

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

property destruction are not forms of political speech but violent crimes whose perpetrators should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law; and [that] the innocent law enforcement officers, public officials, and private citizens who suffer the mob's violence and endure its scorn while protecting our communities from them deserve [every American's thanks and appreciation].

As I say, it is very straightforward.

As we saw in Seattle this week, these mobs are not going to stop until they are stopped. A nonbinding resolution is the tiniest first step of a response—the merest exercise of the Senate's atrophied institutional muscles. We need to do much, much more, and I look forward to working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to develop the legislation to do it.

Yet, in this divided political moment, heading into the 244th birthday of the greatest, freest, most tolerant, and prosperous nation the world has ever known, I think showing that Senate Republicans and showing that Senate Democrats can work together and speak with one voice against woke mob violence and in defense of equal justice and civic peace would be a welcomed step.

Therefore, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 645, submitted earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the preamble be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, look, there are nuggets in the Senator's resolution—certainly recognizing that, overwhelmingly, law enforcement does an honorable and valuable job in our society. It is a tough job. The bad ones make it difficult for all the good ones. I would agree with that. But I have to be honest with you. There are also elements of this resolution that are not as straightforward as the gentleman would have you believe.

First of all, the very first paragraph says that we were founded on universal principles of freedom, justice, and human equality. Of course, slavery existed at the time. There is no mention of America's original sin, which is slavery. Certainly we cannot think of slavery as human equality.

Then, to go on to suggest in his third paragraph that we are morally committed to justice "across all such differences, and protecting the God-given rights of all Americans under the law," well, I can tell you, in my home State of New Jersey and across the Nation, there are many Americans who clearly do not believe that we are morally committed to justice across all such differences. As a matter of fact, we saw that in how the majority responded to the George Floyd death and others across the Nation—a lot of rhetoric;

very little reform. So we would be hard-pressed to believe that paragraph has legitimacy as well.

Then the resolution reeks of supremacy, self-righteous illiberalism, manifest ignorance, and historical illiteracy. It reeks of a supremacist view: We know better.

Even with all of those problems and even with the fact that it has come at the last moment, there was no effort to work with anybody to offer maybe a bipartisan resolution that would capture all of this. Even though it seeks to mischaracterize overwhelmingly what has been the peaceful protests of people in the Nation, I would consider not objecting to the Senator's request if he also recognized and added to his resolution the fact that we have a President of the United States who ultimately provokes inciteful language and inciteful violence.

I mean, we have a President who retweets a video of people saying "White power. White power."

We have a President who retweets a video of White citizens with arms, pointing them at peaceful protesters who—at the end of the day, it is their right to peacefully protest.

We have a President who said that there were good people on all sides, including the White supremacists, in Charleston.

We have a President who used violence—the armed force of the State and violence against peaceful protesters in Lafayette Park, who were doing none of what the Senator suggests in his resolution.

Despite all of that, if the Senator would modify his request to include the following language: Insert at the end of his last line, line 15, section—make a new section (5): "Our elected officials, especially the President of the United States, should not incite violence or legitimize those who engage in hate-fueled acts," I would consider allowing the Senator's resolution to move forward and not objecting to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, as I look at the language proposed by my colleague from New Jersey, I would accept the rest of it except for the words "especially the President of the United States." The rest of it is unobjectionable.

The point here is that without pointing to any one specific individual, we should all be able to acknowledge, as a sense of the Senate, that we do hold these truths as self-evident; that our country was founded on these very strong ideals. Even if, as the resolution itself acknowledges, we have failed at times to live up to them, we have still done it.

So I would accept the modification but only with the removal of the words "especially the President of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, it is especially the President of the United States—the person who leads our Nation—who should be a unifying force, not one who incites violence; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, what is happening here? This is the U.S. Senate. Just so everyone is clear about the bat guano-inspired insanity we just witnessed, I just proposed a nonbinding resolution condemning mob violence, and Senate Democrats objected. I don't know whether to be outraged or embarrassed for them. This isn't even a bill; it is just a statement that says mob violence is bad. Democrats can't say mob violence is bad without simultaneously taking a jab at the President of the United States?

By the way, what about the mayor of Seattle? What about the city council of Minnesota? What about the countless other people who have perpetuated or enabled or facilitated or coddled mob violence across the country?

It is one of the reasons why we are not going to engage in this task of making it a political tit-for-tat. It is not that. People are being shot. Businesses are being looted. Innocent Americans are being attacked and threatened. Lives are being ruined. Communities are burning—literally burning.

So whose side are you on? This resolution was designed to be unifying. It avoided controversial subjects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Presiding Officer to remind us of rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind Senators of both parties that rule XIX provides that no Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming of a Senator.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the resolution was designed to be unifying. It avoided controversial subjects. All it asks of us is basic dignity and respect.

As long as we are on the topic of rule XIX, it is unbecoming to accuse a colleague of using language that is supremacy simply by reflecting on language in the Declaration of Independence, simply by reflecting on language that acknowledges the incivility and intolerance of mob violence. But apparently that is too much to ask today. I guess we should be thankful for clarity. And now we know. We don't have to ask. They told us how they feel about this resolution.

You can't really oppose this, it seems to me, without being on the side of the mobs, of mob violence, of mob mentality, of cruelty and intolerance and terror. Now we understand what this resolution is about. I don't think one can oppose this without being comfortable with those things. These mobs

are not progressive. These mobs are not enlightened. These mobs are not edgy. They are not hip. They are not frauds. They are dim-witted, phony, drama addicts—

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is this line not in direct violation of rule XIX?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair concludes that pointing out that mob violence is dangerous to our Nation is not contrary to rule XIX or any other rule of the Senate.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, further parliamentary inquiry. There is not a question of mob violence. The question is that imputing to Members who did not agree with the framework and language of this resolution that they are supporting mob violence—that must be in violation of rule XIX if this is going to be a deliberative body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is more than entitled to express his views in the course of debate, but other Senators will likewise express their views in the course of debate.

Mr. LEE. Failed by an education system and addled by a social media culture that taught them to be victims instead of citizens. A privileged, self-absorbed crime syndicate with participation-trophy graduate degrees, trying to find meaning in empty lives by destroying things that other Americans have spent honest, productive lives building.

Today we learned—today we learned—that there are those who are comfortable with this. There are those who are at least not inclined to vote for this resolution, which simply condemns mob violence. Now we know. Now we know.

I want all my colleagues to know that when we return from recess, we are coming back to the Senate floor and we are not just going to be debating nonbinding resolutions. It is long past time to expose the shiftless idiocy of the anti-American, anti-science, anti-establishment, anti-Constitution mob and remove their snouts from the Federal trough.

Colleges and universities that punish free speech and discriminate against conservative and religious students; city councils that defund their police departments and refuse to protect public safety; States that force doctors to mutilate confused children without their parents' consent; school districts that embrace the ahistorical nonsense of the 1619 Project; the smug, sneering privilege of all of the above and much more—the whole garbage fire that is the so-called “woke” ideology—depends on Federal money.

The mob hates America on America's dime. It is time to cut off their allowance. I think the American people would be very interested to know who stands for them and who stands for subsidizing the mob. I intend to show them.

Mr. President, this debate is not ending today; it is only the beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, we have learned something today. We have learned that my colleagues are unwilling to call out the President of the United States when the President of the United States uses language that incites violence; says that White supremacists in Charleston are as good as everybody else; retweets a video of White Americans saying “White power;” retweets a video of two individuals with guns pointed at peaceful protesters; uses the force of the State to clear out peaceful protesters in Lafayette Park; goes and says, in fact, “when the looting starts, the shooting starts.” That has a historical context to it, and the “liberate Virginia. It is under siege,” and so, so much more.

So, yes, I look forward to that debate because I have legislation to deal with the rising tide of White supremacists' actions that, at the end of the day, have even been recognized by some of our law enforcement entities as a growing national threat. So I look forward to having that debate, look forward to having that legislation on the floor, and we will see how our colleagues act then.

But it is totally unacceptable to cast aspersions that do not equal those of the person who leads our country, and we should recognize that. What it shows me is that I guess President Trump is right—he could shoot someone on Fifth Avenue and get away with it, and certainly my colleagues here would not hold him responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, all I asked in my counter was that we remove the words “especially the President of the United States.” Why? Because it is different than the entire approach taken by the resolution.

As long as we are calling each other out on casting aspersions on each other's intentions, no one's intention here is to shield anyone from anything, as evidenced by the fact that, as my proposed modification would have provided, it would have said that “our elected officials should not incite violence or legitimize those who engage in hate-fueled acts.” Last I checked, the President of the United States was and is an elected official. This would apply to him. My counter in no way insulated—not him, not any elected official, not any of us from this resolution, which simply condemns mob violence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I will be very quick. I understand we have work to do on the Defense authorization and the vote coming up, but I am glad the majority leader is on the floor, and I am glad so many Members are on the floor.

We have a problem in this institution of the uneven enforcement of rule XIX, and it is hurting this body.

I have just by happenstance been on the floor for various violations being called by the Presiding Officer, usually

with the advice of the Parliamentarian. It is very clear to me that the rules are not being applied equally to each party, and I think that is something we are going to have to wrestle with if we are going to continue to be worthy of the moniker “the world's greatest deliberative body.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, could I ask my colleagues to yield momentarily?

I would request that Senator INHOFE be able to lock in an agreement on the NDAA, and then the discussion could resume.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator INHOFE be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the leader, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of S. 4049.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Portman) amendment No. 2080 (to amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the following amendments be made pending en bloc and the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with a 60-affirmative vote threshold for adoption, and that there be 2 hours of debate on each amendment, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, prior to the vote in relation to each amendment. Those amendments are: Schatz No. 2252, Inhofe No. 2411, Sanders No. 1788, Cornyn No. 2244, Shaheen No. 1729, and Tester No. 1972, as modified.