

printed on. You don't have to take my word for it. Go ask Republican Senators from South Carolina and Nebraska who aren't too thrilled with it either.

Of course, the biggest problem with these Executive orders is not what they do but what they don't and can't do. The orders don't address testing, tracing, and treatment of COVID-19—desperately needed to curb the health crisis which, in turn, is hurting the economy so badly.

The orders leave out money to safely reopen our schools and provide the PPE and other help to keep the kids, teachers, and staff safe. The orders will not give food assistance to hungry kids and families.

The orders will not aid State and local governments, firefighters, sanitation workers, bus drivers, healthcare workers. All the people who keep our communities running could lose their jobs.

The orders leave out funds to ensure elections can be carried out safely amid COVID-19, and the orders do nothing to keep our post offices open and make sure our elections are conducted in a safe and sound manner during this COVID crisis.

The fact is, we are facing an unprecedented crisis. The government is going to have to commit resources to fight this disease and the economic devastation it has wrought. Executive orders cannot do that and, therefore, will always be insufficient, especially those crafted in such a poor way as these.

The only way to crush the virus and truly protect American working families is to pass a comprehensive bill in Congress that is equal to the challenges facing our country. Democrats remain ready to return to the table. We need our Republicans to join us there and meet us halfway and work together to deliver immediate relief to the American people. We are ready as soon as our Republican colleagues have come off this view that it is their way or no way and meet us in the middle.

Now, before I yield the floor, I want to take a step back and talk about the core problem in our negotiations over the past few weeks. President Trump and the Republican Party—certainly in the Senate—are not alive to the suffering of the American people. The response from the White House to the greatest domestic challenge of the 21st century can be summed up in five words issued by President Trump in an interview last week: "It is what it is."

President Trump was challenged to defend his claim that COVID-19 is under control. "How?" he was asked. "A thousand Americans are dying a day." President Trump's response: "It is what it is."

"It is what it is." That is how the President of the United States of America responds to the harrowing fact that more than 1,000 Americans are dying every single day from a virus his administration has failed to contain—not a morsel of empathy, not an

ounce of sorrow, not a shred of remorse for the many mistakes his administration has made. The President says: "It is what it is."

What a shocking admission of Presidential failure. We live in the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on Earth. Yet countries around the world manage to test their citizens, isolate cases, stop the spread of the disease—countries with bigger populations than ours and countries with a mere fraction of our resources and know-how. President Trump's response to this crisis is a national and an international embarrassment. The President says: "It is what it is."

President Trump is not the only one who dismisses the gravity of COVID-19. The lack of empathy and understanding starts at the top, but it goes all the way down. The President's Chief of Staff said COVID-19 isn't such a big deal for schoolchildren compared to the flu. Leader MCCONNELL put the Senate on ice for 4 months in the middle of a global pandemic because his party "didn't feel the urgency of acting"—his words. Now, by the leader's own admission, more than a third of the Senate Republican caucus doesn't want to vote for anything—anything—to help the American people.

The economy is failing. Small businesses are closing. State and local governments are cutting essential services. Americans can't pay the rent and will be thrown out of their homes. Families can't afford to feed their children. Essential workers don't have PPE. We are sending our kids back to school without a plan. The number of Americans we are testing is going down. The disease is ravaging our nursing homes. Americans are dying—so many in so short a time that funeral homes and morgues are storing the dead in refrigerated 18-wheelers.

Yet the President says: "It is what it is." The President, his aides, his party, and Congress are not even awake to what is happening in this country. That is the reason Senate Republicans delayed for 4 long months, and that is the reason we have been unable to find agreement with the White House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank you. I want to thank the minority leader—the Democratic leader, Mr. SCHUMER—for his remarks.

There are not many of us around here in the Senate today. It is pretty quiet. If you walk through the halls, there is virtually nobody around. That is what it was like last Thursday afternoon. That is what it was like here in the Senate on Friday and again on Saturday and again on Sunday. Here we are again on Monday, and this Senate is virtually a ghost town—a few people here, but for the most part, everybody was sent home by the majority leader, by Senator MCCONNELL.

He told Senators: Go home until further notice. Go home. We are going to put the Senate on standby. No need to be here doing the people's business.

Well, the coronavirus is not on standby. The coronavirus is very much alive and well and spreading throughout the country—more severely in some parts than others but spreading throughout the country—and with it has come the spread of economic pain and economic harm. So COVID-19 is not on standby, and neither is the economic pain and fallout that it has caused.

But here in the U.S. Senate, the Republican leader, the majority leader, has said: Go home and be on standby. That is not leadership at any time. It is certainly not the kind of leadership that the American people need and should expect during a global pandemic and recession-era unemployment levels.

So why did the majority leader tell people to just go home and be on standby? It is because he wanted the Trump administration to negotiate an agreement. Last I checked, the U.S. Senate was a separate branch of government with its own responsibilities. Yet we have the Republican leader, who runs the U.S. Senate from the floor, telling people to go home and be on standby because he wants the President of the United States, the Trump administration, to negotiate an agreement and then come back to us. In other words, the Republican leader wants to contract out his responsibilities and the responsibilities of the U.S. Senate to the executive branch.

If you look at the U.S. Constitution, there are three separate branches of government. Yet the Republican leader has decided to give his proxy to the President of the United States, to the executive branch, rather than stay here in the U.S. Senate and do our work.

Now, why is that? Why is it that the majority leader has decided to contract out his responsibilities and those of the Senate to the executive branch of government? Well, we don't have to guess because Mr. MCCONNELL has told us. He told PBS NewsHour: "About 20 of my Members think that we have already done enough." Let me read that again. This is from the Republican leader: "About 20 of my Members think that we have already done enough."

He is obviously referring to Republican Members of the Senate caucus. These are Members of the Senate Republican caucus. They think all is well; we have done enough; we don't need to do any more to expand access to testing, don't need to expand access to personal protective equipment, don't need to do anything to help our schools. We have done enough. We don't need to do anything more on unemployment insurance, where the additional \$600 a week has expired.

Senator MCCONNELL said that 20 of his Members thought they have already done enough. The eviction moratorium is coming to an end, both nationally and in many States, but 20

Members of the Senate Republican caucus, their leader says they have done enough.

Here is what Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM said on FOX: “I think, if MITCH can get one-half of the conference, that would be quite an accomplishment”—referring to the Republican conference. So Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina is saying that if MITCH MCCONNELL—if Mr. MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, can get half the Members of the Republican Senate caucus to do anything, that would be quite an accomplishment.

I want all of us to think about what that means. What it means is that many of our colleagues are happy to have packed up and gone home and that we are not doing anything because they don't think we need to be doing anything. That is really why we are not here.

That is also why you saw the Trump administration emissaries, Secretary Mnuchin and Chief of Staff Mark Meadows, walk away from the negotiating table. They understood that, if they reached what was truly a compromise, a principal compromise, Senator GRAHAM said that half the Republican caucus would oppose it because they would oppose anything.

So that is why you had the Trump administration walk away from the negotiating table and refuse to come to a sensible agreement. What did we get instead? Because they walked away from an agreement, we had the President of the United States throw together a press conference at his golf club in New Jersey. He put the American flags up at his golf club, put out a podium with the Presidential seal, invited club members to witness the signing of an Executive order and some memos.

Here is the really sad truth about the matter: It was mostly show rather than real substance. It was something that we would come to expect from somebody who is really good at reality TV but somebody who did not understand the painful realities being experienced by Americans throughout this country during this health pandemic and the economic pandemic. I say that because, if you begin to look at what the President actually signed, it is both inadequate and also unworkable in almost all its parts.

Let's put aside for now the question of whether or not the President had the legal authority to do what he did because, clearly, in some parts of his Executive order and his memos, he does not have the constitutional authority to do that. We have heard that from some of the Senate Republican Members already. But let's set that aside and just see whether it will actually deliver meaningful relief to Americans or whether it is more like the degree that was given to folks who attended so-called Trump University, which turned out to be a fraud and is now shuttered. Let's take a look at what the President did.

First, with respect to extending the \$600 a week of unemployment insurance benefits—and let's remember the starting point for this is that neither the President of the United States, Donald Trump, nor the Republican Senate want to extend the \$600-a-week unemployment compensation. They say it is too much for Americans who are out of work, through no fault of their own, because of this pandemic and even though there are poor people looking for work right now in America for every job that is available. I hear from constituents every day—I read some of their stories last Thursday on the floor of the Senate—people who badly want to get back to work, but their former job is gone, and there is no new job to replace it, and they need that additional \$600 a week to make ends meet.

In fact, I want to read to the Senate some additional letters I received from constituents on this point: Please act to extend the \$600-a-week unemployment enhancement. I am requesting it both in my name and on behalf of my wife. We both lost our jobs. And the additional \$600 is significantly helping keep us afloat and purchase the needs of life. My job was supposed to restart in late June, but the owner has pushed it back to November, December, to be determined. My wife was put on furlough and told the company hoped to bring everybody back but has heard nothing yet. Without the additional \$600, a time will come in the next few months when we will be unable to pay our bills.

Here is a note I received from another constituent: Respectfully, Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, I would like to write to you about the \$600 unemployment. I understand that the other party is fighting you all the way. This is painful because I am a diabetic, and, at this point, because that benefit was taken away, I have to choose between paying my bills or my insulin. I applied sometime in June, since I was thinking I would be back to work. Gone are my savings to pay rent, car loan, insurance, and other bills. From this week on, because of losing the \$600, I will have to stop paying bills so I can pay for my insulin. I never thought that I would be in a situation like this in America, where if you work hard, pay your taxes—to be able to have a roof over your head, health insurance, and human dignity.

I, like I am sure many of my colleagues, have received hundreds—hundreds of notes like that from our constituents, people who will not be able to make ends meet without the additional \$600 a week, but the President doesn't want to continue that, nor do Senate Republicans.

And so what did the President say up in New Jersey? He came up with this plan that, unfortunately, will not deliver. Essentially, what he said was: Take the funds that were provided in the CARES Act to the States—the U.S. Congress provided about \$150 billion to

States to help during the early stages of this pandemic, both to help purchase things like PPE and also to address the economic fallout.

I should remind my colleagues that Senator MCCONNELL was dead against that, even in the earlier version. If you go back and look at the debate in the RECORD, you will find that he was dead set against providing any funds to State and local governments. That was the result of a compromise that he succeeded in pushing in those negotiations. But in these most recent negotiations—these most recent negotiations—both the White House and, again, Senator MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans took the position of no funds for State and local governments.

I remember a few months back when asked, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, said: Let them go bankrupt. Let them go bankrupt. Well, there is a productive solution. He may have walked those comments back a little bit, but he did not walk back his opposition to any funds for State and local governments.

What did the President say in New Jersey the other day? OK, States, take the earlier emergency funds that Congress provided and use those as a 25-percent match to the 300 Federal dollars so we can provide \$400 per week in additional employment insurance.

Here is the problem with that. We provided that \$150 billion emergency assistance to the States because of the emergencies they were facing then and continue to face because they are facing both increased costs with respect to helping frontline healthcare providers and hospitals and providing them with personal protective equipment.

The Federal Government has been pretty much AWOL when it comes to testing. The President said to the States, you-all set up testing regimes. And so they are using some of those funds we provided for that. They are using those funds to try to open schools safely or help provide distance learning when schools can't be open safely.

Many of the States—especially those hardest hit—have already allocated the great majority, if not all, of those funds. And now the President is saying: Oh, well, use those funds that we provided to you earlier for this other purpose.

No. 1, those States and other areas have already allocated most of those funds. I noticed that if you look at the Treasury tables, the data they released, it was for the end of June, and that money was already spent—not today. The money was already allocated.

So, first of all, for many States, that money is already spoken for, but let's say in some cases there is some money left over. What is the President of the United States saying? He is saying he wants to take from one American to give to another one. The President wants to pit these needs against one

another. He wants to rob constituent Peter to pay constituent Paul. Those moneys went to the States. Those moneys went to States to pay for real needs.

OK, Governor; OK, State legislature, you are going to have to fire that emergency responder who will now both be out of a job and unable to provide emergency assistance so that you can give a \$100 match to help somebody who has lost their job a little bit more. That is what the President is saying to those States that do have something leftover. We don't even know how much that is.

If you think about it, that is not how a country should be responding in the middle of a pandemic. Governors, you have to hurt that person to help that one. That is what the plan of the President of the United States says, and that is when it is working the way he wants it. That is if it works as advertised.

From the President's perspective, best case scenario, when this plan is working, he is asking Governors to take from one set of constituents of Americans who are hurting badly, could lose a job—they need the PPE; they need testing; they need to open the schools, but take it from over there, and put it over here. That is what the President is saying.

That is assuming it works at all, whether that money is available and whether there is a way you can actually do all of this through what is a pretty cumbersome administrative process.

I don't know if any of my colleagues saw the Sunday shows in realtime or reruns or read about them, but here is what Larry Kudlow was asked on the CNN "Morning Show" by Dana Bash, simple question: Have you checked with the States? How many of the 50 States and DC and other territories say that they are going to be able to pony up \$100 a week per unemployed citizen?

Larry Kudlow: Good question. Good question. We will probably find that out today or tomorrow as we make our canvas.

If there wasn't another sign that what happened in New Jersey was a total show, this tells it all. They laid out a plan asking States that have run out of money, but if they have some money, to rob Peter to pay Paul, but they didn't even ask the States if it was doable. They didn't even ask the States if it was doable. That is a reflection of this entire plan.

Let's look at what the President said about the second piece—payroll tax deferral. A lot of Americans might have heard that and thought: I am an employee. I am working, and now the portion of my check that is withheld for payroll taxes—like Social Security—I am not going to have to pay that anymore, and that will be money in my pocket.

That is not what it did. What it did was say to these people who are working—by the way, as we all know, de-

ducting payroll taxes from paychecks doesn't help the 30 million who don't have a job. They are not getting a paycheck. They have nothing to deduct something from. People who are working and thought this was going to be extra money that they can pocket forever, that is not the case.

What the President was saying is that we will withhold those payroll taxes from your paychecks through the end of the year, but it is going to come due and owing.

These are people who are working. These are people who have their jobs. Maybe they want to defer that for a little while or not, but at the end of the day, they are going to have to pay it back to Uncle Sam.

Here is the other problem. Employers are the ones who are legally responsible for the delivery of those payroll taxes, not just for the employer but for the employee as well. They are going to have to take the risk that if one of their employees doesn't want their Social Security taxes paid—in other words, they want them withheld—ultimately, they will be paid back. But what we are hearing from lots of employers is they can't guarantee that. First of all, what if that employee leaves? How am I going to repay that portion of the payroll taxes?

Here is another example of something that may have sounded good to some people when they heard it, but it really is a shell game in the first instance and, in many ways, a sham.

By the way, whether it is a deferral or if it is ultimately forgiven—that would require an act of Congress—then, the Social Security system takes a hit. Then the Social Security system takes a hit unless you refund it, but that is not in the President's plan. The President's memo doesn't talk about refunding it if, in fact, it were ever forgiven, which he can't do either.

Let's look at the eviction moratorium. That is a real mirage. I urge my colleagues just to read the Executive order. The Executive order tells Health and Human Services and the Centers for Disease Control to "consider" whether an extended eviction moratorium is reasonably necessary to protect the public health. He is asking two Federal agencies to consider a question he posed to them.

I imagine a lot of people who may have watched the President with the American flags up in his country club thought: Wow, the President just said that no one can get evicted.

That is not what he said at all. It was a sham. He said HHS and CDC should "consider" whether an extended eviction moratorium is reasonably necessary to protect the public health. Then he asked HUD and Treasury to look around in their bank accounts to see if they have money to help people who might be evicted.

Do you know the way to help people who may be evicted? First of all, don't let them be evicted in the first place, and help them and the landlords by

passing the rental assistance provision that is in the Heroes Act that passed the House.

Whether you look at the unemployment insurance provision or the payroll tax provision or the so-called eviction moratorium provision, this really is show and not substance. I am only talking about what the President put into the plan, not everything that got left out—everything that got left out that is in the Heroes Act: helping people go back to schools safely; helping to expand realtime testing so that we can open our economy and schools safely; food assistance for those who are struggling; rental assistance; money for State and local government, whose needs have only risen dramatically since the last down payment that Congress passed in the CARES Act.

Now the President is saying that we want you to go poach that fund and hurt people by taking things away from them in order to help other Americans. Those are some of the things that were totally left out of here.

I have often heard, when talking about State and local governments, that the President tweets all the time that this is just a question of blue States wanting to be bailed out for bad economic decisions or bad budget problems they had and that red States are just doing great. Anybody who looks at the State financial affairs knows that is not true. Take a look at my State of Maryland. Most people would consider us a blue State. We have the AAA bond rating. The last I checked, the State of Kentucky was a single A bond rating. This isn't a question of whether we want to help States that somehow had difficult financial situations before the coronavirus hit. The reality is that right now this is not a red State or blue State issue. This is an American issue. We all know that the virus has spread throughout the country. Nobody can totally escape it. It doesn't matter whether you are a red State or a blue State. This is a red, white, and blue moment, and we need to treat it as a national effort, not a State by State effort but one also where the Federal Government plays a very important role and is not AWOL in the middle of a pandemic, and not playing politics in the middle of a pandemic. Listen to the healthcare experts about whether or not to wear a mask instead of making that a political statement that puts people at greater risk who follow the President's political advice rather than the healthcare advice of the healthcare experts.

I hope we will get back to the negotiating table. But to do that, the President has to be serious about reaching a conclusion, and he is going to need help from the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and from that more than half of the Senate Republican conference that both Senator MCCONNELL and Senator GRAHAM say do not want to do anything at all. Let me clarify that. The Republican leader said 20 Members don't want to do anything at

all, and it was Senator GRAHAM who said about half. If that is the case, our country is in even bigger trouble than we might have thought because there is a failure to recognize the immediacy of the need and the depth of the problem that we face. Let's get back to the negotiating table.

I remember some of the President's top priorities when he first presented his plan. He wanted that tax break for three-martini lunches for business executives—no food assistance for needy families but yes to tax breaks for three-martini lunches. That is what the President said. I think we were all surprised to see he wanted \$1.6 billion or \$1.7 billion to build a new FBI headquarters at its current site, rather than follow through with the original plan, which was to move that headquarters to a suburban campus for security needs and to consolidate. But I guess if you rebuild it at its current site, there really is no risk that someone will buy that land and end up building a hotel that competes with the nearby Trump hotel. That was part of the President's set of priorities in the middle of an emergency. American people need to understand that.

Let's get back to the negotiating table. What the President did was show and not substance. We need to work together in order to do something meaningful. Don't walk away. Come on back and let's work.

And, finally, when I say come on back—again, I will end where I started. It is awfully quiet around here. We are in the middle of a pandemic. The virus hasn't taken a vacation. The virus hasn't taken any time off. The economic harm isn't taking a vacation or any time off. Yet here we are in the Senate, all quiet. Talks break down with the administration. We are a separate branch of government under the Constitution of the United States. Let's get back here and do our job for the American people.

I yield the floor.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 20-31 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Argentina for defense article and services estimated to cost \$100 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-31

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Argentina.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$69 million.
Other \$31 million.
Total \$100 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Twenty-seven (27) M1126 Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles.

Twenty-seven (27) M2 Flex .50 Cal Machine Guns.

Non-MDE: Also included are AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancers; AN/VIC-3 Vehicle Intercom Systems; AN/VRC-91E Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINGARS); Basic Issue Items (BII); Components of End Items (COEI); Additional Authorized List (AAL); Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE); M6 Smoke Grenade launchers and associated spares; Outside Continental United States (OCONUS) De-processing Service; OCONUS Contractor-provided training; Field Service Representatives (FSR); technical manuals; spare parts; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (AR-B-UYU).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 6, 2020.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Argentina—Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles

The Government of Argentina has requested to buy twenty-seven (27) M1126 Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles and twenty-seven (27) M2 Flex .50 Cal Machine Guns. Also included are AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancers; AN/VIC-3 Vehicle Intercom Systems; AN/VRC-91E Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINGARS); Basic Issue Items (BII); Components of End Items (COEI); Additional Authorized List (AAL); Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE); M6 Smoke Grenade launchers and

associated spares; Outside Continental United States (OCONUS) De-processing Service; OCONUS Contractor-provided training; Field Service Representatives (FSR); technical manuals; spare parts; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$100 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a Major Non-NATO Ally that is a strategic partner in South America.

The proposed sale will improve Argentina's capability to meet current and future threats by increasing operational capabilities and force availability. Argentina will use the Stryker vehicles to conduct stability operations in support of disaster relief and international peace keeping obligations. Argentina will have no difficulty absorbing these vehicles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be General Dynamics Land Systems, Anniston, AL. There are no known offset agreements in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the temporary assignment of two (2) U.S. contractor representatives to Argentina to support the program.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20-31

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The M1126 Stryker is an infantry carrier vehicle transporting nine soldiers, their mission equipment, and a crew of two, consisting of a driver and vehicle commander. It is equipped with armor protection, M2 machine guns, and M6 smoke grenade launchers for self-protection. The Stryker is an eight-wheeled vehicle powered by a 350hp diesel engine. It incorporates a central tire inflation system, run-flat tires, and a vehicle height management system. The Stryker is capable of supporting a communications suite, a Global Positioning System (GPS), and a high frequency and near-term digital radio systems. The Stryker is deployable by C-130 aircraft and combat capable upon arrival. The Stryker is capable of self-deployment by highway and self-recovery. It has a low noise level that reduces crew fatigue and enhances survivability. It moves about the battlefield quickly and is optimized for close, complex, or urban terrain. The Stryker program leverages non-developmental items with common subsystems and components to quickly acquire and filed these systems.

2. The AN/VAS-5 Driver's Vision Enhancer is a compact thermal camera providing armored vehicle drivers with day or night time visual awareness in clear or reduced vision (fog, smoke, dust) situations. The system provides the driver a 180 degree viewing angle using a high resolution infrared sensor and image stabilization to reduce the effect of shock and vibration. The viewer and monitor are ruggedized for operation in tactical environments.

3. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system