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINÉ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 653. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that a United States withdrawal from the World Health Organization undermines United States global health leadership and the international COVID-19 response; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Res. 654. A resolution designating July 25, 2020, as "National Day of the American Cowboy"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advance notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 393

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 393, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States.

S. 568

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1669

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1669, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese.

S. 1727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1727, a bill to establish the Partnership Fund for Peace to promote joint economic development and finance ventures between Palestinian entrepreneurs and companies and those in the United States and Israel to improve economic cooperation and people-to-people peacebuilding programs, and to further shared community building, peaceful coexistence, dialogue, and reconciliation between Israelis and Palestinians.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2043, a bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

S. 2587

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2587, a bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend State court funding for child welfare, and for other purposes.

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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. 2898

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 3067

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3067, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 3152

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3152, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps.

S. 3189

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3189, a bill to

use proceeds from spectrum auctions to support supply chain innovation and multilateral security.

S. 3196

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3196, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 3221

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3221, a bill to place a moratorium on large concentrated animal feeding operations, to strengthen the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to require country of origin labeling on beef, pork, and dairy products, and for other purposes.

S. 3263

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3263, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the production and use of certain single-use plastic products and packaging, to improve the responsibility of producers in the design, collection, reuse, recycling, and disposal of their consumer products and packaging, to prevent pollution from consumer products and packaging from entering into animal and human food chains and waterways, and for other purposes.

S. 3393

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3393, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 3419

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3419, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 3424

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3424, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 3427

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added

as cosponsors of S. 3427, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to digitize and make publicly available geographic information system mapping data relating to public access to Federal land and waters for outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3656

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3656, a bill to authorize a comprehensive, strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to strengthen global health security, and for other purposes.

S. 3703

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3703, a bill to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to improve the prevention of elder abuse and exploitation of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 3725

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3725, a bill to expand vote by mail and early voting, and to improve the safety, accessibility, and efficiency of in-person voting during elections for Federal office.

S. 3742

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3742, a bill to establish a program in the Department of the Treasury to allocate funds to States, units of general local government, and Indian Tribes to provide assistance to certain small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3745

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) 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. 3775

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3775, a bill to establish a

United States-Israel Operations-Technology Working Group, and for other purposes.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) 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. 3874

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 3874, a bill making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 3876

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3876, a bill to make a technical correction relating to the treatment of refunds of merchandise processing fees under the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.

S. 3893

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3893, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to allow for emergency use of certain land during a pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 3979

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily waive cost-sharing amounts under the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program during certain declared emergencies.

S. 3997

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) 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. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a \$120,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4048

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 4048, a bill to modify the deadlines for completing the 2020 decennial census of population and related tabulations, and for other purposes.

S. 4075

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4075, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for the release of certain Federal interests in connection with certain grants under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4089

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) 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. 4112

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4112, a bill to support education and child care during the COVID-19 public health emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4133

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4133, a bill to modernize the REAL ID Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 4140

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4140, a bill to provide additional emergency funding for certain nutrition programs.

S. 4143

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4143, a bill to extend the unemployment insurance provisions of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act for the duration of the economic recovery, and for other purposes.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors 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. 4152

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4152, a bill to provide for the adjustment or modification by the Secretary of Agriculture of loans for critical rural utility service providers, and for other purposes.

S. 4156

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4156, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide relief from hardship due to the COVID-19 pandemic to agricultural producers, and for other purposes.

S. 4167

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 4167, a bill to set the interest rate applicable to certain economic injury disaster loans, and for other purposes.

S. 4193

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 4193, a bill to develop and nationally disseminate accurate, relevant, and accessible resources to promote understanding about African-American history.

S. 4202

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand online

benefit redemption options under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 4208

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4208, a bill to require the Minority Business Development Agency of the Department of Commerce to promote and administer programs in the public and private sectors to assist the development of minority business enterprises, to ensure that such Agency has the necessary supporting resources, particularly during economic downturns, and for other purposes.

S. 4220

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) 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. 4224

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4224, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess technology needs along the Southern border and develop a strategy for bridging such gaps.

AMENDMENT NO. 1689

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1689 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. 1701

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1701 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. 1702

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1702 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. 1729

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1729 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. 1972

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1972 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. 2174

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2174 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. 2244

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2244 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. 2252

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Massachusetts

(Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2252 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. 2455

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2455 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 Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2477

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2477 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 RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and
Ms. SMITH):

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; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill with my colleague, Senator SMITH that will help the hard-working loggers across this Nation whose operations have suffered serious losses directly due to the pandemic. In Maine alone, logging has a roughly \$650 million annual economic impact, and is the backbone of the forest products economy. The industry is made up of countless multi-generational family businesses, whose survival is being seriously threatened.

In Maine and in many places across the Country, the logging industry first felt the effects of COVID-19 in January as exports to foreign markets were significantly limited if not eliminated entirely. Declines in demand for paper products and other wood fiber based products caused by the COVID-19 pandemic have prompted shutdowns, slowdowns, and closures across the globe. As a result, Maine has seen declining demand for wood from mills across the board, and low prices and quotas driven by that lack of demand. And while timber prices have remained relatively stable, mills have drastically reduced their processing capacity—resulting in a ripple effect that has hit loggers and timber hauling companies hard.

The Professional Logging Contractors of Maine projects at least a 20 percent reduction in the annual harvest, which would threaten more than 600 jobs and represent the potential loss of \$86 million in economic activity in my State. The explosion of a pulp digester earlier this year at a mill in Jay, coupled with the recent shutdown of a paper machine at another mill in Westbrook, have compounded the harm imposed by the pandemic.

Although the industry is certainly not alone in its struggles during this time, it faces unique challenges, including high capital costs relative to payroll and the fact that payroll costs do not reflect the amounts paid to independent contractors. And unlike some of our farmers who have been able to access direct payments from USDA and our fishermen who were allocated relief funding in the CARES Act, our forestry professionals have not been provided targeted assistance.

The legislation we are introducing today would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to loggers and timber hauling businesses that have experienced at least a 10 percent loss in revenues from January 2020 through July 2020 as compared to the same timeframe last year. The amount would be equal to 10 percent of 2019 gross revenues and could only be used for operating expenses, including payroll. I am grateful for the American Logging Council's support of our legislation, and urge my colleagues

to join in this effort to support one of our country's core economic drivers.

Loggers and forestry industry professionals were rightfully deemed essential workers during this public health crisis, and we must ensure that they receive the support necessary to emerge from this downturn.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4237. A bill to extend zero interest rate benefits and payment suspension to all Federal student loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with Senator MURKOWSKI, we are introducing legislation to provide relief to all Federal student loan borrowers during this public health and economic crisis. The bipartisan Student Loan Fairness Act, which is also cosponsored by Senators MURKOWSKI, JONES, and TILLIS, will correct an inequity in the CARES Act that left out millions of Federal student loan borrowers from benefits to ease the burden of repayment as we continue to fight COVID-19.

The CARES Act benefits are restricted to borrowers of student loans that are held by the Federal government. This leaves out the borrowers whose Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL) are still held by commercial and State agency lenders, and those with Perkins Loans that are administered by institutions of higher education. In fact, nearly 6 million borrowers were left out under the FFEL Program and another 1.9 million under the Perkins Loan Program. This disparate treatment by loan type is as confusing as it is unfair.

In April, a broad group of more than two dozen organizations representing educators, borrower advocates, veterans, lenders, guaranty agencies, and student loan servicers implored Congress to remedy this inequity. They wrote, "A Federal loan borrower—regardless of the origination of that loan, be it Part B, D, E, commercial, or government-held—should receive equal, immediate, and critical support in this unprecedented time . . . Already, borrowers are confused as to why their Federal loans are treated differently than others."

The Student Loan Fairness Act will extend the CARES Act relief to these borrowers by covering the cost of interest and suspending monthly payments for the period of March 13 through September 30, 2020, and suspending all involuntary collection, such as administrative wage garnishment or offsets from tax refunds, for this period.

This legislation is one component of what should be a comprehensive package of student loan debt relief. As the crisis continues, we should extend the repayment relief until health and economic conditions improve sufficiently for borrowers to be able to begin repay-

ment. Additionally, we should forgive at least \$10,000 of debt for each student loan borrower to help speed the recovery and reduce the drag of the roughly \$1.6 trillion in outstanding student loan debt on economic prospects for over 40 million Americans. Going forward, we must reduce the need for student loan borrowing by expanding need-based grants, such as the Pell Grant, and ensuring that states and institutions do their part to lower the cost to students and families.

We should work together to build on the important steps Congress took to provide relief to student loan borrowers in the CARES Act. However, we need to ensure that all Federal student loan borrowers have access to this relief. I hope that my colleagues will join us in cosponsoring the Student Loan Fairness Act and pushing for its inclusion in the next COVID-19 relief package.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to criminal street gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Mr. President, this spring, 14-year-old Janina Valenzuela was riding a bike with a friend in Marietta, GA, when she was killed as part of an initiation into an MS-13 gang. In 2016, Christopher Dean was brutally murdered by gang members in Atlanta. The D.A. called it "the most horrific death" in recent history. His murder left two children without a father. In 2010, 11-year-old Nicholas Sheffey was shot and killed sleeping in his bed during a drive-by shooting in Chamblee, GA. These are just three of the too many lives that have been lost, tragically cut short due to senseless gang violence.

In Georgia, there are over 71,000 known gang members representing a variety of gangs, including the Ghostface Gangsters, an all-White gang in Georgia; the Gangster Disciples, which formed in Chicago and quickly spread to Georgia; and the Aryan Brotherhood, a White supremacy gang.

Nationwide, there are more than 1.4 million members and 33,000 gangs across the U.S. According to the most recent National Gang Report, half of law enforcement officials reported that gang-related violence has increased in each of their jurisdictions. Thankfully, President Trump and Georgia leaders have taken strong action to address the rising tide of gang violence and to end the cycles of violence that they cause.

For the first time ever, the Department of Justice has brought terrorism charges against a member of the MS-13 gang, taking action against their leader and 21 other gang members.

Under the leadership of Georgia Governor Brian Kemp and Attorney General Chris Carr, my home State of

Georgia has led the way on confronting gang violence, passing legislation that gives prosecutors the tools they need to disrupt and dismantle these terrible gang networks.

Today, I am introducing the Cracking Down on Gangs and Deporting Criminals Act to apply Georgia's anti-gang, pro-community measures across our country. This legislation, based on the Georgia law that Attorney General Carr has called "one of the strongest statutes in the Nation," aims to deter and punish criminals who set out to destroy lives and communities. This includes violent crimes like the murders of Janina, Christopher, and Nicholas.

In addition to violence, gangs run elaborate drug operations. One recent bust in Pickens County last month resulted in the arrest of nearly 50 individuals. Law enforcement confiscated nearly \$2 million worth of methamphetamine from a drug ring run by three gangs.

They deal in the abhorrent world of human trafficking. A study in San Diego County found that an astounding 85 percent of those involved in human trafficking were actively involved in gangs.

Current Federal gang statute has three strict criteria that are difficult for prosecutors to meet in order to hold someone accountable for their participation in a street gang. The legislation I am introducing today will make it easier for Federal prosecutors to seek harsh sentences for gang activity. It will facilitate the removal of criminal gang members who are in our country illegally, and it would create a national gang database, making it easier to eradicate these gang networks.

We need to take action now to take violent gang members off of our streets. Across the country, violence is skyrocketing in our cities, while radicals call to defund and abolish the police. The troubling decline in support for law enforcement, coupled with the effects of the pandemic and recent unrest, threatens the further spread of gang violence across communities in America.

The Cracking Down on Gangs and Deporting Criminals Act will help keep our communities safe and support law enforcement in their work to root out gang activity. No family should have to go through what Janina, Christopher, and Nicholas did. Parents should be able to send their children outdoors and off to school without worrying that they won't make it home, and children shouldn't fear that their parents won't return home. It is time that we hold gang members accountable for their vile and evil actions and keep the American public safe.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4242. A bill to establish programs related to prevention of prescription opioid misuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4242

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 "Addiction Prevention and Responsible Opioid Practices Act".

SEC. 2. EXCISE TAX ON OPIOID PAIN RELIEVERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter E of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 4192. OPIOID PAIN RELIEVERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed on the manufacturer or producer of any taxable active opioid a tax equal to the amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT DETERMINED.—The amount determined under this subsection with respect to a manufacturer or producer for a calendar year is 1 cent per milligram of taxable active opioid in the production or manufacturing quota determined for such manufacturer or producer for the calendar year under section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 826).

"(c) TAXABLE ACTIVE OPIOID.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'taxable active opioid' means any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this section) manufactured in the United States which is opium, an opiate, or any derivative thereof.

"(2) EXCLUSIONS.—

"(A) OTHER INGREDIENTS.—In the case of a product that includes a taxable active opioid and another ingredient, subsection (a) shall apply only to the portion of such product that is a taxable active opioid.

"(B) DRUGS USED IN ADDICTION TREATMENT.—The term 'taxable active opioid' shall not include any controlled substance (as so defined) which is used exclusively for the treatment of opioid addiction as part of a medication-assisted treatment."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of subchapter E of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "Medical Devices" and inserting "Other Medical Products".

(2) The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E and inserting the following new item:

"SUBCHAPTER E. OTHER MEDICAL PRODUCTS".

(3) The table of sections for subchapter E of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 4192. Opioid pain relievers."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. OPIOID CONSUMER ABUSE REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) OPIOID TAKE-BACK PROGRAM.—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h)(1) The Attorney General shall establish a national take-back program for the safe and environmentally responsible disposal of controlled substances.

"(2) In establishing the take-back program required under paragraph (1), the Attorney General—

"(A) shall consult with the Secretary and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

"(B) may coordinate with States, law enforcement agencies, water resource management agencies, manufacturers, practitioners, pharmacists, public health entities, transportation and incineration service contractors, and other entities and individuals, as appropriate.

"(3) The take-back program established under paragraph (1)—

"(A) shall—

"(i) ensure appropriate geographic distribution so as to provide—

"(I) reasonably convenient and equitable access to permanent take-back locations, including not less than 1 disposal site for every 25,000 residents and not less than 1 physical disposal site per town, city, county, or other unit of local government, where possible; and

"(II) periodic collection events and mail-back programs, including public notice of such events and programs, as a supplement to the permanent take-back locations described in subclause (I), particularly in areas in which the provision of access to such locations at the level described in that subclause is not possible;

"(ii) establish a process for the accurate cataloguing and reporting of the quantities of controlled substances collected; and

"(iii) include a public awareness campaign and education of practitioners and pharmacists; and

"(B) may work in coordination with State and locally implemented public and private take-back programs.

"(4) From time to time, beginning in the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to one-half of the total amount of taxes collected under section 4192 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the Attorney General to carry out this subsection. Amounts transferred under this subparagraph shall remain available until expended."

(b) FUNDING OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMS.—From time to time, beginning in the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to one-half of the total amount of taxes collected under section 4192 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this Act, to the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for programs of the Center, including the Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse program under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.) and Programs of Regional and National Significance. Amounts transferred under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study examining the coverage offered under commercial health insurance plans and reimbursement rates under the Medicare program and State Medicaid plans with respect to—

(A) substance use disorder treatment services, as compared to other health services, and how any disparity identified under this paragraph may contribute to differences in salary and turnover among substance abuse disorder providers; and

(B) rates of coverage or reimbursement, as applicable, for substance abuse disorder services provided via telehealth, as compared to such services provided in-person; and

(2) provide recommendations with respect to addressing any disparities identified under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) in order to bolster retention of substance abuse disorder providers and the provision of substance abuse disorder services.

SEC. 5. EXPANDING ACCESS TO SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FURNISHED THROUGH TELEHEALTH UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1834(m)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(m)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by inserting "AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES" after "SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER SERVICES";

(2) by inserting "or, on or after the first day after the end of the public health emergency described in section 1135(g)(1)(B), to an eligible telehealth individual for purposes of diagnosis of a substance use disorder or diagnosis or treatment of a mental health disorder, as determined by the Secretary," after "as determined by the Secretary,".

SEC. 6. ENSURING PARITY FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT SERVICES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 29011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in part K, by redesignating section 550 (42 U.S.C. 290ee-10), relating to sobriety treatment and recovery teams, as section 553 and transferring such section to appear after section 552 in part D; and

(2) by adding at the end of such part D the following:

"SEC. 554. COMPLIANCE WITH MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT PARITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, shall award grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, States to ensure that health insurance issuers in the State comply with section 2726.

"(b) USE OF GRANT.—A State shall use amounts received under a grant or cooperative agreement under this section to—

"(1) establish clear guidelines for parity compliance for mental health and substance use disorder benefits;

"(2) ensure parity compliance during public health emergencies with best practices for delivering evidence-based mental health and substance use disorder treatment, including to ensure virtual, video, internet, telephonic, and other remote services are appropriately covered, including alignment with authorities, flexibilities, and coverage promulgated by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

"(3) engage with health insurance issuers to ensure that they comply with the guidelines promulgated and other provisions of section 2726, including through audits, market conduct examinations, secret shopper programs, or other means;

"(4) share information with other States who receive grants under this section;

"(5) submit a report to the Secretary and the Secretary of Labor on information, actions, recommendations, and such other information as such secretaries may require; and

"(6) publicly post a summary of the report submitted under paragraph (6) on the websites of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025."

SEC. 7. FEDERAL LICENSURE OF PHARMACEUTICAL REPRESENTATIVES WHO PROMOTE CERTAIN OPIOIDS.

Subchapter E of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C.

360bbb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 569E. FEDERAL LICENSURE OF PHARMACEUTICAL REPRESENTATIVES WHO PROMOTE CERTAIN OPIOIDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall establish a licensure program for pharmaceutical representatives described in subsection (b).

“(b) LICENSURE PROGRAM.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Beginning on July 1, 2021, no individual described in paragraph (2) may engage in the marketing or promoting of opioid drugs unless such individual is licensed under this section.

“(2) INDIVIDUALS REQUIRED TO OBTAIN LICENSURE.—An individual required to obtain a license under this section is any individual who, on behalf of a drug manufacturer, engaged, on more than 15 days in a calendar year, in the marketing or promotion to health care professionals, including educational or sales communications, meetings or paid events, and the provision of goods, gifts, and samples, of any opioid drug (other than methadone) that is listed in schedule II of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act.

“(3) LICENSURE PERIOD.—Each license issued under this section shall be valid for 3 years, and may be renewed for additional 3-year periods.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS.—An individual required to obtain a license under this section shall—

“(1) submit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require—

“(A) such information as the Secretary may require; and

“(B) a registration fee in the amount of \$3,000;

“(2) certify that such individual has completed training on ethics, pharmaceutical marketing regulations, the ‘CDC Guidelines for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain’, published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2016 (or any successor document) or the ‘FDA Blueprint for Prescriber Education for Extended-Release and Long-Acting Opioid Analgesics’, and applicable Federal laws pertaining to drug marketing, labeling, and clinical trials, as the Secretary may require;

“(3) certify that such individual will not engage in any illegal, fraudulent, misleading, or other deceptive marketing of schedule II opioid drugs; and

“(4) file with the Secretary annual reports disclosing the names of providers visited and any drug samples or gifts such individual gives any such provider.

“(d) MANUFACTURER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The manufacturer who employs or contracts with any individual required to obtain a license under this section shall include in reports required under section 1128G of the Social Security Act the name of each such licensed individual that provides payments or other transfers of value required to be reported under such section 1128G that relates to an opioid drug that is listed in schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act.”

SEC. 8. WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF CERTAIN OPIOIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any ultra-high-dose opioid shall be considered a drug that presents an imminent hazard to the public health within the meaning of section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(e)), and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall suspend the approval of such drug, in accordance with such section 505(e).

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “ultra-high-dose opioid” means an opioid

drug for which the daily dosage provided for in the approved label exceeds the morphine milligram equivalents per day outlined in the report entitled “CDC Guidelines for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain”, published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2016 (or any successor document).

SEC. 9. CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAM REGISTRATION FOR PRESCRIBERS.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following:

“(k)(1) The Attorney General shall not register, or renew the registration of, a practitioner under subsection (f) who is licensed under State law to prescribe controlled substances in schedule II, III, or IV, unless the practitioner submits to the Attorney General, for each such registration or renewal request, a written certification that—

“(A)(i) the practitioner has, during the 1-year period preceding the registration or renewal request, completed a training program described in paragraph (2); or

“(ii) the practitioner, during the applicable registration period, will not prescribe such controlled substances in amounts in excess of a 72-hour supply (for which no refill is available); and

“(B) the practitioner has registered with the prescription drug monitoring program of the State in which the practitioner practices, if the State has such program.

“(2) A training program described in this paragraph is a training program that—

“(A) follows the best practices for pain management, as described in the ‘Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain’ as published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2016, or any successor thereto, or the ‘FDA Blueprint for Prescriber Education for Extended-Release and Long-Acting Opioid Analgesics’ as published by the Food and Drug Administration in 2017, or any successor thereto;

“(B) includes information on—

“(i) recommending non-opioid and non-pharmacological therapy;

“(ii) establishing treatment goals and evaluating patient risks;

“(iii) prescribing the lowest dose and fewest number of pills considered effective;

“(iv) additive and overdose risks of opioids;

“(v) diagnosing and managing substance use disorders, including linking patients to evidence-based treatment;

“(vi) identifying narcotics-seeking behaviors; and

“(vii) using prescription drug monitoring programs; and

“(C) is approved by the Secretary.”

SEC. 10. REPORT ON PRESCRIBER EDUCATION COURSES FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL STUDENTS.

Each school of medicine, school of osteopathic medicine, and school of dentistry participating in a program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a et seq.), as a condition for such participation, shall submit an annual report to the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on any prescriber education courses focused specifically on pain management and responsible opioid prescribing practices that such school requires students to take, and whether such courses are consistent with the most recently published version of the “Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain” of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the “FDA Blueprint for Prescriber Education for Extended-Release and Long-

Acting Opioid Analgesics”, as published by the Food and Drug Administration in 2017. The Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall compile the reports submitted by such schools and submit an annual summary of such reports to Congress.

SEC. 11. REQUIREMENTS UNDER PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each State that receives funding under any of the programs described in subsection (c) shall—

(1) require practitioners, or their designees, in the State to consult the database of the prescription drug monitoring program before writing prescriptions for controlled substances (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) in schedule II, III, or IV under section 202 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 812);

(2) require dispensers of controlled substances in schedule II, III, or IV, or their designees, to input data into the database of the prescription drug monitoring program within 24 hours of filling a qualifying prescription, as required by the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including patient identifier information, the national drug code of the dispensed drug, date of dispensing the drug, quantity and dosage of the drug dispensed, form of payment, Drug Enforcement Administration registration number of the practitioner, Drug Enforcement Administration registration number of the dispenser;

(3) allow practitioners and dispensers to designate other appropriate individuals to act as agents of such practitioners and dispensers for purposes of obtaining and inputting data from the database for purposes of complying with paragraphs (1) and (2), as applicable;

(4) provide informational materials for practitioners and dispensers to identify and refer patients with possible substance use disorders to professional treatment specialists;

(5) establish formal data sharing agreements to foster electronic connectivity with the prescription drug monitoring programs of each State (if such State has such a program) with which the State shares a border, to facilitate the exchange of information through an established technology architecture that ensures common data standards, privacy protection, and secure and streamlined information sharing;

(6) authorize direct access to the State’s database of the prescription drug monitoring program to all State law enforcement agencies, State boards responsible for the licensure, regulation, or discipline of practitioners, pharmacists, or other persons authorized to prescribe, administer, or dispense controlled substances; and

(7) in order to enhance accountability in prescribing and dispensing patterns, not fewer than 4 times per year, proactively provide informational reports on aggregate trends and individual outliers, based on information available through the State prescription drug monitoring program to—

(A) the State entities and persons described in paragraph (6); and

(B) the Medicaid agency and the department of public health of the State.

(b) TRANSPARENCY IN PRESCRIBING PRACTICES AND INTERVENTION FOR HIGH PRESCRIBERS.—

(1) STATE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each State that receives funding under any of the programs described in subsection (c) shall, twice per year, submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

(A) a list of all practitioners and dispensers who, in the applicable reporting period, have prescribed or dispensed schedule II, III, or IV opioids in the State;

(B) the amount of schedule II, III, or IV opioids that were prescribed and dispensed by each individual practitioner and dispenser described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) any additional information that the Secretary and Administrator may require to support surveillance and evaluation of trends in prescribing or dispensing of schedule II, III, or IV opioids, or to identify possible non-medical use and diversion of such substances.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall submit to Congress, and make public, a report identifying outliers among the medical specialties and geographic areas with the highest rates of opioid prescribing in the Nation, by zip code.

(3) DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLAN.—

(A) INITIAL PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall submit to Congress a plan of action, including warning letters and enforcement mechanisms, for addressing outliers in opioid prescribing practices and ensuring an adequate Federal response to protect the public health.

(B) UPDATED PLAN.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress updates to the plan of action described in subparagraph (A), as such Secretary, in consultation with the heads of agencies described in such subparagraph, determines appropriate.

(c) PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.—The programs described in this subsection are—

(1) the Harold Rogers Prescription Drug Monitoring Program established under the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107-77; 115 Stat. 748);

(2) the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3900 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3);

(3) the Prescription Drug Overdose: Prevention for States program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(4) the Prescription Drug Overdose: Data-Driven Prevention Initiative of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(5) the Enhanced State Opioid Overdose Surveillance program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(6) the opioid grant program under section 1003 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114-255); and

(7) the State Opioid Response Grant program described under the heading “SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT” under the heading “SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION” of title II of division A of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “dispenser” and “practitioner” have the meanings given such terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

SEC. 12. INTEROPERABILITY OF CERTIFIED HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

Section 3001(c)(5) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj-11(c)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) INTEROPERABILITY.—Beginning on January 1, 2021, the National Coordinator shall not certify electronic health records as health information technology that is in compliance with applicable certification criteria under this paragraph unless such technology is interoperable with the prescription drug monitoring programs of each State that, at the time of the request for such certification, has such a program.”.

SEC. 13. STUDIES RELATED TO OVERDOSE DISCHARGE AND FOLLOW-UP POLICIES.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) conduct a study on the scope and circumstances of non-fatal opioid overdoses, the policies and procedures that States, health care systems, and first responders have implemented; and

(2) in partnership with stakeholder organizations with subject matter expertise, establish guidelines for hospital procedures following non-fatal opioid overdose and the administration of overdose reversal medication.

(b) STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY MEASURES UNDER MEDICARE RELATED TO OPIOID ABUSE AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.—Section 1890A(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395aaa-1(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “MEASURES.—The Administrator” and inserting “MEASURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY MEASURES RELATED TO OPIOID ABUSE AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator of the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services shall study, and through contracts develop, in coordination with appropriate subject matter organizations (such as the entity with a contract under section 1890), for use under this Act, quality measures related to standards of care for treating individuals with non-fatal opioid overdose, discharge procedures, and linkages to appropriate substance use disorder treatment and community support services.”.

SEC. 14. MEDICAID OPIOID DRUG MAPPING TOOL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall create an interactive opioid drug mapping tool, which shall be made publicly available on the internet website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, showing prescribing practices of providers that participate in State Medicaid programs and geographic comparisons, at the State, county, and ZIP code levels, of de-identified opioid prescription claims made under State Medicaid programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) COLLECTION OF DATA FROM STATES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may request from States such data as the Secretary determines necessary to create the opioid mapping tool described in subsection (a).

SEC. 15. NATIONAL ACADEMIES STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall enter into a contract with the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine (referred to in this section as the “National Academies”) to carry out a study on the addition of coverage under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act of alter-

native treatment modalities (such as integrative medicine, including acupuncture and exercise therapy, neural stimulation, biofeedback, radiofrequency ablation, and trigger point injections) furnished to Medicare beneficiaries who suffer from acute or chronic lower back pain. Such study shall, pursuant to the contract under this paragraph, include an analysis of—

(1) scientific research on the short-term and long-term impact of the addition of such coverage on clinical efficacy for pain management of such beneficiaries;

(2) whether the lack of Medicare coverage for alternative treatment modalities impacts the volume of opioids prescribed for beneficiaries; and

(3) the cost to the Medicare program of the addition of such coverage to treat pain and mitigate the progression of chronic pain, as weighed against the cost of opioid use disorder, overdose, readmission, subsequent surgeries, and utilization and expenditures under parts B and D of such title.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, pursuant to the contract under subsection (a), the National Academies shall submit to Congress a report on the study under subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4243. A bill to protect children of certain immigrant workers from detention and removal and aging out of lawful status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4243

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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 “Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act”.

SEC. 2. PROTECTING CHILDREN OF CERTAIN IMMIGRANT WORKERS FROM DETENTION AND REMOVAL AND AGING OUT OF LAWFUL STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to subsection (b), with respect to an individual whose parent is the principal beneficiary of an approved employment-based immigrant worker petition filed on a date on which the individual was a child (as defined in section 101(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)))—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security shall not detain, refer for removal, initiate removal proceedings against, or remove the individual; and

(2) the individual shall—

(A) without regard to immigrant intent and on application by the individual, be eligible—

(i) to extend nonimmigrant dependent status connected to the nonimmigrant status of such parent until the date on which an application for lawful permanent resident status filed by the individual pursuant to subparagraph (B) is adjudicated; or

(ii) to extend or change status to an alternative nonimmigrant status independent of such parent’s visa status until the date on which an application for lawful permanent resident status filed by the individual pursuant to that subparagraph is adjudicated; and

(B) qualify as a derivative beneficiary child for immigrant visa purposes beginning on the date on which such parent's employment-based immigrant worker petition is approved and ending on the date on which the individual's application for lawful permanent resident status is adjudicated, regardless of whether such parent is living or deceased.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any individual who the Secretary determines, on an individualized basis, poses a threat to public safety or national security.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 653—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT A UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL FROM THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION UNDERMINES UNITED STATES GLOBAL HEALTH LEADERSHIP AND THE INTERNATIONAL COVID-19 RESPONSE

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. Kaine, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. REED, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 653

Whereas United States contributions to the World Health Organization (WHO) are leveraged with contributions from other countries, the private sector, and foundations to advance longstanding United States global health priorities;

Whereas the WHO was founded in 1948 with United States help and has been at the forefront of major global health achievements in the last 72 years, including the eradication of polio, because of United States financial and diplomatic support;

Whereas the United States has consistently been the largest donor to the WHO in recognition of its vital role in saving lives, improving global disease detection, and coordinating a global public health response;

Whereas the WHO is able to implement health programs in places the United States Government cannot as effectively operate in, including Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Whereas the WHO leads polio surveillance, immunization, and technical support, and is able to reach remote areas in countries where polio still exists;

Whereas the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief works with the WHO to enhance programs and policies in areas, including laboratory capacity, prevention of mother to child transmission of HIV, health system strengthening, prevention of tuberculosis infections, and counseling and testing;

Whereas the United States is home to 83 different WHO collaborating centers, more than 20 of which are at the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health;

Whereas the WHO, following the 2014 West African Ebola outbreak, undertook a series

of reforms to strengthen its health emergencies program and response in large part due to United States involvement;

Whereas the WHO is leading the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic with its technical, communications, and organizational capacities in 150 countries;

Whereas the WHO is coordinating an unprecedented global clinical trial, known as the "Solidarity Trial", to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of 4 drug treatment combinations against COVID-19, involving more than 100 countries, 400 hospitals, and more than 3,500 patients;

Whereas the WHO is leading the global effort to supply health commodities and is coordinating the United Nations Global Supply Chain Task Force, which is working with the private sector, the World Food Programme, and the European Central Bank to establish an emergency supply chain for low-resource countries;

Whereas at least 135 countries rely on the WHO to procure millions of pieces of personal protective equipment and other vital health commodities like tests and testing supplies;

Whereas the WHO is the only organization with the legal mandate and capacity to gather public health data from any country in the world and use it to quickly develop and disseminate technical guidance to help countries prepare public health responses;

Whereas the WHO, through a partnership with member states, major donors, and private sector partners called the ACT Accelerator, is already working to pre-position manufacturing capacity and distribution channels to ensure that all countries have access to future therapies and vaccines faster and at a fair price;

Whereas the Trump Administration froze funding to the WHO pending a "60 to 90 day review" on April 14, 2020, but without any disclosure of the review's findings, gave the WHO 30 days to make unspecified reforms on May 19, 2020, and then, 11 days later, announced the United States would withdraw from the WHO;

Whereas, on June 25, 2020, the Senate passed by unanimous consent S. Res. 579, urging United States leadership and participation in global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19; and

Whereas, on July 6, 2020, the Trump Administration officially submitted a formal letter to the United Nations Secretary General to withdraw the United States from the WHO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) withdrawing the United States from the World Health Organization—

(A) undermines United States global health priorities and threatens lives around the world and in the United States;

(B) risks weakening the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic;

(C) threatens United States humanitarian responses; and

(D) creates a vacuum of leadership at the WHO at a time when it has been our expressed interest to counter China's growing influence within the organization; and

(2) the World Health Assembly agreed by consensus to appoint an interim assessment of the response to COVID-19, and by remaining a member in good standing, the United States will have the most leverage to advocate and put in place the reforms necessary for the World Health Organization to respond to this and future crises.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we are in unprecedented times. Modern transportation and communication technology make our world more inter-

connected than it has ever been. These advancements, especially international travel, create risks, as we have seen through the devastating spread of the novel coronavirus all over the globe. But close global connections also strengthen our capacity to work collaboratively to tackle threats facing our communities. The COVID-19 pandemic is one such threat—it is a challenge that we will only be able to overcome together. United Nations Secretary General Antonio Guterres put it best when he said, "We are only as strong as the weakest health systems."

President Trump's decision on July 6th to begin formally withdrawing the United States from the World Health Organization, or the WHO, is irrational, reckless, and simply the wrong thing to do. While the WHO is not perfect, its technical capacities and relationship with nearly every country in the world make it the best organization to manage the response to a global pandemic like COVID-19. A few weeks ago, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee heard from a panel of public health experts who all spoke with one voice—leaving the WHO in the middle of a global pandemic will not only compromise the international response to COVID-19, it will put Americans' lives at risk.

Today, I am introducing a resolution with 28 co-sponsors that expresses the sense of the Senate that withdrawing from the WHO undermines U.S. global health leadership and the international COVID-19 response. This resolution recognizes that since the WHO was founded in 1948—with help from the United States—it has relied on U.S. support to lead the world in disease detection and eradication and strengthening health systems. The resolution also highlights the significant benefit the U.S. gains by participating in the WHO, including the ability to improve public health in regions of the world that would be impossible to reach on our own.

Finally, the resolution highlights the lifesaving work of the WHO in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. This work includes convening an unprecedented global clinical trial—the Solidarity Trial—to help find an effective treatment for COVID-19; coordinating global supply chains of personal protective equipment and other health commodities for more than 135 countries; and pre-positioning manufacturing capacity and distribution channels to ensure that all countries have access to future therapies and vaccines faster and at a fair price. Last month, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution urging U.S. participation in global efforts on therapeutics and vaccine development and delivery to address COVID-19. Leaving the WHO will make it drastically more difficult to accomplish those goals.

The WHO has its flaws, but the United States is best positioned to effect positive changes by maintaining our seat at the table. Historically, we

have been able to encourage the WHO to make important reforms, like improvements to the organization's health emergencies program that were undertaken following the 2014 West African Ebola outbreak. By withdrawing from the WHO, we are forfeiting our voice in these conversations and empowering countries that do not have our best interests in mind. The international community, and especially the American people, will suffer as a result.

For these reasons, I hope that I can count on the Senate's support for this important resolution. If we are to be successful in the fight against COVID-19 and any other pandemic health challenges we may encounter, the U.S. cannot isolate itself from the rest of the world. An isolationist stance will only lead to domestic and global failure. With the pandemic raging in our own backyard, it is more important than ever before for the United States to continue to collaborate with countries around the world to end this global health emergency and prevent future ones from starting. If I may paraphrase John Donne, no nation—not even the United States—“is an island entire of itself.” We are all “part of the main” and the bell tolls for all of us.

SENATE RESOLUTION 654—DESIGNATING JULY 25, 2020, AS “NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY”

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 654

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as “cowboys”, helped to establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment, is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the United States who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, making rodeo one of the most-watched sports in the United States;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 25, 2020, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2481. Mr. DAINES 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 2482. Mr. ENZI 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 2483. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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 2484. Mr. TILLIS 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 2485. Mr. SCOTT, of Florida (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, and 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 2486. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) 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 2481. Mr. DAINES 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PENALTIES FOR REPRESENTING VETERANS AS AGENTS AND ATTORNEYS WITHOUT RECOGNITION BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PENALTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 5905. Penalty for certain acts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), whoever commits any of the following acts shall be fined as provided in title

18, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both:

“(1) Undertakes or attempts to undertake any work in furtherance of the preparation, presentation, or prosecution of a claim under a law administered by the Secretary—

“(A) without recognition by the Secretary under sections 5902 through 5904 of this title; or

“(B) while suspended or excluded under section 5904(b) of this title.

“(2) Unlawfully withholds from any claimant or beneficiary any part of a benefit or claim under the laws administered by the Secretary that is allowed and due to the claimant or beneficiary.

“(b) SEEKING RECOGNITION.—Subsection (a)(1)(A) shall not be construed to include the seeking of recognition from the Secretary to prepare, present, or prosecute a claim under a law administered by the Secretary.

“(c) RECOGNITION PENDING.—Subsection (a)(1)(A) shall not be construed to include activities undertaken by an individual not suspended or excluded under section 5904(b) of this title in furtherance of the preparation of a claim under a law administered by the Secretary while waiting for recognition by the Secretary under sections 5902 through 5904 of this title.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to acts committed after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) BIENNIAL REVIEWS BY GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Section 5904 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) BIENNIAL REVIEWS BY GENERAL COUNSEL.—(1) Not less frequently than once every two years, the General Counsel of the Department shall submit to Congress a report on activities under this section.

“(2) Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

“(A) A discussion of the rates generally charged for services covered by this section.

“(B) A discussion of the requests made by claimants under subsection (c)(3)(A).

“(C) A discussion of the fees reduced under such subsection.

“(D) The number of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary that were prepared, presented, or prosecuted by an individual acting as an agent or attorney who did so while not recognized under this section.”.

SA 2482. 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 SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES URANIUM PRODUCERS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Energy should provide support to producers of uranium in the United States in light of the threat to national security posed by uranium producers owned or controlled by foreign governments.

SA 2483. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) 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 E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1052. LIMITATION ON USE FOR SEARCH, SEIZURE, ARREST, OR OTHER SIMILAR ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORTING FEDERAL OPERATIONS OR MISSIONS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act may not be obligated or expended for the performance of search, seizure, arrest, or other similar activities by members or units of the National Guard performing training or duty under section 502 of title 32, United States Code.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to members or units of the National Guard performing training or duty in connection with disaster relief efforts pursuant to a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

SA 2484. Mr. TILLIS 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 C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 752. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE ARMED FORCES INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Armed Forces Institute for Regenerative Medicine (in this section referred to as “AFIRM”) delivers critical regenerative-based technologies lead to functional and aesthetic recovery from injuries incurred during service in the Armed Forces;

(2) AFIRM is a highly rated, nationally respected public-private consortium leading the development of restorative therapies for battlefield trauma as part of several research and development programs directed to meet defined medical technology gaps for warfighter groups;

(3) the efforts by AFIRM span from research and development to clinical translation, implementation, and commercialization, with therapies developed for extremity and craniofacial trauma, skin and genitourinary injuries, and transplantation;

(4) each AFIRM project specifically addresses a key need of the wounded warfighter, which has helped guide research projects toward partnerships with industry that can be reviewed for approval and entered into clinical trials for eventual placement in the marketplace;

(5) technologies developed by AFIRM include, in part, those that will result in the ability to generate and integrate functional composite tissue, neural pathways,

vascularization, aesthetic skin, bone, and muscle;

(6) despite the technology challenges, the public-private teaming approach to medical research and development used by AFIRM has resulted in more than 24 products reaching clinical trials;

(7) it is essential that Congress continue to support the technology exploration, maturation, and transition in regenerative medicine set forth by AFIRM; and

(8) the Senate encourages allocation of funds to AFIRM from the undistributed medical research funds provided in this Act to facilitate the continued implementation of the innovative consortium model used by AFIRM that has a proven track record of success.

SA 2485. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, and 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 title VIII, add the following:

Subtitle H—Limitation on Procurement of Drones and Other Unmanned Aircraft Systems

SEC. 896. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “American Security Drone Act of 2020”.

SEC. 897. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COVERED FOREIGN ENTITY.**—The term “covered foreign entity” means an entity included on a list developed and maintained by the Federal Acquisition Security Council. This list will include entities in the following categories:

(A) An entity included on the Consolidated Screening List.

(B) Any entity that is subject to extrajudicial direction from a foreign government, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(C) Any entity the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, determines poses a national security risk.

(D) Any entity domiciled in the People’s Republic of China or subject to influence or control by the Government of the People Republic of China or the Communist Party of the People’s Republic of China, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(E) Any subsidiary or affiliate of an entity described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(2) **COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.**—The term “covered unmanned aircraft system” has the meaning given the term “unmanned aircraft system” in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 898. PROHIBITION ON PROCUREMENT OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under subsections (b) through (f), the head of an executive agency may not procure any covered unmanned aircraft system that are manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity, which includes associated elements (con-

sisting of communication links and the components that control the unmanned aircraft) that are required for the operator to operate safely and efficiently in the national airspace system. The Federal Acquisition Security Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, shall develop and update a list of associated elements.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for—

(A) electronic warfare;

(B) information warfare operations;

(C) development of UAS or counter-UAS technology;

(D) counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities; or

(E) Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations; and

(2) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for the Federal Aviation Administration’s Alliance for System Safety of UAS through Research Excellence (ASSURE) Center of Excellence (COE) for Unmanned Aircraft Systems.

(d) **NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD EXEMPTION.**—The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of conducting safety investigations.

(e) **NATIONAL OCEANIC ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION EXEMPTION.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of marine or atmospheric science or management.

(f) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) upon notification to Congress.

SEC. 899. PROHIBITION ON OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal department or agency may operate a covered unmanned aircraft system manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity.

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTED SERVICES.**—The prohibition under paragraph (1) applies to any covered unmanned aircraft systems that are being used by any executive agency through the method of contracting for the services of covered unmanned aircraft systems.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for—

- (A) electronic warfare;
- (B) information warfare operations;
- (C) development of UAS or counter-UAS technology;
- (D) counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities; or
- (E) Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations; and

(2) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS EXEMPTION.**—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for the Federal Aviation Administration's Alliance for System Safety of UAE through Research Excellence (AS-SURE) Center of Excellence (COE) for Unmanned Aircraft Systems.

(d) **NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD EXEMPTION.**—The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of conducting safety investigations.

(e) **NATIONAL OCEANIC ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION EXEMPTION.**—The Administrator of the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation or procurement is necessary for the sole purpose of marine or atmospheric science or management.

(f) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) upon notification to Congress.

(g) **REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prescribe regulations or guidance to implement this section.

SEC. 899A. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PURCHASES AND OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), no Federal funds awarded through a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, or otherwise made available may be used—

(1) to purchase a covered unmanned aircraft system, or a system to counter unmanned aircraft systems, that is manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity; or

(2) in connection with the operation of such a drone or unmanned aircraft system.

(b) **EXEMPTION.**—A Federal department or agency is exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if—

(1) the contract, grant or cooperative agreement was awarded prior to the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the operation or procurement is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, or the Attorney General, for—

(A) electronic warfare;

(B) information warfare operations;

(C) development of UAS or counter-UAS technology;

(D) counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities; or

(E) Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations; or

(F) the safe integration of UAS in the national airspace (as determined in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation); and

(3) is required in the national interest of the United States.

(c) **WAIVER.**—The head of an executive agency may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis—

(1) with the approval of the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) upon notification to Congress.

(d) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall prescribe regulations or guidance, as necessary, to implement the requirements of this section pertaining to Federal contracts.

SEC. 899B. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GOVERNMENT-ISSUED PURCHASE CARDS TO PURCHASE COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

Effective immediately, Government-issued Purchase Cards may not be used to procure any covered unmanned aircraft system from a covered foreign entity.

SEC. 899C. MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING INVENTORIES OF COVERED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective immediately, all executive agencies must account for existing inventories of covered unmanned aircraft systems manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity in their personal property accounting systems, regardless of the original procurement cost, or the purpose of procurement due to the special monitoring and accounting measures necessary to track the items' capabilities.

(b) **CLASSIFIED TRACKING.**—Due to the sensitive nature of missions and operations conducted by the United States Government, inventory data related to covered unmanned aircraft systems manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity may be tracked at a classified level.

(c) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security may exclude from the full inventory process, covered unmanned aircraft systems that are deemed expendable due to mission risk such as recovery issues or that are one-time-use covered unmanned aircraft due to requirements and low cost.

SEC. 899D. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.

Not later than 275 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of commercial off-the-shelf drones and covered unmanned aircraft systems procured by Federal departments and agencies from covered foreign entities.

SEC. 899E. GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY FOR PROCUREMENT OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Transportation, the Department of Justice, and other Departments as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall establish a government-wide policy for the procurement of UAS—

(1) for non-Department of Defense and non-intelligence community operations; and

(2) through grants and cooperative agreements entered into with non-Federal entities.

(b) **INFORMATION SECURITY.**—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall include the following specifications, which to the extent practicable, shall be based on industry standards and technical guidance from the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to address the risks associated with processing, storing and transmitting Federal information in a UAS:

(1) Protections to ensure controlled access of UAS.

(2) Protecting software, firmware, and hardware by ensuring changes to UAS are properly managed, including by ensuring UAS can be updated using a secure, controlled, and configurable mechanism.

(3) Cryptographically securing sensitive collected, stored, and transmitted data, including proper handling of privacy data and other controlled unclassified information.

(4) Appropriate safeguards necessary to protect sensitive information, including during and after use of UAS.

(5) Appropriate data security to ensure that data is not transmitted to or stored in non-approved locations.

(6) The ability to opt out of the uploading, downloading, or transmitting of data that is not required by law or regulation and an ability to choose with whom and where information is shared when it is required.

(c) **REQUIREMENT.**—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall reflect an appropriate risk-based approach to information security related to use of UAS.

(d) **REVISION OF ACQUISITION REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the policy required under subsection (a) is issued—

(1) the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation, as necessary, to implement the policy; and

(2) any Federal department or agency or other Federal entity not subject to, or not subject solely to, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall revise applicable policy, guidance, or regulations, as necessary, to implement the policy.

(e) **EXEMPTION.**—In developing the policy required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall incorporate an exemption to the policy for the following reasons:

(1) In the case of procurement for the purposes of training, testing or analysis for—

(A) electronic warfare; or

(B) information warfare operations.

(2) In the case of researching UAS technology, including testing, evaluation, research, or development of technology to counter UAS.

(3) In the case of a head of the procuring department or agency determining, in writing, that no product that complies with the information security requirements described in subsection (b) is capable of fulfilling mission critical performance requirements, and such determination—

(A) may not be delegated below the level of the Deputy Secretary of the procuring department or agency;

(B) shall specify—

(i) the quantity of end items to which the waiver applies, the procurement value of which may not exceed \$50,000 per waiver; and

(ii) the time period over which the waiver applies, which shall not exceed 3 years;

(C) shall be reported to the Office of Management and Budget following issuance of such a determination; and

(D) not later than 30 days after the date on which the determination is made, shall be

provided to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 899F. STUDY.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center under which the center will conduct a study of—

(1) the current and future unmanned aircraft system global and domestic market;

(2) the ability of the unmanned aircraft system domestic market to keep pace with technological advancements across the industry;

(3) the ability of domestically made unmanned aircraft systems to meet the network security and data protection requirements of the national security enterprise;

(4) the extent to which unmanned aircraft system component parts, such as the parts described in section 898(a), are made domestically; and

(5) an assessment of the economic impact, including cost, of excluding the use of foreign-made UAS for use across the Federal Government.

(b) SUBMISSION TO OMB.—Upon completion of the study in subsection (a), the federally funded research and development center shall submit the study to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget receives the study under subsection (b), the Director shall submit the study to—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 899G. SUNSET.

Sections 898, 899, and 899A shall cease to have effect on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2486. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) 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 XII, insert the following:

SEC. 1210. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF AND HIRING AUTHORITY FOR THE GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT CENTER.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1287(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking “the date that is 8 years after the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 31, 2027”.

(b) HIRING AUTHORITY FOR GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT CENTER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, during the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and solely to carry out functions of the Global Engagement Center established by such section, may—

(1) appoint employees without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code,

regarding appointments in the competitive service; and

(2) fix the basic compensation of such employees without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title regarding classification and General Schedule pay rates.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARASSO. Mr. President, I have 6 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 Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

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 Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 10 a.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 Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURING, TRADE, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Subcommittee on Manufacturing, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 21, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 654, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 654) designating July 25, 2020, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the preamble be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be con-

sidered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 654) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

UNITED STATES SEMIQUINCENTENNIAL COMMISSION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2020

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 3989 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3989) to amend the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 to modify certain membership and other requirements of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. LOEFFLER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3989) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3989

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 “United States Semiquincentennial Commission Amendments Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES SEMIQUINCENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—Section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–196; 130 Stat. 685) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking subparagraph (I) and inserting the following:

“(I) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts.

“(J) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

“(K) The Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

“(L)(i) The Chief Justice of the United States; or

“(ii) an Associate Justice or former Associate Justice appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REMOVAL OF MEMBERS WHO ARE PRIVATE CITIZENS.—On an affirmative vote of not less than 2/3 of the members of the Commission, the Commission may remove a member of the Commission appointed under subsection (b)(3).”; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “All meetings” and inserting the following:

“(1) LOCATION OF FIRST MEETING.—The first meeting”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) LOCATION OF SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.—At least 1 meeting of the Commission each year shall be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.”

(b) DUTIES.—Section 5(c)(1) of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196; 130 Stat. 687) is amended by striking “2 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “March 31, 2020”.

(c) COORDINATION.—Section 6(b) of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196; 130 Stat. 689) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “presiding officer of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities” and inserting “Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and other” after “founding”.

(d) EXPENDITURES OF COMMISSION.—Section 9 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196; 130 Stat. 691) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—All expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donations, earned income, and any funds made available to carry out this Act under subsection (g).”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “Once each year during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “Annually during the period beginning 1 year after the Commission submits the report to the President under section 5(c)(1)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTIONS.—The Commission shall have the sole power to authorize, license, and, as applicable, derive income from, the usage of official marks, imprimaturs, products, and logos of the Commission and the official United States Semiquincentennial activities sponsored or cosponsored by the Commission.

“(f) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), except as authorized under rules and regulations officially issued by the Commission, any person who knowingly manufactures, reproduces, or uses any logo, symbol, or mark originated under authority of, and certified by, in accordance with paragraph (2), the Commission or the secretariat of the Commission described in subsection (b) for use in connection with the commemoration of the United States Semiquincentennial, or any facsimile of the logo, symbol, or mark, or holds out to the public objects in a manner to suggest any logo, symbol, or mark not officially authorized by the Commission or the secretariat of the Commission, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 for each unauthorized use, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

“(2) APPLICABILITY DATE.—The requirements of paragraph (1) shall apply beginning on the date of publication in the Federal Register of notice of certification by the Commission or secretariat of the Commission with respect to a logo, symbol, or mark.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such

sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, at 12:10 p.m. tomorrow, all debate time with respect to the Sanders amendment No. 1788 and the Tester amendment No. 1972, as modified, expire and the Senate vote in relation to those amendments, in that order, with all other provisions under the order of July 2 remaining in effect with respect to these amendments; finally, that the time from 11:20 a.m. until 12:10 p.m. be under the control of Senator SANDERS and that 10 minutes be under the control of Senator SULLIVAN prior to the votes in this series.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2020

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 22; 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 that morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. LOEFFLER. Madam 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 7:11 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

MATTHEW MOURY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2021. VICE JOSEPH BRUCE HAMILTON, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DANIEL HUFF, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE MICHAEL PLATT JR., RESIGNED.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

ROBERT E. PRIMUS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023. VICE DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANDRE BAUER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BELIZE.

BRIAN D. MCFEETERS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MALAYSIA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUTAPA GHOSH STRICKLETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE JONATHAN NICHOLAS STIVERS.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

JOHN GIBBS, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DALE CABANISS, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANDREW W. BATTEN
COL. JOHN W. BOZICEVIC
COL. LONNIE J. BRANUM, JR.
COL. ROBERT H. BUMGARDNER
COL. TOBIN R. CLIFTON
COL. TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY
COL. BRETT P. CONAWAY
COL. CHRISTOPHER R. CRONIN
COL. CHARLENE C. DALTO
COL. DANIEL A. DEGELOW
COL. WAYNE W. DON
COL. RODRIGO R. GONZALEZ III
COL. DAVID L. HALL
COL. JEFFREY S. HEASLEY
COL. MURRAY E. HOLT II
COL. LISA J. HOU
COL. TODD H. HUBBARD
COL. MICHAEL J. HUNT
COL. DAVID L. KAUFFMAN
COL. KEVIN R. KICK
COL. SEAN A. KLAHN
COL. ELMON R. KRUPNIK
COL. NATHAN F. LORD
COL. JOHN P. MAIER
COL. ERIC D. MAXON
COL. LAURA A. MCHUGH
COL. ERIN K. MCMAHON
COL. PAUL L. MINOR
COL. PETER V. MONDELLI
COL. THOMAS E. MOORE II
COL. CHARLES W. MORRISON
COL. MICHAELLE M. MUNGER
COL. RONALD M. NEELY
COL. JOHN C. NIPP
COL. LANCE A. OKAMURA
COL. JUSTIN W. OSBERG
COL. JAMES M. PABIS
COL. ROBERT F. PAOLETTI
COL. PATRICK T. PARDY
COL. KENT M. PORTER
COL. DAVID K. PRITCHETT
COL. DANIEL L. PULVERMACHER
COL. JOSEPH D. REALE
COL. RYAN J. ROBINSON
COL. BREN D. ROGERS
COL. RICARDO R. ROIG
COL. DANA P. SANDERS-UDO
COL. SHAWN R. SATTERFIELD
COL. WILLIAM P. SCOTT, JR.
COL. ISABEL R. SMITH
COL. MONIE R. ULIS
COL. JOHN M. WALLACE
COL. MARK B. YOUNG

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RYAN M. KOHLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

LAUREN A. Z. OTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JEREMY P. MALLARI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

EBONY V. GODFREY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PAMELA L. BLUEFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SUZANNE K. ROMEO

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARIECLAUDE C. BETTENCOURT
LEVI FUNCHES, JR.
BRIAN J. GOLDSMITH
WILLIAM W. LECATES
DANIEL S. SCHWARTZ
TRENT TIMMONS
ROBERT S. VAIDYA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RUFFIN BROWN III
JILL M. BRUNOENRIGHT
JENNIFER R. COOPER
WILLIAM L. FLYNN
RONALD GREEN, JR.
ROBERT C. HAMMOND
ERIC T. KREMERS
ROBERT F. LUNDGREN
GINA Y. MURRAY
JONAS PATRUNO
AMY C. PAYTON
RICHARD G. RASMUSSEN
ROSEMARIE ROTUNNO
JAMES M. SARDO
EDWARD T. SCHLESSER
ANGIE N. SNEED
JASON M. SQUITTER
MARK C. STEVENS
ROBIN UKLEYA
JENNIFER VARGASSANCHEZ
MELINDA K. WELLER
JOHN R. ZILLHARDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY N. AAMLAND
PHILLIP S. FARRIS
DAVID D. FOSSUM
LUIS GARCIA
BRIAN P. HARRITY
CHRISTOPHER C. HOWELL
DONALD F. MCARTHUR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JULIE H. FORMBY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

EVAN HART
DONALD R. LIBERTY
TERRY L. MALCOLM
JOEL S. MILLER
DANIEL C. SHIN
EDWARD M. WISE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JASON J. CARPENTER
SUSAN O. KOAGEL
JAMES A. MOWERY
KATHRINE M. THOMPSON
SHANE D. VANIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JENNIFER M. DOUTHWAITE
CHRISTINA J. HENDERSON
JOSHUA P. STAUFFER
JASON J. YIRSA
JEFFREY L. YONKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DANIELLE M. TACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TERRY L. CLARK, JR.
BRYAN V. STEVENS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LAURA C. FAHRENBROOK

JOHN F. KILPATRICK
SUELLYN M. MAHAN
SAROLYN H. MORGAN
DAVID J. NYBACK
BARBARA R. OUSBY
ISMAEL RODRIGUEZ, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHARLES C. BOGGS
ELIZABETH L. BRENT
MOSES H. J. CHENG
SIDNEY W. COLLINS, JR.
AMANDA S. CUDA
CHAD A. DEROSA
DUANE DUKE
MILTON A. FOWLER, JR.
STANISLAW GOLEC
RACHEL T. KAISER
SCOTT P. KELLY
KANG H. LEE
SUKHYUNG LEE
MICHAEL A. MAHLON
GEORGE J. MEYERS IV
JAMALAH A. MUNIR
NATALIE A. NEVINS
OLUGBENGA O. OBASANJO
JULIE A. REID
ANNE B. SHROUT
KARL G. WAGNER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY J. BELUSCAK II
RICHARD L. BUCHANAN, JR.
LESLIE M. CARLSON
FRANCISCO HURTADO
BRYAN F. MOORE
SCOTT J. POMYGLSKI
JASON J. POTTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WILLIAM C. COMSTOCK
KELLY L. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

ALEXANDER L. AILER
ERIC ALEGATA
ANA C. BARTHOLO
HILLARY L. BATTLES
GASTON BAZA
DANIEL E. BOONE
JENNIFER L. BRADY
MICHAEL A. BROWN
ZACHARY A. CALAMANTE
RICARDO D. CARINO, JR.
AMBER CHIAPUZZO
HOLLYE B. COTTLE
VORIS D. CROOMS
AMATUL W. DAVIS
JAMES M. DEACON
JILL F. DEANDA
NATHANIEL J. DECARLI
ZELALEM DESTA
MADIAAGNE DIOUF
MICHAL DOMENY
BRIAN R. DULZO
KARLA H. EDWARDS
MARIE A. ELLIOTTGAFFIELD
ARIE L. EMDE
GENEVIEVE G. ESPIRITU
JASON R. FARRIS
SETH G. FILLMORE
AILLENA M. FLYNN
TERESA M. FULTON
STACY L. GARRETT
JOSHUA B. GEIGER
ZACHARY W. GODWIN
ANGELA K. GREEN
BRITTANY L. HALL
HOLLY A. HANSON
MATTHEW D. HAYES
ERIC A. HENDERSON
CHELSI Y. HENNESSEY
KEISHA M. HENRY
DAVID T. HOFF
CHARLOTTE J. HOLLAND
MARKEISHA J. HUBBARD
JOHN A. HUDSONODOI
ASHLEY N. JEFFERSONWATTS
MEGAN N. JENSEN
NICHOLAS R. JOHNSON
ROBERT JOHNSON
TAMARA D. JOHNSONCASWELL
KEISHON G. JOSEPH
HANA L. KARPIE
JOSEPH KIECK
JUSTIN W. KIMMEL
SARAH K. KITCHIN
MICAH V. KRISHNAN
MARIA KUNKEL
SOON W. KWON
LUIS A. LACERNACASTILLO

CODY A. LACHAPPELLE
JOSHUA D. LAWLER
MICHELLE A. LIEBEL
THALES D. LOPES
ROSE K. MANKTELOW
JARED J. P. MARTIN
JESSICA A. MARTIN
TTTISHA C. MASTEN
DUSTIN W. MCCRARY
DONALD A. MCGHEE
CAITLIN M. MCGOWAN
DANIELLE MILES
MELISSA J. MILLER
ORPHELIA C. MORAGA
MONIQUE L. NASH
JOYCELYN C. NEVILLE
PETER K. NGANGA
JESSE S. NOELL
DENISE D. OCANAS
RICHARD T. PARK
CRYSTAL R. PARKER
TYEARA A. PHIFER
ADAM O. RICH
SUSANNE N. RICHTERICH
DAMALI A. ROBINSON
EMILY A. ROBINSON
JASON L. ROBINSON
AMANDA RODRIGUEZ
BRIAN C. ROYER
CRISTAL A. SAENZ
ERIC S. SAMUEL
JEANETTE SANTIAGO
PAULA F. SCATURRO
LOVEA H. SHAMPINE
CHAO SHEN
DUSTI N. SIKES
ELLEN SIMPSON
CELESTE M. SINGLETARY
SARAH A. SLEDD
AMBER L. SMITH
PETRA M. SPENCER
JOHN E. STAADS
CHRISTOPHER M. STONE
AMBER N. STRATTON
WILLIAM A. SUTLEY
ASHLEIGH J. TELMAN
TODD V. THOM
JAMES A. THOMPSON
WILLIAM L. TOWNSEND
SHEILA D. TYNDALL
DONALD J. VALLIER
MATTHEW M. VEITH
JESSICA L. VERWIEL
KRISTOPFER M. VILLAMIN
NIKOLA D. VUJAS
MARY L. WALLACE
JENNIFER L. WERTZ
TONDA S. WILLIAMS
PERRY D. WISEMAN
LANA J. WOLFE
KARLENE M. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

LIDILIA M. AMADORGARCIA
DHAVAL K. AMIN
MATTHEW B. ANGEL
HUGH P. ANSTETT
ANTHONY P. APA
LESLIE R. ARMSTRONG
MICHAEL A. ASH
ANGELO P. BARTOCCI
MICHELLE S. BEMENT
GEVAR R. BINGHAM
ALISHA R. BLOOM
CASSIE R. BONAEDO
DAVID A. BOUDREAUX, JR.
LEIALOHA H. BRATTON
GERALD H. BREDLAU
CHRISTIAN B. BUENAVENTURA
MATTHEW A. BUFFINGTON
LAUREN M. BULLIS
ERIC B. BUNNELL
TIMOTHY B. BURNETT
VALERIE A. BURTON
ALEXANDER N. CAMPOS
GLENN S. CANTY
DEIDRA M. CARTER
LENNIN I. CASTELLON
ARIEL S. CASTRO
TIMOTHY T. CAVANAGH, JR.
JOSHUA L. CHAPPELLE
JUSTIN K. CHEN
MALIA L. CHILDRESS
HYUN J. CHO
JASON A. CHRISTMAN
ANDREW A. CLACK
SYLVESTER COBBINA
TURNER A. CONRAD
JONATHAN M. COURAGE
RAINA G. COVINGTON
JUSTIN G. COX
JEFFERY W. CROOK
GERALYN T. CSIZMAR
IVETTE DALEY
HELEN K. DANIELS
JOSHUA R. DAVIS
ANDREW DESTEFANO
JASON G. DICK
JENNIFER L. DIXON
CHRISTOPHER L. DONAGHE
GABRIELLE M. DUNN
HUNG C. DUONG

ADAM M. ESCHENLAUER
 BRIAN J. FLANNERY
 JONATHAN E. FOSTER
 ALYSIA M. FRANCO
 ROSITA G. FREGOSOALENCASTRO
 JAMES J. FREY
 ALYSSA H. FRY
 FRANZ A. FRYE
 ANDREW L. FULTON
 JOHN P. GALAN
 CASSANDRA M. GARZA
 ORLANDO M. GELPI III
 PHILLIP J. P. GEORGE
 MERLE L. GILBERT
 REBEKAH L. GINGRAS
 ABIGAIL M. GIUNTA
 CHRISTOPHER L. GLASS
 ELISABETH R. GLASS
 JOSHUA A. GOTAY
 JONATHAN P. GRAY
 AMANDA R. P. HAIGHT
 AMY M. HASHIMOTO
 KATHERINE L. HERRON
 JERRY L. HICKEY
 VICENTE D. HIDALGO
 KANDICE D. HINES
 ANDREW W. HOLT
 MICHAEL A. HONSBERGER
 JUSTIN A. HOTZEL
 ENRIQUE INCLEBENITEZ
 BRANDON J. JACKSON
 JAMIE R. JACKSON
 EFRAIN JIMENEZ III
 TROY J. JOHNSON
 ZACHARIA M. JOHNSON
 CHERRITA L. JONES
 LAURA V. KAAE
 BRADLEY M. KEARNEY
 ZACHARY R. KING
 JENNIFER L. KOONTZ
 KRISTY K. KOONTZ
 STEPHEN W. KRAUSS
 MICHAEL A. KUNHAVIJIT
 ELIZABETH LEE
 JUNG S. LEE
 APRIL L. LINDSAY
 ROBERT A. LINDSAY
 VLADISLAV A. LITOSH
 TANYA R. LOCKETT
 MICHAEL O. LOZANO
 RAYMOND L. MANN
 JOSEPH W. MARGOTTA
 JOSHUA G. A. MARTINEZ
 MARIA D. L. MARTINEZ
 LIANA M. MATSON
 CJ K. MCAULAY
 JOSE E. MELENDEZ
 URIAH G. MEYER
 CORY T. MOORE
 RYAN P. MORAVEC
 MARCELO M. MOYA
 LANCE R. MURPHY
 RICHARD J. MURPHY
 ANDREW W. NEUBECKER
 CHARLENE N. NEWBERRY
 JOSUE E. NUNEZ
 SAFRONA R. OSBECK
 AUSTIN C. OTOCKI
 ABIGAIL E. PANTER
 ZACHARY S. PATTERSON
 JASON L. PEARCE
 SAMANTHA R. PELCAK
 JOHN D. PENNINGTON
 AARON S. PETERSON
 KYLE J. PIECORA
 CHARMAYNE E. POPE
 JACOB E. PORTALATIN
 WINSTON B. POSVAR
 KARA A. POTARACKE
 DANIEL M. PRENDERGAST
 JAMES A. PRIMM
 BRYAN C. PRUITT
 FELICIA C. PRYOR
 VINAY X. RAMSAY
 HUNTER H. REBERGER
 SONDRRA R. REYNOLDS
 MARIA A. RICHARDSONCALLIS
 TAYLOR S. RIDGE
 APRIL G. ROBINSON
 LIGIA I. RODRIGUEZROSADO
 OANA L. RUJAN
 RYAN W. SANDERS

DANIEL K. SCHUERCH
 RICHARD K. SKINNER
 LOUIS H. SMITH IV
 PETER E. SMITH
 TYLER B. SMITH
 LOUISE M. SODOS
 RAYVON S. STANLEY
 STEFANIE STARR
 KELLY B. STEELE
 BRENT E. STOLZOFF
 JOHN J. STUART
 HEATHER A. SULTEMEIER
 GLENN P. THOMAS
 MARCELL THOMAS, JR.
 CHRISTEL L. THOMPSON
 AMY M. THRASHER
 JASMINE L. TORRENCE
 ALY T. TRAN
 ARMANDO E. VALENCIA
 CYNTHIA VAZQUEZ
 HIRAM J. VIRCHIS
 ROBERT A. WALLACE
 SOMONIA M. WANKEY
 MATTHEW D. WARD
 ELIZABETH H. WERLY
 KAITLIN E. WHITMORE
 TAYLOR J. WHITTEN
 ANTONIO D. WIGGINS
 JOSEPH C. WINKLE
 RYAN J. WOODFIELD
 HEATHER A. WOODRUFF
 MARK A. WORKMAN
 SCOTT W. WYNOCKER
 MATTHEW S. YOSUA
 JESSICA E. W. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

ALEXANDRIA A. E. ARGUE
 KIVA M. AUTEN
 RICHARD M. BLAIR
 CHELSI D. BLUME
 SEAN P. CURRY
 MATTHEW J. DECKER
 ROBERT J. EDWARDS
 EMILY R. FARMER
 ROBERT L. FATHKE, JR.
 ALICIA M. GEHLING
 SARAH P. GREGORY
 MICHAEL B. HARLOW
 JUDITH A. KOVACHZUKIN
 COLLEEN E. MANS
 MAREN E. MASON
 JARROD A. MILLER
 MELISSA N. NORTH
 SALLY J. PLICHTA
 GRETCHEN J. POWERS
 KYLE P. ROSS
 JENNIFER A. SAFKO
 ANNA L. SCHULTZ
 SAMUEL A. SMITH
 CHRISTIAN N. STAGER
 MCKENZIE L. STEGER
 CAITLIN P. SULLIVAN
 SHAWN M. THOMAS
 SAMUEL J. TIDWELL
 MICHAEL J. WHITE
 JARROD R. C. WILKINSON
 CAITLIN G. WILLIAMS
 AIDAN K. WOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

JASON C. S. ADAMS
 JENNETTE M. ANDERSON
 KELLY A. AVANT
 TIMOTHY M. BEARDEN
 JENNIFER M. BLACKWELL
 FRANKLIN G. BROWN
 TERRENCE M. CANNY
 BRANDON M. CARIUS
 LEAH M. CARRENO
 BRANDON J. CARROLL
 MICHAEL R. CHILDRRESS
 URSELA S. T. CHRISTOPHERSON

KRISTIN A. DEGUZMAN
 MOMODOULAMIN S. DRAMMEH
 JOHN E. ELAM III
 BRYAN K. FILLMORE
 ERIN M. FOLEY
 CHARLES S. GANG
 BEATRIZ GEORGE
 ANDREW P. GOLDEN
 KIMBERLY S. GORDON
 JEFFREY O. GRACE
 BRIGETTE GRIMES
 JAMES K. HARDIN
 DANIEL H. HUFFMAN
 MICHAEL R. HURST
 PETER H. JONES
 TRAVIS E. KAUFMAN
 SLOAN W. KELLY
 ROBERT M. KERCHOFER
 SHANNON M. KRUEGER
 PAUL A. KUWIK
 ELIZABETH L. LOPEZ
 MITCHELL T. MARKS
 SAMANTHA C. MORGAN
 TORRANCE L. NEVELS
 DANIEL J. PEREZ
 JOSHUA J. PIERPONT
 JAREN T. PILLING
 CHARLES P. RETTING, JR.
 EVAN T. SCHIDER
 BRANDON R. STANLEY
 ALIVIA K. STEHLIK
 SHAWN M. STOUTE
 MEGHAN K. SWAFFORD
 MATTHEW J. VANDERLUGT
 VINCENT H. VANDERMAAREL
 ANTHONY P. WILLIAMS
 AXEL WOLFF
 AMANDA M. WOODALL
 D013803
 D014800
 D013139
 D014877
 D015630

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GARY W. BROWN
 KATHLEEN E. GENEST

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RUTH E. COOK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRENT J. TILSETH

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*KATHERINE A. CRYTZER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.