

The American people cannot completely stop building their lives until the vaccine is available. The United States of America was not built for a defensive crouch. We need to stand up an educational system and an economy that works for workers and families in the meantime. We need to find the right sort of middle ground—middle ground that is smart and safe but also more sustainable. It is another historic set of challenges and another opportunity for the U.S. Senate to deliver.

For weeks now, I have made it clear that further legislation out of the Senate will be a serious response to the crisis. We will not be wasting the American people's time like the House Democrats, with their multimillion-dollar proposal for high taxes on small businesses, cut taxes for blue-State millionaires, and send diversity detectives into the cannabis industry.

I have said we will start with the facts and develop real, targeted solutions on the subjects that matter most to American families. It turns out that means three things: kids, jobs, and healthcare—kids, jobs, and healthcare.

Surveys show the American people's top priorities for reopening are childcare and K-12 schools. This country wants its kids back in the classroom this fall—learning, exploring, making friends. Their educations depend on it. In some cases, their safety depends on it, and so do the livelihoods of working parents.

The American Academy of Pediatrics stated unambiguously that our goal must be in-person—in-person instruction. But of course, parents, teachers, and doctors all agree it has to be as safe as possible. That is where the Senate comes in.

This majority is preparing legislation that will send \$105 billion so educators have the resources they need to safely reopen. That is more money than the House Democrats set aside for a similar fund, by the way, and that is in addition to support for childcare needs. It is amazing how you can find room to fund serious priorities when you take a pass on the far-left daydreams.

Second, the economic slowdown has hurt millions and millions of Americans. Before this crisis, we had never had 7 million Americans receiving unemployment at the same time. Today, we have 17 million. More than a million people have filed new unemployment claims every single week for more than 4 months now.

The American job market needs another shot of adrenaline. Senate Republicans are laser-focused on getting American workers their jobs back. Our bill takes several specific incentives to hire and retain workers and turn the dials on those policies way up. The legislation will help reimburse for safe workplaces so Main Street can afford the PPE, testing, cleaning, or remodeling to protect workers and entice customers.

The ingenuity and spirit of America's small business isn't possible to over-

state, but they still face a tough road. With the majority of businesses expected to exhaust their initial Paychecks Protection Funding this summer, we will also be proposing a targeted second round of the PPP with a special eye toward hard-hit businesses.

Speaking of building on what worked in the CARES Act, we want another round of direct payments—direct payments to help American families keep driving our national comeback. Helping to create more Americans jobs is an urgent, moral priority, and these are just some of the policies we are discussing that will help that happen.

In addition to kids and jobs, our third major focus is healthcare. The reason is obvious. The reason is obvious. If we lose control of the virus or if research stalls, then everything else will be window dressing.

Our proposal will dedicate even more resources to the fastest race for a new vaccine in human history, along with diagnostics and treatments. Our bill will also protect seniors from a potential spike in premiums. And the Federal Government will continue to support hospitals, providers, and testing.

These are just some of the elements that Senate Republicans are discussing among ourselves and with the administration. There is one more central proposal that ties kids, jobs, and healthcare all together.

As I have said for months, the next recovery package will include strong legal protections for the healthcare workers who save strangers' lives and the schools, colleges, charities, and businesses that want to reopen. The American people will not see their historic recovery gobbled up by trial lawyers who are itching to follow this pandemic with a second epidemic of frivolous lawsuits.

Gross negligence will still be actionable, but we are creating a safe harbor for institutions that make good-faith efforts to follow the guidelines available to them. Doctors and nurses clearly deserve this protection, and school districts, universities, nonprofits, and small businesses will need it, as well, if we want any genuine reopening at all.

The legislation that I have begun to sketch out is neither another CARES Act to float the entire economy nor a typical stimulus bill for a nation that is ready to get back to normal. Our country is in a complex middle ground between those two things. We can't go back to April, and we can't snap our fingers and finish the vaccine overnight. We need to carve out a new normal.

Senate Republicans are continuing to discuss these and other ideas among our conference and with the administration. The majority will be laying down another historic proposal very soon. Here in the Senate, an outcome will require bipartisan discussions.

I do not believe there will be anything in our bill that our Democratic colleagues should not happily support, but we will stand ready and eager to

work together and produce a bipartisan outcome.

As I said yesterday, in March the Senate gave a historic master class in how to pass major bipartisan legislation. The CARES Act, the largest rescue package ever, was drafted by Republicans, promptly negotiated across the aisle with Democrats, and then passed urgently without a single dissenting vote.

Last month, in June, we recorded a master class in how not to make a law. Instead of amending Senator TIM SCOTT's JUSTICE Act, our Democratic colleagues flat-out blocked him. They filibustered the issue of police reform altogether. Well, for the sake of America's kids, jobs, and healthcare, let's hope our Democratic friends bring their bipartisan urgency and good faith to the process and leave the partisan poses behind.

The Senate has led every step of this crisis. We need to rise to the task one more time.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

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

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.

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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, our country faces the greatest health threat in 100 years and the greatest economic crisis in 70 years, but here in the Republican-led Senate, you would

hardly know it. Over the past several months, even as COVID-19 surged through the country once again, even as our States hit new records of infections and hospitalizations, the Republican majority in the Senate dithered and delayed on the next phase of major emergency relief.

In April, May, and June, Democrats tried to jolt the Senate into action, but almost every time we tried to pass much needed legislation by average Americans, our Republican colleagues objected. Unemployment claims reached 50 million. The number of cases topped 3.8 million as the virus resurged over the past several weeks, and more than 140,000 Americans have died. Still, Senate Republicans wanted to, in the words of their leader, “hit the pause button” and “assess the conditions” in the country before providing any more relief. The country was burning, and Senate Republicans, led by Leader MCCONNELL, said: “Let’s wait a little longer and see how this goes.”

Like President Trump, they were hoping it would go away, ignoring all of the scientific evidence but paying obeisance to the hard right, which didn’t want to spend money no matter what the cost to America.

Now it seems our Republican friends have finally found the motivation to do another emergency relief bill. Even they, with their heads still half in the sand, have to see the crisis the country is in. But instead of working with Democrats in either the Senate or the House, Leader MCCONNELL has decided to write the bill behind the closed doors of his office—the same partisan, one-side-only process that has failed time and again to produce successful legislation in the Senate.

MCCONNELL talked about how the Senate led in the last three bills. I would add a word to that. It was Senate Democrats that led. Republicans put a small, stingy, corporate-oriented proposal before the Senate. We said no, and they were forced to add provisions friendly to workers and average American families. That is what happened. History knows that.

Yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL, once again, called for the same spirited bipartisanship that helped us pass the CARES Act. Well, Leader MCCONNELL, writing a bill in your own office without any input from Democrats, dropping it on the floor, and demanding that Democrats support it is no one’s idea of bipartisanship. You can’t fool the American people with these facile words that just don’t ring true.

Even worse, the Republican proposal appears destined to fall drastically short of what is required. From all indications, the bill will prioritize corporate special interests over workers and Main Street businesses. It will not provide hazard pay for essential workers. It will not provide new funding to State, local, and Tribal governments or enough investments in communities of color that have been ravaged by the virus.

Enhanced unemployment benefits will expire at the end of the month. According to reports, the Republican bill will not do nearly enough to aid the 20 to 30 million Americans currently unemployed. We have heard Republicans debate a credit for Americans who are going back to work, but those are the very same Americans who will be getting a salary again. What about Americans who remain unemployed and actually need the help?

The moratorium on evictions expires this week. According to reports, the Republican bill will not do anything for the millions of Americans who can’t afford the rent and could get kicked out of their apartments. After all the hemming and hawing and the delay, which cost America so much—months of delay—it appears the next Republican proposal on COVID will not even come close to meeting the moment.

It has become clear over the last few weeks that the reason our Republican colleagues have taken so long to put even this inadequate proposal together is because they are paralyzed by internal divisions among themselves and by division with the President.

According to reports in the press, even after all these months that our Republican colleagues spent “assessing” the conditions in the country, the White House and Senate Republicans are starkly divided about what to do. The Trump administration is fixated on a payroll tax cut, an idea that will not only harm those who rely on Social Security but will do nothing for the tens of millions of Americans who lost their jobs during the crisis. Many of my Republican colleagues aren’t too keen on that idea, with good reason. Yet it may still be in MCCONNELL’s proposal because he and the other Republicans are afraid to tell President Trump no, even when they know he is wrong.

Recent reports also suggest that the administration is trying to block billions of dollars from going to the States in order to improve their testing and contact tracing capabilities. Can you imagine? Republicans are arguing about whether to block funds for testing and tracing, the two most important tools in our arsenal to manage this crisis right now. It is amazing.

Americans are hanging their heads in some degree of shame at the President’s actions because every other developed country—just about every other one in Europe and East Asia—is doing much better than us because they have leadership and their leadership provided, above all, testing and tracing. This President refuses to do it, and the Republicans say nothing. They are so afraid of President Trump, even when they know he is wrong. Even when millions of lives are at stake, even when the economy is at stake, they just are deathly silent.

What do they end up doing? Well, the one thing that unites Trump and all the Republicans is pleasing corporate

interests. So if reports are accurate, the Republicans are doing just that. They are pleasing corporate interests, not workers and families and small businesses, and that will not get the job done.

For 60 days, Senate Democrats have been clear about where we should start the negotiations. The Heroes Act passed by the House provides crucial relief for education funding, for hospitals and medical workers, for essential workers on the frontlines, and for State and local governments.

Right now Republicans seem to want to play chicken with pandemic relief and string everyone along with a bill and a process we all know is doomed to fail.

I urge all of my Republican colleagues to abandon their one-party, one-Chamber approach before it is too late and immediately begin bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the next round of COVID legislation.

The problems, of course, don’t end with the Republican Senate. We are living through one of the greatest failures of Presidential leadership in our country’s history.

Do you hear that, Donald Trump? You have created one of the greatest failures of Presidential leadership in our country’s entire history and the history books will record it that way. President Trump cannot even model good behavior and consistently encourage Americans to wear a mask.

When the White House coronavirus briefings resume, President Trump should not take the podium. Every time President Trump takes the podium at one of these briefings, he is a threat to public health. Even after 140,000 lives were lost to COVID, the President claimed again on Sunday that this disease will disappear. It has been over 6 months since the start of the virus, and this Trump administration still lacks a national testing strategy. The administration ordered hospitals to hide their coronavirus data from the CDC.

The President is pressuring schools to reopen this fall without the necessary resources or guidance to keep our kids safe.

Remember, President Trump, you pushed Republican Governors to open their States too early, and look at what happened. You are now making the same mistake with schools. COVID surged through those States that reopened too quickly, and many now are being forced to reimpose restrictions. We cannot repeat those mistakes when it comes to the schools and safety of our kids and our families.

The question looms over this Chamber: When will our Republican friends stand up to President Trump and tell him to get his act together—when push comes to shove, when people’s health and even lives are at stake? It seems that Senate Republicans are always too timid, too afraid to buck the President.

Will they stand up and tell him he is wrong to block more funding for testing and tracing? Will they tell him to stop ignoring the signs, trying to hide the data, and undermining medical experts like Dr. Fauci? Most of all, most importantly, will our Republican colleagues finally step up to the plate and do what is right—work with us in a bipartisan way to provide desperately needed relief to the American people?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, John Lewis was a great American, but there was a humility in his heart that showed his greatness even more, and he gave speeches that stirred a nation. Who among us can forget his trademark speech of explaining how, as a young man, growing up on a farm, he practiced public speaking to an audience of chickens? He told that story over and over again.

John Lewis used to say, “People come up to me in the airport, and they say, ‘I’m going to cry. I’m going to pass out.’”

John’s reply was, “Please, don’t pass out; I’m not a doctor.”

John Lewis was a healer and a balm for troubled souls. I was struck by an article in the Atlanta newspaper that talked about an incident that occurred in January of 2009.

A former Ku Klux Klan member, Elwin Wilson, confessed to being part of the White mob that had bloodied John Lewis and other Freedom Riders in Rock Hill, SC, nearly 48 years before. Lewis noted in his 2012 book “Across That Bridge” that Wilson was the first of his attackers to apologize for his actions. Wilson traveled to Washington a short while later to meet Lewis face-to-face and ask for forgiveness.

“Without a moment of hesitation, I looked back at him and said, ‘I accept your apology,’” John Lewis wrote.

This was a great testament to the power of love to overcome hatred.

John Lewis had another incident that I thought was worth mentioning this morning, as well, that was another example of the forgiveness.

Kevin Murphy wasn’t born until a year after John Lewis was knocked unconscious by a blow from a wooden Coca-Cola crate in 1961 after the Freedom Riders pulled into the bus station in Montgomery, AL. As the city’s police chief in 2013, Mr. Murphy wanted to issue an apology for the officers who declined to step in as a White mob descended on Lewis and his bus-riding colleagues. So, when Lewis and other dignitaries assembled at Montgomery’s First Baptist Church to commemorate the event, Murphy walked to the microphone and offered Lewis what was long a symbol of oppression for many African Americans—his police badge. Murphy told Lewis he hoped it would serve as a token of reconciliation.

“I often said, when I started going up through the ranks, that if I had a chance—if I ever became police chief—that I was going to try to right that wrong,” said Murphy during an interview—now the deputy sheriff for Montgomery County, AL. He went on to say: “A lot of my peers didn’t want to talk about it. They didn’t want to face the truth.”

Because of that gesture, John Lewis and Kevin Murphy struck up a friendship, and John Lewis invited Murphy to the White House to meet President Barack Obama. Then the two of them, both Lewis and Murphy, traveled to Ireland and Northern Ireland to talk with Catholics and Protestants about bridging the religious divide.

Murphy said he was awed by Lewis’s capacity to walk through the world with an open heart. You can just tell, with everything he had been through, that he wasn’t a bitter man. He truly had tried to put a lot of what happened—the injustices—behind him. That was John Lewis.

It is a miracle that he didn’t die when angry Klansmen and their sympathizers torched the bus that carried a young John Lewis and other Freedom Riders near Anniston, AL, in 1961. It is amazing that he survived the Edmund Pettus Bridge, on Bloody Sunday in 1965, when the Alabama State troopers nearly beat him to death. Clearly, there was a purpose in his life that had to be served.

I had the honor to serve with Congressman Lewis in the House for 10 years, and I called him my friend for nearly 40 years. For a man who had witnessed the depths of hatred and despair, John Lewis was one of the most hopeful people I had ever met. He once said the only time he came close to giving up was after the murder of Robert Kennedy in 1968. Martin Luther King had been assassinated 2 months earlier. So when Bobby Kennedy died, it seemed for a few weeks that any hope for justice and equality had died too. That is what John Lewis said. Yet he didn’t allow despair to overcome him. He didn’t spend his life hoping for better; he spent his life making the world better. He still had hope, and he had a profound belief in the future of this Nation.

I was reminded this weekend of a story that captured so well John Lewis’s humility and his enormous redemptive influence on America. It was January 20, 2009—a day I will never forget. Barack Obama was sworn in to be the first African-American President of the United States. As he was leaving the podium, John Lewis stepped forward to the new President and asked him to sign his inauguration program. The President hesitated, pulled out a pen, and wrote the following inscription: “Because of you, John. Barack Obama.”

John Lewis was an icon of the American civil rights movement. If he had confined his life’s work to only ending racial injustice, he would have still

been in the pantheon of heroes, but his vision and faith were bigger than justice for just one group. His commitment was to genuine democracy and equality. He said so many times: “You cannot build a wall when it comes to equality; it must be equality for all and not for some.” He told us: “We must be headlights, not taillights.” For John, being a headlight meant going out ahead and shining a light so that we could see the people living in the cold shadows of discrimination and bring them into the warmth of America’s promise.

He challenged us always to expand our concepts of justice and equality—as he said, “to respect the dignity and worth of every human being, Black or White, Latino or Asian, immigrant to Native American, gay, straight, Muslims, Christians, Jews.” John spoke for all of them. How many times did he tell us: “We are one people, one family; we live in one house”?

One of the great injustices for our times was overly harsh drug laws. It was a measure passed in the 1980s and 1990s that disproportionately harmed people and communities of color. Many of us worked for years to replace those biased laws. John Lewis was deeply committed to our cause.

About 2 years ago, a proposal was offered that would have shifted the focus of our efforts and really walked away from a commitment to criminal sentencing reform. It was John Lewis who stepped up. His steadfast insistence made a difference, and it resulted in having the FIRST STEP Act being signed into law.

Rosa Parks was one of John Lewis’s heroes. When she died in October 2005, her body lay in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. Tens of thousands of people filed past to pay their respects to this great heroine of justice who had the courage to refuse to sit in the segregated portion of that bus. They came all night and all the next morning.

Late at night, John Lewis walked quietly into the Rotunda. He waited in line with every other mourner. Accompanying him were a handful of blind men and women who were using white canes. That was John Lewis, showing the way by quiet and powerful example. He showed us that the promise of America is the promise of dignity for everyone. In John’s eyes, none of us is free until all of us are free.

Born in rural Troy, AL, the son and grandson of sharecroppers, he saw the injustice of Jim Crow even when he was a young boy. When he was 15, he discovered a man who became an iconic leader and his personal mentor. At that age, John bought a comic book entitled “Martin Luther King and the Montgomery Story.” It was 14 pages long, and it cost him a dime, but it touched his heart and inspired his life. That thin dime had yielded arguably the greatest return on investment of any purchase in the history of our Nation.

Now we are asked, how should we honor this man?

It was a little over 10 years ago that I joined the Faith & Politics pilgrimage and made a trip to Alabama. It was a weekend that John had led for so many years wherein we visited the shrines of the American civil rights movements. We saw the monument and tribute to Rosa Parks, and we went to the church where those little girls were killed in Birmingham. Unfortunately, my schedule was such that I had to leave before we actually visited Selma, which was to occur at 12 noon on Sunday.

I went to John and said: I am sorry I can't be there, as I have always wanted to be on that Selma bridge and to hear your story in your own words.

He said: You have got to come. We will make a special trip. I will meet you in the lobby of the hotel at 6:30 in the morning, and we will drive over and see it. I will take you on that tour.

How could I possibly say no?

I said: I will be there in the lobby. Let's go.

And off we went.

We talked all the way over about his memories of what led to that march in Selma. He was the one who told me personally how Federal Judge Frank Johnson had often been overlooked but that if it were not for his rulings that had allowed that march to go forward, it might never have happened.

It was an inspirational visit for me to be there in the early Sunday morning hours on that misty day, standing at the end of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, right next to John Lewis. He pointed down, just at the foot of the bridge, and said:

That's where I fell. That's where they hit me.

There is a lot of talk about what to do next to honor John Lewis. There has been talk of renaming the Edmund Pettus Bridge in his honor. I am not opposed to that. I think that humble bridge is becoming a defining piece of American history. Yet John Lewis did not risk his life on Bloody Sunday for the right to rename a bridge; he risked his life for the right of every man and woman in America to vote and to have a voice in our democracy. John said so many times that the right to vote is precious, that it is almost sacred, and that it is the most powerful, non-violent tool we have.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been weakened and whittled down by recent Supreme Court and other court decisions and by the actions of this Department of Justice. In December, the House of Representatives voted to restore the Voting Rights Act. John Lewis presided over the U.S. House of Representatives on the day of that important vote. That bill to restore the Voting Rights Act has been sitting on Senator McCONNELL's desk for more than 225 days.

Words of praise for John Lewis are fine, but they are not enough. This Senate should honor the life and the sacrifice of John Lewis by voting to restore the Voting Rights Act. There are

some who are trying mightily to diminish American's faith in our democracy and our elections. We can honor John Lewis by protecting the right to vote. Let's do it and do it now.

Let me close with another story I learned about John Lewis this weekend. We have seen those iconic photos of the 23-year-old John Lewis as he led those marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in 1965—a young man, dressed in a tan trench coat, with a backpack. John Lewis had been arrested before for nonviolent protests. He just had a hunch that he was going to be arrested again that day and jailed, so in his backpack he had his toothbrush, toothpaste, an apple, an orange, and two books.

One book was "The Seven Storey Mountain" by the Catholic monk and mystic Thomas Merton. That book spoke about the power of hope to transform abstract principles into realities that, one day, if necessary, we would be willing to sacrifice and even die for.

On that day, the other book in John Lewis's backpack was entitled "The American Political Tradition." It opened with a quote from the writer John Dos Passos. Here is what it read: "In times of change and danger when there is quicksand of fear under men's reasoning, a sense of continuity with generations gone before can stretch like a lifeline across the scary present."

John Lewis was the bridge that connected the civil rights generation with what we see today in the streets of America—again, a common effort to make sure we fulfill the promise of equality for everyone. John Lewis was heartened by the Black Lives Matter movement. His last public appearance was here in Washington in the area they have reserved for speaking their minds about this important issue.

In this time of change and loss, may we honor the legacy of John Lewis and find within us the hope and courage to continue his work, as he reminded us that the cause of justice and equality is the cause of a lifetime.

PROTESTS

Madam President, let me start by saying that there is no place for violence or vandalism in the exercise of any constitutional right. The use of force against peaceful protesters or members of law enforcement in the reasonable exercise of their responsibilities is unacceptable.

In recent days, President Trump has indicated that he wants to send Federal agents into cities, including Chicago, to conduct policing activities that are traditionally handled by local law enforcement.

The Chicago Tribune has reported that the Department of Homeland Security is developing a plan to send an additional 150 agents to Chicago as soon as this weekend, although details have not been made public as to what they are going to do.

I join Governor J.B. Pritzker of Illinois and Chicago Mayor Lightfoot in

strongly urging the Trump administration to refrain from taking any action that resembles what has occurred in Portland, OR. Any involvement by Federal law enforcement in community policing activity must be conducted in coordination with and with the approval of local law enforcement officials. In this time of heightened tension, we cannot have Federal law enforcement operating at cross-purposes with local leaders.

In recent days, the Trump administration has deployed Federal law enforcement agents in the streets of Portland, OR. They have arrived without any visible identifying information. These Federal agents have reportedly used excessive force against peaceful protestors and detained residents in unmarked vehicles. Such conduct is unacceptable anywhere in the United States and certainly unacceptable in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

I am joining Senator JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon this week in introducing legislation to prevent President Trump from taking this action in Chicago or any other American city. The bill we jointly are offering would require Federal officers to wear identifying insignia. There is no place in America for secret police.

The bill also would limit Federal forces to the immediate vicinity of Federal property unless there has been a written request by local leadership or the Insurrection Act has been invoked. There is no question that the Federal Protective Service and other Federal law enforcement does have the responsibility for Federal facilities, but what we have seen in Portland has gone far beyond that location and into the community at large.

Our bill would also prohibit arrests or apprehensions in unmarked vehicles and render any arrests made in violation of this act unlawful.

How in the world can we explain that in the year 2020, the Trump administration would follow the example of Vladimir Putin in his invasion of Ukraine with these so-called green monsters, who would arrive without any insignia or any indication of whom they were fighting for? These little green men turned out to be agents of the Russian Government. We don't need anything like that—even close to it—in the United States.

Finally, the bill would require notice to the public in the event of crowd control-related deployments that includes information about the agencies involved, the number of personnel, and information related to requests and other details. That is what you come to expect in a democracy.

In February 2017, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH and I sent President Trump a letter suggesting how he could help, how the Federal Government could come forward to give us assistance in fighting crime and gun violence in the city of Chicago. The letter noted that public safety is primarily a

local responsibility, but the Federal Government can be a partner in public safety efforts alongside local officials, law enforcement, and community stakeholders.

We recommended the administration take steps to assist local violence-prevention efforts, including enhancing Department of Justice programs that improve community policing; directing the Department of Justice to promote mentoring and job-training programs for youth and the formerly incarcerated; improving mentoring and violence-prevention initiatives and boosting funding for recidivism-reduction programs; directing the Department of Justice to abide by its commitment to help implement policing reforms recommended by the Department's Civil Rights Division; closing the gaps in the FBI gun background check system and in Federal firearm laws that enable straw purchasers and gun traffickers to flood Chicago's streets with illicit guns; prioritizing career and youth training programs to address lack of economic opportunity; and redirecting resources that are devoted to the construction of his border wall to making our cities and communities across the United States safer. That is the way the Trump administration can show that it really cares about law enforcement in the city of Chicago and across this Nation and can help us move forward in reducing the incidence of violence.

I join Mayor Lightfoot in making it clear to President Trump that we have no need and will not tolerate tyranny by the Federal Government on the streets of Chicago.

If the President truly wants to cooperate with law enforcement efforts, we can find ways to find common ground and make it a safer city together, but sending in secret police with unmarked vehicles to snatch people off the streets is not only unacceptable, it is un-American.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, I listened carefully to Senator MCCONNELL this morning as he came to the floor and talked about the situation we currently face.

Make no mistake—we are still in the midst of this pandemic. COVID-19 is taking its toll on many parts of America. In the last week, more than 40 different States that decided to open their economies early have found that it was not a wise decision; that, in fact, many more people are becoming infected and dying. Over 140,000 have died in the United States so far, and over 3 million have been infected. I am afraid that there will be more to follow. I wish that were not the case. The question is, What can we do?

First, what can we do when it comes to COVID-19?

I listened the other day when Dr. Anthony Fauci of the National Institutes of Health was interviewed, and he and Dr. Collins have both been asked, why does it take so long to get results when people go in for testing for COVID-19?

Well, there is no explanation, and there is no good reason, and, sadly, that delay is causing a problem. People are uncertain of their status as to whether they are positive or otherwise for days on end, waiting for the results of the test.

It is time for us to develop a test that is timely in its results and widely available to Americans. We cannot realistically open the economy or even conceivably get our schools back to normal until we have that testing.

Why, then, does the White House resist putting money in the next COVID-19 bill for the additional testing that is fundamental to the question of dealing with the future of this COVID-19 virus?

In addition, I am joining with a number of my colleagues—KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, MICHAEL BENNET, CHRIS COONS, and others—in an effort to try to expand the medical and healthcare personnel necessary to make sure that we finally bring this virus to bay. We are going to try to include this in the COVID-19 legislation.

I have legislation that Senator RUBIO—a Republican from Florida—and I have cosponsored that would enhance the training of National Health Service doctors, nurses, and dentists and medical professionals, mental health counselors and the like. I think our bill is a step forward because it provides scholarship assistance to those who will pledge years of service to the National Health Service Corps once they have graduated and are licensed. We need that.

CHRIS COONS is talking about expanding the opportunity for Americans to step forward and serve their Nation doing contact tracing and other things that are essential. It would create thousands and thousands of jobs across the United States at a time when we desperately need them for a cause that we must conquer ultimately.

These are good things to include in this legislation, but there are more immediate things on the economic side.

Do you realize that this coming Saturday will be the last day we will be sending out unemployment checks with the Federal supplement that we voted on on March 26 in the CARES Act? Yes, this week—before next Sunday—the last check will be mailed because, you see, our effort under the CARES Act expires on July 31.

The last payment will be made on Saturday, and then what? And then what? For the millions of Americans who depend on this Federal supplement to feed their families, pay their rent, pay their mortgage, pay the utilities, pay their health insurance premiums—what are they going to do next?

I listened to Senator MCCONNELL say: Well, we are going to have to take a look at what that is going to be in the future. Well, let's do it, Senator, but let's do it quickly. Why have we waited? It has been since March 26 that we have taken up any legislation on the subject, and we knew this day would come. Why did we wait until the last minute?

Eight weeks ago, the House of Representatives did their measure, the Heroes Act—one which I think is sound and principled and I would have supported. Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor regularly to say it is so bad, it is inadequate, it is wrong. Yet we still don't have a proposal from the Republicans, who are the majority in the Senate, about what they would do to move forward from this point in the next COVID-19 bill.

One of the areas that I want to address specifically is the fact that almost 3 months ago—maybe longer—Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said: There is a redline here. If the COVID-19 bill that we are considering in the future does not include a provision giving immunity—legal immunity—to businesses across the United States, it has no chance. We are not going to consider it.

Well, many of us have a lot of questions about this legal immunity that Senator MCCONNELL is asking for. What is it? How far does it go? Well, it turns out there was a memo describing it that was leaked to K Street. That is where the lobbyists' offices are for special interest groups in Washington. That memo found its way into a newspaper, and we have read it, and there are still many unanswered questions.

We have been waiting for months for the language—this redline immunity language that Senator MCCONNELL insists on. He has described the number of lawsuits and litigation that have been filed under COVID-19 as being a tsunami, overwhelming in number. Completely false. The number of claims that have been filed is few across the United States, with more than 3 million people who have so far been infected.

Should we have a standard of conduct? Of course we should. The Senate Judiciary Committee, almost 3 weeks ago, had a hearing where a Texas businessman came forward and said: I want to do the right thing, but what standard should I be following here? Something local? Something State? Something Federal? Give me the standard, and I will do my very best to live up to it.

Well, that sounded like a good-faith effort by a businessperson who wants customers and employees to be safe when they come into his establishment. He has every right to ask for that standard, and we have every responsibility to provide it based not on the politics of the moment but on public health, on medical certainty, and on science. That is what the standard should be drawn to, and the notion that any standard published by anyone—whether by a town, a city, a township, a county, a State, whatever it might be—is sufficient to absolve any business from any liability goes way too far. Unfortunately, it is going to be misused, I am afraid, by those who do not—as this businessman clearly was not going to do—want to live up to their responsibility.

What that Texas businessman said in the Senate Judiciary Committee gave me a good belief and strong faith that the business community wants to do the right thing but just wants guidance. It would be amazing if the CDC and OSHA stepped forward and provided clear, enforceable standards so that businesses and others across the United States knew exactly what to do in terms of social distancing and masks and the like. We need that, but first we need the language from Senator MCCONNELL. This so-called redline has been promised now for months. Let's see the details. Let's move forward from there.

The notion of immunity for businesses by any standard that will not protect employees and customers is unacceptable. It would not make America safe; it would make the situation even worse.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4049

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have three groups of speakers having to do with the vote that will take place at 11:45 a.m., and during that time I will take the first 15 minutes, and then other Members will have amendments. The first two amendments will be the Schatz amendment and then my amendment.

I did have the intention of having more time and was going to kind of rejoice a little bit because, right now, I understand we are about to get the information on suggestions that the Secretary of Defense has after working over a realignment of some of our resources, particularly in Europe. This is kind of interesting because this is something that 18 years ago this year I tried to do unsuccessfully when Jim Jones was the Supreme Allied Commander, and we were not able to get it done. After 18 years, we are going to try it again. I will be speaking about that issue at 4 p.m. today, and it is a significant one.

Today we are considering amendments to our national defense authorization bill. We are still working on a managers' package, but as I previously noted, we have already agreed to more than 140 bipartisan amendments.

Let me be more specific than that. This is the first time we have done this. We have had amendments to a lesser degree in the past. This is the first time that the entire bill has been put together by Members of the U.S. Senate.

To demonstrate that, the total number of amendments to date, on July 21—including our request prior to com-

ing to the floor—are 818 amendments, of which 440 are Republican and 428 are Democratic. Then there was the adoption of the substitute amendment. We all remember what happened then. We had 79 amendments. Those amendments were 34 Democrat and 34 Republican, and 11 were joint. Then the amendments we adopted with the managers' package included 34 amendments, 15 from Republicans and 18 from Democrats, as amendments on the second managers' package numbering 28 and the third package of 34. What I am saying is that we have had many amendments, and this is the first time there has been a bill that was entirely written by the Members. That is why we are at a point now where we can introduce our amendments.

It was important to both Senator REED and me to try to vote on at least a few individual amendments. This is something we haven't been able to do in the last several years. We made this arrangement 2 weeks ago when we set up some six amendments to be voted on. We will start in just a few minutes voting on the first two, which will be Senator SCHATZ's and mine. I am glad we are doing this within the hour.

The first two amendments will be in relation to Senator SCHATZ regarding the 1033 Program. I am strongly opposed to the Schatz amendment to end the 1033 Program. I hear people talking about this, and I guess they don't realize what we have done in the State of Oklahoma. Our sheriffs and law enforcement officers were quite upset when they heard that it might be in jeopardy. The 1033 Program is an effective use of the taxpayers' money, taking equipment that is not being used by the military and allowing it to go into the law enforcement sector. All kinds of precautions have already been taken, but we are talking about adding a few more precautions.

The 1033 Program is an effective use of taxpayers' money. In fact, since the program's creation in 1990, more than \$7 billion worth of vehicles, desks, boots, computers, and more have been responsibly recycled into law enforcement. This is military equipment that the military no longer needs and that these agencies would be purchasing anyway. The equipment is always demilitarized so that it is appropriate for public safety use.

For years, local law enforcement has been asked to do more with less. Now they face the liberal cause to defund the police. We need to continue this transparent, responsive program.

There are a lot of us who have a hard time believing that this is going on today—that people are trying to play down law enforcement, trying to say that it is acceptable to break the law. This has never happened before in America, but that is what we are seeing right now. That makes this program one that is even more valuable.

Senator SCHATZ's amendment would place such stringent limitations on the 1033 Program that it would make the

program virtually impossible to use. It adds only burdensome certification and reporting requirements.

Now, I don't say this critically of Senator SCHATZ, but he doesn't like the program, and he wants to kill the program. We are not going to allow this to happen.

As an example, let's say that a sheriff's office in my State of Oklahoma or any other State decides that they want to receive sleeping bags that the Department of Defense no longer needs. Under the Schatz amendment, that sheriff's office would need to, No. 1, put the request for sleeping bags out for public comment 30 days prior; second, they would have to receive approval from local and State authorities; and third, they would have to file reports on how the sleeping bags would be used and the kind of training officers will have to receive in order for them to have these sleeping bags.

Sheriff's offices are too busy working to keep our communities safe to file numerous reports on sleeping bags that they receive from DOD. To put it bluntly, I think this amendment would kill the 1033 Program. Again, this is allowing trained law enforcement officers to use surplus equipment that is not going to be used and has no value to the military. This is why both the National Sheriffs' Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police strongly oppose Senator SCHATZ's amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the recommendations from the National Sheriffs' Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police.

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

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 14, 2020.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Armed
Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write today to lend the voice of 3,068 sheriffs in support of your amendment #2411 to the National Defense Authorization Act and in opposition to Senator Schatz' amendment #2252. The National Sheriffs' Association has studied this issue thoroughly and determine that your amendment to prohibit the transfer of bayonets, grenades (other than flashbang and stun), weaponized tracked combat vehicles and armed drones is a more thoughtful approach. Senator Schatz, on the other hand, would stop the 1033 completely thru bureaucratic recordkeeping and reporting requirements that make it all but impossible to legally comply. It seems to us that, since taxpayers have bought this equipment once, to simply throw the equipment away or let it rust in warehouses is an incredibly wasteful approach to taxpayers' dollars. The sheriffs implore you to let us continue to use this equipment to save lives in high water rescues, deep snow rescues, and hostage situations, which we do many times a year.

Best regards,

JONATHAN THOMPSON,
Executive Director and CEO.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2020.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MCCONNELL AND SCHUMER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our opposition to S. Amdt. 2252, which will be offered to S. 4049, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021." The FOP urges members of the Senate to vote against this amendment, which would impose sweeping restrictions on an important surplus equipment program for State and local law enforcement agencies.

The FOP has long supported the 1033 program, which is a surplus equipment program administered by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO) at the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). The media is constructing an inaccurate narrative that State and local law enforcement agencies are becoming too "militarized" simply because this program is administered by the DoD.

It is important for Senators to understand that equipment received through the 1033 program is demilitarized and repurposed for public safety use. Simply because a piece of equipment was originally purchased—with our tax dollars—by the DoD does not make it military equipment. A tool is defined by its use. The equipment is used to defend and protect officers and civilians from threats and to carry out law enforcement and public safety objectives.

There is no data, studies, or other information to support the contention that State and local law enforcement agencies are misusing equipment obtained through these Federal grant programs. For this reason, on behalf of the more than 354,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we urge members of the Senate to vote against this amendment. If I can provide any additional information on this issue, please feel free to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I support strong oversight of the 1033 Program, and I understand the intent behind my colleague's amendment. We want to make sure that the wrong kind of equipment doesn't get into the hands of people who cannot properly use it, so we have actually put those modifications into an amendment that will be voted on—the Inhofe amendment—right after the Schatz amendment, in another 30 minutes from now.

We are offering an alternative to the Schatz amendment. It would place a more narrow limitation on the transfer of Department of Defense equipment, including weapons that cannot be used by State and local enforcement. We are talking about weapons such as weaponized tracking vehicles, drones, and lethal grenades. They are not being used anyway, so let's put them on a list so that they can't be used. That should satisfy a lot of people's concerns.

It also makes sure that those who receive this equipment get necessary training on how to protect citizens' constitutional rights and enhanced training on deescalation techniques.

Defunding and deequipping our law enforcement agencies simply will not fix anything. Making sure they have the right equipment and right training will. So I would request that my colleagues vote no on the Schatz amendment and recognize the value of this program, and vote yes on my amendment putting new safeguards into the 1033 Program.

With that, Madam President, having used the first 10 minutes of my time, I yield the next 5 minutes to Senator CRAMER.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I thank Chairman INHOFE for his leadership and eloquence. I rise today in defense of the heroes on the thin blue line and in opposition to amendment No. 2252 to the National Defense Authorization Act, which Chairman INHOFE just spoke to.

Over the past few months, America has watched as we have seen a rise in civil unrest turn into violence in cities all across our country. Anarchists and domestic terrorists have exploited the peaceful protests of millions of well-intentioned Americans in order to inflict chaos and instill fear in our communities. Standing on the frontlines as a shield from absolute anarchy are our local law enforcement officers who, by and large, have applied the appropriate force required to protect American families as well as First Amendment rights.

Unfortunately, some have made the political calculation that they would benefit more from chaos than from peace. They believe defunding and abolishing police departments and restricting their access to protective gear are politically better than an honest look at what our justice system really needs to succeed.

The 1033 Program has been utilized for years to provide State and local law enforcement with valuable tools already purchased by the Federal Government to promote public safety. It would be the epitome of waste to gut this program and let these valuable tools rust in a pile or a closet somewhere.

As the chairman stated, the police and sheriffs associations oppose amendment No. 2252, and for good reason. Patrick Yoes of the Fraternal Order of Police says:

It is important for Senators to understand that equipment received through the 1033 program is demilitarized and repurposed for public safety use. Simply because a piece of equipment was originally purchased with our tax dollars by the Department of Defense does not make it military equipment. A tool is defined by its use. The equipment is used to defend and protect officers and civilians from threats and to carry out law enforcement and public safety objectives.

It is stunning to me that some of my colleagues are more appalled at where law enforcement gets some of their tools and equipment than they are at the violence that our police officers have to endure every day. The amend-

ment offered today would bury law enforcement, especially those from poor communities, in unnecessary bureaucracy, effectively preventing them from procuring the equipment needed to keep our communities and citizens safe. This unworkable messaging ploy is born out of Democrats' belief that vilifying the police will somehow help them win the election in November.

Thankfully, there is an alternative, amendment No. 2411, offered by the chairman from Oklahoma. It is a thoughtful, commonsense approach with a focus on trained prevention and deescalation. It puts the right equipment in the right hands and places commonsense restrictions on what transfers can occur, all while saving the taxpayers' money.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 2411 and call on the Members of this body to reject any attempts to prevent these brave men and women from doing their jobs to safely secure our communities.

I yield back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 2252 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2301

(Purpose: To reform Department of Defense transfers of personal property to law enforcement agencies.)

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 2252, as provided for under the previous order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. SCHATZ] proposes an amendment numbered 2252 to amendment No. 2301.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, Senators MURKOWSKI, HARRIS, PAUL, and I are offering a bipartisan amendment that proposes reasonable, commonsense reforms to the 1033 Program. Groups on the left and the right support it, including the NAACP, the National Urban League, OurStreets, FreedomWorks, Concerned Veterans for America, the American Conservative Union, Campaign for Liberty, Americans for Tax Reform, and the Faith and Freedom Coalition.

People on the left and the right agree that it is time to start to demilitarize the police.

Our amendment will permanently prohibit the transfer of lethal military weapons to police departments. This includes heavy ammunition, bayonets, grenade launchers, explosives, stripped-down tanks, tear gas, and weaponized drones, among other things. Now, think about that list—weaponized drones and bayonets. Is anybody under the impression that a police department needs a weaponized drone or a bayonet?

Our amendment also ensures the police departments can still get access to

the equipment that actually helps them to protect the public under the 1033 Program, like first-aid kits, cold-weather gear, flash lights, and high-water vehicles to respond to flood disasters.

The last month has made clear that weapons of war don't belong in police departments. Weapons of war have no place in police departments. We saw the terrifying images of police in military gear storming the streets, combat vehicles rumbling down city blocks, rounds and rounds of tear gas shot at peaceful protesters, frequently without warning and often unprovoked. None of this helps anyone deescalate a crisis.

Our communities are not battlefields. The American people are not enemy combatants. If our troops can't use tear gas while overseas, police departments shouldn't use it on American citizens. It is really that simple.

Across the country, more than 8,000 police departments are stockpiling weapons of war at no cost. The research plainly shows that outfitting our police for war does not help to keep the peace. Militarized equipment actually leads to more violence, disproportionately impacting communities of color. More militarized law enforcement is associated with more civilians killed each year by police.

One study found that when a county goes from having no military equipment to receiving about \$2.5 million worth of weaponry, civilian deaths at the hands of police are likely to double. To make matters worse, some police departments are misusing this program by selling, trading, or pawning equipment. Often, county and city officials don't even know what weapons and equipment police departments are acquiring because equipment like armored track vehicles are very expensive to store and maintain. This program is actually blowing up local budgets across the country because these tanks are tearing up the streets.

Today, we have an opportunity to fix it. It is not to repeal the 1033 Program outright, which, frankly, I would favor, but this amendment is the result of a bipartisan compromise wherein we worked with each Member who was willing to engage—former Governors who served in the Senate, former prosecutors who served in the Senate, Members of both parties—and they specifically came to our office and said: You know, that specific item has an important civilian use, could you exempt it from the list of prohibited transfers? We worked and we worked and we worked, and this is the compromise measure. By passing this amendment, we can prevent the abuse of a 1033 Program, and we can limit the amount of dangerous weapons in local precincts.

To be clear, reforming this program is not the only thing we need to do. No single amendment will end police brutality and violence, and alleviating the deep mistrust between police and the communities they are sworn to protect

is not easy work, and it will not be solved by one vote. This amendment is meaningful, and it is bipartisan.

There is simply no evidence to support the idea that police are outgunned. Criminals are not rolling around with IEDs and armored vehicles. This is an opportunity, given the failure of us to do anything about the relationship between police and communities—anything at all in this Congress, in this historic moment—this amendment is an opportunity to actually get something done. We have bipartisan cosponsors. This will be a bipartisan vote. We have organizations, frankly, on the far left and the far right supporting this amendment. This is an opportunity for the Senate to actually get something done. So I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I appreciate the words of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii. Those of us who served in law enforcement know the temptation to seek out this kind of military hardware and the basic uselessness and cost of it when that is done.

I will just be very brief in mentioning that we had a small, very safe, and very quiet community. The police chief was in my office when I was State's attorney, and the chief law enforcement officer of the county was all excited because he was going to get an armored personnel carrier. I said: What are you going to do with it?

Well, just in case there is an uprising.

I said: An uprising is whether somebody is shouting too much on your Fourth of July parades. I said: If you get that, I can assure you that if it is used, I will have an inquiry into why it was used, and no cases from your jurisdiction will be allowed in the court. He decided he could find better uses of their other things.

I said: Besides, you are going to get laughed out of town if you get it.

CORONAVIRUS

I have spoken many times about the need for another COVID-19 supplemental. We see the frightening trajectory of this virus. The terrible human suffering, loss, and economic devastation that is causing families, businesses, and public services in every State and municipality in this country have greatly accentuated the urgency of that need.

As the coronavirus continues to outpace the White House's appallingly belated, I would say, incompetent, inadequate, and incoherent efforts to contain it, and while they keep trying to make a sound bite, the number of Americans becoming sick and dying continues to rise.

They ought to be worried, first and foremost, about Americans and Americans' health and Americans' safety far more than what might be a political sound bite for this fall's election. I re-

mind those who are running this fall, if you want to make sound bites about this and not do anything, as of yesterday, the virus has infected more than 3.8 million Americans. It has killed more than 143,000. Those are not numbers. Those are people. There have been 30,000 more Americans who have been killed by this virus in the past 5 months than died in Vietnam, Korea, Iraq, and Afghanistan combined.

What is the President's response? Well, the virus will soon just go away. After dismissing the virus as nothing to worry about and predicting that the U.S. economy would come roaring back in June, our self-proclaimed wartime President has, for all intents and purposes, left the battlefield.

Unfortunately, the people who are fighting COVID have not left the battlefield. These are friends of mine. I have known people who have died from this. We all do. Hopefully, we all know doctors and nurses and others who work on the frontlines of this.

After months of the President belittling those who wear masks to protect themselves and others, almost nothing he has said about this pandemic has turned out to be accurate or, worse yet, helpful. At this point, his priority appears to be keeping the Confederate flag flying and honoring those who fought to defend slavery and destroy the Union. This is appalling, even for this divisive President who wants to protect the names of people who are traitors to the United States and fought against the United States. Why not put names of people on those forts and those military bases who actually defended the United States and fought for us?

Back to COVID-19. We know the virus toll in this country is staggering, and unlike many countries where governments quickly put in place effective controls, and the virus has receded in those countries that put the controls in and their economies have largely reopened, here, it is getting worse.

We also need to be aware of what the virus is doing in other parts of the world because that will determine how long it is going to take to defeat this pandemic and how long before life returns to normal in our own country. Any virus is only an airplane trip away from our shores, but that has been ignored by the White House.

Last week, the World Health Organization, which the White House blames for favoring China—at the same time, incidentally, President Trump was praising Xi Jinping for China's response to the virus—reported more than 14 million confirmed infections and more than 600,000 deaths worldwide. The virus has spread to 216 countries and territories. It affected the entire world. Countries with the most advanced healthcare systems in the world are struggling to cope with the flood of sick people. As bad as that is, the situation is far worse in developing countries, where billions of people have no access to quality medical services, and,

for that matter, even safe water and sanitation.

Their governments have minimal ability to stop the spread of the virus or to shore up their failing economies and to stop the virus from going elsewhere. Without aid from the United States and other donors, the virus spreads out of control. You know, we are not isolated from the rest of the world. We have already seen this happening in our hemisphere.

According to USAID; the World Food Programme; the Vaccine Alliance, GAVI; the Global Fund; and other public health and humanitarian organizations, COVID-related needs around the world are spiking in every area. USAID said that whatever amount of resources the Congress provides is not going to be enough.

They describe massive gaps in meeting what they foresee as a tidal wave of need in the making, at the same time that they and others are trying to stop the backsliding in other infectious disease programs, which, because we are all on one globe, ultimately affect us.

If the current trend continues, 270 million people will be without adequate food by the end of this year, an increase of 150 million due to the pandemic alone. U.S. Food for Peace Program, known as P.L. 480 Title II, has been a lifesaver for over 60 years. More than 3 billion people in 150 countries have received P.L. 480 food aid, and it has been backed strongly by both Republicans and Democrats in this body. It is absolutely vital to the COVID-19 response.

The World Food Programme is undertaking the biggest humanitarian response in its history. Does that affect us in the United States? Of course, it does because we are interrelated, and because if these problems continue in other parts of the world, ultimately, they do affect us very, very much.

In the United States, we see that our agriculture economy is continuing to suffer. The Trump trade wars have hurt our farmers. The pandemic has accelerated their decline. Actually, additional funding for P.L. 480 will help address immediate global hunger needs, while it would also support America's farm community suffering from the economic crisis caused by COVID-19.

The U.N. believes the number of COVID-19 infections are massively underreported and is running out of funds to support the hundreds of passengers and cargo flights carrying international aid and workers' food and medical supplies, and, of course, many of these humanitarian workers are themselves becoming ill.

Both USAID and the U.N. have stated that you have to have U.S. leadership to get other countries to help. It is a practice widely understood, apparently everywhere except at the White House. The less prepared we and other countries are for what lies ahead, the worse it is going to be for them and for us.

You know, this is not just being good humanitarians on our part; we have an

interest in this, too—in the world being healthy. It is not a problem that is going to be solved by an "America First" policy or by building a wall and saying somebody else will pay for it or by blaming others.

Americans can't safely resume normal international travel and commerce without a successful global strategy to reduce the number and rate of infections. As long as the virus is spreading in this hemisphere and beyond, Americans will continue to become infected and die, and the U.S. economy will suffer, no matter how many tweets and sound bites come from the White House.

The amount appropriated for the international response to the virus in previous COVID-19 supplementals totals \$2.4 billion, including less than \$1 billion for food and other humanitarian aid. That is about one-half of 1 percent of the sum total of those emergency supplementals.

I will put much of these numbers in the RECORD, but there are billions needed for the cost of purchasing and distributing billions of doses of a coronavirus vaccine, as soon as one is available. GAVI will play an essential role in that, protecting the world and protecting us because that distribution is going to be immensely difficult and costly, and we have to be prepared as soon as the vaccine is proven to be safe and effective.

The longer Congress delays, then the more costly—in lives and dollars—an effective international response to COVID-19 becomes.

The President does not want to be the leader we need at this critical time. So it is up to Congress—an independent branch of government—to actually stand up and do our work.

On July 10, the House Appropriations Committee marked up its fiscal year 2021 bill for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which includes \$10 million in emergency funding to respond to COVID-19. That is a good start, but we have a lot more to do. I hope the proposal that will finally be unveiled by the majority leader will include funds for an international response.

Senator GRAHAM—a Republican—and I have worked together on this Foreign Ops bill. We are in agreement that we need strong U.S. leadership at this critical time. I am going to be making recommendations to other members of the Appropriations Committee on this.

I will close on an entirely different matter.

When I see a Navy veteran come and ask masked, unidentified soldiers, police officers—nobody really said who they were—dispersing a crowd in Portland, and he just stands there and says: Look, who are you? What are you doing? He was not being in any way threatening. What is their response to him? They start beating him and beating him and firing tear gas at him. He simply asked: Who are you? Why are you in our town? What are you doing?

Will you please tell me who you are. They start beating him, and they break his hand. This is a Navy veteran who has served our country.

This is as out of control as anything else. And to hear smug comments from members of the administration saying that we have to do this—no, everybody knows they are doing that hoping that somehow it will help the President's reelection.

I want to help the United States of America.

I have spoken many times about the need for another COVID-19 supplemental. The frightening trajectory of this virus and the terrible human suffering, loss, and economic devastation it is causing families, businesses, and public services in every State and municipality in this country, have greatly accentuated the urgency of that need.

As the coronavirus continues to outpace the White House's appallingly belated, incompetent, inadequate, and incoherent efforts to contain it, the number of Americans becoming sick and dying continues to rise.

As of yesterday, the virus has infected more than 3.8 million Americans and has killed more than 143,000.

Those are not numbers. They are people. Thirty thousand more Americans have been killed by this virus in the past 5 months than died in Vietnam, Korea, Iraq, and Afghanistan combined.

The President's response? That the virus will "soon just go away". After dismissing the virus as nothing to worry about and predicting that the U.S. economy would come "roaring back" in June, our self-proclaimed "war time President" has for all intents and purposes left the battlefield.

After months of belittling those who wear masks to protect themselves and others, almost nothing he has said about this pandemic has turned out to be accurate or helpful.

At this point, his priority appears to be keeping the confederate flag flying and honoring those who fought to defend slavery and destroy the Union. That is appalling, even for this divisive President.

The virus's toll in this country is staggering, and unlike many countries where governments quickly put in place effective controls and the virus has receded and economies have largely reopened, here it is getting worse.

But we also need to be aware of what the virus is doing in other parts of the world because that will determine how long it will take to defeat this pandemic and how long before life returns to normal in our own country. This, too, has been all but ignored by the White House.

Last week, the World Health Organization—which the White House blames for favoring China at the same time President Trump was praising Xi Jinping for China's response to the virus—reported more than 14 million confirmed infections and more than 600,000 deaths worldwide. The virus has

spread to 216 countries and territories—in effect, the entire world.

Countries with the most advanced health care systems in the world are struggling to cope with the flood of sick people. As bad as that is, the situation is far worse in developing countries, where billions of people have no access to quality medical services or even safe water and sanitation.

Their governments have minimal ability to stop the spread of the virus or to shore up their failing economies. Without aid from the United States and other donors, the virus will spread out of control. In fact, that is already happening in this hemisphere.

According to USAID, the World Food Programme, WFP; The Vaccine Alliance, GAVI; the Global Fund; and other public health and humanitarian organizations, COVID-related needs around the world are spiking “in every area” and USAID says that whatever amount of resources the Congress provides “will not be enough.”

They describe “massive gaps” in meeting what they fore see as a “tidal wave of need” in the making, at the same time that they and others are trying to stop the backsliding in other infectious disease programs.

According to WFP, if current trends continue, 270 million people will be without adequate food by the end of this year, an increase of 150 million due to the pandemic alone.

The U.S. Food for Peace Program, known as P.L. 480—Title II, has been a life-saver for over 60 years. More than three billion people in 150 countries have received P.L. 480 food aid.

This program is absolutely vital to the COVID-19 response. As countries restrict international travel to slow the spread of the virus, it is disrupting the transport and movement of food.

WFP is undertaking the biggest humanitarian response in its history. According to David Beasley, “[t]his unprecedented crisis requires an unprecedented response. If we do not respond rapidly and effectively to this viral threat, the outcome will be measured in an unconscionable loss of life, and efforts to roll back the tide of hunger will be undone.”

In the United States, the agriculture economy is continuing to suffer. Not only have the Trump trade wars hurt our farmers, the pandemic has accelerated their decline. Additional funding for P.L. 480 would help address immediate global hunger needs, while also supporting America’s farm community suffering from the economic crisis caused by COVID-19.

The United Nations believes the number of COVID-19 infections is “massively under-reported,” and is running out of funds to support the hundreds of passenger and cargo flights carrying international aid workers, food, and medical supplies. Their efforts are also threatened by the fact that many health and humanitarian workers are getting sick.

All of this requires large infusions of money, and USAID and the U.N. both

say that U.S. leadership is crucial to obtaining contributions from other donors. It is widely understood—at least everywhere except inside the White House—that the less prepared we and other countries are for what lies ahead the worse it will be for them and for us.

This is not a problem that will be solved by an “America First” policy or by building a wall or by blaming others.

Americans cannot safely resume normal international travel and commerce without a successful global strategy to sustainably reduce the number and rate of infections. As long as the virus is spreading in this hemisphere and beyond, Americans will continue to become infected and die and the U.S. economy will suffer.

The amount appropriated for the international response to the virus in previous COVID-19 supplementals totals \$2.4 billion, including less than \$1 billion for food and other humanitarian aid. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of the sum total of those emergency supplementals.

Today’s appeals from just the Global Fund, WFP, and GAVI total \$10 billion, and that doesn’t include the needs of agencies like the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, UNICEF, or our own programs administered by USAID and the State Department.

Several billion dollars are needed just for the cost of purchasing and distributing billions of doses of a coronavirus vaccine as soon as one is available, in which GAVI will play a central role. The distribution will be immensely difficult and costly, and we have to be prepared as soon as a vaccine is proven to be safe and effective.

The longer Congress delays, the more costly—in lives and dollars—an effective international response to COVID-19 becomes. Controlling the outbreak here at home is ultimately a lost cause if we do not act aggressively to assist other countries in the global fight against this pandemic.

President Trump has shown that he cannot and will not be the leader we need at this critical time. It is up to Congress. The longer we delay, the more difficult and costly it will be to defeat this virus.

On July 10, the House Appropriations Committee marked up its fiscal year 2021 bill for the Department of State and Foreign Operations, which includes \$10 billion in emergency funding for the international response to COVID-19. That is a good start, but it is too little. The virus is racing around the world and the costs of stopping it are increasing every day.

I hope the proposal about to be unveiled by the majority leader includes the necessary funds for the international response because, to repeat, controlling the outbreak here at home is ultimately a lost cause if we do not act aggressively to assist other countries against this pandemic.

I believe Senator GRAHAM and I are in agreement about the need for strong

U.S. leadership at this critical time. I will be making my own recommendation to the other members of the Appropriations Committee for the necessary funding to combat the virus overseas, and I urge other Senators to support it.

S. 4049

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, there is a Cold War-era quote, attributed to Winston Churchill, that “in a democracy, a knock on the door in the early morning is the milkman.”

In the United States, we are not supposed to fear a knock on our front door. If the police do knock on our door, we expect them to come at a reasonable hour and to respond to criminal activity with the professionalism befitting the peace officers they are.

Those are the expectations of a free people, proud of its history and tradition of separating the roles between civilian law enforcement agencies and the Armed Forces—one is to keep the peace within its community, the other is to destroy foreign adversaries.

By keeping those roles separate, Americans have historically built and sustained a strong bond of trust with their police officers. But, for years, the war on crime and the misguided war on drugs has looked a lot like the war on terror.

Throughout our country, due to the Department of Defense’s 1033 Program, law enforcement is equipped with the tools of the U.S. military, which has predictably resulted in the continued decline of the relationship between the police and those they serve.

Perhaps we should discuss the kinds of machinery provided to local police departments.

The 1033 Program provided to the sleepy New England town of Keene, NH, a Ballistic Engineered Armored Response Counter Attack Truck, otherwise known as a Bearcat.

That might sound menacing, but it is nothing compared to what the Department of Defense provided to Columbia, SC: a mine-resistant war truck, equipped with a machine gun.

These examples are by no means unique. Between 2006 and 2014, the Department of Defense transferred over \$1.5 billion worth of equipment, including over 600 mine-resistant ambush protected vehicles, 79,288 assault rifles, 205 grenade launchers, and 11,959 bayonets to civilian police departments. These are not the tools of peace officers. These are weapons uniquely designed to crush an enemy army.

Mr. President, there has emerged a consensus that we have turned our back on our own principles and blurred the lines between civilian law enforcement and soldiers of war.

And we know that because the Inhofe amendment concedes as much. By limiting the types of weapons that can be transferred, such as bayonets and grenades, the Inhofe amendment acknowledges that there are at least some military-grade weapons that should not be turned on the streets of America’s communities.

But, despite that major and very welcome concession, the Inhofe amendment contains a very telling blind spot. It focuses almost exclusively on weaponry and not the true issue here, the importance of trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The Inhofe amendment takes as a given that the transfers of military surplus equipment are between the law enforcement agencies, the DOD, and no one else.

The Schatz-Paul amendment takes a different approach by ensuring that communities are notified of requests and transfers, by posting notices throughout the community and on a public website, as well as community participation by ensuring that a jurisdiction's governing body approves of the transfers. And the Schatz-Paul amendment provides enforcement mechanisms to combat police militarization.

Mr. President, the police have a very difficult job and serve a critical function. Without the rule of law, a civilized society cannot exist. We cannot take the police for granted. They are brave citizens, and they deserve our gratitude.

That is the core of the Schatz-Paul amendment. Our amendment takes seriously the idea that the cops on the beat can only do their job well when they are well known to their neighbors and trusted by their communities.

By providing the Federal Government and local citizens a role in evaluating what tools should be available to civilian police forces, the Schatz-Paul amendment will help build the relationship between law enforcement, their communities, and, in turn, make our citizens, our police, and our neighborhoods safer.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Schatz-Paul amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Schatz amendment. The Schatz amendment would make changes to one of the Defense Department's surplus property programs, known as the 1033 Program, which allows the Defense Department to disperse excess military equipment to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

The 1033 Program has provided the Defense Department a way to reuse taxpayer-funded equipment it no longer needs by providing it to law enforcement agencies. This, in turn, saves State and local governments from having to buy new equipment. This program is almost 25 years old, and it has been the subject of continued scrutiny and modifications.

I would first like to review what is in place. DOD requires that all requests for equipment from law enforcement agencies include a justification of how the property will be used. This justification is a key factor in determining if a requisition is to be approved.

Next, according to the Defense Department, 92 percent of the equipment transferred during fiscal year 2019 was in the category of uncontrolled property—things like office equipment, first aid kits, hand tools, computers, and digital cameras. After 1 year from transfer, items in this category become the property of the law enforcement agency and are no longer subject to annual inventory requirements. The rest of the property transferred under the 1033 Program is considered controlled property and is given to law enforcement agencies on a conditional or "loan" basis. This includes things like small arms, demilitarized vehicles, and night vision equipment.

Typically, small arms weapons only make up about 5 percent of the property transferred in the 1033 Program. When a law enforcement agency no longer wants or needs this controlled property, it must be returned to the Department of Defense.

To ensure that this program is run responsibly and effectively, the Government Accountability Office has provided several reviews of this program that have been helpful in past years to tighten the requirements on participants in the 1033 Program. The committee report accompanying the bill before us requires another GAO review of DOD's disposal of military vehicles, which could inform additional reforms when we receive the results of the review.

I also know that the Defense Logistics Agency requires annual audits of participating agencies to ensure they are accountable for the equipment they have received. If an agency is delinquent or doesn't meet the requirements, then they can be suspended or terminated from the 1033 Program.

While this Program is an effective way of reusing equipment that taxpayers have already paid for, we continually need to ensure that our civilian law enforcement agencies do not end up looking like or acting like our military when they patrol the streets. Given some of the incidents that have occurred in recent months, I believe that additional modifications are necessary.

The Schatz amendment adds some reasonable requirements and limitations to the 1033 Program. For one thing, it would codify the prohibition of certain items from being transferred under the 1033 Program, things like certain kinds of ammunition, grenades, and drones. This amendment would also prohibit the use of transferred equipment against First Amendment-protected activities, such as the right to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

I know that the Defense Department has some concerns about how this amendment would be implemented, but I believe these concerns can be addressed during conference with the House. I believe it is important and timely to make such changes to the 1033 Program today.

I support the Schatz amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 2411, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, and oppose amendment No. 2252, offered by the Senator from Hawaii.

I have heard from law enforcement in my State. They use this program to get critical search-and-rescue equipment that saves lives. In Sweetwater County, the sheriff used equipment from the 1033 Program to rescue 22 people in just 5 months. In Big Horn County, equipment from the program rescued a family who was kayaking when 6-foot waves arose. A boat from this program was the only equipment that could break through the waves to rescue the family. Without the 1033 Program, they would not be able to afford this life-saving equipment.

Sometimes the equipment is not used, in which case we are pleased that there is no need for a search and rescue that year, or some of it is converted to fire protection equipment.

The burdensome paperwork required by the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii would effectively end access to the program for the local law enforcement in my State whose departments are small. Our towns are small. The activities have to be combined between fire and police protection.

Senator INHOFE has attempted to find the middle ground. His amendment requires reforms and training without an egregious paperwork burden that could end this important program.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of amendment 2411 offered by Senator INHOFE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, just by way of rebuttal to the Senator from Wyoming, to make clear what the Schatz-Murkowski-Harris-Paul amendment does, we were very thoughtful and deliberative and collaborative with Members of the Senate to ensure that the problem he is describing would not occur under this new statute. So let me just be specific. Search-and-rescue equipment, boats, things like that which clearly have a virtuous civilian use are not prohibited transfers under my amendment.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2252

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the Schatz amendment No. 2252.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin | Harris | Peters |
| Bennet | Hassan | Reed |
| Blumenthal | Heinrich | Rosen |
| Booker | Hirono | Sanders |
| Brown | Jones | Schatz |
| Cantwell | Kaine | Schumer |
| Cardin | King | Shaheen |
| Carper | Klobuchar | Sinema |
| Casey | Leahy | Smith |
| Coons | Manchin | Stabenow |
| Cortez Masto | Markey | Tester |
| Daines | Menendez | Udall |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Van Hollen |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Warner |
| Feinstein | Murphy | Warren |
| Gardner | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand | Paul | Wyden |

NAYS—49

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Alexander | Fischer | Risch |
| Barrasso | Graham | Roberts |
| Blackburn | Grassley | Romney |
| Blunt | Hawley | Rounds |
| Boozman | Hoeven | Rubio |
| Braun | Hyde-Smith | Sasse |
| Burr | Inhofe | Scott (FL) |
| Capito | Johnson | Scott (SC) |
| Cassidy | Kennedy | Shelby |
| Collins | Lankford | Sullivan |
| Cornyn | Lee | Thune |
| Cotton | Loeffler | Tillis |
| Cramer | McConnell | Toomey |
| Crapo | McSally | Wicker |
| Cruz | Moran | Young |
| Enzi | Perdue | |
| Ernst | Portman | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 49.

Under the previous order, the 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2411

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2411 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 2411 to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose additional conditions and limitations on the transfer of Department of Defense property for law enforcement activities)

At the end of subtitle E of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 1052. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) ADDITIONAL TRAINING OF RECIPIENT AGENCY PERSONNEL REQUIRED.—Subsection (b)(6) of section 2576a of title 10, United

States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including respect for the rights of citizens under the Constitution of the United States and de-escalation of force”.

(b) CERTAIN PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(d) PROPERTY NOT TRANSFERRABLE.—The Secretary may not transfer to a Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency under this section the following:

“(1) Bayonets.

“(2) Grenades (other than stun and flash-bang grenades).

“(3) Weaponized tracked combat vehicles.

“(4) Weaponized drones.”.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2411

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on Inhofe amendment No. 2411.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—90

| | | |
|------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander | Gardner | Portman |
| Baldwin | Gillibrand | Reed |
| Barrasso | Graham | Risch |
| Bennet | Grassley | Roberts |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Romney |
| Blunt | Heinrich | Rosen |
| Boozman | Hirono | Rounds |
| Braun | Hoeven | Rubio |
| Brown | Hyde-Smith | Sasse |
| Burr | Inhofe | Schatz |
| Cantwell | Johnson | Schumer |
| Capito | Jones | Scott (FL) |
| Cardin | Kaine | Scott (SC) |
| Carper | King | Shaheen |
| Casey | Klobuchar | Shelby |
| Cassidy | Lankford | Sinema |
| Collins | Leahy | Smith |
| Coons | Lee | Stabenow |
| Cornyn | Manchin | Sullivan |
| Cotton | McConnell | Tester |
| Cramer | McSally | Thune |
| Crapo | Menendez | Tillis |
| Cruz | Merkley | Toomey |
| Daines | Moran | Udall |
| Duckworth | Murkowski | Van Hollen |
| Durbin | Murphy | Warner |
| Enzi | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Ernst | Paul | Wicker |
| Feinstein | Perdue | Wyden |
| Fischer | Peters | Young |

NAYS—10

| | | |
|-----------|----------|---------|
| Blackburn | Hawley | Sanders |
| Booker | Kennedy | Warren |
| Cotton | Loeffler | |
| Harris | Markey | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 10.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:59 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and reassembled

when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to discuss our Federal finances and the need to address our unsustainable fiscal debt and deficit.

The Federal budget has already been on an unsustainable path before COVID-19 reached our shores and before the pandemic and our government's response to it, which has accelerated what I believe is a coming day of reckoning.

I recognize the unprecedented crisis presented by COVID-19. I support the necessary response. Together, Congress has passed and the President has signed five separate pieces of legislation responding to the pandemic and its economic fallout that together will cost more than \$2 trillion.

I never would have supported trillions in new spending unless I truly believed that it was necessary to combat the virus and prevent economic catastrophe resulting from the government shuttering the economy. I know many of my colleagues feel that same way.

When this crisis abates—and it will—the Federal Government cannot afford to return to the status quo of unsustainable budgets and surging debt that jeopardizes the prosperity of future generations. We have to start serious conversation about how we are going to pay our bills and put our finances on a more sustainable path. We can justify aggressive borrowing and spending as necessary during times of crisis, but that can't be the default.

So far this fiscal year, we have already run up a deficit of \$2.7 trillion in 1 year, more than triple the size of the deficit we ran at the same time last year. The Congressional Budget Office says that we are on track to spend \$3.7 trillion more than we take in this year, and that is assuming we don't pass new COVID legislation. By the end of the fiscal year, our publicly held debt will exceed the size of our economy and, by the end of next year, debt as a percentage of the economy will be higher than it has ever been in our history. I have a little chart here that demonstrates that.

We have been fortunate the interest rates on our debt are currently low, and the government has been able to borrow the funds necessary to address the crisis caused by the pandemic. The dollar has remained relatively strong, helping to keep inflation low. The U.S. dollar remains the world's reserve currency and the safe haven for investments in the current time of crisis.

But how long will that be the case if we continue to run trillion-dollar deficits each year? Future Congresses will not have the same flexibility to deal