

any future emergency relief bill will be written in his office.

Assess the conditions of the country when we have more unemployment than any time since the Great Depression? When a pandemic is killing tens of thousands of Americans monthly, ignore that and assess the conditions? And then for Leader McConnell to say the bill will be written in his office, has he learned any lessons on COVID 2, COVID 3, COVID 3.5, the Justice in Policing Act? When you try to do something major on a partisan basis, nothing happens, and America desperately needs something to happen.

Leader McConnell knows he has to negotiate if he wants to pass legislation. He has been around here a long time. He knows that. His refusal to engage in bipartisan talks on policing reform shows that maybe our Republican friends are not interested in passing bipartisan legislation, but that is what needs to happen—bipartisan negotiations on policing reform and bipartisan negotiations on COVID.

This morning, Speaker Pelosi and I sent a letter to Leader McConnell urging him to join Democrats at the negotiating table for the next round of COVID-19 relief legislation.

We are on the precipice of several deadlines: For millions upon millions of Americans, another rent payment is due this week. States are planning their budgets right now before the new fiscal year on July 1. The emergency boost in unemployment will run out by the end of next month.

This week, Senate Democrats will force action on the floor on some of the most urgently needed measures to help working Americans, starting this evening, when Democrats will ask consent to pass crucial Federal support for State, local, and Tribal governments.

I will have more to say about this issue this evening, but I do want my Republican colleagues to hear the words of State and local officials across the country.

Today, the Big 7 national associations representing Governors, mayors, State legislatures, counties, and city managers—all bipartisan groups, with many Republican Members coming from the deepest red States to the darkest blue—wrote the Senate a letter pleading—pleading for Federal support and warning of dire consequences of delay. These are the seven organizations representing Governors and legislatures and counties and towns and cities.

Here is what they write:

Previous federal bills responding to COVID-19 provided important support . . . yet none allow for the replacement of billions of lost revenue due to COVID-19. More robust and direct stimulus is needed for State and local governments to both rebuild the economy and maintain essential services in education, health care, emergency operations, public safety and more.

Months have gone by and our communities continue to suffer. Americans have a history of standing together in times of crisis and must do so now.

Republican colleagues, please listen to those words. Leader McConnell, please listen. These are your own States that are included here. They are demanding relief. To say we still don't see an urgent need, to say maybe we will get around to it in a month, to say the legislation will be written in McConnell's office—all setting up for failure and the desperately needed lack of relief that America needs.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 4049, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor as we start further consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act and ask my colleagues to pay close attention to what is included in this legislation. No one is going to be surprised that the National Defense Authorization Act might include something that had not gotten the bright light of day shown on it, but I am here to say to my colleagues, what is in this act is really egregious, and we need to correct it before we continue to move forward.

This legislation—mostly done behind closed doors—is not unusual for the Senate Armed Services Committee, but when you think about the billions of dollars that we are spending, we need to make sure this policy out here on the Senate floor is not just another rubberstamp.

We are here to look at particular provisions that I think are troubling, particularly because it wrestles away civilian control of our nuclear arsenal and gives it to the military—provisions that, in the future, would allow the Defense Department to raid dollars used by the Department of Energy for cleanup of nuclear waste, R&D for our National Laboratories, or maybe other infrastructure investment.

I am aware that the Presiding Officer knows how much the quadrennial review called for in investment in energy infrastructure. So I find it troubling

today to see that we are at a provision that would wrestle away control of our nuclear arsenal and give it to the military. These provisions are dangerous because, one, they would strip from the Secretary of Energy the power over his own budget by requiring that he agree to a sub-Cabinet member group of the Nuclear Weapons Council to approve the National Nuclear Security Administration's budget.

That is right. That is why the current Energy Secretary and past Energy Secretaries oppose this language. They oppose it because it basically tells the Energy Secretary what the majority or a big chunk of his budget will be, and it would allow DOD, then, to prioritize things within the Energy budget as they saw fit for making nuclear weapons instead of focusing on our Federal priorities of nuclear waste cleanup, R&D that we want to see in our National Labs, or other issues that we want to see an investment in that Energy is already doing.

I just can't even believe that this shift in control away from the Secretary of Energy into this sub-Cabinet so that the nuclear weapons complex would be moving away from civilians to the military is actually in this legislation. I do not believe the Nuclear Weapons Council understands the Department of Energy's priorities. How could they? Do they sit in on any of the meetings for the National Labs or the waste cleanup?

I do believe the DOD and the Nuclear Weapons Council know there is a long history of raiding the nuclear waste cleanup budget, and other administrations have tried this. These same individuals tried this in 2018, only to be shot down by our colleagues in the House of Representatives. The NNSA, or the National Nuclear Security Agency, was created in 2000 to be part of the Department of Energy, to manage both the nuclear weapons complex and the nonproliferation activities. Congress made them a part of the Department of Energy, not a part of the Department of Defense. We did that because we wanted to maintain a longstanding civilian control over the country's nuclear weapons. Giving the DOD now control over the Nuclear Weapons Council and their complete power over this budget gives control of our nuclear weapons to the military.

I can't believe that we are here with all the things we have to deal with—a COVID-19 crisis, an economic crisis, justice reform—and now we have to worry about people, in the dark of night, changing control of our Energy budget and turning it over to the DOD and giving them control of our nuclear arsenal, to say nothing of the concerns I have for what they will do to short-change the Hanford cleanup budget, which is a challenge to the Nation. It is an obligation that needs to be met every year, and I guarantee you there are always people looking at the nuclear waste cleanup budget and thinking they can either do it on the cheap,

cut some of the funds early, or just skip the obligation. It is a national obligation, and this bill undercuts it.

Yet not only does it undercut it, it would be giving the Department of Defense greater say over building new nuclear weapons. That is literally like obliterating some of the people here who have a say in the budget process because, basically, it is getting rid of the checks and balances that we have and, instead, putting this incredible process in place.

So it is no surprise that my colleagues, the ranking member and the chair of the Energy Committee, sent a letter in opposition to the Armed Services Committee about this last week. I am pretty sure they have been ignored. They were ignored before this and are continuing to be ignored. The letter says:

Most immediately, Section 3111 would empower sub-cabinet level officials, primarily from DOD, to make potentially sweeping decisions about DOE's budget. We believe this goes against good governance and is contrary to the Department of Energy's Organization Act of 1977.

It is clear that my colleagues on the Energy Committee don't support this. I don't know what the fake act of the NDAA bill is that somehow you consulted with members of the Energy Committee, because I guarantee you didn't consult with them. And now every member of the Energy Committee has to worry about whether their priorities are going to be set by some sub-Cabinet person over at DOD or whether they will be questioning an Energy Secretary who will be able to give them an answer instead of saying: Senator, I don't know; I have to go check with the Department of Defense.

This is unacceptable. I know my colleague, Senator MANCHIN, has worked on this and is trying to get a change to this legislation. I hope that we are successful in either just pulling it out right now, admitting it is the wrong approach and has not been discussed with the committee of jurisdiction, or at least having our colleagues have a vote on this.

It is unbelievable that we would be changing this big of national policy stuck into the NDAA bill without the bright light of day shone on it. These provisions would allow the Nuclear Weapons Council—as I said, made up of a sub-Cabinet officials, primarily from DOD—to require significant modifications to the DOE budget. Likely, as I said, where else are they going to get the money but at the expense of other critical DOE projects? I have already told you why that is so important to me.

But let's read from their report language. Basically, they are saying in their report language: The Secretary would be required to transmit a proposed budget request of the NNSA to the nuclear council, and submit it to the Office of Budget Management. That isn't like saying: Consider this. This isn't like saying: Let's discuss this.

This isn't like an issue of saying: Here are some things we want you to better consider.

This is a total jam by the DOD, neutering the Department of Energy on almost half of its budget, to basically say: We know better what to do.

I hope my colleagues will speak loudly and clearly about this. This is a bipartisan issue. This is about the people we should have listened to in the first place. I know some of my colleagues are going to say: Wait, wait, wait. No, this is just a bureaucratic budget change. It is an interagency thing. It is just accounting. It doesn't really mean anything.

No, this is a very big change. That is why I oppose subtitle B of the budget of the National Nuclear Security Administration and why my colleagues should work in a very aggressive way to stop this legislation with this language in it. They should take this language out now or work with our colleagues to basically protect the Department of Energy and the Department of Energy's budget and stop turning over to DOD something that the U.S. Congress never had an intent to turning over from civilian control of our nuclear weapons to the Department of Defense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. For the 60th consecutive year, the Senate stands poised to pass legislation that authorizes funding for national defense and sets the course for the Department of Defense's policies.

This year, we consider this legislation during a moment of deep reflection and anguish, as Americans reckon with our ugly history of systemic racism and the original sin of chattel slavery. For weeks, all across this Nation, Americans have taken to the streets to call for justice and call for an end to the racist violence that has stolen far too many Black lives. We say the names of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Atatiana Jefferson, and so many other Black men and women to reaffirm the simple but powerful truth that they mattered. Their lives mattered. Black lives matter.

This moment is about ending police brutality once and for all. It is also about ending systemic racism and dismantling White supremacy in every aspect of our economy and our society. It is about building an America that lives up to its highest ideals.

The Defense bill we are debating today takes an important step in this direction by addressing the honors that our Nation continues to bestow on Confederate officers, who took up arms against the United States in defense of chattel slavery. This bill denies those honors to military leaders who killed U.S. soldiers in defense of the idea that Black people are not people, but instead, are property to be bought and sold.

It has been more than 150 years since the end of the Civil War, but 10 U.S. Army posts around this country currently bear the names of officers of the Confederate States of America. Think about that. These bases were named to honor individuals who took up arms against our Nation in a war that killed more than half a million Americans. They took up arms to defend an institution that reduced Black people to property.

The Defense bill now before us includes language I wrote that would require the Secretary of Defense to remove Confederate names from all military assets. The Senate Armed Services Committee, which has a long history of bipartisan leadership within this body, adopted this language with the support of Senators from both parties, recognizing that this is an opportunity to correct longstanding historic injustice.

This bill covers more than military bases. It also requires name changes for Federal buildings and streets on those military bases and at other installations that celebrate the traitors who took up arms against the United States to defend slavery.

The USS *Chancellorsville*, for example, is named for a Confederate battle victory, a defeat for the United States of America. The ship's crest pays homage to Confederate Generals Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

Defenders of these symbols of oppression speak often in generalities, glossing over the details of the Confederacy, the Civil War, and the specifics about the individuals whose names are attached to American military installations.

Let's begin with the truth about the men for whom some of these bases are named. Fort Benning, GA, "Home of the Infantry," is named for Brigadier General Henry L. Benning. Benning led Georgia's secession from the Union and commanded the Confederate soldiers at Gettysburg. He was a leader of the secessionist movement. Why? Because, according to Benning's own words, he had a "deep conviction that a separation from the North was the only thing that could prevent the abolition of [Georgia's] slavery."

He was fearful that the end of slavery would lead to "Black Governors, Black legislatures, Black juries, Black everything. Is it to be supposed that the White race will stand for that?"

Fort Gordon, GA, is named for Major General John Brown Gordon. Historians believe he led the Georgia chapter of the Ku Klux Klan's murderous terrorists in years after the Civil War.

Fort Pickett in Virginia is named for Major General George Pickett. During the war, Pickett ordered the execution of 22 former Confederate soldiers, men whose crime was declaring their allegiance to the Union, the United States of America. For this despicable act, he was later investigated for war crimes and forced to flee to Canada after the war.

Fort Bragg, NC, is named for Major General Braxton Bragg. Bragg was a slave owner and, like the others, Bragg chose to take up arms against the United States and kill U.S. soldiers. But with an infamously poor record as a military commander, he wasn't very good at it. Widely regarded as the most disliked man in the Confederate Army, Bragg commanded forces that were so badly defeated at the Battle of Chattanooga in 1863 that he ultimately resigned. Those are just a few examples, as are Fort Hood, Fort Lee, Fort A.P. Hill, Fort Polk, Camp Beauregard, Fort Rucker.

American military bases that carry the names of Confederate generals are not named for heroes, and they are not named for men who risked their lives defending the United States and its soldiers. They are named for men who took up arms against the United States of America and killed American soldiers in the defense of slavery. They are the names of men who were directly responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Americans in the defense of slavery.

Those who complain that removing the names of traitors from these bases ignores history ought to learn some history themselves. These bases were not named in the years following the Civil War. No. They were named decades and decades later—during the Jim Crow era—to strengthen a movement that tried to glorify the Confederacy and reinforce White supremacy.

As the Nation prepared to fight in World War I, the Army needed more bases to train new draftees. The military decided to establish half of the new bases across the Southern States. Only 40 years had passed since the end of Reconstruction, and putting Federal troops back into the South was a sensitive matter. Choosing Confederate commander names for these bases curried favor with the same local politicians who were devoted to maintaining the brutal regime of White supremacy.

The strategy was successful. In August 1917, the magazine *Confederate Veteran* noted: “For the first time since the War between the States, the United States government officially paid tribute to the ‘military genius’ of noted Confederate war chieftains in naming four of the training camps.”

Naming these bases after Confederate rebels was wrong. After years of resistance and denial, the Department of Defense is finally recognizing that it is time for our military to stop paying homage to individuals who betrayed the United States and who took up arms against it to defend slavery.

Secretaries Esper and McCarthy have both said they are “open to a bipartisan discussion on the topic.”

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mark Milley also “fully supports the discussion and Secretary McCarthy’s efforts . . . to explore this issue.”

GEN Robert Abrams, commander of U.S. Forces Korea, announced on June 15 that he is prohibiting the Confed-

erate flag in all U.S. installations in that country.

Commandant of the Marine Corps Gen. David Berger has banned the Confederate battle flag from Marine bases worldwide because “this symbol has shown it has power to inflame the feelings of division.”

The Chief of Naval Operations, ADM Michael Gilday, also issued an order last month prohibiting the Confederate flag from all public spaces and work areas aboard Navy installation ships, aircraft, and submarines, saying that the step was necessary “to ensure unit cohesion, preserve good order and discipline, and uphold the Navy’s core values of honor, courage, and commitment.”

It is time to follow the example of these military leaders and to take steps to remove all forms of commemoration of the Confederate States of America from all of our military assets.

Senate Republicans have suggested that Congress should simply study the issue. They suggest forming a commission that prioritizes the wishes of State and local officials but that doesn’t make any decisions. Let me be completely clear. The current bill already includes a commission charged with thoughtfully executing the requirement to remove these names from U.S. military installations, and it requires consultation with local officials. The intent of the Republican amendment is simply to erase the requirement currently in the bill that requires the Confederate names to be eliminated—not studied, eliminated.

It has been 150 years since Lee surrendered at Appomattox and the rebellion against the United States in defense of owning human beings was finally put down. We know whom these bases were named for. We know why they were named. There is nothing left to study. We are long past the time for action.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services has declared that the time for honoring the legacy of men who championed the cause of slavery and White supremacy on military installations is now over. The committee voted to rename the installations where millions of servicemembers of color have lived, trained, and deployed abroad in defense of our country. Now the entire Senate has an opportunity to add its voice to the chorus, and I am certain that the House will join us soon.

President Trump has already declared his opposition to this provision. He has, instead, chosen the well-worn path of hatred and division. So, despite the fact that the Department of Defense already has the statutory authority it needs to change those names, it has hesitated to take action in defiance of the Commander in Chief.

Congress has the power and the responsibility to end decades of injustice. Servicemembers of color have been pledging to support and defend the Constitution of the United States for a

long time. They have done so knowing they might be called upon to give what Lincoln called the last full measure of devotion, and they have done so despite being surrounded by these visceral reminders that the military in which they serve honors men who fought to kill fellow Americans and to keep their ancestors enslaved. We can tear those visceral reminders down, and we will.

The Confederate soldiers who betrayed the United States to fight for the Confederacy were fighting for the institution of slavery—plain, simple, ugly. It is time to put the names of those leaders who fought and killed U.S. soldiers in defense of a perverted version of America where they belong—as footnotes in our history books, not plastered on our Nation’s most significant military installations.

The tens of thousands of Americans protesting the appalling killings of Black men and women are calling upon us—on all of us—not just to say the words “Black lives matter” but to take a tangible step toward making it true by breaking apart the systems that have stolen countless Black lives and denied Black Americans opportunity and equal treatment.

Being race-conscious is not enough. It never was. We must be anti-racists. Removing the names, symbols, displays, monuments, and paraphernalia that honor or commemorate the Confederacy and anyone who voluntary served it from military property is, in the broader scheme, only one step toward addressing systemic racism in our society, but it is an important step. It will bring us closer to acknowledging the truth of that ugly past, and it will give us a firmer foundation on which to build a better future for everyone.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4049

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to further discuss the fiscal year 2021 national defense authorization bill.

Senator INHOFE will be speaking later today on the bill, and I again want to thank him for his leadership and bipartisanship throughout the drafting of this very important legislation.

As I noted last week, the Committee on Armed Services adopted this bill with the strong bipartisan support of 25 to 2. I am hopeful that we can have a productive consideration of this bill on the floor this week, with votes on amendments and packages of cleared amendments, so that we can conduct further efforts to improve and amend this legislation.

The bill authorizes \$662.3 billion in base funding for the Department of Defense and Energy’s nuclear programs

and an additional \$69 billion for overseas contingency operations, which align with the caps established in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

I want to applaud the chairman for providing the Department with the resources it needs while remaining within the constraints we set under the Budget Control Act. The bill before us will provide much needed stability and predictability to the Department of Defense.

For the Army, the bill supports many modernization objectives, including critical priorities such as Long Range Precision Fires and the Future Vertical Lift Program. It also fully funds critical legacy platforms such as the M1 Abrams tank that the Army needs until new systems are fielded in the future. Further, the bill includes resources for active protection systems for combat vehicles, as well as additional funding for the Army's Multi-Domain Task Force, which is critical to the Army's efforts in the Pacific.

For the Navy and Marine Corps, the bill would add roughly \$900 million to authorize a number of unfunded priorities identified by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant.

I am disappointed that we could not, however, fully fund the CNO's top unfunded priority—the 10th Virginia class submarine in the current multiyear procurement program. However, I am pleased that this bill provides sufficient funds to keep open the option for the 10th boat in fiscal year 2022 or 2023.

It also mandates changes in the oversight and execution of shipbuilding and unmanned systems development programs—changes that should help instill more rigor and discipline within the Navy.

Turning to air power, the bill helps improve oversight of the Department by requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual 30-year plan for the procurement of the aircraft in the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Department of the Army. This is similar to the 30-year shipbuilding report that is already in statute.

The bill also supports the Department's efforts to achieve reduced operating and support costs of the F-35 program and perhaps motivates the Department to lower costs in other weapons systems overall, which will be a critical factor going forward.

In the area of special operations, our forces remain heavily engaged around the world, and I am pleased that the bill authorizes funding at the requested level of \$13 billion, including increased funding for high-priority requirements identified by the commander of U.S. Special Operations Command necessary to reconstitute capabilities lost in combat over the past several years.

Further, the bill also includes provisions designed to enable the Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict to more effectively fulfill advocacy and oversight responsibilities with regard to the Special Operations Forces.

Turning to personnel matters, the bill authorizes the active and reserve component end strengths necessary to meet national defense objectives, provides a 3-percent pay raise for the troops, and reauthorizes a number of bonus, special, and incentive pay authorities necessary to recruit and retain the highest quality individuals for military service.

Further, the bill includes a number of additional provisions that support quality of life for our military personnel. It authorizes \$75 million for the services to conduct better oversight of privatized housing and hire more staff in the housing arena. It also requires the Department of Defense inspector general to conduct an audit of the medical conditions of servicemembers and their families who lived in unhealthy military privatized housing.

I am particularly pleased that this bill authorizes \$50 million for supplemental impact aid and \$20 million in impact aid for severely disabled military children, and it rejects a proposal by the Department to cut 172 teachers from DOD schools.

In addition, the bill includes a provision, sponsored by Senator GILLIBRAND, which would allow victims of sexual assault to report incidents without fear of being disciplined for minor misconduct that was collateral to the sexual assault. It further includes a provision to improve the tracking and response to child abuse on military installations.

Turning to readiness, the bill authorizes an additional \$79 million in Army operations and maintenance to replace child development center playground equipment, which will address safety issues and provides an additional \$47 million in Army operations and maintenance for six key Child and Youth Services Program improvements across multiple installations.

To help counter the effects of climate change, the bill authorizes \$50 million in planning and design for military installation resilience for climate change adaptation projects. It also adds \$8 million to the Navy's direct air capture and seawater carbon capture program.

To reduce fuel use, the bill adds \$65 million to the Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund to pursue promising innovations to weapons platforms like hybrid electric drive for ships or improved turbine engines for aircraft that improve combat capability with less fuel. The bill also increases Air Force operational energy programs which reduce fuel, such as using smaller fins and streamlining the C-130 fuselage.

I am disappointed, however, that the committee did not accept an amendment, offered by Senator SHAHEEN, which would have deemed the chemicals PFAS and PFOA as hazardous and a pollutant under the DOD Environmental Restoration Program. Elevated levels of PFAS, a class of manmade chemicals that have been manufactured since the 1950s, may be contami-

nating drinking water in 33 States nationwide, including my State of Rhode Island. PFAS has been linked to a variety of cancers, weakened immunity, and other serious health problems.

Senator SHAHEEN's amendment would have also codified Secretary Esper's PFAS task force; required blood testing of PFAS in servicemembers and their dependents as part of their existing annual checkups; stopped incineration of PFAS substances by DOD until final guidance following EPA rules are published; reported on remaining installations not yet tested for PFAS and all DOD locations of PFAS incineration; and also added \$25 million in O&M for Air Force environmental restoration.

I will continue to work with Senator SHAHEEN and other colleagues to gain acceptance of this legislation. I think it is vitally important that we do so as we debate this bill on the floor.

In the area of science and technology, I am pleased that the bill increases funding for important research activities and includes provisions to support Pentagon efforts to develop and deploy artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and emerging biotechnologies to protect our national security. It also includes several provisions that continue our efforts to reform antiquated Pentagon procurement practices and strengthen our domestic manufacturing and industrial base, including in critical sectors such as microelectronics, pharmaceuticals, and rare earth materials.

In the area of spectrum management, this bill includes a provision sponsored by Senator WICKER, along with Chairman INHOFE, Senator CANTWELL, and myself. I am pleased by the provision's inclusion, which would aid development of a common database to allow executive branch agencies to share finite spectrum resources efficiently. This is an example of bipartisan work between two important committees—the Armed Services Committee and the Commerce Committee—and I hope we can continue to build upon it.

Turning to cyber security, I am pleased that this bill adopts 11 of the recommendations from the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, which was co-chaired by Senator KING. I want to commend Senator KING on extraordinary work. His insight, his ability to work with others, his grasp of not only the present situation but what is emerging quickly in the future is extraordinary and commendable. He has done a remarkable job.

The Commission took on a tough issue and did a very, very thorough job. While we were able to include recommendations in the Armed Services Committee's jurisdiction in our bill, the Commission has many more thoughtful recommendations that span across many committee jurisdictions, and I hope we can work together on the floor in this bill to incorporate those provisions.

The bill also requires the Department to present a strategy to the White

House and Congress to revive the manufacture of advanced microelectronics in the United States.

This Defense authorization bill includes a number of provisions that enhance the United States' ability to compete with near-peer competitors, and we are actively seeking ways in which we can prevent these competitors from undermining our national security and, indeed, the international order.

With regard to Russia, this bill enhances our deterrence capabilities, including by fully funding the request for the European Deterrence Initiative.

In addition, the bill requires a report on Russian support to racially or ethnically motivated violent extremist groups in Europe and the United States. The problem of racially and ethnically motivated violent extremist groups is an emerging national security threat, not simply a law enforcement problem, as Russia and Russian agents or entities are working to advance Russian strategic objectives by co-opting, supporting, and amplifying these groups to sow divisions and threaten our democratic institutions.

The bill also maintains strong support for Ukraine through the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative and requires a 5-year plan for helping Ukraine build the capabilities it needs to defend itself from Russian aggression.

Turning to China, the bill establishes the Pacific Deterrence Initiative, a new authority for the Department of Defense modeled after the European Deterrence Initiative, and authorizes \$200 million in funding.

The bill also increases funding for the Indo-Pacific Maritime Security Initiative to ensure that our partner countries in South and Southeast Asia are able to respond effectively to Chinese coercion in the South China Sea and beyond.

The bill also includes a provision that was adopted during markup, expressing the sense of the Congress that the USS *Mercy* and the USS *Comfort* should conduct port calls in Taiwan to collaborate on COVID-19 response and best practices.

While I applaud Taiwan's efforts on COVID-19, Taiwan is not a sovereign state, and conducting port calls is a larger policy issue that should be more fully discussed and debated. For those reasons, I voted against the amendment.

With respect to countering the continued threat by ISIS, the bill extends the Iraq and Syria Train and Equip Programs at the requested funding levels, while ensuring appropriate congressional oversight of the use of such funds. Specific to Iraq, the bill continues efforts to normalize security assistance to Iraq by transitioning funding to enduring authorities.

For Afghanistan, the bill extends the authority to train and equip Afghan Security Forces at the requested funding level and enhances congressional

oversight of such funds. It requires an assessment of the progress made on issues such as anti-corruption, recruitment and retention of security forces, and commitments made by the Afghanistan Government in support of peace negotiations. It also includes a specific reporting requirement should the Department elect to withhold any security assistance to Afghanistan.

In addition, the bill includes a sense of the Senate provision, which I was proud to cosponsor, expressing concern that a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. military, diplomatic, and intelligence personnel from Afghanistan without effective, countervailing efforts to secure gains in Afghanistan may allow violent extremist groups to regenerate. These conditions would threaten the security of the Afghan people and create a security vacuum that could destabilize the region and provide ample safe haven for extremist groups seeking to conduct external attacks.

It also requires a report on current and projected threats to the United States homeland and that of our allies emanating from Afghanistan.

Further, the bill includes a provision sponsored by Senator SHAHEEN to refine and clarify expectations for the Department on the implementation of the Women, Peace, and Security Act, which was adopted by unanimous consent during the committee's markup.

Turning to nuclear testing, I have concerns about the addition of a provision sponsored by Senator COTTON which holds \$10 million to cover costs of reducing the time to conduct nuclear tests if they are deemed necessary.

The United States has not conducted a nuclear test since 1992. Each year the three lab Directors of our National Laboratory give a written assessment of the stockpile and whether it needs testing. For 22 years, they have said that weapons do not need to be tested as long as we continue the Stockpile Stewardship Program. In addition, it would realistically take over 2 years and hundreds of millions of dollars to actually be ready for a test. I don't believe we should be even signaling that the Nation is considering doing this without a full and lengthy debate of the issues by Congress, and that was one of the reasons I opposed the amendment.

For 18 years, the Senate Armed Services Committee has honestly struggled over the Defense Department's detainee policy, particularly regarding the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. For many years, the policy remained unchanged, but for the past several years, the committee has adopted an amendment in markup that would allow detainees to be transferred to the United States for emergency medical treatment and then returned to the detention facility at Guantanamo.

This is an aging population of detainees, and there are certain conditions that cannot be treated at Guantanamo, and moving all the medical equipment

and specialty doctors to Guantanamo would be cost-prohibitive. However, I was very disappointed that this year the medical transfer amendment was defeated for the first time. Allowing detainees to be transferred to the United States for medical treatment is the most cost-effective and humane way forward to ensure we treat detainees with dignity and in accordance with our obligations under the Geneva Conventions. This is a problem that can only get more urgent as time passes, and I hope we can find a way forward on this issue.

Finally, it is impossible to discuss this bill without discussing the many crises facing our Nation. The crisis affecting every citizen is the exponential spread of COVID-19, and our military is not immune. As of today, 11,770 military personnel are infected. Adding in DOD families and civilians, the number is closer to 17,000. That number increased by over 1,500 individuals in the last 48 hours and continues to trend upward. That is a startling growth in these cases. Our National Guard members are most heavily impacted because they are on the frontlines of the pandemic.

These infections affect the readiness of our force in their ability to train and deploy and to do so without worrying about the health of their families. The administration's response to the pandemic has been woefully inadequate, and immediate steps must be taken to aid civilians and military personnel alike.

Our Nation has also been engulfed by protests over the senseless murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and others at the hands of police officers and some civilians. These deaths magnify centuries of injustice and brutality against African Americans.

These protests have been occurring across the country and have been overwhelmingly peaceful, although there have been isolated exceptions. Our Nation is in pain, but rather than call for unity and calm, President Trump has threatened to bring military troops against peaceful protesters. While the President does have the authority to call up military personnel under the Insurrection Act, it does not mean he should. It is used quite rarely as an exception to the broad principle embedded deeply in American democracy and history that the Active Armed Forces should not be used to enforce State laws or to exercise police power reserved to the States unless absolutely necessary and as the very last resort. Therefore, I am pleased that this bill includes a provision that was overwhelmingly adopted during the markup to prohibit the use of DOD funds to take actions against U.S. citizens that would infringe on their First Amendment rights to assemble peaceably and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

Senator Kaine of Virginia was instrumental in that bill, and Senator

BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut has additional legislation that is worthy of consideration.

In addition, the bill includes an amendment adopted by voice vote that requires the Defense Department within 3 years to implement the recommendations of a commission on how to remove all names, symbols, displays, monuments, and paraphernalia from DOD assets that honor or commemorate the Confederacy. Such legislation is long overdue. Senior Department officials have all indicated they are open to changing these names. There is bipartisan cooperation on this issue. This is the right thing to do, and DOD needs to lead the way.

To conclude, let me again commend Chairman INHOFE for his efforts in getting us to this point. Let me thank my colleagues especially for all of their hard work on getting this bill out of the committee.

I look forward to an open debate on the floor, voting on amendments, and getting this legislation passed. I look forward—in fact, look back at the days when that was a routine procedure, when our Defense bill was a way in which many people from different committees and different aspects of the Senate could come forward and offer legislation. We could debate legislation, vote, move forward, and at the end have a piece of legislation that this entire Senate was extraordinarily proud of, and that is my hope for this year.

With that, I thank you.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as the whole country knows now, in my State of Texas, we have recently lost some ground in our war against COVID-19. After seeing serious progress in flattening the curve, we have taken what Governor Greg Abbott has called a “swift and dangerous turn.”

Over the last couple of weeks, the data has trended in the wrong direction. We have seen an increase in daily new cases, hospitalizations, and overall positivity rates. In response to these growing numbers, I have been working with leaders at every level of government to ensure we have the resources necessary to continue to win this fight.

Yesterday, I was privileged to travel back to Texas with Vice President MIKE PENCE for a briefing on Texas coronavirus response efforts. We were joined by Dr. Deborah Birx and HUD Secretary Dr. Ben Carson—two Coronavirus Task Force members—for a meeting with Governor Abbott at UT Southwestern Medical Center.

Governor Abbott discussed the concerning picture painted by these growing numbers. We went from 2,000 cases a day to 5,000, and the positivity rate soared from 4 percent to more than 13 percent. Some of our largest cities have experienced single-day records of new cases.

We have relied on our growing testing capability and capacity to understand how quickly this disease is spreading. In several Texas cities, community-based testing sites have been integral as part of this effort. These locations are a partnership between the Department of Health and Human Services, local public health authorities, and pharmacy and retail companies, and have been a major driver of our large-scale testing increase. Many Texans have gone to locations and received no-cost coronavirus testing, and this information has been crucial to understanding the community spread of the virus.

As case counts have recently climbed, the concern has only been magnified by an approaching deadline. Federal support for these testing sites was set to end tomorrow. The goal, of course, is to eventually shift these from Federal to State and local partners, but, to be frank, Texas was not yet ready to make that transition. Until we are, shutting down these sites would leave us without valuable information about the growing number of infections.

Last week, Senator CRUZ and I sent a letter to the administration to urge continuing Federal support for community-based testing in Texas. Our cities need more time to prepare to take on the financial responsibility of these testing sites, and it would have been a tremendous risk and an unnecessary risk to cut off funding before that transition was complete.

On Friday, we got some good news. The administration agreed to extend these operations in Texas for at least 2 more weeks, with an ongoing evaluation period after that. This will make sure we can maintain the testing capacity our public and private partners have worked hard to establish. Now we are roughly at about 1.9 million tests taken, but more testing will be the key to navigating this surge. I thank President Trump and his administration for taking swift action following our request to ensure that these critical testing sites will remain operational.

Each day, we are learning more and more about this virus. That is maybe one of the most maddening things about it. When we started, we had no idea what the trajectory of this virus would be. We have models, to be sure, but many of those models proved to be wildly wrong. People were necessarily and understandably anxious and some fearful about exactly what we were dealing with. I know we all manage risk in our daily lives, but uncertainty is hard to manage, and that is what we had at the very beginning.

So we have learned a lot, Dr. Birx pointed out yesterday, about the virus.

We know it predominantly affects elderly people over the age of 80 and younger people with underlying comorbidities for the disease. Almost everybody else will recover from the virus. But because more and more people are turning up with no symptoms themselves, they are a risk to the people with the highest risk of mortality.

So I also believe we need to remind ourselves of the simple lessons we were told at the beginning. We were actually pretty good at it. Dr. Carson said: We know what to do; we just quit doing it. We know we need to maintain social distance. Mask when we can. We need to wash our hands. If you feel sick, stay home. Those are the sorts of things we do here in the Senate, which have allowed us to safely operate these last couple of months.

I also think we need to come up with a different strategy when it comes to testing. We not only need more testing, we need a strategy for testing, because until now, we have depended on people to show up and raise their hand and say: I want to be tested. But if you are asymptomatic, why would you go in for a test? You would have no indication that you have the virus or were potentially a risk for community spread to the most vulnerable part of our population.

So talking to Dr. Birx and others, I think this is something that we all ought to think more about and that the administration—I know I talked to the Vice President about this as well—not only come up with a strategy for more testing but a better strategy to make sure we are hitting as many people as we can so we can find those asymptomatic carriers because that is primarily what we are finding out now with more testing in Texas. But we also know that, whether it is a combination of Memorial Day or the opening of bars, where it is hard to socially distance—and there is not a whole lot of that going on in the bars—our Governor has now tapped the brakes, has closed the bars, and has stopped the gradual reopening of our economy until we get a handle on this worrisome spread of new cases.

If you look at the demographics of the new cases, it is people between the ages of 20 and 59. More and more, there are those who have underlying health problems who are ending up in our intensive care units, and as we know from before, when we wanted to flatten the spread so as not to impose an uncontrollable surge on ICU beds, we have to get our house back in order.

For the most part, that means that not only does the Federal Government have to do its part, but the State and local governments have to do their part, and we have to do our part, each of us. Each American has to do their part to follow the guidelines, and we will defeat this virus.

I know, in listening to Secretary Carson yesterday, that I told him he must have some Texas in his background because he made these comments, which

I thought were so appropriate. He said: "We must learn to dominate this virus and not let the virus dominate us." I think that is exactly the kind of spirit that we all ought to have as we work forward together on an individual, on a local, on a State, and on a Federal level to dominate this virus.

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.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am awaiting my colleague, the ranking member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, to come. We are going to engage in a short colloquy about our energy bill.

But before we do that and before he arrives, I would like to comment on a matter that my friend and also fellow traveler on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator CANTWELL, raised on the floor just about an hour ago, and this is with regards to a provision within the National Defense Authorization Act. This is section 3111, related to the review of the adequacy of the nuclear weapons budget at DOE.

She has raised the concerns and articulated them extraordinarily well. Know that, as the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I joined with my friend and colleague, the ranking member, in sending a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as well as the ranking member, outlining the concerns that we had with this provision and really very, very clearly alarmed about the lack of the Energy Committee's involvement in drafting this section 3111.

But as Senator CANTWELL had outlined, what this provision would do is effectively empower sub-Cabinet level officials, primarily from DOD, to make potentially sweeping decisions about DOE's budget, going against what we think is good governance, in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act, and, as she outlined, it could put you in a situation where the priorities from the Department of Energy through the Secretary of Energy, whether it is cleanup of legacy defense waste, cyber security, funding for energy innovation, all of these priorities could basically be put at the wayside. We have significant, significant concerns about this.

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter that Senator MANCHIN and I sent to Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED, outlining the concerns that we have, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY
AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2020.

Hon. JIM INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JACK REED,
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN INHOFE AND RANKING MEMBER REED: As the Senate begins consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2021, we write to express our opposition to Section 3111, related to the review of the adequacy of the nuclear weapons budget at the Department of Energy (DOE), and several related sections. As written, these provisions would undermine and subordinate the Secretary of Energy's statutory authority, including his or her responsibility to prepare a budget for congressional review, and would likely result in collateral damage for DOE's non-weapons priorities.

Section 3111 directs the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC), which is comprised of five officials from the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), to determine whether DOE's proposed budget request is adequate, "in whole or in part, to implement the objectives of the Department of Defense with respect to nuclear weapons for that fiscal year." If the NWC determines the budget request is inadequate for that purpose, it is required to provide recommendations, including for funding levels and initiatives, to the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary of Energy is then required to accept those recommendations verbatim and wholesale, with no ability to improve or depart from them.

We support the objectives of increased stewardship of taxpayer dollars, transparency, and oversight of the DOE and NNSA budget as our nation embarks on the modernization of the nuclear weapons stockpile. Those objectives will help ensure continued stockpile safety, security, and reliability. However, as the leaders of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee with jurisdiction over DOE and its National Laboratories, we are alarmed by the lack of our Committee's involvement in the drafting of Section 3111 and related provisions.

Most immediately, Section 3111 would empower subcabinet level officials, primarily from DOD, to make potentially sweeping decisions about DOE's budget. We believe this goes against good governance and is in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977. The NWC has a narrower focus than the Secretary of Energy, and its recommendations would likely prioritize nuclear weapons at the expense of other critical missions undertaken by DOE, ranging from the cleanup of legacy defense waste sites to the cybersecurity of our electric grid and funding for energy innovation.

We are also concerned that Section 3111 and its related sections would complicate the current statutory process by adding unnecessary steps before the DOE and NNSA budget request is finalized and thereby serve to delay DOE's ability to submit its annual proposal to Congress.

The Secretary of Energy must maintain clear control over, and accountability for, the Department's budget. The Secretary's statutory responsibility to certify the reliability of the nuclear stockpile must also be preserved. Alignment of the DOD and DOE nuclear weapon responsibilities cannot come at a cost to other critical DOE programs.

We appreciate your leadership on the NDAA bill but hope you will work with our Committee on provisions that impact DOE, the Secretary of Energy, and the NNSA. We

filed several amendments to NDAA to strike Section 3111 and its related provisions, and we ask that you accept those while we work towards a compromise that avoids the impacts outlined here.

Sincerely,

SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI,
Chairman
SENATOR JOE MANCHIN III,
Ranking Member.

AMERICAN ENERGY INNOVATION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to be with my good friend, the Senator from West Virginia, to talk about our American Energy Innovation Act. I talked on the floor and we talked on the floor for a long while now, talking about the process that we used. We spent more than a year working with members of our Energy Committee and many other Members of this Chamber to put together an overwhelming bipartisan package.

We focused on a range of promising technologies, including energy storage, renewable energy, carbon capture, advanced nuclear, cleaner vehicles, and energy efficiency. We worked to improve cyber security. It would help modernize the electric grid. It addresses known weaknesses in our mineral security and our supply chains. It focuses on boosting the workforce development and job creation. It renews a range of popular programs, from ARPA-E to Weatherization Assistance.

It is a significant bill, and as you may recall, we were on this bill earlier in the year in February, and an unrelated matter stalled that measure out. It is stalled, but it is not dead, and I tell you that I remain 100 percent committed to advancing our bill into law before the end of the year. I know that this is something that Senator MANCHIN and I agree on very, very strongly, that we continue our work to advance the energy bill into law.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, I sure do agree with you wholeheartedly. It is something we worked on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, the bill is the product of over a year of work and a robust process, both in the Energy Committee and also on the Senate floor, in early March, as you just said. And 39 of the 53 bills are bipartisan, which you don't hear very often, and 72 Senators have either sponsored or cosponsored language included in the package. That is 72 out of 100 of our Senators, Democrats and Republicans, who have participated in this energy policy.

The American Energy Innovation Act would authorize just over \$24 billion for technologies critical to an "all of the above" energy policy. I repeat: "all of the above." We need everything that we have. That keeps our energy dependable, affordable, and reliable, while also reducing emissions.

It truly takes a balanced and forward-leaning approach to updating our national energy policy for the first

time in over 13 years. This bill is necessary to help us chart the way to a cleaner and more secure energy future.

As you mentioned, our bill was unfortunately derailed, Chairman MURKOWSKI, back in March, by an issue that is entirely outside—entirely outside—of the Energy Committee's jurisdiction. We had no input in this whatsoever, but it stopped a piece of legislation that 72 Senators were involved in.

Since then, the world has dramatically changed, and our hearts are heavy with the loss of over 128,000 Americans due to the virus. What our country has gone through over the last few months reinforces a need for a comprehensive energy bill, as we heard just 2 weeks ago from experts testifying before the Energy Committee.

I am steadfast in my commitment to getting our American Energy Innovation Act done this year. I think it is needed more now than even 4 months ago, when you look at the shape that our country is in. It is a stimulus bill. It is basically an infrastructure bill, and it is a reliable energy portfolio that takes us well into the 21st century.

Senator MURKOWSKI.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Well, Senator MANCHIN, I think we both would agree that we were more than ready to pass the bipartisan bill before the pandemic hit, and, as you point out, I think it is even more important, and I am certainly more ready than ever to pass that.

As you mentioned, the U.S. economy, our quality of life, and our health all depend on stable, secure, and an innovative energy industry. What we do within this bill—and, again, it is a very, very bipartisan bill—is we ensure that we remain a global energy leader while strengthening our security, making timely investments in clean technologies, and rebuilding our supply chains. And we have been talking a lot about the imperative to focus on the vulnerability of our supply chains.

But it also helps us capture the industries of the future and all the jobs and the benefits that are associated with them. So, as I mentioned before, it will help to improve our cyber security and foster innovation. When you think about the economic growth that we have seen in this country since World War II, it is that innovation that helps spur that economic recovery.

So, again, I feel pretty strongly that this bill was important before the pandemic, and it is even more important now as we try to focus on our Nation's recovery. I think that is where we can also help. Wouldn't you agree, Senator MANCHIN?

Mr. MANCHIN. We both agree, Senator MURKOWSKI, that the Energy Innovation Act is going to absolutely help our economy recover. We will never have a recovery coming off a recession or a real shutdown the way we have just seen unless there is infrastructure, and this is, by far, the best.

Between March and April, the energy industry lost 1.3 million jobs. That is a

13-percent drop that essentially wipes out all industry-wide job growth in the last 5 years. I repeat: For the last 5 years, it has been wiped out over 3 months. That is on top of the major shifts in the U.S. and global energy markets that preceded and intensified in the pandemic with a catastrophic hit to the economy, and, most importantly, to the workers.

American workers need immediate relief, as well as longer term assistance, and they need jobs in the sectors of tomorrow's energy economy. This energy package puts billions of dollars into research, development, demonstration, and deployment of energy technologies that will create skilled and high-paying jobs while also establishing workforce grants to ensure unemployed or new workers have the skills and opportunities to get back to work as quickly as possible.

On top of that, our bill would help develop technologies needed in four sectors of the U.S. economy—power generation, transportation, industry, and commercial and residential buildings—that contribute 90 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.

While we are expecting a 14-percent drop in U.S. carbon dioxide emissions from the energy sector in 2020—the largest drop ever—because our economy was shut down, those emissions will bounce back as our country opens back up. Investing in technologies like carbon capture, energy storage, and energy efficiency are critical for rebuilding our economy, something that we desperately need right now while also reducing emissions.

Senator MURKOWSKI, our bill invests in technologies across the board and across fuel types. Do you agree that keeping this “all of the above” energy package together is, by far, the best path forward?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. It is absolutely the best path forward. When you take the good committee work that we have engaged in and you then bring that to the floor, as we have, we had substantive process. We are so close to getting this measure actually through the Senate, but I think we recognize that, as we do that, that ideal package is not before us right yet.

As the chairman and the ranking member on the committee, we have received requests from Members who have items in our energy bill who are seeking to include them as potential amendments on the NDAA, which is currently on the floor. I have actually filed two amendments to NDAA. One is the text of our Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, and the other is our American Mineral Security Act. Effectively, this provides a second pathway in case we remain blocked on our energy bill. I want to say that this is not the preferred path at all. That is not where we want to go with this bill.

My clear, clear, clear, and undeniable preference is that we enact all of these measures as part of the energy package. So to my colleagues who might

think, “Well, wait, I see a few energy-related provisions; what is going on?” we are not taking our foot off the gas of our American Energy Innovation Act.

I know, Senator MANCHIN, you have been working with us on some of these amendments that we are dealing with within NDAA, but I know you also greatly prefer to pass them as part of our broader energy bill.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator MURKOWSKI and I, working together, and our staffs working so diligently, have put together a truly bipartisan energy package, which is comprehensive, and our country needs every part of it to get enacted—every part of it.

Our national energy policy hasn't been updated since 2007. I want you to think about 2007. That was the same year the iPhone was released. There have been 10 different iPhone models to keep up in a world that is constantly evolving since 2007, but we haven't been able to do the same for energy policies. So it is long overdue.

Getting this update enacted is long overdue, as I said, and I hope that every one of my colleagues agrees and will come together to support passing this bill in its entirety—in its entirety—rather than moving it in pieces, and that is what we want to prevent from happening.

Seventy-two of my fellow Senators have language in this bill that they have either sponsored or cosponsored. Let's move this bill as it is rather than piecemeal, or, even worse, having to start from scratch for next year, which will put us behind even further. Would you agree, Madam Chairwoman?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Senator MANCHIN, the thought of having to start over—as you say, to start from scratch—is absolutely the wrong way to address our energy policies and the reforms that are needed. I completely and fully agree with you. It would be a mistake. It would be a significant mistake for Congress to simply give up on energy policy for yet another year.

As you have indicated, Congress last enacted a major energy bill in 2007. That is more than 12½ years ago. That is unacceptable.

That is the thing that is holding us back then, but even despite the fact that we have not been able to update our energy laws, we have even an oil-and-gas renaissance. The cost of renewables has declined sharply. New technologies have begun to emerge. We have new challenges and opportunities to address, but what is missing here is the U.S. Congress coming together to modernize our Nation's energy policy.

I think it would be a mistake to decide that this is just too hard; that there is not enough time left. We have been down that road before. Ladies and gentlemen, we are so far along in this process that we just need to keep pushing and keep moving. We are so far along, but that thinking would push us back to a reset or a restart. It is just not where we want to be.

Senator MANCHIN, I will just ask one final question; that is, whether you agree that there will be no giving up at any point from either one of us on this very important American Energy Innovation Act.

Mr. MANCHIN. That is exactly right, Madam Chairman. We have worked so hard on this.

This is going through the process. We always talk about the process. Before it comes to the floor, every piece of legislation should go through the process.

We have fifty bills that have gone through the process in our committee, and most of them are bipartisan. It doesn't get any better than that. We didn't have any disagreement at all, until we got another piece of legislation they were trying to throw in that we had no jurisdiction over. We would love to help them if we could, but they shouldn't hold up this bill here. Hopefully, they are working out their differences in the other committees. I am sure they are.

I am committed to working with you, as we have been working in the past year or more, to get this completed once and for all. It is something I know that we, as a committee, every Member in this Senate—72 are cosponsors—but, truly, the entire country needs. They need to have dependable, reliable, and affordable energy. They need that to be pragmatic and realistic, working with all the energies we have but demanding, through innovation—not elimination but through innovation—a much cleaner result and a better environment for all of us. That is what we do in this bill. We tackle every part of it.

I am very pleased to be working with you. I am as committed as you are to get this done before we get out of here.

Thank you.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FAMILY FARMS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the past few months have resulted in some dramatic changes in our daily lives. We all know that is because of the virus pandemic, but for America's farmers and the 86,000 Iowa family farms, there were still crops to be planted, fields to be fertilized, and livestock to care for, regardless of the virus pandemic.

These family farms take great satisfaction in the fact that they are part of the most affordable, abundant, and safest supply of food of any country in the world. They are also proud to help fuel the country, knowing that almost every gallon of gas consumed in the United States is blended with renewable fuels.

Family farmers have a lot to be proud of. As one of two farmers serving in the U.S. Senate, I can speak to that because I am one.

One of the most enjoyable aspects of my job is the opportunity to speak

with farmers across the State during my annual 99 county meetings. Being able to hear from them directly and to use my position on the Senate Agriculture Committee to work on their issues is an honor and a privilege that I don't take lightly.

At my meetings, farmers will introduce themselves by telling me how many generations of their families have made their living on the same land that they now operate—third-, fourth-, and fifth-generation farmers using the same soil and oftentimes the same tools and barns as generations before them.

In fact, the Iowa Department of Agriculture Century Farm database shows that out of these 86,000 family farmers in Iowa, there are 20,060 farms in our State that have been in the same family for more than 100 years. Even more impressive, out of that 86,000 family farmers, we have a classification called the Heritage Farm database showing 1,360 farms that have been in the same family for 150 years.

Farming isn't just a profession. It isn't just a hobby or a personal passion. Farming is how many Iowans leave their mark in our world.

The legacy of many Iowa families is built and created around life at that farm. Every farmer intends to leave their land to their children better than when they found it when it was entrusted to them for their care in the first place. Farmers live by that creed, and it is reflected by the fact that Iowa is a global leader in sustainable farming practices.

Through farm bill programs at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government has proven it can successfully partner with farmers to enhance conservation practices.

At the State level, Governor Reynolds and Iowa Agriculture Secretary Naig are leading the charge to implement the Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy—our way of cleaning up the rivers and helping the Gulf of Mexico to not be as dead as it is so often. This includes techniques like no-till, cover crops, and wetland restoration to improve soil health and enhance water quality.

Researchers at Iowa State University continue to develop new conservation techniques, like adding tall grass prairie strips to fields and modeling when to best apply fertilizer.

Iowa farmers have embraced voluntary stewardship investments and practices that allow them to stay productive and to be profitable—maybe not so profitable now when corn is at less than \$3 a bushel, as an example, but overall time profitability. They do this while also ensuring their land can be productive for years to come, for when it is time to give their children a chance to take over the farm.

So while the Federal Government has shown an ability to partner with Iowa farmers, there are also times when the Federal Government has overstepped its authority and attempted to regu-

late private landowners with one-size-fits-all solutions.

For example, in 2010, the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service—it goes by NRCS in most States—determined that an Illinois farmer by the name of Kurt Wilke and his family could not maintain and farm their land. This was in 2010. It is now 2020. We might have a resolution of this, finally. The USDA claimed the land contained wetlands, despite documentation to the contrary.

In early 2011, Mr. Wilke started making improvements to his drainage tile system on that farm. That is when the NRCS got involved. For him, it was a terrible life for the next several years. They told him to stop the work; in other words, stop improving your land through the drainage tile system. They warned him that he was putting farm program payments at risk.

Earlier this month, after nearly a decade of court battles with the NRCS—Farmer Wilke was fighting the NRCS in court battles—a determination by the Director of the USDA's National Appeals Division reprimanded this NRCS agency for overstepping its bounds. Can you imagine stepping in to say that a farmer can't farm his farm?

The USDA stepped in because they had failed to obey their own rules. The appeals division favored Mr. Wilke. This protracted court battle should have been avoided.

In regard to that, I am going to read, and then I am going to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation newspaper called the Spokesman.

This started in 2010. So, in 2020, this finally ends, where one division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, called the National Appeals Division, because of their decision, Mr. Wilke will have an opportunity to be reimbursed for tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees incurred while fighting for fair treatment.

I ask unanimous consent to print this article in the RECORD.

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

[June 17, 2020]

USDA APPEALS DIVISION ADMONISHES NRCS FOR NOT FOLLOWING ITS OWN RULES

A battle over a farmer's right to use and care for his own land is one step closer to being resolved. A determination by the director of USDA's National Appeals Division admonishes the Natural Resources Conservation Service for failing to obey its own rules. The ruling favors an Illinois farmer who battled NRCS for more than a decade. The decision is a welcome signal that concerns from across the countryside about NRCS conservation compliance are being heard.

In 2010, the NRCS determined that Illinois farmer Kurt Wilke and his family could not maintain and farm their land, claiming it contained wetlands, despite documentation to the contrary. An administrative judge ruled against the NRCS, but the agency repeatedly filed the same findings, forcing Wilke to fight the issue in court four times over more than a decade. Each time, an administrative judge ruled in Wilke's favor.

Wilke's case is not unique. In 2019, the American Farm Bureau Federation called on USDA to ensure fair treatment of farmers and ranchers by NRCS, highlighting Kurt Wilke's case and others. AFBF called for due process in enforcement of conservation and a transparent decision-making and appeals process.

AFBF welcomes the NAD director's decision, which clears the way for Wilke to be reimbursed for tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees incurred while fighting for fair treatment. The NAD director found that the NRCS ignored its own standards in determining what constitutes a wetland, stating, "NRCS's decision to disregard evidence affected the accuracy of its calculation." The ruling continues, "Because NAD determined that, NRCS's scopes and effect analysis did not follow federal regulations or established procedures, NRCS cannot now argue that it did so."

American Farm Bureau President Zippy Duvall said, "This decision about a decade old case sends a strong message to NRCS that the government must play by its own rules and treat farmers and ranchers fairly. We understand the importance of following environmental rules, but we expect fair enforcement of those rules. We hope this marks the end of NRCS ignoring facts and procedures. We look forward to conservation being a partnership between NRCS and farmers."

The NAD director's decision follows a unanimous ruling by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *USDA v. Boucher*, which sternly rebuked NRCS conservation program enforcement in 2019. In the court's words, "USDA repeatedly failed to follow applicable law and agency standards. It disregarded compelling evidence showing that the acreage in question never qualified as wetlands that could have been converted illegally into croplands. And the agency has kept shifting its explanations for treating the acreage as converted wetlands. The USDA's treatment of the Bouchers' acreage as converted wetlands easily qualifies as arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion."

Mr. GRASSLEY. He finally gets justice, but just think of the life of Mr. Wilke for the 10 years that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and that agency said he could not farm his land the way he wanted to and put in the tile system the way he wanted to. Sometimes maybe their opinion is justified, but you can see how they overstepped their bounds and how it hurt this farmer.

I want to give you another example of government overreach. It was the Obama-era regulation called waters of the United States. Most people know that as WOTUS. The 2015 WOTUS rule was a dramatic expansion of the authority that Congress provided to the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate the navigable waters of the United States. Remember navigable waters? It is supposed to be the definition of—as far as the big boats can go up a river. That is Federal regulation. Beyond that, it is State regulation, but not for that previous administration and WOTUS. They were going to regulate the road ditches, as an example.

In fact, the Obama-era rule would have claimed jurisdiction to require Federal permission to do any number of activities, not just in or near Iowa rivers and streams but on 97 percent of Iowa's land.

To clear up a common confusion, this rule wasn't about regulating discharge of pollution into the waterways, which is important and is done through other parts of the Clean Water Act. What this whole WOTUS rule was about was requiring Federal redtape for routine land use decisions with little or no environmental benefit. It was a power grab, pure and simple.

One week ago today, the Trump administration's WOTUS rule went into effect. This rule balances the need to protect our navigable rivers while also protecting the private property rights of businesses, homeowners, and, of course, family farms. This is a major accomplishment, and I congratulate President Trump and Administrator Wheeler on getting this rule over the finish line.

I hope people remember 4 months from now—particularly people who are farmers—what WOTUS would have done for you if it had been kept in place. You maybe would have had to get a permit from the government to do normal farming operations. Now you don't have to. You never have had to in 150, 160 years in Iowa.

For the time being, these two examples of government overreach have been resolved. However, the U.S. Congress and the executive branch must continue to advocate for fairness and common sense when passing legislation or regulations that will impact private land owners.

Farmers understand the importance of environmental rules, and farmers will follow those rules. However, we must demand fair enforcement of those rules so that they don't disadvantage family farmers like Mr. Wilkie of Illinois was disadvantaged for 10 years fighting the bureaucracy. However, we must demand fair enforcement of these rules so that they don't disadvantage anybody, for that matter.

The virus pandemic that we are in has demonstrated the importance of supporting farmers and ensuring that we have a stable, safe, and affordable food supply for our country. Through natural disasters, through droughts, through pests, through pandemics, America's families are still farming. Let's make sure that the Federal Government doesn't get in their way so that they can pass along their legacy and their farm to future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

RUSSIA

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today appalled by what appears to be a total betrayal of troops by the man who is supposed to be their Commander in Chief, a man who swore an oath to support and defend our Constitution from our Nation's enemies.

This weekend, news broke that Russia offered bounties to Taliban-linked militants for the murders of U.S. troops and other coalition forces in Af-

ghanistan—bounties that have reportedly led to the death of at least one American servicemember, and there may have been more. Yet, while numerous news outlets have confirmed that Donald Trump was briefed on the matter months ago, his administration still hasn't taken any apparent steps to push back against Russia's blatant and provocative act of aggression. In fact, far from authorizing any normal, reasonable, expected retaliation, Trump has actually refused to issue even a cold word about the foreign adversary colluding with terrorists to kill Americans in exchange for cash. Instead, he has continued to heap praise on Russia and the tyrant at its helm, describing the "great friendship" between our countries as recently as last month, long after he reportedly learned about the bounty scheme.

Despite many independent news reports claiming otherwise, the White House spent the weekend denying that Trump was ever told of this intelligence. Well, saying that Trump administration officials are prone to lying is like saying they are prone to breathing, but there are two possible scenarios before us. Both are damning for the man who is supposed to be in charge.

The first is that Trump was never actually looped in. In this case, ignorance isn't exculpatory. "I didn't know that our adversary was helping kill American troops because no one told me" is not an excuse for the Commander in Chief of the greatest military on Earth. It is, in fact, a confession of incompetence.

If he was truly never told, then that means that his own staff either believes he is so compromised by Russia or they consider him so counterproductive to the running of the country that they thought it necessary to hide critical information about our national security from him.

If it is true that those who knew of this threat to American lives failed to tell the President, then we should expect a President with such an affinity for firing senior officials to have no qualms about acting swiftly to remove Cabinet officials who failed to share this critical information with him.

The second and far more likely option is that they are covering for him; that Trump knew—that of course Trump knew—yet he still did not act; that this "America first" President went right on placing Russian interests ahead of American lives, kept on acting as Putin's lackey, trying to score Russia an invite back into what would be the G8, even as he learned that they were working with terrorists to target our troops. Then, when the news finally broke on Friday, he decided to lie about what he had known all along, focused more on protecting his own personal reputation than protecting the troops sacrificing for our country overseas on his orders.

Well, at least one American servicemember is reportedly dead as a result

of these bounties. While he spent his weekend golfing, lying, and making sure the buck stopped anywhere but with him, our troops in hotspots around the world were forced to wonder whether they might be next, whether a bounty might be placed on their head tomorrow, and whether President Trump would even care enough to respond if that was the case. Once again, Donald Trump has abdicated any semblance of real leadership.

Look, even if we somehow swallow the pill that the Trump administration is so incompetent that no one ever told Trump that a foreign power conspired to commit acts of terror against our troops, it still wouldn't explain his response now that he does know. Not once—not once—since the story broke has he expressed his sorrow for those who lost a loved one or expressed awe at the bravery of the servicemembers who are in harm's way because they love their country so much that they are willing to go to a war zone for her.

He has had time to call Joe Biden names, however. He has had time to retweet a video promoting White power. He has had time to promote conspiracy theories and bolster Russia propaganda by questioning the American intelligence experts who work for him. Not once—not once in the past 72 hours has he found the time to express outrage that American service men and women are dead. We, the American people, should be outraged by what he is choosing to prioritize instead.

I am racking my brain for any justifiable reason for Trump's reaction. Does he think that maybe there are good people on both sides of this debate too—in the debate between killing American troops and protecting them?

Does he think that the word of Vladimir Putin is just as good as the dedicated public servants and intelligence officers who put themselves at great risk to make sure he has the best, most accurate information to make national security decisions?

Does he think that not retaliating will help bury the issue and that by burying the issue, it will help keep his poll numbers from sinking any lower?

Make no mistake—not responding here is a response in its own way, and it is a response that further endangers our national security. Just as he did when he pandered to another tyrant and announced he would sweep our troops out of Syria last fall, just as he did when he wanted to look tough by ordering the assassination of Iranian General Qasem Soleimani last year, he has put Americans in war zones in even greater danger than they were in already—in greater danger than they needed to be.

By refusing to call out this wrong, by decrying the reports as fake news, by being so incompetent in matters ranging from foreign policy to common decency, Donald Trump is making it more likely that other hostile powers will work with other terrorist networks to exchange other American

lives for stacks of cash. He has made it more likely that more spouses will be widowed and more moms and dads will turn into Gold Star parents.

Listen, I ran for Congress so that when the drums of war started beating, I would be in a position to ensure that our elected officials fully considered the true cost of war—not just in dollars and cents but in human lives. If that war must occur, then of course I will support it, but what I never ever imagined was that I would have to come to the floor of the Senate to point out that the American President should be angry—even furious—when another nation puts a bounty on the heads of our troops; that I would have to be here to point out for our President that the Commander in Chief of the most powerful fighting force the world has ever known should act like a Commander in Chief.

Those troops deserve to know what the administration is doing to protect them and why Trump has, so far, failed to take any action to protect them. That is one reason why I am demanding a Senate hearing to hear testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of the CIA, and others so we can get to the bottom of this once and for all.

Donald Trump has never understood what words like “sacrifice” or “courage” mean, so how dare he let his own personal cowardice, his inability, or—even worse—his disinterest in standing up to Vladimir Putin lead to a reality where those Americans who are actually brave enough to put on a uniform and serve are put at greater risk. How dare he let his own personal insecurities and failings endanger our national security.

In the face of all he has done, all he continues to refuse to do, how dare he still call himself the Commander in Chief.

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

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

S. 4049

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for 59 years in a row, Congress has passed the NDAA—almost always on a bipartisan basis. This year will be the 60th year in a row. I am proud to say the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act continues in that long bipartisan tradition.

There is not much around here anymore that passes every single year, let alone with the support of both parties. But we all know what the bill is all about; it is about support of our troops and our national security. I hope we will all keep that in mind, as we discuss the amendments to this bill, to keep them on topic.

Last week, I talked a little bit about how we are falling behind China and Russia and how those two countries are now our biggest threats. I think we all know how that happened. It happened in the last 5 years of the Obama administration. During those last 5 years, the President's budget took 25 percent of the military budget away from the military. This has never happened before. Yet that is what happened.

What happened at the same time—I don't think a lot of the Members are aware of this, but China and Russia—they are the enemies out there. During the time that our President had defunded the military by 25 percent, Russia actually increased theirs by 34 percent. We went down 25 percent; Russia went up 34 percent.

What was China doing during this time? China, while we were going down 25 percent, went up 83 percent.

You see what the problem is. They just passed us up in a lot of areas. We can name those—hypersonics and other areas where they were building.

They are building up their military capabilities and positioning themselves strategically around the world. We know they are showing up in places they have never been before.

Fortunately, we have a strategy to counter them. It is called the national defense strategy. I meant to bring that down with me because I make reference to that. The national defense strategy is a document that is put together by 12 Democrats and 12 Republicans—all very top people in terms of their knowledge of the military—who get together and say: What should be our roadmap? What we are going to do to put ourselves in a position where we can counter Russia and China?

We have the national defense strategy. It came out in late 2018. At that time, the military services had been implementing this plan with the support of Congress in previous NDAA's. This is the third year now that we have that.

What we did this year was speed up the implementation. We set America on a course to make sure that we are setting ourselves up for success no matter what threat comes our way. We do that by using this document, the NDS, the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

What this says is that we need to create a credible military deterrent that tells Russia and China and anyone else who would do us harm: You just can't win. We are going to win. We will beat you—no matter who you are out there. That is what this NDAA does.

It says that we need to invest in the equipment, tools, weapons, resources, and training our troops need to succeed in their mission. We also make sure that they are in the right places and at the right time. That is what the NDAA, which we are considering right now—which we are proceeding to right now—will do.

It says that our biggest threats come from Indo-Pacific region. The NDAA

creates a Pacific Deterrence Initiative to enhance lethality, address key capability gaps, and support our allies and partners over there. This is something that we haven't done before. The strategic Pacific Deterrence is like European Deterrence. It was very successful, and that is what we are doing now in the Middle East.

Several of us, including the Chair, have been to the South China Sea. We have watched China doing things, building islands—something that has never been done before—going into areas they have never been before, such as Djibouti. Historically, it has been the practice to do things in China, starting things within their city limits. But that is not the way it is anymore. It is now all throughout Africa, Djibouti, as far south as Southern Tanzania.

It says that technology is changing the nature of warfare rapidly and that we have to keep up with China and Russia, who are working hard to build weapons that we have never even heard of. So the NDAA pushes innovation and makes it easier for the Pentagon to harness that innovation throughout the defense industrial base. We harden our supply chains so that China and Russia can't be a threat to us there. We have issues there, but the pandemic really showed us where our weaknesses are.

This bill helps us reduce our reliance on foreign countries and protects our supply chain and our key technologies from infiltration and other risks. The NDS Commission report also tells us how the Pentagon's massive bureaucracy sometimes inhibits our ability to innovate and operate. The NDAA helps the Pentagon fully implement the NDS, improving the way they budget, giving them flexibility to hire and keep top talent, but always making sure they are accountable to the taxpayer.

No matter what threats we face—no matter who, what, where, when, or how—the one constant is the men and women who make up the force. These are the brave Americans who volunteer to wear the uniform and put themselves in harm's way because they believe in this Nation, and they are willing to give their lives to defend it.

At the end of the day, that is the most important thing this bill does: It takes care of our troops and their families. They sacrifice so much, and they risk so much. We are all aware of that. We have to make sure that we are taking care of them right. That is what this bill does.

This is a very serious, sacred responsibility we have—one I don't take lightly. While I am on the floor, throughout the debate on this bill, I am thinking about them.

When we are talking about this bill, the numbers we are talking about—the \$740.5 billion and the 2.1 million servicemembers—the sheer size can make you forget sometimes that these are real people who rely on us to do things and to do things right. That is one of

the big differences. We hear people all the time—the anti-defense crowd out there is always talking about how we are actually spending more money on military than China and Russia put together. That is true. The most expensive part of the military is the people. That is the most expensive part.

Of course, Communist countries don't care about the people. They just give them a rifle and say: Go out and kill somebody.

Here are a few of those people who are counting on us this week.

I am thinking about one of my former interns who started his journey at the Air Force Academy last week, as well as all of the other new cadets and midshipmen at the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and West Point.

I am thinking about the 40 new soldiers I talked with before they took their oath of office on the birthday of the U.S. Army. They are the future of our military.

I am thinking about the sailors and marines serving overseas whom I had the honor of meeting earlier this year.

I am thinking about Janna Driver, a tireless military spouse. Her husband was stationed at Tinker Air Force Base. She came to my office. I was thinking it was something that was just happening at Tinker Air Force Base, but she talked about the deplorable housing situation, and it all started with the privatization of housing. She was talking about that. I assumed this is a problem that we needed to address only at Tinker Air Force Base. Then I found out it was all over the State of Oklahoma, in all five of our major military installations. Then we found out it was nationwide. This is something that we started working on. This is the privatization of housing and how it is deteriorating. We got on it right away.

Again, this is something that China and Russia don't have to do because they don't care about taking care of their people. They don't have to do that in a Communist country.

I am also thinking about Kristie Roberts, a member of the 138th Fighter Wing of the Tulsa Air National Guard, who lost her husband, Staff Sergeant Marshal Roberts, in March.

Each of them represents hundreds of thousands of other men and women who are serving our Nation, and we owe it to them to get this done together.

I am glad to have by my side the ranking member, who shares my dedication and gratitude to our troops, JACK REED. I have to thank JACK REED for being a great partner and friend and for his support of this bill. In fact, JACK REED and I have worked together for 3 years now, and we are singular in the efforts that we want for our military system. I am sure there are occasionally some differences, and we don't agree on everything, but we resolve the problems.

Of course, we wouldn't be here if it weren't for our staff. We have John Bonsell for the majority and Liz King

for the minority. I will talk more about them later, but they deserve a lot of praise. They are used to working at night, and they are used to working at odd hours. They are tireless. They have done tremendous work, and the proof of that is the overwhelmingly bipartisan vote out of committee. The vote to move forward with the NDAA last Thursday passed out of committee to the Senate floor by a vote of 25 to 2, and the 2 who voted against it never vote for military anyway, so I call that unanimous. I am looking forward to seeing the same strong bipartisan support and to voting on this bill, hopefully, at the end of this week.

We are going to give it careful consideration, and I look forward to working with you all to make it better through the amendment process. That is what we are starting on right now.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Coons	Heinrich
Baldwin	Cornyn	Hirono
Barrasso	Cortez Masto	Hooven
Bennet	Cotton	Hyde-Smith
Blackburn	Crapo	Inhofe
Blumenthal	Cruz	Johnson
Blunt	Daines	Jones
Booker	Duckworth	Kaine
Boozman	Durbin	Kennedy
Braun	Ernst	King
Brown	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Fischer	Lankford
Capito	Gardner	Leahy
Cardin	Gillibrand	Lee
Carper	Graham	Loeffler
Casey	Grassley	Manchin
Cassidy	Hassan	McConnell
Collins	Hawley	McSally

Menendez
Moran
Murkowski
Murray
Paul
Perdue
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Romney

Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shaheen
Shelby
Sinema
Smith

Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker
Young

NAYS—4

Harris
Murphy

Warren
Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Burr
Cramer
Enzi

Markey
Merkley
Sanders

Toomey

The motion is agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2301

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up the substitute amendment No. 2301.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 2301.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2080 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2301

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2080.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for Mr. PORTMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2080 to amendment No. 2301.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment (No. 2080) is as follows:

(Purpose: 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)

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 240. 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.

Section 257(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92; 133 Stat. 1291) is amended by adding at end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) Efforts to work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities.”.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, Senator REED and I have reached an agreement on the first managers' package, and we will be hotlining that list on both sides this evening with the hopes of clearing it and adopting those amendments tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 7259

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7259) to allow acceleration certificates awarded under the Patents for Humanity Program to be transferable.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 38 (116th Congress), appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: the Honorable MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky; the Honorable ROY BLUNT of Missouri; and the Honorable AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it

adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 30; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time of the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 483, S. 4049; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the COVID-19 pandemic has thrown our country into a nightmare level crisis of joblessness. The Congress has not done enough to stop it and has not done enough to save the jobs of our people.

I have come to the floor this evening to call for the Senate to pass legislation that is all about saving the public sector jobs that form the backbone of our local communities, our firefighters, our first responders, our teachers, our families, and so many others. They need our help. They need it now.

Senate Democrats have been warning since March that when COVID-19 cases exploded and our economy went into lockdown, our States, our cities, and our towns are now facing budgetary disasters unlike any they have gone through in recent memory. The shortfalls that State and local governments are facing due to the pandemic make the great recession look like a modest little economic hiccup. Layoffs are now happening at nightmarish levels.

In March, April, and May, there were 1.5 million job losses. Among these key individuals were the firefighters, the first responders, our public employees, folks who teach our kids, work in public health, emergency response, and play a key role in maintaining our roads and highways. I am just going to take a few minutes to run through some specific examples of why Senate Democrats think this is so important.

First, what kind of sense does it make to sit back and allow thousands and thousands of first responders to lose their jobs in the middle of a pandemic? COVID-19 cases have spiked now in places around this country. Our public health systems are getting hit like they were hammered with a wrecking ball. State and local governments are being forced to cut EMS