

Chinese Communists, but the bill is a larger signal to China. It is a message that the United States and the free world are no longer willing to look past some of the worst behavior that has been occurring. It is a message that our patience has run out.

China is being warned to expect stiff resistance—stiff resistance to stealing American intellectual property, to committing genocide against religious minorities like the Uighurs, to militarizing artificial islands and infringing on other nations' sovereign waters, and trampling on the basic freedoms of the people of Hong Kong.

I could go on, but suffice it to say that this is occurring in the context of a great battle—the great battle about what model the world is going to pursue. Will the citizens of the United States and other democratic nations around the world continue to foster the liberal democratic model that spread around the world after World War II, with open societies, the just rule of law, greater economic freedom underpinned by respect for private property, basic human rights like the freedom of speech and the freedom of a free press and the freedom to worship?

All of the prosperity and the elevation of human dignity that comes from human freedom and democratic values from our model—that is the model that is up against the dark shadows of the authoritarian governments that are constantly pushing to systematically erode, corrode, and warp the values and freedoms that we cherish. Through this bill, the U.S. Senate makes clear which side we are on.

At this point, I would like to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to salute my friend and colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, for his remarks and for his leadership on this very vital issue of standing up for the rights and freedom of people in Hong Kong and, as he said, sending a signal to others around the world who would seek to stamp out human rights and political freedom.

When Senator TOOMEY and I saw that the Chinese Communist Party was taking its more recent steps to crack down on freedom in Hong Kong, we introduced the Hong Kong Autonomy Act. That act just passed the U.S. Senate unanimously last week and was sent to the House of Representatives.

This is a very fast turnaround from either of the Chambers in the U.S. Congress. I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and her Republican partner and all the Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives for coming together so quickly on this legislation.

The legislation before us made a technical fix to the bill that Senator TOOMEY and I introduced in which this Senate passed out last week a technical fix to comply with the constitutional requirements as to where a bill that might generate revenue begins.

With that technical fix, Speaker PELOSI and the Republican leadership sent it right back. Why did they send it right back so quickly? Because this is an urgent moment. In fact, our timing could not be more critical. On Tuesday, President Xi imposed a national security law on Hong Kong by fiat. It was only after the law was passed that Beijing unveiled its provisions. Even Hong Kong's Chief Executive and President Xi loyalist, Carrie Lam, said she hadn't been allowed to see a draft before the law's passage.

As Senator TOOMEY indicated, this law is written broadly enough that it will criminalize speech and peaceful assembly. Anybody who publishes anti-Beijing viewpoints could be punished by life in prison. Saying anything seen to be undermining the ruling Communist Party's authority would be a violation.

This is consistent with mainland China's approach, which has virtually eliminated independent journalism and severely restricted NGOs.

Here are some highlights of the law that was just passed—I should say, imposed. It now mandates that the Hong Kong Government undertake “national security education” in school, social organizations, and media outlets. The law mandates that anyone entering public office in Hong Kong swear allegiance to Beijing.

What is more, the law applies to anyone, anywhere. It can even apply to offenses committed outside the region by a person who is not a permanent resident of the region. That means a U.S. citizen penning an editorial that argues for sanctions against China could technically fall afoul of the new law for “inciting hatred” against Beijing. Legal experts believe this is even broader than the Chinese criminal law applied in mainland China.

Senator TOOMEY said, despite this—despite this threat, despite passage of a law that would punish people for up to life imprisonment for expressing their views, thousands of protesters took to the streets yesterday and staged the largest rally in Hong Kong this year. Hundreds of Hong Kong police officers moved in swiftly to quash dissent and implement the law. Police fired tear gas, pepper spray, and water cannons to disperse the protesters.

The police then issued a statement that noted some protesters were chanting “Hong Kong independence, the only way out.” The statement said such slogans are “suspected to be inciting or abetting others to commit secession” and may violate the new law.

The United States must stand with the people of Hong Kong. That is what this bill says. This bill says we stand with the people of Hong Kong.

As Senator TOOMEY indicated, it would impose mandatory sanctions on individuals in firms who violate China's obligations to the people of Hong Kong under the joint declaration and the basic law—rights of freedom of speech and equality before the law,

freedom of association, and the right from arbitrary or unlawful arrest, detention, and imprisonment. It goes beyond that to impose mandatory sanctions on banks that do business with individuals who are complicit in undermining these freedoms and the rights of the people of Hong Kong.

I am glad we acted quickly. As you can see, the Government of China is moving by the day to squash the rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong. We need to move with urgency to send a statement that we stand with the people of Hong Kong.

In a moment, I am going to be joining my colleague, Senator TOOMEY, in asking for unanimous consent. Before I turn it back over to him, let me just say, assuming we get that—and it looks like we will—I hope President Trump will sign this immediately—immediately.

As a country, Republicans and Democrats together need to send a strong signal that we will not stand for the actions of Beijing, undermining their own agreements—agreements under international law, which they are bound to, and we will not stand still in silence and do nothing while they crack down on freedom in Hong Kong.

I yield to Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, again, let me stress how grateful I am for the passionate, persuasive, and very effective advocacy of Senator VAN HOLLEN throughout this entire effort. I am very grateful to him, as I am to other colleagues who helped make this happen.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7440, which was received from the House.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7440) to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons involved in the erosion of certain obligations of China with respect to Hong Kong, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 7440) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

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

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I see there are colleagues and friends on the floor waiting to speak, and I just want to assure them that I will be very rapid.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 4155 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

#### OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have made a career in the Senate fighting against government waste, fraud, and abuse. Most recently, I have found this waste in an office within the Department of Defense called the Office of Net Assessment. Its purpose is to produce an annual net assessment, which is a long-term look at our military's capabilities and those of our greatest adversaries.

I am here to say to my colleagues that that office has lost its way. When I began a review of Stefan Halper's contracting work at the Office of Net Assessment, something didn't look right. So I asked the inspector general to look into it.

For those who are unaware, Stefan Halper was a central figure in the debunked Russia collusion investigation. Stefan Halper secretly recorded Trump campaign officials during Crossfire Hurricane. Halper also received over a million taxpayer dollars from the Office of Net Assessment for several "research" projects, but the inspector general found some problems with that contract.

The Office of Net Assessment didn't require Halper to submit evidence that he actually talked to the people he cited in his work, which included Russian intelligence officers.

Secondly, the Office of Net Assessment couldn't provide sufficient documentation that Halper conducted all of his work in accordance with the law.

And, three, the Office of Net Assessment didn't maintain sufficient documentation to comply with all Federal contracting requirements and Office of Management and Budget guidelines.

The inspector general also found that these problems were not unique just to Halper's contracts, which indicates, then, systemic issues within the Office of Net Assessment. Moreover, it has been reported that some of the individ-

uals that Halper cited as sources in his research have denied contributing to Halper's work.

Oddly, Office of National Assessment Director James Baker has repeatedly told me that Halper's deliverables were "high quality" and "conformed to the requirements set forth in the contract."

What planet does the Office of Net Assessment live on?

The office spends almost \$20 million a year of taxpayers' money every year. Yet according to a deposition of Mr. Baker, the Office of Net Assessment hasn't performed any annual net assessments since 2007.

A net assessment is the Office of Net Assessment's core mission. It even says so in the title. Its purpose of doing net assessments got lost along the way.

Moreover, after I began my oversight work at the Office of Net Assessment, a Department of Defense directive regulating the Office of Net Assessment was changed to provide cover for the unit's lackluster performance. Isn't that convenient? When your work is to do net assessment and you have been in existence for decades, and since 2007, you haven't been doing your net assessment, you issue a directive changing what the purpose of the Office of Net Assessment is all about. They did it pretty simply.

On April 14, 2020, the word "shall" was removed from the December 23, 2009, version of the directive that required the Office of Net Assessment to produce what their title said—"net assessments." The new version also changed the Office of Net Assessment's research scope to generic research, seemingly untethered to a net assessment—how convenient.

This swamp needs to be drained.

Last week, I introduced an amendment to the Defense bill that does several things. First, it reduces Office of Net Assessment's budget to \$10 million a year instead of \$20 million a year. Second, my amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to create a comprehensive plan to ensure that the Office of Net Assessment performs what the title of the agency says it is supposed to do—an annual net assessment—and complies, at the same time, with every dollar they get with Federal contracting requirements. This would take it back to the reason why it was first created decades ago.

Third, the amendment would require the Department of Defense inspector general to study and report on the Office of Net Assessment's contracting failures and determine if the net assessment can be done for less than \$10 million.

And, fourth, it requires the Government Accountability Office to perform an audit of the effectiveness of the comprehensive plan.

Right now, it is pretty clear that the Office of Net Assessment lacks leadership and discipline, and it is also pretty clear that it has wasted tens of millions of dollars over the years. Con-

gress must take a stand. That is why I am here to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 645

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, before we break for the Fourth of July recess, I think it is important for the Senate to go on record condemning the rising tide of mob violence that we see across the country and the increasingly prevalent mob mentality that is fueling it. The violence struck home for me this week when one of my constituents was shot after an armed mob surrounded his vehicle in Provo, UT.

This resolution is not controversial. Even in these divisive times, it is something, I think, we can all agree on, and I want to read through some highlights right now so you get a feel for it.

The United States of America was founded in 1776 on universal principles of freedom, justice, and human equality.

Throughout our nation's history, Americans have struggled to realize those ideals . . . but nonetheless [have made] greater progress toward them than any [other] nation on earth.

[The United States is a diverse nation] committed to cultivating respect, friendship, and justice across all such differences, and protecting the God-given equal rights of all Americans under the law.

America's law enforcement officers do an extremely difficult job extremely well, and despite the inexcusable misconduct of some, the overwhelming majority of such officers are honest, courageous, patriotic, and rightfully honored public servants.

In recent weeks, people across the United States have organized legitimate, peaceful, constitutionally protected demonstrations against instances of police brutality and racial inequality.

[Some of these Americans have organized these peaceful protests, asking for investigations into serious problems meriting investigation and reform.]

Some Americans, unsatisfied with peaceful and positive demonstrations, have instigated and indulged in mob violence and criminal property destruction, not in service of any . . . coherent cause, but simply as an arrogant, bullying tantrum of self-righteous illiberalism and rage.

These mobs have demonstrated not only contempt for public safety (as evidenced, among other crimes, by an unprovoked physical assault on a Wisconsin State Senator and the [more recent] shooting of a motorist in Provo, Utah) and common decency (as evidenced by their . . . obscene berating of law enforcement officers standing their posts to protect their communities), but also their manifest ignorance and historical illiteracy (as evidenced by their destruction of public memorials to historical heroes like Ulysses S. Grant, St. Junipero Serra, Miguel Cervantes, George Washington, Hans Christian Heg, and a reported plan to target a statue of Abraham Lincoln financed in 1876 entirely by private donations from freed African-American slaves).

It is the sense of the Senate that the rising tide of vandalism, mob violence, and the mob mentality that feeds it—including its cruel and intolerant "cancel culture"—should be condemned by all Americans; [that] peaceful demonstrations and mob violence are different in kind; [that] physical assault and