

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4065 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4065) to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4065) was passed, as follows:

S. 4065

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Reinforcing American-Made Products Act of 2020”.

#### SEC. 2. EXCLUSIVITY OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE LABELING OF PRODUCTS MADE IN THE UNITED STATES AND INTRODUCED IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “To the extent” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of this section shall supersede any provisions of the law of any State expressly relating to the extent to which a product is introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in interstate or foreign commerce with a ‘Made in the U.S.A.’ or ‘Made in America’ label, or the equivalent thereof, in order to represent that such product was in whole or substantial part of domestic origin.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the application of the law of any State to the use of a label not in compliance with subsection (a).”; and

(3) in the third sentence of subsection (a), as so designated by paragraph (1), by striking “Nothing in this section” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), nothing in this section”.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### DRIFTNET MODERNIZATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 316, S. 906.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 906) to improve the management of driftnet fishing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment as follows: (The part of the bill to be inserted is shown in italic.)

S. 906

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

#### SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

#### SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(1) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-

scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

#### SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

#### SEC. 6. FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KAINE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 906), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 906

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITION.**

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

**SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

**SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.**

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(i) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

**SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.**

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

**SEC. 6. FEES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. Kaine. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

S. 4049

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act that would direct the renaming of military bases and facilities that are currently named for those who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War.

I thank Senator Warren for offering the amendment, and I particularly thank her for making adjustments to the amendment to accommodate concerns of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I was proud to cosponsor the revised amendment in committee and speak in favor of it today.

It is important to state clearly what this amendment will do. If it passes and survives a threatened Presidential veto, it will require the Department of Defense to initiate a 3-year process to change the name of any military base, barracks, or other facility named after a Confederate military leader. Why 3 years? The timing is designed to allow a full public process in each location so that the desires of the community leaders can be taken into account in choosing new names.

I state with clarity the substance of the amendment because one of my colleagues took the floor earlier this

month to oppose the amendment, and he obscured its purpose in describing it, only saying that it required that “some of the names of our Nation’s military bases must be removed.” He neglected to mention that the amendment specifically sought change only to facilities named for Confederates. In fact, he did not mention the Confederacy or the Civil War at all.

If you are unwilling to be plain about what is at stake, it portrays a weakness in your position. So let me be plain. I speak today because I am a Senator from the State with the most at stake in this discussion. Three of the ten bases whose names must be changed under this amendment are in Virginia. Virginia was the State whose people were most affected by the Civil War, and I served as its 70th Governor. My hometown of Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy, and I served as its 76th mayor. I have dealt with issues of Civil War names, statues, memorials, battlefields, and buildings throughout my 26 years in public life. Based on decades of grappling with this question, I want to describe a principle, explain an epiphany, and finally pose a question.

First, a principle: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This principle is nowhere stated in law because it need not be. It is a basic commonsense principle. The principle explains why we have no Fort Cornwallis, Fort Benedict Arnold, Fort Santa Ana, Fort Von Hindenburg, Fort Tojo, Fort Ho Chi Minh.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you, but we make an exception. Ten bases and many other military facilities are named after Confederate leaders who declared war on the United States, took up arms against it, and killed U.S. troops. Even further, they took these actions to destroy the United States, to tear our country in half so that the seceding Southern States could continue to own those of African descent as slaves—a species of property—rather than treating them as equal human beings. Is this worthy of honor? Does it justify an exception to the sound principle that I describe?

Why were these 10 bases so named when they were constructed in the years before and during the First and Second World Wars? The names were not chosen due to the military skill of the Confederate leaders. Some are revered for their prowess, but some are reviled. The names were not chosen to honor the character of the 10 leaders. Some are respected—excepting the blight on character that support for slavery confers—but others were not