

There is a pattern to these tragedies, and we need to pass the EAGLES Act to make sure more people are aware of how to identify these young men and get them the help they need before we have another tragedy.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Madam President, on another matter, I had the privilege of spending time meeting with Iowa law enforcement during a recent break when the Congress was not in session. I met with them to hear directly what they are facing on the ground. I asked what support they needed from Congress and what challenges these people are facing.

Law enforcement faces too many problems, and we need to understand more how that affects their work and their morale. Do you know what I heard from these people? That recruiting new officers and retaining their current officers is a harder job for the chiefs to do than ever. In part, this is because young people are being told by leaders, even Members of Congress, that being in law enforcement is not an honorable profession. They are hearing that it isn't a career worth pursuing.

These Iowa officers asked me to speak with my fellow legislators to stop that kind of nonsense talk, and they happen to be right when they give us that advice, that we ought to honor the policemen today and law enforcement generally. There is no greater love than for a man to lay down his life for his community, and that sacrifice of personal safety for the well-being of others is what law enforcement embodies every day.

Recruiting and retaining good officers is also hard because of the increase in ambush attacks on law enforcement. Not only are citizens much less cooperative when dealing with law enforcement, but some are actually intentionally targeting and murdering our law enforcement personnel. Twenty twenty-one was the most dangerous year to be a law enforcement officer in the last two decades. Many officers in Iowa aren't volunteering for overtime anymore because it is too dangerous.

An ambush attack like this happened a few weeks ago in Los Angeles. Two officers responded to reports of a stabbing. When they knocked on the door, they were shot and killed by a gang member who was out on probation. He should have been already in jail, but he caught a huge break from progressive prosecutors in that city.

That wasn't the first time an officer was killed by a gang member in Los Angeles this year. This type of tragedy is getting replayed over and over again throughout the country, but we simply don't have good data on gang violence and on assaults on law enforcement, so we don't know the exact number of gang killings of policemen.

We need more data, which is why I am working on two pieces of legislation to improve data collection on both gang violence and assaults on law enforcement. The Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee will have a hearing on attacks on police to discuss these issues. I look forward to having it during that period. I hope my colleagues will stay on target and focus on the violence these brave men and women face and not use this as a forum to chastise police. We cannot wait any longer to talk about this issue and the effects it is having on our communities.

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN WILLIAMS AND DEPUTY SHERIFF AUSTIN "MELVIN" RICHARDSON

Madam President, while I am addressing this issue, I have some related and tragic news. Once again we in Iowa have a heavy heart as I recognize two Iowa officers who recently died in the line of duty.

Sergeant John Williams of the Coralville Police Department died from a medical issue while he was on patrol July 3. He was described by those who knew him as "an extraordinary officer, a friend, and a neighbor" and also a "fantastic family man and a true public servant." He was a fixture in the community as a 28-year veteran of the force, the longest serving sergeant with the Coralville Police Department—a department which said that Sergeant Williams' "knowledge, experience, and leadership will be near-impossible to replace."

Deputy Sheriff Austin "Melvin" Richardson perished on June 14 in a traffic collision. Deputy Richardson was a dedicated public servant in law enforcement for 15 years. He was an officer for Sidney, IA, and then joined the Fremont County Sheriff's Office in 2015, where he faithfully served since. Deputy Richardson truly fulfilled the meaning of a public servant. He was not only a member of law enforcement but also a volunteer firefighter for Percival and Sidney. He was described as a "staple" in the community, and he will be deeply missed.

Sergeant Williams is survived by his wife Kim; his four children: Brandon, Benjamin, Sarah, and Rebekah; as well as six grandchildren: Noah, Elijah, Elsa Adalyn, Kalliope, and Emma.

Deputy Richardson will be left behind by his wife Jennifer and three daughters, Bryxtol, Cheyenne, and Everly.

I say to all of them: Your sacrifice is honored and appreciated in your community and by your country. We thank you all.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Madam President, on to my last statement, it wasn't too long ago I came to the Senate floor to talk about the dangers of bad blue city policies, ideas like defunding and degrading the police, progressive prosecutors, and bail reform. These policies are dangerous for our citizens, our children, and our communities.

Well, a few weeks later, I am up here again with an update. Americans agreed with those statements I have made. Americans are concerned about the nationwide rise in violent crime, and they don't trust politicians who allow crime to continue. I don't blame

them, and most Americans don't blame them for being upset.

New York Governor Kathy Hochul was forced to change bail laws to allow judges to set bail for more repeat offenders and those accused of gun crimes. About 66 percent of the registered voters in New York overwhelmingly support that change that took place in New York. Why wouldn't they? Keeping dangerous criminals away from the innocent public makes our communities safer, and New Yorkers now know that and probably did always know it.

Across the country, in San Francisco of all places, another referendum on safety happened. Voters there recalled their progressive prosecutor, Chesa Boudin. Boudin refused to charge or prosecute certain violent crimes, like felony domestic violence. After only 2 years on the job, even liberal San Franciscans rejected his soft-on-crime approach, and he was fired. Why wouldn't they? Prosecuting dangerous criminals for the crimes they commit makes the community safer, and San Franciscans now know it.

Nationwide, it looks like Americans have cause for hope when it comes to violent crime. Compared to last year, many cities are a bit safer, but a few cities are getting worse, sadly to say. Why? Because they are still using the bad ideas that Americans are rejecting.

Homicides in Los Angeles are up compared to this time last year. Well, they have a progressive prosecutor, George Gascon.

Homicides in Washington, DC, are up. Well, we have police defunding to thank for that statistic. Now the city is trying to play catch-up to fix its mistake while their citizens are still in danger.

Homicides in Milwaukee are up. Well, they have bad bail reform policies. These policies led a dangerous man who should have been locked up run his car through a parade last year.

I will spend a few minutes focusing on bail reform.

We know that only a few hundred people commit most of the murders in any given cities. These criminals get arrested an average of 12 times. Most Americans know what logic tells us: Keeping people who commit crimes off the streets increases public safety. It seems pretty simple to me. If most crimes are committed by a small group of individuals who commit crimes over and over again and we can keep these repeat offenders away from innocent people, innocent Americans, then we should do just that. The best way to do this is through effective bail policies. The Federal bail system assesses the risk to society posed by the individual who is arrested. States would do well to mirror the Federal system.

Americans are paying the price for bad policies that they don't want. It is time to stop these terrible, progressive blue city ideas to make Americans safe again.

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

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

USICA

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, during the immediate past recess, the bipartisan conference committee negotiations over the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, otherwise known as USICA, have officially come to a screeching halt. It has been more than a year since the Senate actually passed this bill—more than a year.

Eight months later, House Democrats passed their own partisan bill, which looked more like the failed “Build Back Broke” agenda, rather than a serious attempt to protect our national security by countering the Chinese threat.

And earlier this summer, a conference committee was appointed and began negotiating a compromise bill that would finally fund the CHIPS Act and make other critical investments in our national security and competitiveness. Of course, the CHIPS Act was designed to try to bring back on shore American manufacturing of advanced semiconductors, which I will talk more about in a moment.

But with the CHIPS funding on the five-yard line, the majority leader, the Senator from New York, has tossed a grenade into the end zone.

And why would you possibly jeopardize such an important national security priority? Apparently, so Democrats can try to, yet again, pass their unpopular social welfare bill that doesn't even appear to have universal Democratic support. Forget the bipartisan bill to safeguard our national security; forget commonsense safeguards to protect our most critical supply chains; forget new American manufacturing jobs and big investments in States all across the country.

Senator SCHUMER has chosen to revive the “Build Back Broke” bill because we are just months from an election where polls suggest that his party is going to get swept out of control and then instead of majority leader, he will become the minority leader.

So let's take a moment to recall how we happened to get here. More than 2 years ago, Congress began working to bolster domestic semiconductor manufacturing and address a major supply chain vulnerability.

Semiconductors or microcircuits underpin all of the modern technology we depend upon every day: the cell phones in our pockets, the cars in our driveways, the tractors our farmers drive, and missile systems that our troops use abroad.

Chips keep us safe; they keep us connected; and they ensure that we have fresh food, clean water, and a way to

get to work every day. The United States relies on strong supplies of semiconductors, and we lead the way in chip design, but here is the kicker. While we lead the way in chip design, we outsource the actual manufacturing abroad.

That is right. We manufacture none of the world's most advanced chips—zero.

Seventy-five percent of these chips come from East Asia, and a whopping 90 percent of them are made in Taiwan. Given the explicit threat of war by the Chinese Communist Party against Taiwan, that is a grave cause for concern.

Furthermore, having just lived through a pandemic, consider what another pandemic or natural disaster might do to disrupt the supply chain of these critical semiconductors.

And when you consider the fact that global chip demand is expected to increase by 56 percent over the next decade, it is clear that the problem is going to get worse. A major disruption in our global chip supply would halt manufacturing on everything from laptop computers to cars, to anti-tank Javelin missiles being used in Ukraine against Russian aggressors.

This is a matter of both economic and national security, which is why addressing the chip shortage has been a bipartisan priority. In 2020, 96 Senators supported passing the CHIPS for America Act as part of the national defense authorization bill. That was way back in 2020.

And it took less than 6 months from the time it became law until the Senate passed a bill to fund the CHIPS Program. That bill was called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act passed by the Senate with a vote of 68 to 32.

Despite the broad bipartisan support for the CHIPS Program, the House refused to pass the Senate bill not because it was a bad bill, but because it wasn't a partisan grab bag that provided billions for longstanding liberal policies.

Their “Build Back Broke” agenda was 6 feet under, and they saw a must-pass national security bill as a convenient way to resurrect it. Their partisan legislation known as the COMPETES Act, included handouts for labor unions, a key supporter for the Democratic Party. The labor bosses were promised some pretty big benefits that never came to pass, and this was the way that House Democrats saw to respond.

They also tacked on a range of unrelated partisan provisions, like an \$8 billion payment to a U.N. climate slush fund, which has provided more than \$100 million to China. The stated purpose of our efforts in USICA—the United States Innovation and Competition Act—has been to counter threats from China, not to subsidize them with taxpayer dollars, which apparently is what the House has chosen to do.

Well, throughout the conference committee process, Republicans have pushed back against the long list of un-

related and downright harmful provisions.

This bill should be about safeguarding our critical supply chains and strengthening our competitiveness, not doling out partisan political favors.

Negotiations have made progress, but, frankly, we are running out of time, and time is of the essence. Last month, more than 120 tech CEOs sent a letter to congressional leaders urging quick action on this legislation.

And we are seeing signs that a failure to act will lead to these critical investments being made not in the United States but outside of the United States, just the opposite of what we hoped to attain.

A company called GlobalWafers is planning to build a silicon wafer factory in Sherman, TX, that would create up to 1,500 jobs and produce 1.2 million wafers a month. These silicon wafers are an essential component of semiconductors.

But last month, Secretary of Commerce Gina Raimondo said the CEO told her that the plan was contingent on Congress passing the CHIPS Act funding. Unless the funding is approved by the August recess, the company will scrap plans for the facility.

A couple of weeks ago, the CEO of Intel expressed a similar sentiment. He said the company could expand chip production in Europe instead of the United States if Congress fails to pass this funding.

So the stakes are high, as is the need to move quickly, but apparently none of that matters to the majority leader and House Democrats. They have chosen to ignore this rapidly closing window of opportunity and the national security risks associated with the current chip shortage.

They have chosen to ignore the jobs and investments this bill would bring to States all across this country. They have chosen to ignore the symphony of voices from across the spectrum who want to get this done.

And for what? Apparently, another unwanted and unnecessary partisan spending spree—this trillion-dollar proposal known as a reconciliation bill, which is a spinoff of Build Back Better, which I affectionately call “Build Back Broke.”

This proposal would attack oil and gas producers at a time when gas prices remain at record highs, and one of the most urgent needs of everyday, working American families is to bring down the price of gasoline at the pump so they can afford to take their kids to school and go to work.

Yet the partisan reconciliation bill that the majority leader contemplates bringing up would actually make that problem worse, not better.

This partisan reconciliation bill would also increase taxes on American families, as their budgets are already being pummeled by inflation. And it could be that we are already in a recession, technically defined as two quarters of negative GDP.