

their innovative legislation. They are telling us a couple of things. They are saying, one, invest more money in research and development, so this bill not only increases the NSF budget, it increases DOE's budget and increases the Defense Advanced Research Program Agency's funding as well by \$17.5 billion.

So it is saying, yes, basic research is still very important. But it is also saying, for the first time, we need to get more out of the research that we do, and we need to have more translational science, that is, taking the basic research and applied research and actually using the applications of that in a more robust way so that we can translate more of that into actual science and manufacturing.

Why is this so important? Because we know that our competitiveness as a nation is suffering from the fact that people are looking at our own research and development. They are looking at our teachings and our publishing at universities and actually going and implementing this. So we need to do better on tech transfer.

This underlying legislation not only helps us do that by helping to help universities who are our No. 1 research partner with Federal dollars, it allows those universities to help us with more tech transfer in innovative ways, that universities not just do the research, but help commercialize it. It also makes investments and helping them protect the patenting of that critical information, so no longer having that patentable information used in other places around the globe, but actually capitalizing on the jobs here in the United States.

It also makes a huge investment in STEM, the science, technology, engineering, and math jobs that we need for the future. And clearly, you can't make a major investment in research and development if you don't have the workforce to carry it out. And we need a workforce to carry it out. So this underlying legislation helps us not only diversify our workforce by a major investment in STEM, going from an annual budget of about \$1 billion in the year 2020 to about \$4 billion a year by 2026. So we are going to get a more diversified STEM workforce with women and minorities participating.

And we are also trying to distribute more of our engineering and science capacity around the United States. Our colleagues, Senators SCHUMER and YOUNG, were adamant that we also look at innovation infrastructure happening in more regional places in the United States, where they may not currently have the R&D capability of some of our major institutions.

So this legislation promises 20 percent of the research and investment dollars go to those EPSCoR states, Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, an already identified landmark in how we distribute research dollars, that tries to grow the regional research infrastructure in

more places in the United States. Again, I thank my colleagues Senator WICKER for leading the charge on that and helping us make that investment. And it also triples the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, so that we get more out of manufacturing workforce training and resiliency of our supply chain for the future.

As I mentioned before we left, it also includes an authorization for NASA and the Artemis mission and making sure that we are staying competitive. As Senator Nelson said in a House hearing on our mission and challenges, as China has made it clear, they are going to Mars, we are going back to the Moon to ready ourselves to go to Mars, and we think that it, too, deserves the funding and support to make us competitive.

I think the bottom line here is that we know that American innovation drives the economy of the future. In a lot of ways, in passing this legislation today—and just so our colleagues know, we will have a couple of votes here before we get to a final passage—we really are doing our part.

People hopefully will support this legislation enthusiastically, well past the majority of Members, because you believe in the history of the United States research and development that we have achieved innovation goals—whether that was what we did with the internet, whether that was what we have done on biosciences, even on some of our issues as it relates to energy. We have achieved big breakthroughs.

So today's vote is about investing in that innovation economy of the future. I am pretty confident because I have met some of these innovators across the United States. I don't know if everything that we have done so far will be absorbed by universities, our researchers, and our labs, but literally, we are trying to dust off R&D skills and make them more competitive for today.

I guarantee you, though, these dollars that reach American entrepreneurs, who reach American innovators, they are ready and willing to take up this challenge. Give them those collaborative research resources through innovation at universities, through tech hubs, through more collaboration on workforce training, through investments in semiconductors, and I guarantee you these entrepreneurs in America will innovate our economy and create the economies of the future.

And what is at stake? If my colleagues have a better idea, I am willing to hear it. But I know this: Americans want us to lead on their regional economies, on the U.S. economies, and on global economies. They do not want to get left behind. They look at this time and era as a challenge to the leadership we have provided in the past.

So settling for Federal investment being near their lowest point as a percentage of GDP in 60 years won't cut it. What cuts it is making an investment

in R&D and empowering those entrepreneurs so they will create those future economies.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON RODRIGUEZ NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rodriguez nomination?

Ms. HASSAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Capito	Kelly	Schumer
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Toomey
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Fischer	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wicker
Graham	Peters	Wyden
Grassley	Portman	Young

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blunt	Inhofe	Sasse
Boozman	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Braun	Lankford	Shelby
Cassidy	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	
Daines	Moran	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider S. 1260, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1260) to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 1502, in the nature of a substitute.

Cornyn-Cotton amendment No. 1858 (to amendment No. 1502), to modify the semiconductor incentives program of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 3 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 1858 offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1858

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, during the committee markup on this bill in the Commerce Committee, there was an amendment offered that was accepted that added Davis-Bacon prevailing wage protection to the underlying bill, which is now in the bill before us.

This is purely a gratuitous addition to this bill because the fact is, in constructing these major semiconductor fabs, they pay far greater than the prevailing wage. But perhaps the most dangerous part of this is the fact that this now is being applied to private construction.

Davis-Bacon historically and statutorily has been applied only to public workers. But this is an unnecessary expansion and, frankly, jeopardizes some of the support we are getting for the underlying bill, which we cannot afford to lose any of that support in our competition against China, particularly when it comes to manufacturing semiconductors here onshore and shoring up the vulnerable supply chain.

I would ask colleagues to vote for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, construction is hard, dangerous work, and too often, when it comes to wages for workers, we see a race to the bottom, where workers and communities lose.

Prevailing wage requirements, such as we have in this bill, help make sure that construction jobs created by the Federal Government come with a fair wage that supports our local community.

Prevailing wage requirements have long had bipartisan support, including in this bill. This amendment would strip those protections for construction workers at the same time we need to help rebuild our country's infrastructure.

The workers and the communities that build our bridges and our highways and other critical infrastructure deserve the protections and benefits prevailing wage provides.

I urge my colleagues to oppose amendment No. 1858.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1858

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Collins	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—58

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rubio
Blunt	Kelly	Sanders
Booker	Kennedy	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Capito	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Portman	

The amendment (No. 1858) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Florida.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, there is clearly an urgent need for the United States to address the growing threat posed by Communist China. In so doing, we can't forget the commitment we all made to American taxpayers to be responsible stewards of their tax dollars.

America is in a nearly \$30 trillion debt crisis. We can't afford to spend more than \$250 billion on a bill that doesn't pay for itself. Worse, it would add to our national yearly deficit in dramatic fashion, which is what triggers the point of order I am raising today.

In 2018, we agreed not to pass spending bills without a way to pay for them, but there is no plan to pay for this. We are completely ignoring our own rules to advance this spending.

Spending beyond our means has consequences. There will be a day of reckoning. The pending measure, Senate amendment No. 1502 to S. 1260, would violate the Senate pay-go rule by increasing the on-budget deficit. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. CANTWELL. Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, and section 4(g)3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, I move to waive all applicable sections of those acts and applicable budget resolutions for the purposes of the pending measure, and 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 are ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. If I could explain to my colleagues about this vote because it goes far beyond the simplicity of just the debate regarding the semiconductor chips and emergency appropriations.

The way this point of order is drafted, basically, it would gut the bill. Basically, it not only guts the provisions related to the chips emergency appropriations, but it strikes the Foreign Relations Committee's work, it strikes the Homeland Security Committee's work, it strikes the Banking Committee's work, it effectively strikes the HELP Committee's work and the Judiciary's, and most importantly, the Finance Committee's work, which it was the entire Finance Committee's insistence that the GSP, the System of Preferences, be included in the bill.

So all of those things that everybody wishes would be in the bill would no longer be in the bill, including the Department of Energy funding, the increase in STEM funding, and many other provisions.

I ask my colleagues to waive the budget point of order. Vote yes, and let us move this legislation forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blackburn	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Risch
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Brown	Inhofe	Rosen
Burr	Kaine	Rounds
Cantwell	Kelly	Rubio
Capito	King	Sasse
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Lujan	Shaheen
Collins	Manchin	Sinema
Coons	Markey	Smith
Cornyn	Menendez	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Sullivan
Crapo	Moran	Tester
Duckworth	Murkowski	Thune
Durbin	Murphy	Tillis
Feinstein	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warner

Warnock	Whitehouse	Wyden
Warren	Wicker	Young
NAYS—28		
Barrasso	Grassley	McConnell
Boozman	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Sanders
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Ernst	Lummis	
Fischer	Marshall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 28.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to, and the point of order falls.

The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NOS. 1583, 1637, 1701, 1758, 1777, 1851, 1943, 1958, 1964, 1988, 2000, 2017, 2025, 2048, 2082, 1768, 1823, 1980, 1981, 2001, 2104, 1622, 1801, 2093, 2049, 2085, 2083, 1945, 2026, 1933, 1841, 2103, 2105, 2113, 2094, 2106, 2090, 2101, 2112, 1905, 2081, AND 1782 AS MODIFIED

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we have been working for almost a month to review and vet hundreds of amendments filed by my colleagues on both sides. You maybe followed the floor debate here, where we agreed to numerous amendments and had discussions on many more—I think 20, to be exact.

We had been working on a managers' package that was previously objected to before we left for the recess. Since then, we have been working diligently with our colleague Senator WICKER, on the Commerce Committee, to put forth a bipartisan package of amendments to improve the legislation. Many of these provisions have been great bipartisan efforts: Senators ERNST and HASSAN's bipartisan amendment to improve transparency of the National Science Foundation grant funding; Senator COLLINS' amendment to require an update on implementation of the Energy Implementation Act; Senator BLACKBURN had a technical fix on studying the possible threats to our communications network and fiber optic transmission; Senator WARNOCK's amendment to clarify the definition of minority-serving institutions on STEM grants; Senator CORTEZ MASTO worked on several bipartisan pieces of legislation to resolve issues on amendments dealing with critical minerals and recycling, something very important to us as a nation.

So, in total, we have 42 amendments—23 led by Republicans, 19 led by Democrats—many of which, as I said, are bipartisan. These amendments would seek to improve the bill and accomplish Member priorities. And this is what happens when you negotiate on the Senate floor in regular order. You vote on amendments; you have some voice vote amendments; and you have a managers' package.

So I hope our colleagues will consider giving our colleagues a chance to have their amendments that have been agreed to accepted into this package.

So I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be agreed to en

bloc: Collins 1583; Fischer 1637; Johnson 1701; Shaheen 1758; Rubio 1777; Thune 1851; Wicker 1943; Hagerty 1958; Cotton 1964; Blunt 1988; Scott 2000; Ernst-Hassan 2017; Romney-Menendez 2025; Johnson 2048; Luján 2082; Rosen 1768; Merkley 1823; Warnock 1980; Murray 1981; Hassan 2001; Warren-Rubio 2104; Collins 1622; Wicker 1801; Leahy-Tillis 2093; Van Hollen-Tillis 2049; Blackburn 2085; Cortez Masto 2083, which includes language from Senator DURBIN; Lankford 1945; Baldwin-Braun 2026; Hyde-Smith 1933; Hyde-Smith 1841; Merkley-Rubio-Romney 2103; Ossoff 2105; Kennedy 2113; Barrasso 2094; Rubio 2106; Kaine 2090; Barrasso-Cardin 2101; Peters 2112; Cantwell 1905; Baldwin 2081; and Cardin-Wicker, as modified, 1782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. This bill adds over \$250 billion to our debt. The additional debt will make us weaker, not stronger. As we speak, the massive Federal spending of the last 2 years is already causing inflation throughout the supply chain and eventually will lead to economic stagnation.

There is nothing conservative about this bill. The bill is nothing more than a Big Government response that will make our country weaker, not stronger. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I do believe our colleagues have worked hard to have their legislation considered. I want them to know I am going to continue to promulgate these ideas about competitiveness.

You know, I had a chance to fly home, and for me it is a long way. It is 5½ hours so you get a lot of reading done. And I read Chris Wallace's new book about 1945 and the number of days that our Nation had to respond to the threat of war, what it took them to go out and develop the Manhattan Project, to get them to go and not only in my State, develop the Hanford site—Los Alamos developed that—and not only that, developed what happened at Oak Ridge and a scientific response to make our Nation more secure. All we are asking for here is a little R&D dollars. So I can tell you that I wish we would find a Leslie Groves of today because those are the people who responded to our Nation when we needed to respond in a competitive fashion.

I am so sorry that our colleagues' amendments are not going to be considered, but if my colleague's underlying premise is that you don't want to respond to the competitive threats to our Nation, you have a right to vote no. But holding up our colleagues' good work, I think, is a mistake.

I will commit to our colleagues that these important things on critical minerals, on transparency, and on moving forward on science, we will continue to work with you.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I think now we have a vote on the substitute amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1502, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1502, as amended.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Kaine	Sasse
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wicker
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Graham	Portman	Young
Grassley	Reed	

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hagerty	Moran
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	

The amendment (No. 1502), in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, China announced that it would now allow families to have three children—a profound shift from their previous one- and two-child policies.

Why the change? China looked to the future and realized that its population policies would hamper economic growth. Now, the U.S. Government will never tell families how many children to have. That choice is profoundly personal. Yet we must ask ourselves the same questions China is asking: What kind of changes will lead or deter the United States from a future of economic growth and prosperity? How can we enhance America's competitiveness? And more than just compete, how can we make sure America comes in first?

The answer is obvious: Invest in American creativity. China is investing heavily in electric vehicles, critical minerals, energy production, computer chips—the list goes on. In all of these areas, China is beginning to pull ahead of the pack. They are aiming for first.

And what underscores all of their efforts? Research. Every breakthrough, every new technology, every scientific step forward opens new markets and drives their economy into the future at high speed.

Unfortunately, it is a different story in America. For decades, in both the public and private sectors, we have downsized our discovery and innovation investments. Since the days of the space race, we have stepped away from the great challenge of discovery. If we were to commit the same percentage of our national budget to research today as we did in the Apollo era, we would invest \$900 billion over 5 years. That kind of an investment puts people on the Moon. That kind of investment puts us in first.

So how do we get there? The U.S. Innovation and Competition Act would set us back on track and at a fraction of the cost of Apollo-era spending. As we debate and hopefully pass this bill, we must keep asking: What are we willing to do to be No. 1?

One important way we can compete with countries like China is by increasing support for domestic manufacturing and strengthening our domestic supply chains. The legislation before us does exactly that. It provides \$52 billion in emergency funding to boost our domestic semiconductor manufacturing capabilities. In 1990, the United States produced 37 percent of the world's semiconductors, but today, just 12 percent of semiconductors are manufactured in the United States. Now, we are facing a global shortage of microchips, which is impacting jobs in my State and many others.

I am proud that Illinois has long been a leader in auto manufacturing, thanks to dedicated workers like those at a Stellantis plant in Belvidere, IL, who assemble Jeep Cherokees. Unfortunately, that plant was forced to shut down in March due to the global shortage of semiconductors. And last month, Stellantis announced that as many as 1,640 employees at the plant could be laid off in July—again, because it does not have enough microchips. After briefly resuming operations last week, the plant already has had to shut down again for 2 weeks because of this shortage. Last week, I spoke to representatives from Stellantis who shared that the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act could make a real difference in terms of boosting supply of these chips.

This funding is not just important for the assembly plant in Belvidere. Sadly, we are seeing similar impacts of the semiconductor shortage at Ford's Chicago Assembly Plant, which supports 5,800 jobs. That plant was idled through April, with shutdowns extended into May.

We urgently need to act to address this global microchip shortage to provide certainty to the workers whose livelihoods depend on a stable supply of semiconductors. The legislation before us will not only address our immediate market needs but it will also help prevent these shortages again the future. This investment supports jobs across the entire supply chain, from construction of new facilities, to manufacturing and development of chips, to workers in the auto industry who depend on a reliable supply of semiconductors, to American consumers.

The U.S. Innovation and Competition Act is the result of weeks of negotiation and bipartisan work. I was puzzled by some of my Republican colleagues' arguments for voting against cloture on this bill. If you don't want China's products and values to dominate the global marketplace, why would you cede that marketplace to China—or anyone else, for that matter? If you believe in America's products, values, and most of all, its people, then do the smart thing: Invest in them. Although some of my colleagues seem to believe otherwise, investive isn't going to win this global competition. We need investment to remain No. 1.

No one bill will secure America's economic prosperity or national security or resolve all of the outstanding issues in our relationship with China, but strengthening America's role as a global leader in science and technology is an essential piece of our effort to preserving American leadership in this world. So I put it to my fellow Senators: Let's take a step forward today. Let's invest in the research, the jobs, and the future that all Americans deserve. I plan to vote in favor of the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Let's not settle for second best. Let's put America in the lead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that myself, Senator CANTWELL, Senator WICKER, Senator YOUNG, and Senator SCHUMER be allowed to speak before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I just wanted to take a moment to thank, obviously, my colleagues, Senator SCHUMER and Senator YOUNG, for their hard work on this legislation and thank my counterpart, Senator WICKER, for his tremendous effort in moving this bill.

We have now been on this bill, and we reported it out May 12. I think it came on the calendar May 13, and, literally, we have been working on it since. So this is a very hard effort to produce something very important to today's economy. So I want to thank Senator SCHUMER's staff, Mike Lynch, Meghan Taira, Gerry Petrella; and John Keast, Crystal Tully, Steven Wall, James Mazol, Cheri Pascoe of Senator WICKER's office.

On my team, David Strickland, Melissa Porter, and Mary Guenther. But, specifically, I want to thank Richard Duane Chambers, who came to the Senate from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, I think, maybe like a week before we started working on this bill. So, literally, since he joined the Senate Commerce Committee, he has been just knee-deep in the conversation of dusting off our R&D for the Nation, making a new investment, making more translational science. So I really appreciate Richard Duane's effort.

I also want to thank Gigi Slais, Shawn Bone, John Branscome, Ronce Almond, Alex Simpson, Jared Bomberg, Shannon Smith, John Beezer, Noam Kantor, Tiffany George, Jordan Blue, Kara Fischer, Nikky Teutschel, Matthew Bobbink, Caitlin Warner, Alex Kiles, George Greenwell, Elle Wibisono, Alexis Gutierrez, Eric Vryheid, Brian McDermott, Lucy Koch, Hunter Blackburn, and Alex Hall. So all of these people.

I think my colleagues know that these bills don't come about easily. They come through a lot of hard work. And we thank everybody for participating in a regular order process out here on the Senate floor to produce a bipartisan result for something so important to our Nation's competitiveness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I certainly rise in support of this legislation and urge a "yes" vote. This is an opportunity for the United States to strike a blow on behalf of answering the unfair competition that we are seeing from Communist China, and it is an opportunity to have a game changer in terms of geographic diversity in our research effort.

This morning, the Armed Services Committee heard extensive testimony about the need to compete with China at the military level. This is an opportunity to compete with China at the research level. This bill will strengthen our country's innovation in key technology fields of the future—in areas such as artificial intelligence, robotics, quantum computing, and communications.

And this bill also is a game changer in terms of giving universities all over the United States an opportunity to participate in game-changing research, which will help us compete. Universities, largely in smaller States such as mine, have been left behind in the past. They will finally, under this legislation, have an opportunity to participate in research at a meaningful level—so two good reasons to vote yes.

The distinguished chair of the committee has been gracious in thanking all of our staffs on the majority and the minority side. I appreciate her doing that, as well as Senator CANTWELL's admirable job of managing this bill through the committee.

I congratulate the two authors of this bill, Senator SCHUMER and Senator

YOUNG, who sponsored this legislation. This bill is headed toward passage with a fine bipartisan vote, and I am pleased to support passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I want to begin by thanking my colleagues: Senator SCHUMER, Senator WICKER, and Senator CANTWELL. All showed exceptional leadership over the course of drafting this legislation and ensuring that it made it through the process.

I also want to thank members of my team: Lauren O'Brien, my legislative director; Brandt Anderson, my national security adviser; Dan Cheever; Nancy Martinez, on my ledge staff. They went above and beyond.

So this piece of legislation, yes, it, indeed, is related to countering the threat that the Chinese Communist Party presents to this country. But it also is a piece of legislation that we are considering at a time when so many of our citizens feel overlooked, when the intimate communities that they call home feel hollowed out, when trust in our civic institutions is eroding, and when allegiance seems increasingly to our political tribes and not to one another on behalf of the common good.

So let's not kid ourselves. The Chinese Communist Party aims to exploit all of these divisions. They aim to exploit the insecurities of the global age. They aim to ensure that their power and their capabilities continue to grow. And they are, indeed, locked in a global competition with the United States of America and with our partners and allies.

So let's do what we have always done as Americans in times like this. Let's come together, and let's use this as an opportunity to become a better version of ourselves.

I will end with this. When generation after generation of immigrants have come into the New York Harbor, they have seen that beautiful Statue of Liberty. And at the base of the Statue of Liberty is a sonnet, and everyone here in this Chamber and so many across America are familiar with the words of that sonnet: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses . . ."

There is also a line in there that I particularly love about "imprisoned lightning"—"imprisoned lightning." I am not sure what Emma Lazarus meant by the phrase "imprisoned lightning," but to me that "imprisoned lightning" refers to the untapped potential, the God-given potential of every human being. And this legislation, the Endless Frontier Act, aims to tap into that "imprisoned lightning" of people across the heartland to ensure that they can stay part of the economic game in the 21st century and that they help us outcompete, outinnovate, and outgrow the Chinese Communist Party. We will win. We are going to get a great vote today, and I thank all of my colleagues for their intention to support this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I, too, would like to thank Senators CANTWELL and WICKER for an amazing, bipartisan job; and Senators MENENDEZ and RISCH, another great bipartisan contribution. All the Members—just about every Member has contributed to this bill.

I do want to single out two of my staff members who just slaved over this bill relentlessly, and that is Mike Kuiken and Jon Cardinal. Mike is there. I don't know if Jon is here. But they deserve tremendous kudos for what they did. Without them I don't think we would have had a bill, to be honest with you—and everybody else, all the other staffs who worked so hard.

Now, this is a quote from Dr. Vannevar Bush: "Without scientific progress, no amount of achievement in other directions can insure our health, prosperity, and security in the modern world."

That was Dr. Vannevar Bush, the head of the U.S. Office of Scientific Research, writing in 1945. His report to President Truman was titled: "Science—The Endless Frontier"—an inspiration to the legislation we considered today.

In the wake of Dr. Bush's report, we created the National Science Foundation. We funded the National Laboratories. We split the atom. We spliced the gene. We landed a man on the Moon. We unleashed the internet. We generated 75 years of American prosperity and fostered an innate sense of optimism in the American spirit.

We face a challenge now—in this century—to replicate the success of the previous one. But the Federal Government's commitment to science, unfortunately, has waned. As a percentage of GDP, we spend less than half as much as the Chinese Communist Party on basic research.

We rely on foreign nations to supply critical technologies that we invented, like semiconductors. That sunny American optimism has flickered as well.

The world is more competitive now than at any time since the end of the Second World War. If we do nothing, our days as the dominant superpower may be ending.

We don't mean to let those days end on our watch. We don't mean to see America become a middling nation in this century. We mean for America to lead it. Passing this bill—now called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act—is the moment when the Senate lays the foundation for another century of American leadership.

Let me say that again. This bill could be the turning point for American leadership in the 21st century, and for that reason, this legislation will go down as one of the most significant bipartisan achievements of the U.S. Senate in recent history.

Around the globe, authoritarian governments believe that squabbling democracies like ours can't unite around

national priorities. They believe that democracy itself is a relic of the past and that by beating us to emerging technologies, they—many of the meritocracies—will be able to reshape the world in their own image.

Well, let me tell you something. I believe they are wrong. I believe that this legislation will enable the United States to outinnovate, outproduce, and outcompete the world in the industries of the future. I believe that the strongly bipartisan work on this bill has revealed that in this Chamber, we all believe that another American century lies on the horizon. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. 1260

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

Mr. WICKER. 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 68, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Kaine	Sasse
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wicker
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Graham	Portman	Young
Grassley	Reed	

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hagerty	Moran
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 32. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill is passed.

The bill (S. 1260), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator

SCHUMER be permitted to complete our remarks prior to the next vote.

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

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there are still millions of women across this country today who are doing the same jobs as their male colleagues and are being paid less. It is more clear than ever that we must take steps to close loopholes that allow for pay discrimination and empower women to hold their employers accountable when pay discrimination occurs. Nearly 60 years after passage of the Equal Pay Act and 12 years after passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, women still only earn 82 cents for every dollar paid to men on average. For women of color, the wage gap is even worse. Black women make only 63 cents for every dollar paid to White men, and Latina women make only 55 cents. Mothers make just 75 cents for every dollar paid to fathers.

Throughout the pandemic, too many families have wondered how they will feed their families, keep their homes, and care for their children amid an unprecedented public health and economic crisis. For working mothers, it has been especially challenging. The labor force participation rate among women has dropped to 57.4 percent, the lowest it has been since 1988. A survey last fall found that almost 40 percent of working mothers in Illinois lost their jobs or were working reduced hours. Nearly half of working mothers of color reported the same.

Why has this economic crisis been so economically devastating for so many women? The reasons are clear. Women tend to be overrepresented in the industries that were hit hardest by the pandemic, such as restaurants, retail, and leisure and hospitality. And many women are the primary caretakers for their families. With schools and childcare programs closed, what choice did mothers have other than to step back from work?

The economic hardship women have faced during the pandemic has only been made worse by the wage gap. From wage discrimination to the unavailability of childcare, women are not getting a fair deal. That means working families are not getting a fair deal, and it must change.

This week, we have the opportunity to pass legislation that would close the loopholes that allow paycheck discrimination to continue. The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which prohibits gender-based pay discrimination, was the first bill signed into law by President Obama back in 2009. Unfortunately, it is hard to enforce because employers still maintain policies that punish employees who voluntarily share salary information with their coworkers. Women can't demand equal pay if they don't know they are being underpaid.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would ensure workers cannot be retaliated against if they disclose their wages. It also would prohibit employers from asking prospective employees about their salary history. And it would require employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons—not just because they believe “women's work” is worth less. I am happy to join Senator MURRAY and my Democratic colleagues in supporting this important legislation.

Women have carried America's families through this pandemic, but it may take years for women to recover from the economic and career setbacks they have suffered. By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we can take an important step toward helping women and their families fully recover from this pandemic and economic crisis.

I am disappointed that Republican opposition has previously prevented the Senate from passing this bill. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can agree it is time to pass this commonsense measure that will help put more money in the pockets of women and their families across the country.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, you know, it has been more than half a century since the Equal Pay Act became law, and 12 years since President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, but women in the United States still, on average, earn only 82 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts, and the wage gap is far greater for women of color because, even though the Equal Pay Act and the Lilly Ledbetter Act were critical steps forward, there is clearly a lot more we have got to do.

Right now, an employer can brush aside reports of pay discrimination by saying things like, “Well, he was a better negotiator” or “They work in different buildings.” I mean, what does that have to do with it?

And too often, a woman's history of being paid less means she gets paid less in the future because her past salary can be used to determine her future salary, regardless of what her counterparts are making or her new responsibilities, and that has real consequences for women and their families.

Today, 4 out of 10 mothers with children under the age of 18 are their family's primary or sole breadwinners. As families rely more on women's wages to make ends meet, the gender pay gap has an even greater impact on children.

For example, over the course of just 1 year, the wage gap for Latino women averages almost \$30,000 less compared to what a White man earns. We are talking about women losing out on hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of their working lives, and that is money that could go to pay the bills, put food on the table, buy a house, start a business, save for retirement, get an education, and so much more.

Instead, women struggle with life-long financial effects, including higher poverty rates as compared to men. Women are being shortchanged, plain and simple.

And this pandemic, by the way, has made things worse. Millions of women now, as we know, have left the labor force, and many have fallen behind just as caregiving responsibilities have disproportionately fallen on them.

According to one study, a woman who was earning about \$47,000 a year before the pandemic, could lose nearly a quarter of a million dollars over her lifetime, assuming she is able to return to work this year.

The pandemic has set women—and in particular, women of color—back even further and made clear just how urgent it is for us to act because, you know what, if women don't recover from this crisis, our economy will not either, which is why we desperately need to close the wage gap.

We have got a responsibility to finally make sure women are paid fairly for their work so women can build financial security for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and so our economy—so much of which is driven by women, by the way—can fully recover from this crisis.

We have been fighting for the Paycheck Fairness Act for quite some time, but for those who need a reminder, here is what it would do simply, very straightforward: It will close the loopholes that allow pay discrimination to continue and protect workers from retaliation for discussing their pay; it will limit the use of prior wage history in the hiring process so pay discrimination cannot follow workers from job to job; and it will increase transparency and accountability so workers know whether they are being treated fairly and so they have the evidence to hold their employers accountable if they are not.

These are commonsense steps, and that is why this bill already passed the House with bipartisan support, and it is up to the Senate now to get this done because the reality is each and every Senator represents a State where half of the population earns less than they deserve, and that is ridiculous.

It is past time we end this injustice. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to finally put money women have earned fair and square in their pockets where it belongs and take an essential step toward ensuring our economy can build back stronger and fairer from COVID-19.

There is absolutely nothing controversial about making sure every worker gets paid fairly for their work. Women have been waiting long enough. They need the Paycheck Fairness Act now more than ever. Let's get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from Washington for her incredible leadership not only