

person in this country with a \$2,000 emergency payment each and every month until the crisis is over, so that they can pay the rent, feed their families, and deal with their basic needs.

Furthermore, as a top priority, we have to make sure that nobody in America goes hungry, and that means substantially expanding the Meals on Wheels program, the school meals programs, and SNAP benefits.

Here we are. All over this country people are demanding an end to police killings and brutality and demanding racial justice in this country. All over this country, people are being infected with a virus and continue to die, and all over this country, people are wondering how they are going to pay their bills because they have lost their jobs and have, in some cases, no food in the cupboard. If there was ever a time in the modern history of this country that the Senate and the House are called upon to stand up for families, for the working families of this country, who are struggling, who are living in emotional anxiety, who are scared to death about what is going to happen in the future, and if we are to reaffirm faith in government in this country to know that we are seeing and hearing that pain, now is the time. So today, I just call upon my colleagues. I know we have disagreements, but let us understand the urgency of the moment. Let's deal with the pandemic. Let's save lives. Let's deal with the economic crisis. Let's put people back to work. Let's deal with the issue of racial justice. Let's fight to end racism in this country. There is an enormous amount of work to be done. Let's do it. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today having just heard the Senator from Vermont talking about the Nation in its effort to recover from the coronavirus crisis and the economic crisis as a result, and other important issues affecting our country. I heard him say that we have not done enough and need to do more, specifically with an economic recovery, with a coronavirus recovery, and it sounded like almost a liberal wish list of government providing for food, clothing, shelter, and income for every American.

I come to the floor today to tell you what we have done, in a historic way, because we passed the largest economic rescue package in the history of this country—trillions and trillions of dollars. This Senate, the House, and the White House went all-in to respond to and help us as a nation to recover from the coronavirus crisis.

Last week, the Senate passed and the President signed another bipartisan bill to help small businesses across our country. It is the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act. That is what the people of Wyoming were asking for—this very successful Paycheck Pro-

tection Program, with flexibility, so it would be easier for our small businesses to use the relief funds. And 1,000 businesses in Wyoming took over \$1 billion in loans, and it is keeping our economy alive, breathing life into the economy, and allowing paychecks to continue to be paid as our businesses reopen.

All across the country, this jobs-saving effort is working, because last month the U.S. economy added 2.5 million jobs. It smashed all expectations. It was the largest single month of job growth in this Nation in the history of our great country. Americans literally ran out the front door and back to work. Unemployment was down in May. It defied all of the forecasts and defied what we just heard the Senator from Vermont talking about and what his expectations have been.

We are headed for a faster economic rebound than anyone has imagined. Across the country, the State lockdowns have been ended. States have started to safely reopen. Small businesses are reopening. People are going back to work. I thought I heard the Senator from Vermont say that he was thinking that half of all the small businesses in America wouldn't be able to reopen again ever.

Young people are going back to school. K-12 schools and colleges are planning to reopen this fall. Of course, I don't think any of us were surprised to see the University of California system say that they are going to stay closed until 2021—until next year, all 10 campuses—because in California, one size fits all. But for the rest of our Nation, the schools and the colleges are reopening and students will be heading back to campus.

There is a return-to-normal routine that is going to boost our communities. As the American recovery begins, we are going all in to keep people safe. That is a big part of it. That means more virus testing, more treatment, and better treatment and vaccines.

Innovations are rapidly expanding testing. The country has now performed more than 22 million coronavirus tests. Nearly a half million tests are done every day, including today. Our researchers, our scientists, and our doctors are making record progress on a vaccine. We are calling this effort Operation Warp Speed. It is a public-private partnership with companies producing a vaccine for the American people that will then be used around the world. The private sector finalists will soon be announced. The government will support their vaccine work, will assist with clinical trials, and will prioritize review of the most promising vaccines.

One of the companies, called Moderna, is in phase 2 trials and plans to start phase 3 in July. The Food and Drug Administration approval is then the final step. Another company, AstraZeneca, plans to end phase 2 and phase 3 trials over the next few months.

AstraZeneca just announced a new partnership with the Biomedical Research Authority and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. So our military is joining in this public/private partnership. This project may deliver emergency vaccines as early as October, which would certainly be record-breaking. The pharmaceutical company Merck will conduct trials in July. Johnson & Johnson plans phase 1 and phase 2 trials for July as well. Pfizer hopes to have a vaccine ready by October. The goal is to make a safe, effective vaccine and make it available to all Americans by January of 2021.

Operation Warp Speed partners want to beat this, and they want to make that their most ambitious goal—beating timelines that have never been beaten before, breaking the records. At the same time a number of other companies are pursuing a vaccine independently. America's researchers, scientists, and doctors have dropped everything and are working in overdrive. They have gone all in.

One major drug company CEO said yesterday that there will be no big price for the coronavirus vaccine. Every company should make that same pledge. Every company should make that same pledge. This is a tremendous opportunity for companies to do the right thing, to make the vaccine as accessible as any vaccine in the history of our Nation.

As we begin to recover from this crisis, the goal is clear, and it has been clear: We want to keep Americans safe and get them back to work. Together, that is what we must all endeavor to do.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

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

CONCERNS OVER NATIONS FUNDING UNIVERSITY CAMPUS INSTITUTES IN THE UNITED STATES ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, let me apologize in advance. My accent has not changed, but my speech has. I had a little oral surgery, so I am going to try to be as clear as I can be.

I want to talk for a few minutes today about the Communist Party of China and Confucius Institutes.

As you know, Confucius Institutes are the Communist Party of China's so-called learning centers that are located on 72 university campuses across the continental United States and, of course, Alaska and Hawaii. Each one of these symbols is one of these Confucius Institutes located at one of our universities.

Here is how a Confucius Institute works. The Communist Party of China gives our universities—these 72 universities—the money to open these Confucius Institutes, and supposedly the purpose of these Confucius Institutes is to, A, teach the Chinese language, and B,

to teach culture about the country of China to American students.

At this juncture, it is important to distinguish between the people of China and the Chinese Communist Party. I had the pleasure of visiting China a number of times, and I know the Presiding Officer has. The Chinese people are wonderful people. They are smart. They are hard-working. They have a wonderful sense of humor. They are just extraordinary people. Their government, the Communist Party of China—not so much. Not nearly so much. So when I talk today about China, I am talking about their government, the Communist Party of China.

These Confucius Institutes, which are, once again, funded by the Communist Party of China, you will not be surprised to learn come with a lot of strings attached to that Chinese Communist Party money. For example, most of the teachers who teach at these Confucius Institutes on American university campuses are trained in China. In fact, the Communist Party of China has to approve all the teachers even though they are teaching in our universities. The Communist Party of China also has to approve all of the events and the speakers at these Confucius Institutes.

In addition, in order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities have to agree that the Confucius Institutes will be governed by both Chinese law and American law. I have never seen anything like that. It is unprecedented.

In order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities also have to agree through these Confucius Institutes that certain topics will be off limits. For example, at these institutes, you can't talk about Taiwan; you can't talk about civil liberties in Hong Kong; you can't talk about Tiananmen Square and the murders there by the Communist Party of China; you can't talk about Tibet; you can't talk about the Dalai Lama; and you can't talk about the discrimination and indeed the imprisonment of the Uighur Muslims in northwest China. Once again, these are institutes that are on American campuses, but in order to get the money from the Communist Party of China, our universities have to agree that these topics are off limits.

The Communist Party of China, in short, requires that these institutes can only teach versions of Chinese history, culture, and current events that are approved by the Communist Party of China. That is about the furthest thing you can imagine from academic freedom.

How am I doing? Is my speech OK? I promise you, I haven't been drinking.

The first Confucius Institute was formed on an American campus in 2004, and since that time, they have evolved—and not in a good way.

I want to give you a short quotation. You are familiar with the Politburo of the Communist Party of China. Back

in 2011, a member of the Politburo, which is the senior leadership in China in its Communist Party, Comrade Li Changchun, described Confucius Institutes in a speech he gave in Beijing in 2011. Comrade Li said:

The Confucius Institutes are an appealing brand for extending China's culture abroad. [They have] made an important contribution toward improving [our] soft power. "The 'Confucius brand' has a natural attractiveness"—

A natural attractiveness.

... using the excuse of teaching Chinese language, everything looks reasonable and logical."

But of course it is not.

Many of our professors across America have condemned the behavior of the Confucius Institutes. The American Association of University Professors did a comprehensive study of Confucius Institutes in 2014. Here is their report. This is what our professors concluded. I will quote from their report.

Confucius Institutes function as an arm of the Chinese state and are allowed to ignore academic freedom. Their academic activities are under the supervision of Hanban, a Chinese state agency which is chaired by a member of the Politburo and the vice-premier of the People's Republic of China. Most agreements establishing Confucius Institutes feature nondisclosure clauses and unacceptable concessions to the political aims and practices of the government of China. Specifically, North American universities permit Confucius Institutes to advance a state agenda in the recruitment and control of academic staff, in the choice of curriculum, and in the restriction of debate.

I don't want to beat this to death, but I have a number of studies. There is another one right here from the GAO.

I won't bore you with the details, but here is a 2019 report calling for either the overhaul or the closure of Confucius Institutes in America, which was issued by the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Many U.S. colleges have disbanded Confucius Institutes. I want to be fair. Not that many years ago, there were over 100 of these little symbols. Now there are 72. About 30 universities have said: No, we believe in academic freedom—universities like the University of Chicago, Miami-Dade College, and Pennsylvania State University.

Senator DOUG JONES, our colleague from Alabama, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, and I have a bill. It deals with Confucius Institutes, but it wouldn't abolish them. It would not. The name of the bill—it is called the Concerns Over Nations Funding University Campus Institutes in the United States Act, the CONFUCIUS Act, by Senator DOUG JONES and myself.

Our bill would reform Confucius Institutes. Our bill would allow them to exist, but it would require all American universities that choose to sign a contract and receive money from and with the Communist Party of China to enter into contracts that require the Confucius Institutes to do the fol-

lowing: The Confucius Institute, by contract, would have to provide that it would protect academic freedom at the university; that it would prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and that rather than granting full managerial control to the Chinese Party of China, it would grant full managerial authority of the Confucius Institute to the campus on which the Confucius Institute is situated. That would include full control over what is being taught, the activities carried out, the research grants that are made, and who was employed at the Confucius Institute.

If the Confucius Institutes are going to be part of our universities, they should be part of our universities. Freedom of speech, full academic freedom—anything is open for discussion, and we don't have to have it first approved by the Communist Party of China.

I think Senator JONES' and my bill would restore balance. It would restore truth. It would restore transparency. I know it would restore academic freedom to these Confucius Institutes that are operating in the United States of America.

Toward that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 939—that is the CONFUCIUS Act—and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 939) to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with gratitude to my coauthor, Senator DOUG JONES, who has done an extraordinary job on this legislation, 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. 939) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 939

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 "Concerns Over Nations Funding University Campus Institutes in the United States Act" or the "CONFUCIUS Act".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Confucius Institute" means a cultural institute directly or indirectly funded by the

Government of the People's Republic of China.

(b) **RESTRICTIONS ON CONFUCIUS INSTITUTES.**—An institution of higher education or other postsecondary educational institution (referred to in this section as an “institution”) shall not be eligible to receive Federal funds from the Department of Education (except funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) or other Department of Education funds that are provided directly to students) unless the institution ensures that any contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute includes clear provisions that—

(1) protect academic freedom at the institution;

(2) prohibit the application of any foreign law on any campus of the institution; and

(3) grant full managerial authority of the Confucius Institute to the institution, including full control over what is being taught, the activities carried out, the research grants that are made, and who is employed at the Confucius Institute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— Continued

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, something is happening in America. People across our country and in my home State of Michigan are coming together for the cause of racial justice in a way that we have not really experienced in a generation.

From Holland, to Bad Axe, to Marquette, to Detroit, people of all ages and faiths and backgrounds have been marching together, singing together, praying together, and kneeling together. In one voice, people are demanding change, imploring our Nation to finally be that place where all men and women are truly created equal. Unfortunately, we know that, far too often throughout our history and even today, our Nation has failed to live up to our highest ideals.

Eight minutes forty-six seconds—that is how long a Minneapolis police officer, Derek Chauvin, knelt on the neck of George Floyd, an unarmed, handcuffed Black man lying on the pavement. For 8 minutes 46 seconds, George Floyd pleaded for his life. He said, “I can’t breathe.” He cried out for his mother. He suffered. Then he was silent.

Millions of Americans watched the video in shock and horror. Why didn’t the officer just lift his knee off of Mr. Floyd’s neck? Why didn’t he just lift his knee up for just a minute—just lift it up? Why didn’t one—just one—of the other officers push his knee off of Mr. Floyd’s neck?

What is happening in America that someone—let alone police officers—thought this was OK? Of course, we know it was not OK. It was not OK. It was a crime. It was murder.

Watching those images has awakened something deep in the souls of Americans across the country. We know that racial disparities in every part of our society—from healthcare, to housing, to jobs, to education, to the air we breathe and the water we drink—have existed in our country since its very beginning. We have known for a long time that experiences with the police are different for Black Americans than for White Americans. Yet, despite all of the other times, this time—this time—there the violence was, right in front of us, in a way that people have decided cannot and will not be ignored.

There is much to do. For each of us, we have a personal journey—a personal journey to take concerning our own behavior with one another, and then we have a public journey to take together, to change laws and policies and work together toward the day when what happened in Minneapolis and across our country never happens again. That is the goal of the Justice in Policing Act. I am honored to cosponsor it, and I want to thank my friends Senator BOOKER and Senator HARRIS for leading us in this introduction.

The Justice in Policing Act takes important steps to improve transparency by collecting better and more accurate data on police misconduct and the use of force. This will help ensure that problem officers aren’t simply getting a job with a police department in another city or State to avoid being held accountable for their previous actions.

The legislation improves police training and practices by ending racial and religious profiling, requiring officers to receive training on racial biases, banning no-knock warrants in drug cases, limiting the transfer of military-grade equipment to police departments, and banning chokeholds like the one that ended George Floyd’s life. It finally makes lynching a Federal crime—something that I would have thought we would have done a generation ago. It makes important changes within our criminal justice system to hold police officers and departments accountable for their actions.

This legislation is not about defunding the police. It is not about defunding law enforcement. It is about funding the right kind of law enforcement, the kind of law enforcement that protects all of our neighborhoods and the people who live in them; the kind of law enforcement that officers I know in Michigan—including in my own family, across Michigan—do every day; the kind of law enforcement I know the majority of police officers believe in.

In short, this legislation is about treating people as professionals, with high standards, and expecting them to meet those standards. In any professional setting, including law enforce-

ment, we should expect high standards and accountability for meeting those standards. We have a right to expect the best from our police officers.

Firing dozens of bullets into a Louisville apartment under a no-knock warrant, killing a 26-year-old emergency medical technician and aspiring nurse who grew up in Michigan, did not meet the high standards we have a right to expect. Breonna Taylor deserved the best from our police. She did not get it.

Shoving a 75-year-old man at a protest in Buffalo hard enough that his head cracked open while hitting the ground, creating a pool of blood, and then watching officer after officer walking past him without offering any help does not reflect the high standards we have a right to expect. Martin Gugino deserved the best from our police, and he did not get it.

Kneeling on the neck of a man who is lying on the ground for 8 minutes 46 seconds, as he cries out for his mother and the life leaves his body, is not meeting the high standards he had the right to expect. George Floyd deserved the best from our police. He did not receive it.

The U.S. Senate needs to pass the Justice in Policing Act now. I would love it if there was strong bipartisan support. Wouldn’t that send a wonderful message across our country if we could do that?

However, holding law enforcement to high professional standards is only the first step in becoming the Nation we all want to be. Racism has been with us since slaves were brought on ships to this country. It is an immoral thread that is woven deep in the fabric of our Nation’s history.

It is simply not enough to end racial inequalities in policing because the inequalities in our society don’t end there. The pandemic has shone a brutal light on this truth.

Our Democratic caucus released a report on April 30 that showed that Black Americans are more than twice as likely as White Americans to die from COVID-19, and in some communities, this disparity is even greater. In Michigan, 14 percent of our citizens are African Americans. Yet African Americans make up 41 percent—41 percent—of the deaths from COVID-19. It is not hard to see why, if you look. Because of generations of structural racism, Black Americans are less likely to have health insurance, more likely to have preexisting health conditions and higher risks for Black moms during labor and delivery, more likely to be exposed to air pollution because of where they live, and less likely to live in housing where social distancing is even possible.

Black families also face challenges in accessing healthy food. While around 12 percent of American families overall are food secure, we know that more than 22 percent of African-American families are food insecure—more than one out of every five families.

At the same time, in this health crisis Black Americans are more likely to