

(A) the findings of the British Royal College of Physicians in their 2016 report, "Nicotine without smoke: Tobacco harm reduction";

(B) the article entitled "Invalidity of an Off-Cited Estimate of the Relative Harms of Electronic Cigarettes" published in the American Journal of Public Health in February 2020;

(C) the findings of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in their 2018 report, "Public Health Consequences of E-Cigarettes";

(D) relevant reports and advisories of the Surgeon General; and

(E) other peer reviewed research.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Institutes of Health shall submit a report to Congress on the findings of the study required to be conducted under subsection (a).

(2) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is submitted, all data, research products, and reports from the study required to be conducted under subsection (a) shall be made publicly available online.

(c) NO NEW FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am delighted to be here today with my friend, the Senator from California, with whom I have worked so closely on so many issues. We are both members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and it is always a pleasure to work with her and her staff.

Today is really an important day. It has been long in coming, but finally the Senate has now passed legislation that requires the same proof-of-age requirement that is needed for tobacco products to e-cigarettes and vaping products, particularly those that are sold over the internet. That is what we are focused on.

Last December, I met a 16-year-old young woman named Anna Carey, who is one of my personal heroes. She was one of the students at her high school who became addicted to e-cigarettes.

E-cigarettes are nicotine delivery devices. The only difference between it and smoking a cigarette is the fire, the products of combustion, but it is just as addictive as cigarettes.

Anna started experiencing symptoms that are uncommon in an otherwise healthy teenager. She became extremely lethargic. She experienced random and severe chest pains. Two initial x rays came back clear, so doctors released her, but her health struggles continued. Eventually, she was admitted to the hospital and diagnosed with chemical-induced pneumonia in both of her lungs.

While I am glad to report that she is fully recovered and is now using her

story to prevent more teens from going down the same path, what she told me in Fort Worth not that long ago is that these e-cigarettes and vaping devices are everywhere. They are everywhere and can be easily purchased even though you are not supposed to use tobacco products or nicotine when you are under the age of 21.

So all this bill requires, and it is really rather modest—it is unbelievable that it took us this long to get it here today, as modest as it is. At the time of delivery, if you buy a product online, the buyer has to sign and show an ID proving their age. It is the same requirement you would have if you made a physical purchase at a retail establishment or if you were buying tobacco online. For some reason, e-cigarettes and vaping devices have been operating on a different playing field, but no longer. That is why I am so pleased to be here with Senator FEINSTEIN to pass the Preventing Online Sales of E-Cigarettes to Children Act.

To summarize, this legislation would put the same safeguards in place for e-cigarettes as there are for traditional cigarettes purchased online.

For those who think that we can never do anything on a bipartisan basis, that we can't pass laws because we are hopelessly polarized and dysfunctional, maybe this will provide some source of encouragement to the American people, but it also demonstrates that we are doing our best to try to protect children's health, particularly against addictive substances that are delivered through e-cigarettes and vaping devices.

Thank you, Senator FEINSTEIN, for your leadership on this and for your partnership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas. I have the pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on the Judiciary. We have been there for a long time, and over the years, I have come to have great respect for him. So it is a particular asset for me to be able to share the authorship of this bill.

Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Preventing Online Sales of E-Cigarettes to Children Act. Our common-sense bill would treat e-cigarettes the same as traditional cigarettes and other tobacco products when it comes to purchasing them online. Can you believe it? E-cigarettes can be purchased online by someone 12 years old. There is no age requirement.

This bill would help prevent children from illegally obtaining e-cigarettes by ensuring that online vendors are verifying the age of their customers, properly labeling packages, and checking identification upon delivery. The law exists today, as I stated, for traditional cigarettes, and there is no reason e-cigarettes should be treated differently.

An annual survey by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found

that nearly 5.3 million students are using e-cigarettes—over 5 million students.

Besides being illegal, the rate of e-cigarette use among teenagers is growing. In 2019, almost 30 percent of high school students reported using an e-cigarette in the previous 30 days. That is a 50-percent increase from the year before. So the popularity of them for younger and younger children is going up and up.

According to the U.S. Surgeon General report, the developing adolescent brain is uniquely sensitive to nicotine. Other studies have shown that children exposed to nicotine may be at greater risk for experiencing deficits in attention and cognition, suffering from mood disorders, and engaging in drug-seeking behavior. These effects may continue into adulthood, long after e-cigarette use has stopped.

Further, new research shows that young people who use e-cigarettes are five times more likely to smoke traditional cigarettes within 1 year. Clearly, it is a come-on to children to graduate from the e-cigarette to the real cigarette.

Given the effects of nicotine on children and the likelihood of their transitioning to traditional cigarette smoking, it is critical that we close any legal loopholes that allows underage youth to use e-cigarettes. Studies show that one of the easiest ways for underage users to purchase e-cigarettes is online. Our bipartisan bill would require e-cigarette retailers to meet the same requirements as those that sell traditional cigarettes online.

I believe we have 27 cosponsors equally divided between our two parties, so I am very pleased about that.

By applying the same safeguards we have worked on with online sales of traditional cigarettes, our bill would ensure that online e-cigarette sellers are verifying the age of their customers, properly labeling packages, and checking identification at delivery.

While there is limited research on the effects that vaping has had on coronavirus patients, the virus is known to attack the lungs. People with underlying conditions are particularly susceptible. Last year, we saw a mysterious lung illness sicken thousands of people that had a history of vaping. So it stands to reason that any damage already caused by vaping may further compromise a person's ability to fight off the coronavirus.

I want to thank Senator CORNYN for working with me on this important legislation and our 26 colleagues who joined as cosponsors to address the epidemic of e-cigarette use among American youth.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

HONG KONG

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I rise today with a heaviness in my heart for what we have seen happening in the last 36 hours in Hong Kong.

Freedom-loving people in Hong Kong for the last 23 years have known basic, fundamental human and natural rights, and we see the Communist Party of China coming in and trying to steal their dignity and to steal their freedom. They live in real and tangible fear of what is going to happen tonight and this weekend and next week.

Yesterday was July 1. July 1 is the anniversary 23 years ago of Hong Kong's return to Chinese sovereignty under the Sino-British Joint Declaration. Under that agreement, the Communist Party of China made a pledge not just to Hongkongers and not just to the British but to the watching world, and they said that it would guarantee—they would guarantee—a certain level of autonomy and freedom to the Hong Kong community and that Hong Kong would not be forced to live under the kind of despotism that the mainland Chinese are forced to experience.

The Communist Party announced to the world, in signing that declaration, that Hongkongers would be retaining a lot of freedom. Well, since that handover in 1997 and, especially since 2003, when there was another attempted national security law debated, the people of Hong Kong have been holding pro-democracy protests and celebrations every year on the July 1 holiday. Annually, on July 1, they have reminded the world of what the pledge was of the Communist Party in that agreement of July 1997.

Yesterday, though, protesting and demanding basic human rights and freedoms in Hong Kong became a crime. Under the new national security law, to speak out, to exercise freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, or freedom of the press issues is considered an act of secession, subversion, and terrorism. That is what the new national security law that the Chinese have forced on Hong Kong stipulates.

Thousands of people—thousands of brave freedom lovers—flooded into the streets anyway, and they celebrated yesterday that anniversary, and they demanded that their representatives who have sold them out to Beijing would continue to testify to the pledges that were made 23 years ago yesterday. At the end of yesterday, several hundred of these freedom-loving protesters were arrested, and 10 of them were charged with suspected violations under the new national security law.

Chinese Government officials now seem to be saying that these folks, these 10, are going to be extradited to mainland China and face their charges there. Remember, the protests that we have seen in Hong Kong over the last 15 or 16 months were specifically because of an extradition law where Hongkongers were facing the threat of

being extradited to mainland China, and, supposedly, according to the government officials in Hong Kong, this rule, this intended legislation was going to be suspended. Well, instead, it looks like it is, in fact, connected to this new national security law.

Yesterday really marks the beginning of a new reign of terror in Hong Kong. With the implementation of this national security law, it is abundantly clear that the Communist Party seeks to turn Hong Kong into a police state no different from Tibet or Xinjiang, and the Hong Kong Government no longer derives any power from the consent of the people who govern, but rather it seeks to rule solely by its cooperation with the CCP's security apparatus.

We are witnessing the signs of the coming crackdown. Even before this law was signed, democracy activists and lawmakers, including Martin Lee, who is Hong Kong's father of democracy and the drafter of Hong Kong's basic law, had already been rounded up. Many are expecting the same fate for themselves in the coming days. Many folks have begun to say goodbye to their families in anticipation that they are going to be rounded up and hauled off into another one of the Chinese re-education camps or whatever Orwellian euphemism we want say for the new and potentially coming Auschwitzes.

Reading over the last several days, I am grieved over what are especially painful and tear-jerking farewell messages from many of these democracy activists in Hong Kong on social media heading up to midnight on June 30, before the new law took effect. My heart ached as I read Joshua Wong tweeting out from the Psalms, in particular Psalm 23:4:

I may walk through valleys as dark as death, but I won't be afraid. You are with me, and your shepherd's rod makes me feel safe.

This was mere hours after announcing that he and other Demosisto members—a democracy political organization—would be closing down their organizations.

Pro-democratic parties and pro-independence parties, like the Hong Kong National Front and Studentlocalism, have announced on social media that they, too, have disbanded and will try to continue their fight for freedom from abroad. But if you read the national security law that the Communist Party is imposing, it looks like they are going to try to claim extraterritorial powers over Hongkongers in exile regarding freedom-of-speech issues in other places in the world as also a violation of this new, tyrannical, Communist Party Chinese law.

Videos of restaurant owners and cafe owners are up on social media. You can see them removing their pro-democracy posters, their signs celebrating the freedom that Hong Kong has known in the past. These folks are tearing down these signs in their own res-

taurants and in their places of assembly because they assume they are likely to be punished under the new national security law if they keep up signs that they have had in their places of business where they were communing and breaking bread over the past many, many years. This serves as a chilling reminder of how the CCP rules through fear, which it ultimately turns into self-censorship.

Hong Kong-based Twitter accounts have been deleted en masse. Individuals fear for their safety if they continue to use the platform, and they fear retribution for previous tweets supporting democracy and accountable government, which is just a fundamental human thing to be able to say or do or talk about or plead for. Like in mainland China, Twitter will undoubtedly become a tool that is reserved only for the oppressors, no longer for the oppressed.

I fear that Joshua's request—"If my voice will not be heard soon, I hope that the international community will continue to speak up for Hong Kong and step up concrete efforts to defend our last bit of freedom"—I fear that Joshua's request will be met with silence.

I fear that we will fail Ronald Reagan's challenge to us that we would be "staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the soul prerogative of the lucky few, but [rather, it is] the unalienable and universal right of all human beings." We are all created in God's image, and our rights come to us from God via nature, not because of the beneficence of some government.

I fear that we in the United States and those in the international community will just simply move on from the kind of imminent crackdown in Hong Kong that we are going to see that is going to have echoes of what happened in Tiananmen Square in June of 1989 and that so many people just decide to allow the Chinese Government to whitewash and pretend never happened. We must not allow that to happen.

I pray that we in this body will live up to our convictions and that we will speak out about what the Communist Party is going to do to the freedom-loving people of Hong Kong.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, let me make a comment about the remarks from my friend from Nebraska.

It happens that I was in Hong Kong when that happened, and I saw the people, knowing what was going to happen to them after all the promises that were made. Everything that we suspected and dreaded has now happened.

I appreciate the fact that there is somebody who cares enough to bring all of this to the American people.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, if the chairman would yield for just one moment.

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. SASSE. I would also like to praise the chairman for the work he