



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2021

No. 99

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, breathe upon us the awareness that You continue to dwell with us. Show our lawmakers Your constant love and faithfulness. As they find safety in Your presence, receive their gratitude and praise. Keep them covered until the raging storms are over. Lord, remind them that patient persuasion can break down the strongest resistance. Help them also to remember to see trouble coming and avoid it. Continue to answer their prayers as You fill them with Your peace.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK,

a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julien Xavier Neals, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate, today, will achieve an important milestone for the session. We will confirm the first of President Biden's judicial nominees—the first but, certainly, not the last, not even close. We will soon confirm Julien Neals to be a judge for the District of New Jersey. Afterward, we will turn to the nomination of Regina Rodriguez to be a judge for the District of Colorado. I greatly

look forward to confirming what will be the first of many judicial appointments during the Biden administration.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT

Mr. President, later today, the Senate will take a final vote on the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, paving the way for the largest investment in science and technology for generations.

After 3 months of bipartisan negotiations, after the hard labor of 6 Senate committees, and after considering over 20 amendments from both sides of the floor, we should—and we will—pass this historic bill today. When all is said and done, the bill will go down as one of the most important things this Chamber has done in a very long time—a statement of faith in America's ability to seize the opportunities of the 21st century.

The ambitions of this legislation are large, but the premise is simple: If we want American workers and American companies to keep leading the world, the Federal Government must invest in science, basic research, and innovation, just as we did in the decades after the Second World War.

Technology firms currently make up a quarter—a quarter—of the global stock market. Whoever wins the race to the technologies of the future is going to be the global economic leader, with profound consequences for foreign policy and national security as well. Whoever harnesses the technologies, like AI, quantum computing, and innovations yet unseen, will shape the world in its image.

Do we want that image to be a democratic image, with a small “d,” or do we want it to be an authoritarian image like President Xi would like to impose on the world?

Either we can cede the mantle of global leadership to our adversaries or we can pave the way for another generation of American leadership. That is what this bill is all about, and I look

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3967

forward to joining my colleagues in finally passing this bill later today.

JANUARY 6

Now, Mr. President, on January 6, this morning, the Senate's Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, in partnership with the Rules Committee, released a joint report related to the aspects of the tragedy of January 6.

I particularly salute Chairs PETERS and KLOBUCHAR for the good work they have done with their ranking members.

The report drew a few notable conclusions, especially with respect to the failures in intelligence gathering and communication that took place on and before January 6, but just as glaring as what the report didn't consider is, indeed, what it was not allowed to consider. The report did not investigate, report on, or hardly make any reference to the actual cause, the actual impetus, for the attack on January 6.

With the exception of a brief reference to former President Trump's remarks at the Ellipse, Senate Republicans insisted that the report exclude anything having to do with the cause of the insurrection.

If anything, the joint report by the Homeland Security and Rules Committees has strengthened the argument for an independent commission on January 6.

We had a perfect opportunity to establish such a Commission at the end of last session before Republicans mounted a partisan filibuster against it, despite the fact that the Democrats worked with Republicans for weeks in the House and Senate to construct a Commission that was bipartisan, focused, straight down the middle; despite the fact that Speaker PELOSI acceded to every major request made by House Republicans about the structure of the commission; and despite the fact that, here in the Senate, I supported the changes proposed by my colleague Senator COLLINS.

As the Big Lie continues to spread, as faith in our elections continues to decline, it is crucial—crucial—we establish a trusted, independent record of what transpired on January 6 and what caused it.

So I reserve the right to bring legislation for an independent, bipartisan Commission to the Senate floor for another vote.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

Mr. President, now, on paycheck fairness, finally, this week the Senate will vote on whether to take up legislation that would provide equal pay for women in America.

We have been talking about the wage gap for years now, with no action taken by the Senate.

Women with the same jobs, the same degrees, sometimes even better degrees than their male colleagues, are making less money. For women of color, the gap between them and their male counterparts is even wider.

This is a fundamental issue of fairness, and we have a very simple, com-

monsense legislative proposal to address the issue. But yesterday, the Republican leader said Democrats' attempts to bring this issue up for a debate was "transparently designed to fail." He went on to say that issues like gun safety and pay equity were merely "demands of [our] radical base."

Look, the only way that a bill to provide equal pay for women is designed to fail is if Senate Republicans block it. And if the Republican leader wants to talk about "radical" positions, I would say that opposing legislation to provide equal pay for women, supported by a solid majority of voters, is a radical position. Does he believe that?

You know what is radical? Opposing legislation to expand background checks to prevent felons and the mentally ill from getting a gun. More than 90 percent—90 percent—of Americans support that policy. But Republicans have, in the past, opposed it. That is truly a radical position.

You know what else is radical? Opposing a bipartisan, independent Commission to report on a violent mob that attacked this Capitol. Spreading doubt about the veracity of our elections. That is radical and, in my opinion, despicable. It gnaws at the very roots of this grand democracy. And we hear either encouragement or acquiescence from the other side when President Trump and his minions do this.

You know what else is radical? Passing laws that specifically make it harder for younger, poorer, and non-White Americans to vote. That is truly radical and dangerous. It is against the whole grain of progress we have made in America. Remembering that when the Constitution was passed, the vast majority of us in this Chamber, not the vast majority but probably the majority—I haven't counted—would have to be White, male, Protestant property owners to vote, we have made progress. They want to take a giant step back for pure electoral gain. Radical. That is radical.

So we are going to have a vote on paycheck fairness this week. The first vote is not even a vote on the bill; it is just a vote on whether to take it up for debate. We will see if our Republican colleagues take the radical step of blocking the Senate from even debating equal pay for women.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will wrap up consideration of a broad bipartisan effort to update our approach to competition with China. This bill has accelerated an important conversation on a topic we all know deserves our full attention. From critical supply chains to intellectual property, to counter-espionage, it touches on key issues that will help determine our strategic footing for decades.

That is why an overwhelming majority of us, myself included, voted to proceed to the measure here on the floor, not because the bill was already perfect. In fact, as the ranking member of the Commerce Committee noted when it was reported out, the legislation was "not ready for prime time."

Rather, we took it up precisely because it deserved robust debate and amendment. So I was glad that several of our colleagues were allowed to offer substantial revisions here on the floor. In particular, I am glad the Democratic leader thought better of blocking Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member CRAPO from including their bipartisan provision on combating illicit trade practices.

But I was disappointed that he proceeded with an effort to end this important debate without allowing the Senate to consider a number of other outstanding Republican amendments.

There is no practical reason our consideration of this important issue should have to compete for sufficient space on the Democrats' dance card.

We are talking about making America more competitive with its biggest and fastest growing rival. If any issue demands thorough, exhaustive debate, it is this one.

Unfortunately, the final bill we will be voting on today will remain incomplete. It includes several smart, targeted measures but leaves many more on the table. And so it will advance as an imperfect approach to an extremely consequential challenge.

One thing this legislation did demonstrate extremely well, however, was that the rules of the Senate don't stand in the way of bipartisan legislating.

Needless to say, final passage of this legislation cannot be the Senate's final word—final word on our competition with China. It certainly won't be mine. As I have warned repeatedly, soft power is only as strong as the hard power underpinning it.

The Chinese Communist Party doesn't hesitate in investing the proceeds of its predatory trade practices and influence campaigns directly into modernizing its hard power arsenal.

Over the past two decades, defense spending in Beijing has increased astronomically. Meanwhile, the Biden administration's proposal for defense spending puts forward such a meager—meager—year-on-year increase, it fails to keep pace with inflation, let alone with our rivals.

The White House request would degrade our ability to project power

quickly out in the Western Pacific. It would cannibalize Pacific Deterrence Initiative funds intended to build infrastructure and enhance interoperability with our partners in the region just to cover shortfalls elsewhere in the budget. And it would cut procurement of critical munitions that are already in short supply.

The administration is playing a dangerous shell game, and the political consequences aren't lost on either side of the Pacific.

The perception that the United States might be any less than fully committed to prevailing in great power competition has left China emboldened and our friends in the region quite worried.

Here at home, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs sounded the alarm, warning that great power peace was "fraying at the edge."

Preserving that peace will require more than the action we will take today. It will require this administration to get serious about funding our national defense. It will require major investment in the sorts of cutting-edge capabilities that deter those who intend harm on America and our allies.

So in the coming weeks, we will see whether Democrats' talk about rebuilding alliances has any substance to it. In the annual Defense authorization and the appropriations process, the Senate will embrace this essential debate about restoring America's hard power head-on. This is a pivotal moment, not a time for half measures on America's national security.

JANUARY 6

Mr. President, now on another matter, today, the Homeland Security and Rules Committees released the conclusions of their monthslong investigation into the circumstances of the unprecedented breach of security here at the Capitol on January 6.

I am grateful to our colleagues on both committees whose hard work made this invaluable report possible.

My assessment of the terrible events of the 6th has been consistent from the beginning. I have condemned the perpetrators, as well as those who enabled and encouraged them, and I have given full-throated support to our colleagues' bipartisan inquiry, along with the work of Federal investigators and prosecutors, to ensure that every criminal participant faces justice.

The Rules and Homeland Security report identifies a number of serious shortcomings in Capitol security that were exposed and exploited on the 6th. It directs our attention to the most glaring gaps that could leave the complex vulnerable to future incidents.

Through the efforts of the Capitol Police, the Senate Sergeant At Arms, and other institutional partners, the Senate's work to close these gaps is already well underway. The committee's inquiry into January 6 is ongoing, and the nationwide search for a new Chief of the Capitol Police is making progress. Our colleagues' latest find-

ings should guide the entire institution's ongoing security reviews.

Today's report is one of the many reasons I am confident in the ability of existing investigations to uncover all actionable facts about the events of January 6. I will continue to support these efforts over any that seek to politicize the process, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority whip is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, one of the major responsibilities of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, is the selection of judges to serve our Nation. It is important not only because it is a question of measuring their standards of integrity, honesty, and judgment but also because these are lifetime appointments. Literally, the women and men who are chosen for these slots will have an impact on the future of America in their courts which could last for many years and decades. That is why we are careful with the Biden administration to not only bring good nominees before the Committee but to make certain they bring the necessary qualities.

This week, the Senate will consider several of President Biden's judicial nominees. I believe they understand the role of a judge in our system. They will bring much needed experiential and demographic diversity to our Nation's courts.

I have tried throughout my career, and many others like me have tried, to choose men and women for the bench who will reflect the diversity of America. The face of justice is often as important as the fact of justice, and if people appearing before our courts feel that there is at least a chance for success based on the background and experience of a judge, I think it is a positive thing.

Given the background of these judges in trying cases, arguing appeals, and issuing rulings from the bench, I believe, and the committee agreed, that these judicial nominees are ready for service.

Today, I would like to speak in support of two of them: Julien Neals, nominated to the District Court of New Jersey, and Regina Rodriguez, nominated to the District Court of Colorado.

New Jersey is really in desperate need of Federal judges. They are facing a judicial emergency. In each of the States' six judicial vacancies, they have been designated as a judicial emergency status by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Today, we can begin to address this judicial emergency by finally confirming Julien Neals to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. He is an extraordinary public servant. He has served the people of the State of New Jersey for decades. As an expert in municipal law, he handled several legal disputes that were tried to verdict, judgment, or final decision, including multiple—multiple—jury trials. He was the chief judge of the Newark Municipal Court. He presided over 6,000 cases in that capacity.

He received a unanimous rating of "well qualified" from the American Bar Association. He has the strong support of his home State Senators, Senators CORY BOOKER and BOB MENENDEZ. He has received broad bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee, with five Republicans joining all the Democrats in supporting his nomination.

I urge my colleagues to support him.

This week, the Senate will also consider the nomination of Regina Rodriguez to be a judge in the District Court of Colorado. What a life story she brings. Ms. Rodriguez is the daughter of a Japanese-American mother, whose family was interned during World War II, and a Mexican-American father who was one of the first Hispanic coaches in the National Football League. Her father's job as a coach took the family across the country.

Although Ms. Rodriguez was born in Colorado, she spent several of her formative years in my home State of Illinois. When she was 17 years old, Ms. Rodriguez thought she might want to be a lawyer, so she put on her best suit, as she says, and knocked on doors in Macomb, IL, until she found a lawyer who said: "Come on in. I'll show you the ropes."

Lucky for us, Ms. Rodriguez held on to that passion that first developed when she was a teenager. Over the past 30 years, she has served as a talented litigator who has tried 35 cases to verdict.

She has a range of experience in government and the private sector. In the public sector, she served as an assistant U.S. attorney and rose to become the first Latina Chief of the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Colorado. In private practice, she represented a broad array of clients, from individuals to Fortune 500 firms. During her tenure as a litigator, Ms. Rodriguez has demonstrated that she understands the importance of applying the law to the facts in a fair manner. She has represented plaintiffs, defendants, government, and those who have sued the government. As a woman of color, she has risen as a partner in several leading law firms—no mean feat.

Ms. Rodriguez has taken out time from her demanding schedule to mentor young attorneys, just as that lawyer in Macomb, IL, did for her.

She has received a unanimous "well qualified" rating from the American Bar Association, as well as positive

blue slips from both Senators BENNET and HICKENLOOPER. Her nomination is also supported by the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association, the Latinas First Foundation, and the Colorado Lawyers Committee.

She has earned support across the aisle. On May 20, Ms. Rodriguez was voted out of the committee by a vote of 17 to 5, with the support of six of my Republican colleagues.

When confirmed, she will be the first Asian-American judge to serve not only in the District of Colorado but in the entire Tenth Circuit. Her historic, well-deserved confirmation will bring our Federal judiciary closer to reflecting the lives and experiences of all Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for Ms. Rodriguez's nomination.

The judicial nominees we are voting on this week illustrate something that is substantial and profound. They illustrate that President Joe Biden is dedicated to appointing legal experts with outstanding credentials and a wealth of experience.

During his first several months in office, President Biden has nominated public servants who will bring to the bench a variety of professional perspectives and personal experiences. Too often, those things have been missing in previous nominees. By confirming judges who reflect the experience of all Americans and who demonstrate fealty to the rule of law, we can continue building a justice system that works for everyone.

Over the last 4 years, we have seen a concerted effort on the Republican side to fill vacancies. They broke records, in some respects, in the number of nominees that they brought before the Senate for approval. Some of the records are not ones to be proud of, from my perspective, and 10 of the nominees who were submitted for consideration during the last 4 years before the Senate Judiciary Committee were found unqualified by the American Bar Association. Nevertheless, most of them made it to the bench in lifetime appointments.

Many nominees came before us, of the Trump administration, who were seeking lifetime appointments to become a trial judge and had no personal experience in a courtroom. It is hard to imagine that anyone would be thrust into that situation and expected to perform as a professional. Imagine, if you will, the parties to those lawsuits, many of whom stake their lives and reputations on the outcome, to find a judge who couldn't find their way through the Code of Civil Procedure if they were forced to. That, unfortunately, was the standard that was used. As long as these nominees in the past had the blessing of the so-called Federalist Society, that was good enough for many of my Republican colleagues.

Joe Biden is really responding to that by suggesting nominees who meet much higher standards. I want to work with the Biden administration to con-

tinue in that tradition, so at the end of the day we can fill the vacancies with women and men who are not only competent and honest but have the integrity and experience, both legal and otherwise, to serve our Nation for the rest of their lives, should they choose, in these judicial capacities.

I commend these two nominees who passed out of our committee with a strong bipartisan votes. To my colleagues on the floor today, I hope they will join me in supporting them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JANUARY 6

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me begin by saying that I am grateful to Senators KLOBUCHAR, BLUNT, PETERS, and PORTMAN and the two Senate committees that they lead for their bipartisan investigation into the events of January 6, and for producing a detailed report in a short amount of time. The report makes clear that there is more work ahead for the committees. More importantly, it also highlights the immense bravery of the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police who defended the Capitol Complex on January 6.

In the coming days, after a thorough review of the 100-page report, I will discuss its recommendations with my colleagues and work to institute reforms that will make a meaningful change to better protect the U.S. Capitol.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, on a different topic, in his 1996 State of the Union address, then-President Bill Clinton famously declared: "The era of big government is over."

Well, after taking a look at the Biden budget, it is clear that the era of Big Government is back, and it is bringing Big Government's usual companions: big taxation, big spending, big deficits, and, it seems likely, big inflation.

The Biden budget, which the administration quietly slipped out the door before the holiday weekend, would raise taxes by \$3.6 trillion over 10 years—3.6 trillion. All told, the Biden budget proposes at least 30 separate tax increases, ranging from a hike in the capital gains tax to a hike in the top income tax rate, to a new death tax. And it would raise taxes on middle-class families by allowing the tax relief the Republicans passed in 2017 to expire.

Under the Biden budget, in just a few short years, working Americans could be facing thousands of dollars in higher taxes. All these tax hikes, of course, are an attempt to pay for the Biden administration's new spending.

Under the Biden budget, government spending would exceed \$6 trillion every

year. To put that in perspective, the total—total—Federal budget in 2019 was \$4.4 trillion. An increase to \$6 trillion plus per year—\$8.2 trillion by 2031—is a massive, massive hike in Federal spending.

Over the course of the Biden budget, government spending would equal around 25 percent of our gross domestic product—far exceeding the average of the past five decades for spending, as a percentage of our total economic outlook.

So what would the consequences of all this spending look like? Well, I have already mentioned the \$3.6 trillion in new tax hikes. Another would be the deficits, which would exceed \$1.3 trillion every year for the next 10 years. By 2031, the end of the Biden budget window, our debt would be—get ready for this—\$39 trillion. Our debt would equal 117 percent of the U.S. economy—again, the highest level in our Nation's history, debt to GDP.

The interest payments on the debt would triple over the next 10 years to \$914 billion. That is right. By 2031, we would be paying nearly \$1 trillion a year just in interest on the debt. That is more money than our Nation will spend on Medicare this year.

So let's review. The Biden budget equals taxes, spending, and debt. And here is the real kicker: The Biden budget hikes taxes, hikes spending, and drives up the debt for pretty much nothing. That is right. After an initial good year or two, the Biden budget projects permanently weak economic growth. For a majority of the next 10 years, economic growth wouldn't even hit 2 percent.

All that government spending and debt isn't going to result in prosperity. It is going to result in permanent economic stagnation, and that means permanently diminished opportunities for American families, fewer jobs, lower wages, and weaker career prospects.

Democrats like to talk as if government can provide security and salvation. But the truth is, government is not an engine of prosperity. Government might serve as a safety net in difficult circumstances, but government will never make you prosperous. It is a robust economy, not a robust government, that would produce prosperity, that would produce the good jobs and good salaries and good benefits and good careers.

That is why one of the most important jobs of government is creating the conditions that will allow the economy to flourish. That is what Republicans worked to do with the tax relief that we passed in 2017. And, as we saw before the pandemic hit, it was working.

The Biden budget, on the other hand, focuses on creating a flourishing government, and the economy would pay the price. And working Americans would face a future of diminished earnings and reduced opportunity.

There is a lot more that could be said about the Biden budget. I haven't even mentioned the diminished investment

in our national defense, which could have very serious consequences for our national security.

Less than 3 years ago, the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission released a report warning—warning—that our readiness had eroded to the point where we might struggle to win the war against a major power like Russia or China. And while we have made some real progress since then, we still have a lot of work to do to ensure that our military is prepared to defend our Nation and meet the threats of the 21st century. The Biden budget would send us right back to the situation that we faced 3 years ago.

I guess it is not surprising that a budget that fails to be serious about fiscal realities would fail to be serious about national security realities, but it is deeply concerning that the President doesn't seem to understand the importance of investing in our national defense.

President Biden has made the priorities of liberal interest groups the top priorities for his administration—whether that is canceling the Keystone XL's good-paying jobs and economic growth to please the environmental left or overturning the Mexico City policy so that taxpayer dollars can go to fund abortions overseas.

On the question of abortion, President Biden's budget abandons decades of bipartisan compromise and eliminates the Hyde amendment, which protects taxpayers from having their tax dollars used to fund abortions here at home. You would think that if we can't agree that the human rights of unborn children should be protected, we should at least agree that a taxpayer shouldn't be forced to pay for the killing of unborn children.

Almost 60 percent of Americans oppose using taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions, but President Biden has made it clear that his allegiance to the radical abortion left trumps the opinions of the American people. So his budget eliminates the Hyde amendment and imposes a number of other pro-abortion measures, like additional government funding access for the Nation's largest abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

The Biden budget might be good news for liberal interest groups, but it is bad news for the American people and bad news for our country. I hope that my Democratic colleagues will think twice before forcing this massive government expansion onto the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Also without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF REGINA M. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor today to share a few words about Regina Rodriguez, President Biden's nominee for the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado. Gina's nomination comes to this floor with broad, well-earned support across the State of Colorado. My office has received a flood of letters on her behalf. All of them testify to her character, her hard work, and her commitment to service, justice, and the rule of law.

She learned all of it from her family. Her mom's family knew injustice firsthand. During the Second World War, they were relocated from California to the Heart Mountain internment site in Wyoming, joining over 10,000 people whose loyalty was questioned by the U.S. Government based solely on their Japanese ancestry.

Her mother Linda went on to become a teacher and administrator in the Denver public schools, my old school district. Her father Peter was a Mexican American who went from living in a railroad boxcar on the South Side of Chicago to earning a nomination for the NFL Hall of Fame.

Education and hard work transformed her parents' lives, and Regina has always sought to live up to their example. Gina grew up in Gunnison, CO, but her family moved around the country because her dad coached football. She graduated with honors from the University of Iowa, which I know is not the only reason Chairman GRASSLEY supported her nomination but probably was an important one, and then returned home to earn a J.D. from the University of Colorado Law School.

After starting at a private firm in Denver, Gina joined the U.S. Attorney's Office. The Department of Justice noticed her talent, and she went to work for the Attorney General on alternative dispute resolution—a new approach at the time meant to avoid lengthy trials through arbitration and mediation. She helped to mainstream the approach for all U.S. attorneys, saving the government countless hours and taxpayers' countless dollars over the years.

Gina's leadership in Washington earned her a promotion back in Denver, where she rose to become Chief of the Civil Division in the U.S. Attorney's Office. She was the first Latina to hold that position and quickly developed a stellar reputation among colleagues and judges.

Today, she is one of the most respected trial lawyers in Colorado and has received reward after reward for her work.

Her commitment to the community has been just as impressive. She is a founding board member of Colorado Youth at Risk, a nonprofit that helps kids stay on the right track. She served as one of Colorado's higher education commissioners and still serves

on the board of Denver's highest performing charter school, the School of Science and Technology in my old district. Somehow, she finds time to mentor young lawyers from underrepresented communities.

The evidence is overwhelming: Regina Rodriguez is an exceptional nominee with a distinguished career and commitment to service. She has blazed trails in Colorado and in Colorado law through the sheer force of her intellect, hard work, and character. Regina and her family are what we mean when we come to this floor and talk about the American dream.

She has my full and enthusiastic support, and I want to thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee for advancing her nomination with overwhelming, bipartisan support. They saw what Colorado already knows, which is what an exceptional judge Gina would make, and I wholeheartedly agree. I urge my colleagues to come together and confirm this outstanding nominee in a big bipartisan vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Neals nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Ex.]

YEAS—66

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

NAYS—33

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

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). 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 action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 127, Regina M. Rodriguez, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Regina M. Rodriguez, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

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. 221 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Durbin	Klobuchar
Bennet	Ernst	Leahy
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Luján
Booker	Fischer	Manchin
Brown	Gillibrand	Markey
Burr	Graham	Menendez
Cantwell	Grassley	Merkley
Capito	Hassan	Murkowski
Cardin	Heinrich	Murphy
Carper	Hickenlooper	Murray
Casey	Hirono	Ossoff
Collins	Hoeven	Padilla
Coons	Hyde-Smith	Peters
Cornyn	Kaine	Portman
Cortez Masto	Kelly	Reed
Cramer	Kennedy	Romney
Duckworth	King	Rosen

Rounds	Sinema	Warner
Rubio	Smith	Warnock
Sanders	Stabenow	Warren
Schatz	Tester	Whitehouse
Schumer	Tillis	Wicker
Scott (SC)	Toomey	Wyden
Shaheen	Van Hollen	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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 72, the nays are 28.

The motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Regina M. Rodriguez, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:58 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

HELPING AMERICAN VICTIMS AFFLICTED BY NEUROLOGICAL ATTACKS ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to applaud the swift, unanimous Senate passage last night of the Helping American Victims Afflicted by Neurological Attacks Act, or the HAVANA Act. This bill will provide much needed assistance to the employees of the Intelligence Community, the State Department, and other Federal Agencies who have suffered from often debilitating brain injuries at the hands of our foreign adversaries. Too often, these injured public servants have had to battle the bureaucracy to receive the medical care they desperately require.

I am very pleased today to be joined on the Senate floor by the Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator WARNER. He has been relentless in his pursuit of care for these injured public servants who risk their lives for us, who serve in difficult and dangerous environments. Senator WARNER and the vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator RUBIO, and Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire worked with me to draft the bill that the Senate unanimously cleared last night.

We are very pleased that the following Senators cosponsored our legis-

lation: Senators CORNYN, BENNET, BURR, GILLIBRAND, BLUNT, HEINRICH, SASSE, FEINSTEIN, COTTON, KING, RISCH, DURBIN, SCOTT, MENENDEZ, BLUMENTHAL, and HASSAN. I mentioned those cosponsors to show the breadth of concern in the Senate about these injured employees.

For several years, American personnel serving our country in Cuba, China, and elsewhere have experienced unexplained, serious medical harm, including, in some cases, permanent brain injuries. Their conditions are believed to be the consequence of a mysterious, directed energy weapon used by an adversary.

As we investigate the source of previous attacks and seek to prevent future ones, the bill that passed the Senate last night would provide additional medical care and financial compensation to Americans who continue to experience debilitating symptoms as a result of these heinous attacks.

The injuries that many of these victims have endured are significant and life-altering. I have talked with many of these victims. They have described debilitating headaches, a loss of vision, a decreased ability to hear, dizziness, and many other symptoms as well, including a decline in their cognitive abilities. In some cases, they have been forced to medically retire. In other cases, they somehow continue on while coping with these symptoms.

I have spoken several times to CIA Director Burns and the Director of National Intelligence, Haines, about these attacks, and I am heartened by the commitments that they have made to me and to other members of the Senate Intelligence Committee to care for the victims and to identify the perpetrators and the weapon used in these attacks.

We can speculate. We have our suspicions. But the fact is, we do not know exactly what the weapon is nor who is wielding it. We need a whole-of-government approach to identify the adversary who is targeting our American personnel, and I am grateful to the chairman and vice chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, who I know are committed to getting to the bottom of these attacks.

I hope, when President Biden meets with President Putin, that he will ask President Putin about these attacks, that he will grill him about them to see if the Russians are responsible. At this point, we don't know.

The public servants who work in our embassies and consulates overseas make many personal sacrifices to represent America's interests. They deserve our unwavering support when they are harmed in the line of duty, just as we care for soldiers who are injured on the battlefield. Last night, we took an important step in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise today to echo what my good friend

and colleague, Senator COLLINS, has already said. Let me be clear. She pointed out the virtual unanimous support this legislation has from members of the Intelligence Committee—both sides. Let there be no mistake in terms of who was the relentless driver—some might even say “persistent-beyond-belief driver” of this issue. It was SUSAN COLLINS, and, once again, her service shows that she is standing up for America’s diplomats and the intel community serving our country around the world who, as Senator COLLINS already indicated, have been involved in dangerous incidents resulting in brain trauma and other unexplained illnesses. We have called it the Havana syndrome.

The remarkable thing is that for nearly 5 years, we have been aware of these reports, and we have seen, as the Senator mentioned, attacks on U.S. personnel in Cuba, in China, and around the world. We have these reports here in this country, and rather than disappearing or going down in number, they actually appear to be increasing.

Five years after the start of this effort, we don’t know what happened, we don’t know who did it, and we don’t know what kind of device was used.

This is wrong. Particularly, I want to point out—this is an area where, again, we were in bipartisan agreement—that under the last administration, we just didn’t treat these victims from the intel community, the State Department, and DOD with the seriousness they deserved.

As chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I know the hardships, sacrifices, and risks our intelligence officers, diplomats, and other personnel serving overseas endure—often anonymously, often without recognition.

The fact that some of these brave women and men have been subjected to these serious health issues by unknown attackers is unacceptable. That their own government did not believe them when they were injured or denied them proper medical attention and care is beyond the pale. These are folks who were injured while serving our government and, in some cases, facing lifelong health consequences, and, for a while, we just got blown off. It is inexcusable that they were treated this way, and it is outrageous that we still don’t know who did it or what tool was used in these attacks.

Their country, after their service, needs to have their backs. With Senator COLLINS’s legislation—now that it has passed the Senate, and our hope is that it will soon pass the House—we will show that the country will have their backs.

I also want to give credit to the new CIA Director, Ambassador Burns, for making this a top priority. On the Senate Intelligence Committee, there is complete bipartisan unanimity on this issue. We are going to ensure that the United States gets to the bottom of

this, identifies those responsible for those attacks on American personnel, holds them accountable, and ensures that these attacks on American personnel stop once and for all.

Let me echo what Senator COLLINS said. This should be one in an ever growing list of topics that President Biden ought to raise with President Putin.

We must protect our people around the globe. At the same time, it is more important than ever that the United States also provides those affected by these attacks with the medical and financial support they deserve. Again, that is why Senator COLLINS’ legislation, the HAVANA Act, is so important.

Let me echo again what Senator COLLINS said. My partner in this, as well, has been Vice Chairman RUBIO, and our good friend Senator SHAHEEN. The fact that this passed this quickly, unanimously, is extraordinarily important, but it is just the first step in having the backs of our diplomats, our intel personnel, our DOD, and, for that matter, anyone who has been a victim of this kind of activity. Again, I want to thank Senator COLLINS for her leadership on this issue. I can assure you, as Senator COLLINS said and Senator RUBIO and I have repeated a number of number of times, the Intelligence Committee of the Senate is going to get to the bottom of this. We are going to make sure—and we have taken a giant step on this by passing this legislation—that the personnel will get the medical and, if necessary, financial assistance they need; that we are going to find out who did it, we are going to find out what type of device, and we are going to hold them accountable.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SEMICONDUCTORS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as we all know, in recent years, China has emerged as one of the greatest competitors to the world order. Unfortunately, they don’t play by the same rules that the rest of the international community plays by. The Chinese Communist Party is increasingly aggressive and well-resourced and has made no secret of its intent to gain more influence and power.

For everything from national security to economic policy, there is a clear and urgent need to reorient the way our country views and responds to the challenge from China. I am glad the Senate is taking up an important step today through the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act. The cornerstone of this legislation, of course, is funding to bolster domestic semiconductor manufacturing so the United States can compete with China and secure some of our most critical supply chains.

Nearly 90 percent of the semiconductors made in the world are made by countries in Asia, with Taiwan dominating the market with about 63 percent of that total of 90 percent. In fact,

one company, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, accounted for more than half of the total foundry revenues last year. As I said, companies in Taiwan control 63 percent of the advanced semiconductor markets.

If for any reason that supply chain was cut off, it would lead to very serious consequences across our entire economy. To address this, Senator WARNER, the senior Senator from Virginia, and I introduced the CHIPS for America Act last year to shore up domestic semiconductor manufacturing and reduce our alliance on other countries for one of our most critical products. Semiconductors go into everything with an off and on switch.

The United States is not the only country that spotted this blinking red light, this danger signal. Other countries have recognized the immense risks that exist, and they are also pouring billions of dollars into new foundries. The European Union, for example, is investing up to \$35 billion, South Korea is investing \$65 billion, and China is investing a whopping \$150 billion in semiconductor manufacturing. Our competitors are pouring tens of billions of dollars into boosting their own supplies of these essential semiconductors, and the United States needs to keep up and compete.

The vast majority of our colleagues agree that this was an important and critical task. It was carefully crafted in monthslong, bipartisan, bicameral negotiations, and, in fact, this legislation was adopted as an amendment to last year’s Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 96 to 4. Now, though, it falls to us to fund what we authorized in the Defense authorization bill, and there is just one issue standing in the way.

During committee consideration of the Endless Frontier Act, an amendment was adopted that would apply controversial and unnecessary prevailing wage language to the CHIPS for America Act. The prevailing wage provision creates an obstacle to our funding the CHIPS for America Act, and it confers zero benefit on anybody because the manufacturing of semiconductors is a very sophisticated, well-paying business.

Considering the current wages of U.S. semiconductor manufacturing companies, there is zero impact on workers’ wages by requiring companies to pay an elevated, so-called prevailing wage. So it is really a nonissue. However, these Davis-Bacon provisions also represent an unprecedented expansion of a partisan labor policy, and applying them to private construction projects, as I said, sets a troublesome precedent.

Leaving this language in the bill has the potential to dramatically weaken support for this essential broader legislation, and I hope we can all agree that the stakes are simply too high to let that happen. I have introduced an amendment to strike this unnecessary and divisive provision and to maintain the strong bipartisan support that the

CHIPS for America Act has earned so far. This partisan provision has no impact on workers' wages, and it should hardly be a reason to forfeit the strong bipartisan support the CHIPS Program has previously received.

It is important that we send a clear and distinct and unequivocal message to our competitors and rivals in China. Republicans and Democrats have worked together to bolster domestic semiconductor manufacturing and to confront one of our biggest looming threats from China. Now is not the time to sacrifice the progress we made.

I encourage our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment so we can maintain the strong bipartisan support for this essential program.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, in January of 2020, when reports began to circulate about the coronavirus, I instructed my oversight and investigations staff to get a classified briefing from the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of National Security. Around that same time, I publicly said that there were signs that the virus could develop into a worldwide threat. I also noted at that time my concern that China may not be accurately reflecting the scale or scope of the problem and that China was failing to share information with global health organizations. Unfortunately, my concerns proved to be true.

From the beginning, my goal has been to ensure a robust Federal response to the threat and to better understand the origins of the virus.

Today, as we emerge from the pandemic, the focus has rightly shifted to understanding how the virus originated. We lost over 500,000 of our fellow Americans, and this body has spent trillions of dollars to support the U.S. economy during the pandemic.

We the people have an absolute right to know everything that the U.S. Government knows about the origins of the coronavirus. On March 8, 2021, I wrote to the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Health and Human Services requesting all intelligence, among other requests, relating to what the government knows about the origin of the coronavirus. I received some intelligence product, and that product causes very serious concern and further supports my belief that the ongoing review of its origin can't leave any stone unturned. The effort must be a whole-of-government approach.

In response to my letter, the National Institutes of Health, an Agency within the Department of Health and Human Services, stated that it hasn't funded gain-of-function research on the coronavirus. Recent reports have cast doubts on that position.

Dr. Fauci's unit provided \$3.4 million in taxpayer grants to a research orga-

nization called EcoHealth Alliance. That group then issued subgrants to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. It has been reported that from this \$3.4 million, somewhere between \$600,000 and \$826,000 was sent to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. That money, by the way, is U.S. taxpayer money. It was spent on researching bat coronaviruses.

As the Wall Street Journal noted last week, it is likely that the Wuhan Institute of Virology was doing gain-of-function research. If true, that research could have strengthened the virus to the version that caused the global pandemic.

Dr. Fauci has said that Chinese scientists are trustworthy, that "we generally always trust the grantee to do what they say," and that "I can't guarantee that a grantee hasn't lied to us because you never know." He also said, "I can't guarantee everything that is going on in the Wuhan lab, we can't do that." What complete nonsense and a mess that it is.

Well, Dr. Fauci, why can't you know what is going on inside the Wuhan plant if you are going to send taxpayers' money to do it? For crying out loud, be aggressive and be accountable.

We know the Chinese Government can't be trusted. We know the Chinese Government is involved in risky and deadly viral research. We know that sending money to any entity affiliated with the Chinese Government is a risky proposition, which is why any sign of any taxpayer money sent to the Chinese Government should be subject to the most rigorous and comprehensive oversight.

If Dr. Fauci and his team know that taxpayer money is going to the Chinese Government, what steps did he and they take to oversee how that money was used? Well, that question is exactly what I asked in my March 8, 2021, letter to the Department of Health and Human Services. HHS failed to answer what, if any, oversight was done.

In my followup letter to the Department of Health and Human Services on May 26 of this year, I stated the following:

Your letter failed to describe the steps the Department of Health and Human Services took to oversee the research done at the Wuhan Institute of Virology in light of it being funded by the taxpayer.

The taxpayers expect the Federal Government to, at a minimum, know what their money is buying.

Congress expects the Federal Government to perform aggressive oversight, especially when the funded research involves highly infectious and deadly viruses. Furthermore, if no oversight were performed, then that would call into question the government's confidence that no gain-of-function research was supported by taxpayers' dollars, because that is what I was told by the HHS.

The people have a right to know what the government knows about the origins of the coronavirus. The people have a right to know if Dr. Fauci and

other government officials were derelict in their duty to conduct oversight of the money that they knew would end up with the Communist Chinese Government.

Dr. Fauci is constantly going on television to talk about anything that he wants to talk about. He should start talking about what, if any, oversight he did with respect to the taxpayers' money that he knew was going to the Communist Chinese Government.

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.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote starts.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 3 minutes of debate, equally divided, between the votes today.

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

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor, hopefully today will be the day we wrap up debate on the America Competes-Endless Frontier legislation now known as the USICA, United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021. We come to talk about this now, primarily because we know that the research dollars invested today are going to decide the jobs of the future. And we know that we all believe a significant increase in the investment in research and development dollars will help us spur innovation, continue to help us compete, and continue to be competitive in key sectors of our economy that are so important to us.

We know that we have been having this debate literally now for more than a decade, starting with President Bush's 2006 report saying America needed to invest more in the National Science Foundation. And at the time, I am pretty sure we thought we were in a track meet where our competitor was maybe half a lap behind us.

I am pretty sure now, as the decade has moved on, we are looking over our shoulder and realizing that the competition is gaining. So we need to make this investment in research and development to stay competitive, to grow jobs for tomorrow, and solve some of our most pressing problems, whether that is climate change, national security on cyber issues, or the advent and usage of artificial intelligence and what that will mean both for our opportunities and for our challenges.

So we are making a renewed commitment to the National Science Foundation. I thank my colleagues again, Senator SCHUMER and Senator YOUNG, for

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	Hoeben	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

on this bill but on this issue for pretty close to a decade, and it is long overdue.

You know, we have been working in a very bipartisan way on numerous subjects, including the competition bill that just passed, but it appears there are real limits to bipartisanship here in the Senate.

We are about to vote just to start debate—just to start debate on a bill that is very simple—provide equal pay for women. It is a modest proposal to address a real problem in our economy.

Women with the same jobs and same qualifications as their male colleagues often make less money. It is too hard for too many women to overcome that pay discrimination. This makes it easier for women to achieve pay parity, and like the previous bill, will help unleash strong economic forces to help America go forward because when women are not getting the pay they deserve, it impedes our whole economy and all of the human resources that we need.

Every Senate Democrat is ready to start debate on the Paycheck Fairness Act, but Senate Republicans seem to be mounting another partisan filibuster against this bill.

It is ridiculous that Senate Republicans will not even allow the Senate to debate a straightforward piece of legislation to help provide equal pay for working women in America, just like it was ridiculous for the Republican minority to filibuster bipartisan legislation to create an independent Commission on January 6.

Americans expect their government to make progress to improve our country, but Senate Republicans once again seem to be choosing obstruction.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 46, H.R. 7, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell, Bernard Sanders, John Hickenlooper, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tina Smith, Amy Klobuchar, Thomas R. Carper, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to

proceed to H.R. 7, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, for over a year now, people worldwide have experienced immeasurable pain, suffering, and loss. This pandemic has tested each and every one of us in ways that we didn't know possible.

But perhaps no one has been more tested than our Nation's frontline, essential healthcare workers. They, like so many other frontline workers, did not have the option to telework, to socially distance, to remain in their homes, with their families, while the coronavirus ravaged our communities—no, just the opposite. They showed up more than ever before.

Not only did our Nation's doctors, nurses, and other medical professionals put their own health concerns aside to treat COVID patients, they continued to see all their other patients who couldn't afford to delay treatment, the heart attack and stroke victims, the chemotherapy and dialysis patients, the pregnant moms and new babies, people who had been involved in car accidents or were victims of gun violence.

When the rest of the world was being encouraged to stay home and avoid interactions with people, our medical providers continued to report to hospitals, community health centers, doctor's offices. They did so even when they weren't provided the proper personal protective equipment. They did so even when it meant that they had to quarantine from their own families. They did so even when it meant extra shifts on little to no sleep. They did so even when it meant spending each day watching dying patients say their final goodbyes to loved ones over Zoom. And they did so even when, in the midst of all of this, they were subjected to racism, sexism, and hate.

An essay that appeared in the New York Times last month detailed one doctor's experience. Dr. Chaya Bhuvaneswar—a female, Asian-American, Boston-area physician—recalled an incident last April, when a patient spit on her and said she “brought the sickness.”

Anti-Asian bigotry is, sadly, nothing new in this country, and the rise of it during COVID was certainly fueled by our former President, who seemed to delight in coining hateful, racist terminology to describe the coronavirus. Like so many others, our healthcare providers, whether they are Asian American or African American, or members of other minority groups, are subjected to racism, simply in the course of doing their jobs.

Racism is inexcusable always, but imagine how much worse it must have felt this past year, risking your life every single day to help a nation in the midst of a deadly pandemic, only to be subjected to racial slurs, offensive stereotypes, and vile actions. If this past year has taught us anything, it is that our Nation still has a long way to go on issues of race and immigration.

Consider this: One in six healthcare and social service workers are immigrants. Yet our broken immigration laws prevent many immigrants from contributing more fully to the battle against the pandemic.

As long as I am a U.S. Senator, I will continue to come to fight for all immigrants. We must ensure that the hundreds of thousands of immigrant workers in our essential workforce are not forced to stop contributing when the need for their service has never been greater, and we must give them the chance they deserve to become American citizens. They have waited long enough.

I hope that, even in these divided times, we can come together in Congress to quickly aid our immigrant healthcare heroes and other essential workers. Whether we are witnessing horrific, racially motivated acts of police brutality on the nightly news or reading about bigoted verbal and physical assaults in our hospitals, it is clear that the epidemic of racism, which long predated this pandemic, has not gone anywhere.

It is my hope that, someday soon, we can look at one another and see how much more unites us than divides us, but for now, let me just offer another word of thanks to our Nation's healthcare workforce: You have all given so much and endured so much. We are eternally thankful for all you have done and all you will continue to do.

TRIBUTE TO EULA HALL

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, Southeastern Kentucky lost Eula Hall this May, a humanitarian titan who blessed her community with generosity, tenacity, and dedication. Eula was a self-described "hillbilly activist" whose efforts to improve healthcare in Kentucky enhanced the lives of her neighbors and friends. As the founder of the Mud Creek Clinic, now known as the Eula Hall Health Center, Eula was driven by her selfless spirit to deliver quality care to thousands of Kentuckians. Today, I recognize Eula Hall as a lifelong champion of Floyd County and the entire Southeastern Kentucky region.

Eula founded the Mud Creek Clinic in 1973 with a \$1,400 donation and a calling to improve healthcare in her disadvantaged community. She served everyone, regardless of their ability to pay, through a primary care clinic, mental health counselor, pharmacy, and food and clothing pantry. Even after her clinic burned down in 1982, Eula did not miss a day of service, delivering help directly from her own home. She redefined healthcare in Southeastern Kentucky from the ground up, leaving an indelible impact on the region.

Eula was born into extreme poverty, growing up without plumbing or electricity and only receiving an eighth-grade education. In spite of these obstacles, she was driven by a higher calling to serve her community. When Eula founded the Mud Creek Clinic, she did so based on a conviction that all Kentuckians, regardless of income, deserved to be cared for by their neighbors. Her work quickly caught the at-

tention of local leaders and physicians, bringing much needed resources to her distressed region.

She was a local activist from a young age, driven by the struggles and suffering she saw during her childhood. Motivated by a desire to assist the vulnerable, Eula gave help to the needy and a voice to the voiceless through an ever-expanding series of projects. With an unflappable work ethic, Eula would go on to run the Mud Creek Water District, piping drinking water to 800 homes, and served as the president of the Kentucky Black Lung Association. Her tireless, grassroots efforts have left an enduring legacy of community-based activism in Southeastern Kentucky.

Eula's industriousness permeated every aspect of her life, even as she entered old age. Just last year, she was working on a proposal to found a nursing home in her area as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In recognition of her determination and tenacity, Eula received a number of awards, including honorary doctorates from Berea, Midway, and Pikeville colleges in Kentucky and Trinity College in Connecticut. She was also the subject of a landmark book on healthcare in Eastern Kentucky, "Mud Creek Medicine," by Kiran Bhattraju. She led a vibrant family, and is survived by 4 children, 8 grandchildren, 14 great-grandchildren, and 5 great-great-grandchildren.

I had the opportunity to speak with Eula just a few weeks before she passed and expressed my deep appreciation for her decades of hard work. During our numerous conversations and visits, I was always struck by her ceaseless devotion to Southeastern Kentuckians. Eula was honored with tributes from around the country, including from the U.S. Senate, but she never sought the spotlight. She preferred to dedicate her entire focus to the needy in her community.

After her passing, Eula was recognized by both the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, demonstrating the nationwide impact of her work. She was one of the toughest women I ever met, and it was an absolute pleasure to work with her over the years to deliver much needed help to Kentucky communities. I would like to express my personal gratitude for Eula Hall's decades of service to the Commonwealth and encourage my Senate colleagues to join me in sharing condolences with her family, colleagues, and neighbors, whose lives were uplifted by this one-of-a-kind Kentuckian.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC KING

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, during a year of unprecedented challenges, students, staff, and faculty at the University of Kentucky have been fortunate to have Eric King as their tireless advocate and supporter. As UK's executive director of federal relations, Eric has made lasting contribu-

tions to Kentucky's students, professors, and administrators. In recognition of that hard work, Eric was honored last month by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities with the Jennifer Poulakidas Outstanding Achievement Award. Today, I, too, would like to recognize Eric for his strong advocacy on behalf of the University of Kentucky community and our State as a whole.

Eric has been making contributions to Kentucky higher education since he was an undergrad, serving as the student body president of Murray State University. Since then, he has dedicated his career to helping Kentuckians. Fresh out of college, Eric served as a legislative correspondent in my office and was later promoted to a legislative assistant focused on energy, agriculture, and environmental policy. He contributed to the passage of the Agricultural Act of 2014, which delivered major wins for Kentucky farmers and their families.

Eric also served as the director of government and community affairs at the Kentucky Association of Electric Cooperatives, KAEC. There, he advocated for a statewide association of 24 consumer-owned electric distribution utilities that collectively serve nearly 2 million Kentuckians. I know that Eric's work at that organization had a real and lasting impact on Kentucky families.

Now, Eric has taken his advocacy skills to the University of Kentucky, working closely with President Eli Capilouto to promote the well-being of more than 30,000 students, 12,000 staff, and 2,000 faculty. When the coronavirus pandemic threatened to shut down colleges and universities across the country, Eric stepped up and fought to include vital funding for higher education in the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security, CARES, Act. Because of advocacy like Eric's, the CARES Act included the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund, providing millions of dollars to colleges and universities to overcome the challenges imposed by the pandemic. Thousands of Kentucky students and graduates benefited from Eric's leadership.

Eric has been described by his colleagues as a man with "unmatched integrity" and a "can-do attitude" who has made "incredible contributions" to our Nation's system of public and land-grant universities. As Eric's former boss, I can confirm that these superlatives are correct. His hard work during the coronavirus pandemic provided vital protection to our colleges and universities, both in Kentucky and nationwide.

Kentuckians—and especially Wildcats—are grateful for Eric's tireless dedication to our State's public university system. On behalf of the Senate, I would like to express my congratulations to Eric for receiving this award and my thanks for his service and leadership amid a time of incredible hardship.

U.S. INNOVATION AND COMPETITION ACT

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, today, the Senate passed the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act—USICA—legislation which would establish a new Technology and Innovation Directorate at the National Science Foundation. Section 2005 of USICA would define 10 initial key technology focus areas to direct research at the new Directorate and the Department of Energy. One of these areas is advanced energy technology. I want to put in the record that Congress has previously enacted legislation defining advanced energy technology in 42 USC 18632, and that definition should apply here.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote 215, On the Motion to Table, Motion to Table Rubio Amdt. No. 1802.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote 216, on the amendment, Crapo-Wyden Amdt. No. 1562 as modified.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote 217, on the Motion for Attendance, Motion to Instruct the Sergeant at Arms to Request the Attendance of Absentee Senators.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote 218, on Motion to Invoke Cloture Re: Motion to Proceed to H.R. 3233.

HONORING TROOPER JOHN MARTIN HARRIS

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to Mississippi Highway Patrol Trooper John Martin Harris, who was killed in the line of duty on May 28, 2021. Harris was conducting a routine traffic stop on Highway 16 in Madison County when a vehicle struck and killed him. I honor Trooper Harris' service, extend my deepest condolences to his family, and reiterate my unwavering support for our law enforcement personnel.

A Clarksdale native, Harris knew from a young age he wanted to serve his community as a law enforcement officer. Trooper Harris began his law enforcement career in 1997 in Webb, MS. He earned his first Law Enforcement Purple Heart while serving on the police force in Friars Point and earned a second Purple Heart while serving at the Madison County Sheriff's Office. Harris then continued his career at the Richland Police Department. In 2018, Harris achieved his lifelong dream of becoming a Mississippi Highway Patrolman and graduated from Trooper School as part of Cadet Class No. 62. In addition to the Purple Heart medals, Harris received dozens of awards, too numerous to mention here, for valor

and bravery. Several were commendations for his work on narcotics teams and with K-9 units.

Trooper Harris is survived by his wife Katie Parker Harris of Madison, his two children Parker and Cooper, and his parents Jean and Jimmy Harris of Clarksdale. I send my deepest sympathies to his family and to all who knew him. May God grant them comfort, grace, and peace in these unspeakably difficult times.

Law enforcement officers across our Nation face many challenges in their mission to protect and serve. Trooper Harris's death shows us that our law enforcement officers face tremendous danger to ensure public safety, and I greatly admire those who remain steadfast amidst the dangers of their noble profession. Let us commemorate Trooper Harris's life by redoubling our commitment to support and advocate for those in law enforcement. I will continue to honor the legacy of Trooper Harris and all of those officers who have lost their life in the line of duty by doing all I can to support our law enforcement officers.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATRONA COUNTY MEALS ON WHEELS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today to recognize a significant anniversary for the Natrona County Meals on Wheels Program. On Saturday, June 19, 2021, this wonderful organization will celebrate its 50th anniversary.

Meals on Wheels is dedicated to providing healthy meals, a friendly smile, and a watchful eye to seniors across the Nation. As a doctor, I understand the importance of balanced nutrition but also companionship and care. The hard-working employees and volunteers deliver all three by offering tailored meals and home visits.

In 1971 Casper resident Mabel Marvel founded the Casper branch of Meals on Wheels. Mabel was on a trip to Colorado to visit family when she ran across a similar service. The volunteers for the Colorado organization were delivering hot meals to elderly residents from a church kitchen. Mrs. Marvel realized that Casper did not have such a program. Soon after, she formed an office in a Salvation Army coat closet and requested that the Natrona County Memorial Hospital, now Wyoming Medical Center, aid in providing meals. This was the beginning of the Natrona County Meals on Wheels Program.

When Natrona County Meals on Wheels began initial operations, they were preparing 20 meals a day. By 2001, the number of meals delivered increased to over 500 per day. When the coronavirus pandemic hit, the need for home-delivered meals exploded. This Casper-based organization rose to the challenge and served clients who were forced to quarantine and unable to leave their homes. In Natrona County, they delivered over 650 meals each

Monday through Thursday and an average of 1,550 meals on Fridays to cover the weekends. Their hard work resulted in senior citizens in Natrona County receiving nearly 207,000 meals in 2020.

Serving so many people at once is challenging, especially when many of these meals are prepared with special dietary needs in mind. Meals on Wheels prepares healthy food for community members requiring specific diets including diabetic, celiac, and vegetarian. The volunteers with Meals on Wheels also make home visits to check in with members of the community who may not have enough social interaction or are not as mobile. The giving nature of this organization presents its members with a balanced meal and quality time spent with others. Ensuring the needs of community members allows seniors to preserve their independence at home.

Meals on Wheels continues to find new ways to enrich our community. Jamie Loveall has been leading the charge as the Executive Director of Natrona County Meals on Wheels for more than 17 years. She has written grants, planned community events, and helped prepare meals in order to keep clients fed, staff members engaged, and the community aware. A favorite community event is their Bubbles, Baubles 'n Beans fundraiser. It is a chili and soup tasting experience to raise money for annual operating costs.

The strength of an organization is determined by the dedication of its leadership, staff, and volunteers. The full-time staff are responsible for preparing the meals, managing the financial aspects, and writing the delivery routes. In addition to Executive Director Jamie Loveall, staff members are Katrina Lorenzen, Foundation Development Director, Andrea Trout, Route Coordinator/Administrative Assistant, Debbie Cardinal, Receptionist/Volunteer Coordinator, Ashley Woodward, Client Services Coordinator, Mariah Bokhari, Bookkeeper, and Shelley Blake, Kitchen Manager.

Current board members are Jim Browlee, President, Joe Moss, Vice President, Vickie Ujvary, Treasurer, Don Smith, Secretary, and members Wendy Elmer, Bob Thunselle, Ed Chase, Jennifer Deurloo, Peggy Porter, Kelli Carmichael, Paul Rhodes, CJ Lovato, Dane Grace, and Stacia Hill.

The volunteers deliver the meals, partake in home visits, and spend quality time with clients. Eighty-five percent of the volunteers with the Natrona County service are seniors themselves, using their time to help friends and neighbors. About the volunteers, Jamie Loveall says, "Without these individuals, our program would not exist."

It is my great honor to celebrate the incredible work of this organization. Every day, the staff and volunteers of Natrona County Meals on Wheels work to make our community a better place

to live. My wife Bobbi joins me in wishing the Natrona County Meals on Wheels another 50 years of success.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL NATHAN E. COOK II

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, today I honor a superb leader, liaison, and soldier for his tireless commitment to the U.S. Army, which includes 2 years of service with the Army Office of the Legislative Liaison, as the chief of the Army's Senate Liaison Division. As COL Nathan E. Cook II prepares to retire after 28 years of dedicated and distinguished service to our Nation, I believe it is fitting to recognize his exceptional service and relationship with this Chamber.

Colonel Cook's congressional liaison assignment is only the capstone to what has been an outstanding career of service to the Army and our Nation. Colonel Cook is a 1993 graduate of The United States Military Academy at West Point. He was commissioned into the Army as a field artillery officer and has served in command and staff positions from the tactical to the strategic level in the 2d Armored Division, 4th Infantry Division, 8th Army, 3d Infantry Division, 1st Cavalry Division, Headquarters Resolute Support, and Headquarters Department of the Army. He has led our Nation's soldiers during multiple combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan during OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM, OPERATION NEW DAWN, and OPERATION RESOLUTE SUPPORT. Likewise, he commanded our soldiers in combat as the commander of the 3d Battalion, 82d Field Artillery Regiment from Fort Hood, TX, and the 75th Field Artillery Brigade from Fort Sill, OK. Prior to his assignment as the chief of the Army's Senate Liaison Division, he served as the senior advisor to the Afghan Minister of Defense, where he provided timely and critical advice across the Ministry of Defense and the NATO coalition. The Army has continuously relied upon Colonel Cook for his exceptional leadership and unparalleled work ethic throughout his career.

Over the course of the last few years, Colonel Cook's tireless efforts proved invaluable in broadening the understanding of Members and staff on Army priorities, policies, and initiatives that ultimately provided resources and authorities for the Army and enhanced trust and confidence across the Senate. He managed all of this while leading and managing numerous congressional delegations to various locations around the world. Colonel Cook has become a trusted adviser and friend to many of us, distinguishing himself by continuously going above and beyond the call of duty to serve the needs of Congress.

This Chamber will feel Colonel Cook's absence. I join many past and present Members of Congress in my gratitude and appreciation to Colonel Cook for his outstanding leadership and unwavering support. There is no

doubt that the strength of our soldiers comes from their families. Colonel Cook's strength comes from his wife Traci and his two sons, Nathan and Joshua. This Nation is grateful for their commitment and personal sacrifices made throughout Colonel Cook's career.

On behalf of the U.S. Senate and the United States of America, I commend Colonel Cook for his tireless efforts in the support of our Army, our military, and our Nation. As Nate and his family transition from the military, I congratulate him on completing an extremely successful military career and wish all of them the best in all their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO ZACHARY ZAMPELLA

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I recognize Zachary Daniel Zampella, who, after 12 years of serving the people of Florida in the U.S. Senate, has moved on to new opportunities. I thank him for his years of hard work with my office.

Zach began his time with my office as a caseworker specializing in military and veterans administration issues before becoming my regional director for Southwest Florida in 2012. He returned to my Orlando office in 2015, serving as deputy director of constituent services.

During his time with my office, Zach mentored several of my staffers, played a key role in my Constituent Services Department and disaster relief efforts, and drafted office correspondence. He also assisted veterans with their issues pertaining to the Department of Veteran Affairs and worked with other various Federal, State, and local government agencies.

In 2017, he assisted residents affected by Hurricane Irma, working our Recovery Assistance Center events held in the hardest hit cities across Florida. In 2018 and 2019, he made several trips to the panhandle region after Hurricane Michael's devastation. He walked door-to-door to assist constituents and provided valuable assistance in the region.

Zach grew up in Orlando, FL, graduating with his bachelor's degree in history and master's degree in business administration from Southeastern University in Lakeland, FL. After graduation, he interned for Senator Mel Martinez, later joining his staff in 2008. He also worked for Senator George LeMieux before joining my staff in 2011.

Zach's work for my constituents for my office made a real difference over the years. I am grateful for his dedicated service to the people of Florida and extend my best wishes to Zach on his future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING RUPE'S BURGERS

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, as a senior member and former chairman of

the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today I am pleased to honor Rupe's Burgers in Blackfoot, which will celebrate its 34th anniversary this month, as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2021.

Rupe's Burgers is an American-style diner and drive-in known for its quality food and strong community foundation. In 1962, former owner Vaughn Rupe opened an A&W Restaurant and after years of success made the decision to sell the restaurant in 1978. In 1987, Vaughn's son Kevin purchased the property and renamed the restaurant "Rupe's Burgers."

Rupe's Burgers prides itself on its dedication to community service. The Rupe family donates and volunteers for local philanthropic missions, such as the Santa's Helpers Program, a holiday drive organized by Bingham County emergency responders to provide gifts to economically disadvantaged children. The restaurant has also donated to local organizations that promote the success and leadership of women, such as Blackfoot Distinguished Young Women and Soroptimists. In addition to its philanthropic efforts, the Rupe family puts a premium on serving and celebrating the Blackfoot community, featuring memorabilia from local school sports teams and providing nearly 50 jobs to the local community.

Congratulations to Kevin and all of the employees of Rupe's Burgers on being selected as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2021, and congratulations on 34 years in business. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1125. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under

Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, "Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account" and a semiannual listing of personal property contributed by coalition partners; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1126. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Higher-Priced Mortgage Loan Escrow Exemption (Regulation Z); Correcting Amendments" (RIN3170-AA83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1127. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1128. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1129. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Construction Permits By Rule" (FRL No. 10024-22-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1130. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; OR; Smoke Management Revision" (FRL No. 10022-46-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1131. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Second Maintenance Plan for the Youngstown-Warren-Sharon Area" (FRL No. 10023-70-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1132. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Second Maintenance Plan for the York-Adams Area" (FRL No. 10023-71-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1133. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Texas; Revisions to the Texas Diesel Emissions Reduction Incentive Program" (FRL No. 10024-03-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1134. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Designation; TN; Redesignation of the Sumner County 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Unclassifiable Area" (FRL No. 10024-20-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1135. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Utah; Source Category Exemptions" (FRL No. 10024-14-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1136. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Act New Source Review Operating Permit Program; Notice of Transfer of Permits to Wyoming Department of Environment Quality" (FRL No. 10024-01-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1137. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Medicare Coverage of Innovative Technology (MCIT) and Definition of 'Reasonable and Necessary'; Delay of Effective Date" (RIN0938-AT88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1138. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Qualified Opportunity Zone Boundaries Unaffected by 2020 Decennial Census Changes" (Announcement 2021-10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1139. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2021-26" (Rev. Proc. 2021-26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1140. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2021-0062—2021-0067); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1141. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2021-0068—2021-0070); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1142. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2018: Older Americans Act Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1143. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Council Resolution 23-575, "Transfer of Jurisdiction over Lot 901 within Square 620 Emergency Approval Resolution of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1144. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1145. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1146. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Cedar Rapids, Iowa" ((DA 21-584) (Docket No. 21-51)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1147. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Green Bay, Wisconsin" ((DA 21-581) (Docket No. 21-72)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1148. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Albany, Georgia" ((DA 21-582) (Docket No. 21-70)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1149. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Jonesboro, Arkansas" ((DA 21-595) (Docket No. 21-56)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1150. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Amarillo, Texas" ((DA 21-594) (Docket No. 21-52)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1151. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; St. George, Utah" ((DA 21-596) (Docket No. 21-53)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1152. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Hannibal, Missouri" ((DA 21-601) (Docket No. 21-71)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 27, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 169. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to require the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application

for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 312. A bill to expand eligibility for and provide judicial review for the Elderly Home Detention Pilot Program, provide for compassionate release based on COVID-19 vulnerability, shorten the waiting period for judicial review during the COVID-19 pandemic, and make other technical corrections.

By Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 610. A bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve obstetric care in rural areas.

S. 1675. A bill to improve maternal health.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1963. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1964. A bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1965. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve long-term care provided to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 1966. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the availability of coverage for lung cancer screenings without the imposition of cost sharing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SINEMA:

S. 1967. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to carry out minor military construction projects to construct child development centers and to provide education and treatment services for infant and early childhood mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 1968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide bonus depreciation for certain space launch expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the credit for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms.

WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1970. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct testing for and remediation of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances at or surrounding installations of the Department of Defense located in the United States, formerly used for defense sites, and State-owned facilities of the National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1971. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1972. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve dependent coverage under the TRICARE Young Adult Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1973. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct testing, removal, and remediation of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances at all military installations, formerly used defense sites, and State-owned facilities of the National Guard in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1974. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Strategic National Stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. OSSOFF, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 1975. A bill to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1976. A bill to establish a program to oversee the global COVID-10 response and prepare for future pandemics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1977. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide Medicaid coverage for all pregnant and postpartum women, to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by

doulas, midwives, and lactation consultants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1978. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify the credit for increasing research activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1980. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to track the distribution of all farm subsidies by race, gender, and size of the farm operation and to make that information about farm subsidies available to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 259. A resolution remembering the victims of the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre and condemning the continued and intensifying crackdown on human rights and basic freedoms within the People's Republic of China, including the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, by the Chinese Community Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 260. A resolution remembering the 32nd anniversary of the violent repression of peaceful protests centered in Beijing's Tiananmen Square and expressing the sense of the Senate condemning the Government of the People's Republic of China's ongoing denial of basic rights and fundamental freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 261. A resolution recognizing June 2021 as "LGBTQ Pride Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. Res. 262. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in *United States v. Dodd*; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL):

S. Res. 263. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in *United States v. Taylor*; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 89

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID-19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory causes of death, and for other purposes.

S. 137

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 137, a bill to restrict the availability of Federal funds to organizations associated with the abortion industry.

S. 247

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 247, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 267

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 267, a bill to increase the Federal share of operating costs for certain projects that receive grants under the Formula Grants to Rural Areas Program of the Federal Transit Administration.

S. 331

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 331, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 377

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Mon-

tana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 406

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 406, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 475

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 475, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

S. 477

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable tax credit for travel expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 544

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 544, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one week each year as "Buddy Check Week" for the purpose of outreach and education concerning peer wellness checks for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 699

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 699, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 736

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 792

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 792, a bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify certain agricultural exemptions for hours of service requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to provide for the adjustment or modification by the Secretary of Agriculture of loans for critical rural utility service providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1061, a bill to encourage the normalization of relations with Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1175, a bill to categorize public safety telecommunications as a protective service occupation under the Standard Occupational Classification System.

S. 1178

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1178, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for employers of reservists.

S. 1190

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced Federal matching payments for direct support worker training programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1192

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1192, a bill to amend subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act to authorize direct support worker career advancement demonstration projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to amend subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act to fund additional projects that focus on competency-based training for personal or home care aides, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets, and for other purposes.

S. 1276

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1276, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 1334

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to amend the Toxic Substance Control Act to codify a Federal cause of action and a type of remedy available for individuals significantly exposed to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, to encourage research and accountability for irresponsible discharge of those substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to establish a basic needs allowance for low-income regular members of the Armed Forces.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Inspector General

Act of 1978 to establish an Inspector General of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1535, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1663

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1663, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and title 39, United States Code, to provide the United States Postal Service the authority to mail alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

S. 1682

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1682, a bill to prohibit certain provisions of an Executive Order relating to land conservation from taking effect, and for other purposes.

S. 1762

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1762, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit retirement plans to consider certain factors in investment decisions.

S. 1786

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1786, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require disclosures to contributors regarding recurring contributions or donations.

S. 1793

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1793, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve health care coverage under vision and dental plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to address mental health issues for youth, particularly youth of color, and for other purposes.

S. 1837

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1837, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program for law enforcement agencies and corrections agencies to obtain behavioral health crisis response training for law enforcement officers and corrections officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1841

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1841, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 1844

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1844, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to move Medicare cost-sharing benefits from Medicaid to Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1853

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1853, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a Motorcyclist Advisory Council.

S. 1859

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to require the Secretary concerned to pay a member in the reserve component of an Armed Force a special bonus or incentive pay in the same amount as a member in the regular component of that Armed Force.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to health care for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1904

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1904, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 1939

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1939, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of antisemitic hate crimes, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 9, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

S. RES. 165

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 165, a resolution calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan.

S. RES. 212

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 212, a resolution establishing a McCain-Mansfield Fellowship Program in the Senate.

S. RES. 224

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KANE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 224, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States must seize the opportunity to create millions of jobs, become a net exporter of clean energy, and secure a better, more equitable future by accelerating the electrification of households, buildings, and businesses in the United States, modernizing the United States electricity grid, and continuing on the path towards decarbonizing electricity generation in the United States by 2035.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1970. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct testing for and remediation of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances at or surrounding installations of the Department of Defense located in the United States, formerly used defense sites, and State-owned facilities of the National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "Clean Water For

Military Families Act." This legislation would provide \$10 billion for the Department of Defense to conduct investigations and remediate PFAS contamination at and surrounding DOD installations in the U.S. and state-owned National Guard facilities.

Dating back to the 1960s, the U.S. Navy began using a firefighting foam called aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) that contains toxic PFAS chemicals. The military used AFFF firefighting foam for emergencies, fire training exercises, and equipment testing, resulting in large discharges of PFAS contamination in groundwater and other environments.

For decades, DOD continued using AFFF firefighting foam despite mounting evidence of detrimental health concerns, and even after leading manufacturers voluntarily phased out production of PFOS and PFOA, the two most widespread and studied PFAS compounds.

In recent years, Congress has passed legislation requiring DOD to phase out the use of AFFF firefighting foams. While this is a vital step toward ensuring DOD adopts PFAS-free alternatives going forward, it does not address DOD's legacy pollution.

To clean up the legacy pollution at contaminated military sites across the country, this legislation authorizes a one-time, \$10 billion investment for PFAS investigations and cleanup. We owe it to military communities to ensure that they can drink clean water and live pollution-free.

There are hundreds of contaminated military sites across the country that jeopardize the health, safety, and well-being of military communities who have suffered from exposure to PFAS pollution and toxic drinking water.

In California alone, there are 62 military facilities with a known or suspected PFAS release.

Since the discovery of PFAS at these installations, there has been little to no progress on the bases with the highest PFAS detections. A \$10 billion investment would accelerate DOD's existing cleanup efforts and cover all types of PFAS chemicals. Absent this legislation, it could take decades for DOD to clean up toxic PFAS. We must act now to move beyond studying the problem and toward a comprehensive cleanup effort to protect service-members, veterans, and military communities.

I thank my co-lead, Senator GILLIBRAND for her tireless leadership fighting PFAS contamination at DOD sites. I also thank the bill's cosponsors for championing this effort with me in the Senate.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the "Clean Water for Military Families Act" as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE 1989 TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE AND CONDEMNING THE CONTINUED AND INTENSIFYING CRACKDOWN ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND BASIC FREEDOMS WITHIN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, INCLUDING THE HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION, BY THE CHINESE COMMUNITY PARTY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 259

Whereas, on April 15, 1989, peaceful demonstrators gathered in Tiananmen Square in central Beijing to mourn the death of former General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) Hu Yaobang, who was compelled to resign in 1987 for expressing support of students demanding political reform;

Whereas, throughout April and May 1989, peaceful demonstrations continued in Tiananmen Square and in an estimated 400 cities across China;

Whereas, by May 17, 1989, an estimated 1,000,000 Chinese citizens from all walks of life, including students, government employees, journalists, workers, police officers, and members of the armed forces, gathered peacefully in Tiananmen Square to call for democratic reforms;

Whereas the peaceful demonstrators of 1989 called upon the Government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) to eliminate corruption, accelerate economic and political reform, and protect human rights, particularly the freedoms of expression and assembly;

Whereas, on May 20, 1989, the Government of the PRC declared martial law;

Whereas, during the late afternoon and early evening hours of June 3, 1989, the CCP leadership sent armed People's Liberation Army (PLA) troops and tanks into Beijing and surrounding streets;

Whereas, on the night of June 3, 1989, and continuing into the morning of June 4, 1989, PLA soldiers, at the direction of CCP leadership, fired indiscriminately into crowds of peaceful protesters, killing and injuring thousands of demonstrators and other unarmed civilians;

Whereas the Government of the PRC continues to censor any mention of the crackdown centered on Tiananmen Square, prevent the victims from being publicly mourned and remembered, and harass, detain, and arrest those who call for a full, public, and independent accounting of the wounded, dead, and those imprisoned for participating in the spring 1989 demonstrations;

Whereas the sovereignty of Hong Kong transferred from the United Kingdom to the PRC in 1997 under the terms of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong (in this resolution referred to as the "Joint Declaration"), which guaranteed that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) will "enjoy a high degree of autonomy" and committed the PRC to keep the "social and economic systems in Hong Kong" unchanged through 2047;

Whereas the Joint Declaration states that "[r]ights and freedoms, including those of

the person, of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association, of travel, of movement, of correspondence, of strike, of choice of occupation, of academic research and of religious belief will be ensured by law in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region” and that those rights are reiterated in chapter III of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China;

Whereas the people of Hong Kong have held an annual Tiananmen Square vigil since 1990, which has been the only such mass gathering on Chinese territory because commemorations are banned in mainland China;

Whereas, on June 4, 2020, thousands of people in Hong Kong defied a ban by the Hong Kong Police Force and gathered at the city’s annual June 4 vigil to memorialize the 31st anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre;

Whereas, on June 30, 2020, China’s National People’s Congress Standing Committee flagrantly undermined the high degree of autonomy guaranteed to Hong Kong in the Joint Declaration and Basic Law by passing and imposing upon Hong Kong the oppressive and intentionally vague Law of the People’s Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (the “national security law”);

Whereas the central Government of PRC and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) government have since used the national security law to suppress democratic voices in Hong Kong, including by barring candidates from standing for election and by arresting pro-democracy activists and opposition leaders;

Whereas, on March 11, 2021, China’s National People’s Congress adopted the “Decision of the National People’s Congress on Improving the Electoral System of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region”, thereby further restricting Hong Kong’s electoral freedom and democratic representation;

Whereas, on May 6, 2021, a Hong Kong judge sentenced several Hong Kong pro-democracy activists to between 4 and 10 months in jail for participating in the unauthorized Tiananmen Square vigil in June 2020;

Whereas, on May 27, 2021, the Hong Kong Police Force officially banned the June 4 vigil for the second consecutive year, citing a ban on large gatherings in light of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 pandemic;

Whereas, on May 27, 2021, the Hong Kong Legislative Council passed legislation amending local election laws to bring them in line with the China’s National People’s Congress’ March 11, 2021, “Decision of the National People’s Congress on Improving the Electoral System of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region”;

Whereas June 4, 2021, marks the 32nd anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre;

Whereas the Government of the PRC has committed genocide and crimes against humanity against the predominantly Muslim Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minority groups in Xinjiang; and

Whereas the Government of the PRC continues to violate the human rights of pro-democracy activists, members of ethnic minorities, including individuals in the Tibetan regions, religious believers, human rights lawyers, citizen journalists, and labor union leaders, among many others seeking to express their political or religious views or ethnic identity in a peaceful manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its deepest respect for and solidarity with the families and friends of those killed, tortured, and imprisoned for participating in the pro-democracy demonstrations during the spring of 1989, and with those who

have continued to suffer for their fight to publicly mourn the Tiananmen Square massacre victims;

(2) reaffirms its support for those who continue to work for political reform, rule of law, and protections for human rights in China;

(3) condemns the Government of the People’s Republic of China for its continued human rights abuses, including suppressing peaceful political dissent and ethnic and religious minorities;

(4) calls on the Government of the People’s Republic of China to—

(A) cease censoring information and discussion about the Tiananmen Square massacre;

(B) invite and cooperate with a full and independent investigation into the Tiananmen Square massacre by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

(C) uphold its international legal obligations to Hong Kong under the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong (“Joint Declaration”) and cease undermining Hong Kong’s high degree of autonomy; and

(D) allow those participants in the Tiananmen demonstrations who fled overseas or reside outside of China after being “blacklisted” for their peaceful protest activity to return to China without risk of retribution;

(5) calls on the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, and the relevant authorities in the Government of the People’s Republic of China to—

(A) respect and uphold the personal rights and freedoms of the people of Hong Kong and the independence of Hong Kong’s legal system;

(B) restore independent democratic representation to the people of Hong Kong in line with the “One Country, Two Systems” arrangement set forth in the Joint Declaration and its implementing document, the Basic Law; and

(C) allow those living in exile for engaging in pro-democracy activities to return to Hong Kong without fear of detention or other repercussions;

(6) calls on the United States Government and members of Congress to mark the 32nd anniversary of the Tiananmen Square protests, including through meetings with participants of the Tiananmen Square protests who live outside of China and the families and friends of the victims of the Tiananmen Square massacre based outside China; and

(7) supports ongoing peaceful movements for human rights in China and of the people in Hong Kong, Tibet, and Xinjiang.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—REMEMBERING THE 32ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENT REPRESSION OF THE PEACEFUL PROTESTS CENTERED IN BEIJING’S TIANANMEN SQUARE AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA’S ONGOING DENIAL OF BASIC RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 260

Whereas, during the spring of 1989, an estimated 1,000,000 people engaged in Tiananmen Square protests and staged similar protests in over 400 Chinese cities, including among many others, students, workers, academics, journalists and government employees;

Whereas the peaceful demonstrations of 1989 called upon the Government of the People’s Republic of China (“China”) to eliminate corruption, accelerate economic and political reform, and protect human rights, particularly the freedoms of expression and assembly, issues that have become more acute in United States-China relations 32 years later;

Whereas, on June 4, 1989, troops of the People’s Liberation Army, at the behest of Chinese Communist Party leadership, attacked Tiananmen Square to repress demonstrators, crushing defenseless protestors with tanks and firing on them indiscriminately, killing hundreds or possibly thousands of individuals;

Whereas, since June 4, 1989, the Government of China censors any mention of the Tiananmen Square Massacre, even the date it occurred, and imprisons and harasses its own citizens who attempt to discuss or peacefully commemorate Tiananmen Square protests and their violent suppression;

Whereas the Tiananmen Mothers—a group in China composed of parents and family members of individuals killed on or around June 4, 1989—have annually called upon the Government of China to reveal the full truth of what transpired, and some members of this group have passed away without obtaining justice and accountability for their family members who were killed in 1989;

Whereas people of mainland China and Macau are again barred this year from commemorating the lives lost and the legacy of the 1989 massacre, and the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China (“Hong Kong”) is using pandemic restrictions as a pretext for denying the vigil organizers a permit to gather;

Whereas the Government of China continues to view the demands of the Tiananmen protesters, including democracy, transparency, rights protections, and freedom of speech, as threats to the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party’s hold on political power;

Whereas the 32nd anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre is a poignant milestone, particularly as the autonomy of Hong Kong and freedoms guaranteed to the people of Hong Kong have been crushed by the Government of China’s imposition of the Law of the People’s Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region on June 30, 2020;

Whereas the people of Hong Kong have peacefully commemorated the Tiananmen massacre each year faithfully in large numbers;

Whereas, starting in 2020, the Hong Kong Police Force has blocked the annual candlelight vigil to commemorate Tiananmen;

Whereas Hong Kong’s autonomy and freedoms have been blatantly denied by the actions of the Government of Hong Kong and the Government of China, particularly over the past several years, with disqualifications of elected members of Hong Kong’s Legislative Council, blocking citizens from running for office, failing to address the petitions of the Hong Kong people, banning a political party advocating Hong Kong independence, failing to address excessive use of force by police, and criminalizing peaceful political activities through the use of spurious charges of “subversion,” “collusion with a

foreign country or with external elements,” and “secession”;

Whereas reforms to Hong Kong’s legislative council ended any semblance of electoral democracy in Hong Kong by requiring the nomination of candidates by the Election Committee, which previously only elected the Chief Executive, reducing the number of directly elected seats from 35 to 20, and requires vetting by a screening committee of the “patriotism” of any candidate, defined as allegiance to the Government of Hong Kong and the Government of China and often interpreted as support for the Chinese Communist Party;

Whereas the political turmoil in Hong Kong is the result of actions of the Government of Hong Kong and the Government of China, including the arbitrary arrests and sentencing of peaceful protesters, including well-known democracy advocates such as Joshua Wong, Martin Lee, Jimmy Lai, Lee Cheuk Yan, Margaret Ng, Albert Ho, Leung Kwok-hung, Au Nok-hin, Figo Chan, and others;

Whereas, on May 6, 2021, four Hong Kong pro-democracy activists — Joshua Wong, Lester Shum, Tiffany Yuen, and Jannelle Leung — were sentenced to lengthy prison terms for participating in last year’s Tiananmen Square vigil;

Whereas the arbitrary arrests of Hong Kong residents for participating in peaceful rallies and vigils, which is a violation of the rights guaranteed to the residents of Hong Kong by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing on December 19, 1984 (the “Sino-British Declaration”), should be considered by the international community to be the arbitrary detention of political prisoners for the purposes of applying sanctions under the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-76) and the Hong Kong Autonomy Act (Public Law 116-149);

Whereas China’s National People’s Congress has imposed national security legislation with respect to Hong Kong in contravention of the procedures outlined in the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China (the “Basic Law”);

Whereas that legislation has nullified the independence of Hong Kong’s judiciary and its tradition of rule of law by suspending due process and trial by jury for cases deemed issues of national security;

Whereas the implementation of that legislation has effectively destroyed Hong Kong’s autonomy in direct violation of the Sino-British Declaration;

Whereas the National Security Law is in direct conflict with the rights guaranteed to the people of Hong Kong by virtue of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Hong Kong is made subject by way of the Basic Law;

Whereas the United States Department of State, pursuant to the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383) and the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-76), determined that Hong Kong no longer manifests a “high degree of autonomy” distinct from mainland China;

Whereas vague national security laws are used widely in mainland China to imprison or arbitrarily detain dissidents, rights defenders, civil society advocates, religious leaders and adherents, former party members, and persons from ethnic groups whose religious freedom, linguistic rights, and political expression are heavily restricted by Chinese authorities;

Whereas human rights, democracy, and religious freedom advocates continue to be imprisoned, arbitrarily detained, disappeared and held incommunicado in undisclosed locations, and abducted across international borders under vague national security laws and other criminal charges in mainland China, including Gao Zhisheng, Gui Minhai, Xing Wangli, Jiang Tianyong, Wu Gan, Qin Yongmin, Zhou Shifeng, Yu Wensheng, Wang Yi, and Nobel laureate Liu Xiaobo, who died in state custody nearly four years ago;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party and the Government of China used the tools of state power to silence whistleblowers at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, including doctors such as the late Li Wenliang, journalists, lawyers, scientists, and concerned citizens, and has subsequently imprisoned some of these individuals, including Zhang Zhan, who was sentenced to four years in prison on account of her whistleblowing activity, and Chen Zhaozhi, who has been detained for over a year on account of COVID-19 related social media posts;

Whereas the United States Congress, particularly in recent years, has passed numerous measures articulating the longstanding and bipartisan commitment to human rights in China, including—

(A) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note);

(B) the North Korean Human Rights Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-198);

(C) the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-330);

(D) the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-76);

(E) the Hong Kong Autonomy Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-149);

(F) the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act (Public Law 116-145); and

(G) the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-260);

Whereas, on this day, we stand in solidarity with Chinese human rights lawyers, labor and free speech advocates, Christians and other religious groups, and those distinct ethnic groups who face persecution, such as Tibetans, who continue to face severe restrictions and a concerted state effort to erase Tibetan Buddhism, the Tibetan language, and Tibetan traditional culture;

Whereas, on this day, we condemn the ongoing campaign of genocide and crimes against humanity committed by the Chinese Communist Party and the Government of China against Uyghurs as well as other Muslim ethnic groups who live in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, more than 1,000,000 of whom have been forced into mass internment camps, suffering a range of human rights abuses including being tortured, sexually assaulted, forced to renounce their religion and pledge allegiance to the Government of China, coerced into state-run programs of forced labor, separated from their families, and forced to undergo abortion and sterilization procedures; and

Whereas, on this day, we remember the words of the late Nobel Laureate Liu Xiaobo, who said there is “no force that can put an end to the human quest for freedom, and China will in the end become a nation ruled by law, where human rights reign supreme”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the Tiananmen protests and their violent suppression until such time as citizens of China are able to do so freely and publicly everywhere across their country;

(2) expresses sympathy to the families of those killed, tortured, imprisoned, or exiled for their participation in the pro-democracy demonstrations during the spring of 1989;

(3) calls on the Government of China to allow those Tiananmen demonstration participants currently living in exile in the United States and other countries to return to China without risk of repercussions or retribution to themselves, their families, or their allies;

(4) condemns the use of violence, torture, harassment, and arbitrary detention as a means to repress the legitimate aspirations of the people of China to speak and associate freely, including to petition the government and challenge the policies and ideology of the Chinese Communist Party;

(5) calls on the Government of China to release all prisoners of conscience, including prisoners detained because of their participation in Tiananmen Square commemorations or actions calling for the type of political reforms and rights protections pursued by those who gathered in Tiananmen Square in 1989 and including over one million Uyghurs and other predominantly Muslim ethnic minorities in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(6) condemns the forced imposition of national security legislation with respect to Hong Kong;

(7) calls upon the President to continue to use existing authorities to hold accountable Hong Kong officials, including Hong Kong Chief Executive Carrie Lam, and Government of China officials for crushing Hong Kong’s autonomy and guaranteed rights; and

(8) calls upon the President to build an international coalition to demand that the Government of China adhere to its international agreements and human rights obligations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—RECOGNIZING JUNE 2021 AS “LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 261

Whereas individuals who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as “LGBTQ”) include individuals from—

(1) all States, territories, and the District of Columbia; and

(2) all faiths, races, national origins, socioeconomic statuses, disability statuses, education levels, and political beliefs;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States have made, and continue to make, vital contributions to the United States and to the world in every aspect, including in the fields of education, law, health, business, science, research, economic development, architecture, fashion, sports, government, music, film, politics, technology, literature, and civil rights;

Whereas the coronavirus disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as “COVID-19”) pandemic compounds the systemic inequality that LGBTQ individuals face in the healthcare, employment, and housing systems in the United States, leading to a disparate impact on LGBTQ individuals;

Whereas the persistent failure of Federal and State officials to collect full and accurate data on sexual orientation and gender identity, particularly in the current COVID-19 pandemic, causes tremendous harm to LGBTQ individuals in the United States, who remain largely invisible to the government entities entrusted with ensuring their health, safety, and well-being;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States serve on the front lines during the COVID-19 pandemic as doctors, nurses, medical professionals, law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders in all States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States serve, and have served, the United States Army, Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marines honorably and with distinction and bravery;

Whereas a decades-long Federal policy, known as the “Lavender Scare”, threatened and intimidated Federal public servants from employment due to their sexual orientation, alleging LGBTQ individuals posed a threat to national security, preventing many more from entering the workforce;

Whereas an estimated number of more than 100,000 brave service members were discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States between the beginning of World War II and 2011 because of their sexual orientation, including the discharge of more than 13,000 service members under the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy in place between 1994 and 2011;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States serve, and have served, in positions in the Federal Government and State and local governments, including as members of Congress, Cabinet Secretaries, Governors, mayors, and city council members;

Whereas the demonstrators who protested on June 28, 1969, following a law enforcement raid of the Stonewall Inn, an LGBTQ club in New York City, are pioneers of the LGBTQ movement for equality;

Whereas, throughout much of the history of the United States, same-sex relationships were criminalized in many States, and many LGBTQ individuals in the United States were forced to hide their LGBTQ identities while living in secrecy and fear;

Whereas, on June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584, that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry and acknowledged that “[n]o union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family”;

Whereas Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (referred to in this preamble as “AIDS”) has disproportionately impacted LGBTQ individuals in the United States, due in part to a lack of funding and research devoted to finding effective treatment for AIDS and the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”) during the early stages of the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas gay and bisexual men and transgender women of color have a higher risk of contracting HIV;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has maintained its unwavering commitment to ending the HIV and AIDS epidemic;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States face disparities in employment, healthcare, education, housing, and many

other areas central to the pursuit of happiness in the United States;

Whereas 28 States have no explicit ban on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, housing, or public accommodations, and 34 States have no explicit ban on discrimination against LGBTQ individuals in education;

Whereas LGBTQ youth are at increased risk of—

- (1) suicide;
- (2) homelessness;
- (3) becoming victims of bullying, violence, or human trafficking; and
- (4) developing mental health illnesses, including anxiety and depression;

Whereas only 13 States and the District of Columbia have explicit policies in place to protect foster youth from discrimination based on both sexual orientation and gender identity;

Whereas LGBTQ youth of color are overrepresented in child welfare and juvenile justice systems;

Whereas the LGBTQ community has faced discrimination, inequality, and violence throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas State legislatures across the country have introduced and passed harmful legislation directly targeting LGBTQ youth, particularly transgender youth, and their ability to participate in athletic activities and obtain access to healthcare;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States, in particular transgender individuals, face a disproportionately high risk of becoming victims of violent hate crimes;

Whereas members of the LGBTQ community have been targeted in acts of mass violence, including—

- (1) the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida, on June 12, 2016, where 49 people were killed; and
- (2) the arson attack at the UpStairs Lounge in New Orleans, Louisiana, on June 24, 1973, where 32 people died;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States face persecution, violence, and death in many parts of the world, including State-sponsored violence;

Whereas in the several years preceding 2019, hundreds of LGBTQ individuals around the world were arrested and, in some cases, tortured or even executed because of their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in countries and territories such as Chechnya, Egypt, Indonesia, and Tanzania;

Whereas, in May 2019, Taiwan became the first place in Asia to extend marriage rights to same-sex couples;

Whereas, since June 2019, Ecuador, Northern Ireland, and Costa Rica have extended marriage rights to same-sex couples, the most recent country-wide extensions of those rights in the world;

Whereas the LGBTQ community holds Pride festivals and marches in some of the most dangerous places in the world, despite threats of violence and arrest;

Whereas, in 2009, President Barack Obama signed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act (division E of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2835) into law to protect all individuals in the United States from crimes motivated by their actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States have fought for equal treatment, dignity, and respect;

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States have achieved significant milestones, ensuring that future generations of LGBTQ individuals in the United States will enjoy a more equal and just society;

Whereas, despite being marginalized throughout the history of the United States,

LGBTQ individuals in the United States continue to celebrate their identities, love, and contributions to the United States in various expressions of Pride;

Whereas Pride is a celebration of visibility in spite of marginalization, and the LGBTQ community will continue to observe this significant cultural practice even though physical Pride celebrations may be compromised in June 2021 due to the health and safety needs of all individuals involved;

Whereas, in June 2020, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that existing civil rights laws prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, a landmark victory for the LGBTQ community; and

Whereas LGBTQ individuals in the United States remain determined to pursue full equality, respect, and inclusion for all individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the rights, freedoms, and equal treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this resolution as “LGBTQ”) individuals in the United States and around the world;

(2) acknowledges that LGBTQ rights are human rights that are to be protected by the laws of the United States and numerous international treaties and conventions;

(3) supports efforts to ensure the equal treatment of all individuals in the United States, regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity;

(4) supports efforts to ensure that the United States remains a beacon of hope for the equal treatment of individuals around the world, including LGBTQ individuals; and

(5) encourages the celebration of June as “LGBTQ Pride Month” in order to provide a lasting opportunity for all individuals in the United States—

(A) to learn about the discrimination and inequality that the LGBTQ community endured, and continues to endure; and

(B) to celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community throughout the history of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. DODD

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 262

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Dodd*, Cr. No. 18–243, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony, and, if necessary, documents from Laura Bowen, an employee of the Senate Post Office, a department of the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Laura Bowen and any other current or former employee of the Senate Post Office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *United States v. Dodd*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent any current or former employee of the Senate Post Office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. TAYLOR

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 263

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Taylor*, Cr. No. 21-6, pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony and, if necessary, documents from Nicole Meservey, an employee of the office of Senator Mark Warner;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Nicole Meservey, an employee of the office of Senator Mark Warner, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *United States v. Taylor*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Warner and any current or former employees of his office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2116. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2117. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1782 submitted by Mr. CARDIN and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2116. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3313 and insert the following:

SEC. 3313. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) Definitions.—Section 1262 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—The term ‘immediate family member’, with respect to a foreign person, means the spouse, parent, sibling, or adult child of the person.”

(b) Sense of Congress.—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by inserting after section 1262 the following new section:

“SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

“It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.”

(c) Imposition of Sanctions.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) In general.—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

“(1) any foreign person that the President determines, based on credible information—

“(A) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, serious human rights abuse;

“(B) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

“(i) corruption, including—

“(I) the misappropriation of state assets;

“(II) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

“(III) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

“(IV) bribery; or

“(ii) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

“(C) is or has been a leader or official of—

“(i) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in subparagraph (A) or (B) related to the tenure of the leader or official; or

“(ii) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities related to the tenure of the leader or official;

“(D) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

“(i) an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that is conducted by a foreign person;

“(ii) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

“(iii) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) conducted by a foreign person; or

“(E) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; and

“(2) any immediate family member of a person described in paragraph (1).”

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting “corruption and” after “monitor”.

(3) REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting “or an immediate family member of the person”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS” and inserting “SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE”; and

(II) by striking “described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a)(1) relating to serious human rights abuse or any violation of internationally recognized human rights”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “described in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a)(1) relating to corruption or the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption”; and

(II) by striking “ranking member of” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees”.

(4) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and the immediate family members of that person” after “a person”.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) A description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of serious

human rights abuse, violations of internationally recognized human rights, and corruption in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which sanctions have been imposed under section 1263 are located.”.

(e) **REPEAL OF SUNSET.**—Section 1265 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is repealed.

SA 2117. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1782 submitted by Mr. CARDIN and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 1502 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3313 and insert the following:

SEC. 3313. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) **Definitions.**—Section 1262 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.**—The term ‘immediate family member’, with respect to a foreign person, means the spouse, parent, sibling, or adult child of the person.”.

(b) **Sense of Congress.**—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by inserting after section 1262 the following new section:

“SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

“It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.”.

(c) **Imposition of Sanctions.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **In General.**—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

“(1) any foreign person that the President determines, based on credible information—

“(A) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, serious human rights abuse;

“(B) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

“(i) corruption, including—

“(I) the misappropriation of state assets;

“(II) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

“(III) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

“(IV) bribery; or

“(i) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

“(C) is or has been a leader or official of—

“(i) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in subparagraph (A) or (B) related to the tenure of the leader or official; or

“(ii) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities related to the tenure of the leader or official;

“(D) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

“(i) an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that is conducted by a foreign person;

“(ii) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

“(iii) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B) conducted by a foreign person; or

“(E) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; and

“(2) any immediate family member of a person described in paragraph (1).”.

(2) **CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting “corruption and” after “monitor”.

(3) **REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.**—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting “or an immediate family member of the person”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS” and inserting “SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE”; and

(II) by striking “described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a)(1) relating to serious human rights abuse or any violation of internationally recognized human rights”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “described in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a)(1) relating to corruption or the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption”; and

(II) by striking “ranking member of” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees”.

(4) **TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.**—Subsection (g) of such section is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “and the immediate family members of that person” after “a person”.

(d) **Reports to Congress.**—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) A description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to for-

eign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of serious human rights abuse, violations of internationally recognized human rights, and corruption in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which sanctions have been imposed under section 1263 are located.”.

(e) **Repeal of Sunset.**—Section 1265 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is repealed.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is

authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 08, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, in my opening speech about the rightwing scheme to capture the Court, the Supreme Court, I described the secret strategy memo that Lewis Powell wrote on the eve of his appointment to the Court about how to deploy corporate political power.

As a Justice of the Supreme Court, Powell had the chance to prove to the corporate world his secret memo's theory of what could be achieved by "exploiting judicial action"—his phrase—particularly with, as he called it, "an activist-minded Supreme Court."

Second, Powell had the chance on the Court to start laying the legal groundwork for precisely the sort of corporate political activity that his secret memo had recommended to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Powell did both.

The first case that allowed Powell to implement recommendations from his secret report came in 1976, in a case about the Federal Election Campaign Act. The case was *Buckley v. Valeo*, and the decision was a beast—138 pages, with another 83 pages of dissent and concurrence cobbled together by the Court with what one observer called "extraordinary speed." Five Justices in that case, including Powell, were described as First Amendment hawks who were wary of any portion of the Federal Election Campaign Act that could inhibit free speech and association.

Now, you have to understand that free speech and association were buzz words for corporate political activity precisely of the sort championed in Powell's secret chamber memo. Free speech meant corporate America having the right to be heard, even to, as the secret report said, "equal time." Freedom of association provided corporations the "organization," "careful long-range planning and implementation," and well-financed "joint effort"—all those quotes—that Powell had recommended be done in his report "through united action and national organizations."

The Court's decision in *Valeo* did two noncontroversial things. It accepted that campaign contributions could be limited because unlimited campaign contributions could give rise to corruption or at least the appearance of corruption. Unlimited donations to candidates would even "undermine representative democracy," the Court said. No big deal. The Court also decided that candidates may spend as much of their own money as they want on their own campaigns. It considered unlimited spending on one's own campaign protected by the First Amendment, as there was little danger of corruption from spending one's own campaign money on oneself.

So both of those holdings are unremarkable. What was remarkable

was where Powell and his hawks took the Court when other interests, like corporate interests, wanted to spend money on a candidate. Corporate political spending per se was not at issue in the case, but spending by special interests is precisely the kind of political influence which Powell had recommended in his secret report to the chamber.

Powell and his hawks said special interest political spending, so long as it was not in the form of a campaign contribution, was protected by the same principle that protected a candidate spending his own money on his own campaign.

Powell asserted that limiting these supposedly "independent" special interest expenditures "perpetrates (the) grossest infringement' on First Amendment rights." He did acknowledge the interest in "purity" of elections," but he used skeptical quotation marks around the word "purity," just like he had used skeptical quotation marks in his report around the word "environment." But Powell dismissed those purity concerns as likely "illusory," to use his word.

Powell's Bench memo for the case critiqued the election law's "attempt to lower barriers to political competition to increase the range of voter choice." It read: "[T]he attempt to open access for the many necessarily involves limiting the power of the few to exercise rights of speech and association protected by the Constitution."

This interest in protecting the "power of the few" aligns exactly with Powell's secret chamber memo about corporate power and aligns with Powell's own notes, which have more of his disparaging quotation marks questioning some of the briefs filed in the *Valeo* case that "identify one of the 'evils' as the power of 'the wealthy few' (undefined but obviously unworthy people) to influence elections unduly." In tone and import, that comes right out of Powell's secret chamber report, which counted on the power of the corporate few.

Powell's Richmond history, his corporate law practice, his social position, his boardroom experience, and his anxiety about upheaval all align with a corporate worldview that society's decisions should be made by the sort of people in corporate boardrooms, so the power of those "few" had to be protected, to battle against what his report called the "broad attack" both on the "American free enterprise system" and the "American political system of democracy under the rule of law." Particularly important it was to protect that power when, as he had written to the chamber, the trouble is "deep" and the "hour is late."

To accommodate that corporate perspective, the Court had to reach judgments about politics. It showed itself helpless. The amateurish political outlook of the Court in *Valeo* stood out in the late-added footnote 52, which, in the interest of drawing clear lines—

"vagueness" being a stated concern of the Justices—exempted from disclosure political advertisements that did not expressly advocate for the election or defeat of a candidate using magic words like "vote for," "vote against," "elect," or "defeat."

In the Court's amateur opinion, a hostile bombardment of TV advertising challenging a candidate's morals, decency, or integrity, or attacking the candidate's alignment with the community's values, and dropped on the candidate in the heat of election season with the intention of defeating the candidate, was not deemed advocacy in the election—unless it used those magic words. The idiocy of that premise is obvious to anyone in politics.

The Court's amateurish folly about political spending extended to presuming that spending by a powerful interest for a candidate would create no risk of corruption; that the spending and the resulting influence could be kept separate and independent. That is idiotic in real life.

When a powerful political interest starts signaling that it will spend enormous sums to support candidates, guess what—candidates will find a way to take advantage, perhaps by attracting the spending to their own side by the positions they take or perhaps by avoiding taking positions that would send the spending to their opponent's side. The Court presumed that some etiquette would separate interest from candidate, but that was folly. It is blindingly naive to think that politics would produce no workarounds, that no coordination or signaling or intermediaries would violate whatever etiquette of independence the Court had in mind.

As we know, information travels fast in politics, never mind the etiquette. Drop a rock in a stream, and the stream flows around it. Put eager candidates and enormous interested spenders together, and trouble will follow, as it has. Look no further than the corruption of American politics on climate change by the fossil fuel industry. Again, this was idiocy from amateurs.

But the *Valeo* folly accomplished one thing: It opened the lane for unlimited special interest spending to come into elections to support or oppose candidates, just as Powell's secret memo had recommended.

The next opportunity for Powell came 2 years later, and this, time it involved not just the type of political activity corporations would likely undertake but corporations directly.

Massachusetts had banned corporate campaign contributions from statewide political referenda. A Massachusetts bank, the First National Bank of Boston, objected and sued. Frank Bellotti was then the Commonwealth's attorney general and defendant.

First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti wound its way up to the Supreme Court. Here, the question was the very right of corporations to influence popular elections—in this case, a

referendum election. In a 5-to-4 decision, Powell wrote for the Republican-appointed majority that corporations had a constitutional right to engage in that political activity.

This outcome can't be found in the Constitution, which provides no political role whatsoever to corporations, but this outcome aligned precisely with the recommendations of Powell's secret report to the chamber. Indeed, it was the heart of his pitch to the chamber. His entire secret plan for corporate political power would fall apart if States could bar corporate influence from elections, even referendum elections. Powell had urged in his secret report that corporate interests not have "the slightest hesitation to press vigorously in all political arenas" and that corporations should show no "reluctance to penalize politically those who oppose [them]." Corporations could never "press vigorously" or "penalize politically" if they could be kept out of elections, and so Bellotti was decided.

Paired with Valeo, the Bellotti case established that corporations had a constitutional right to engage in elections—at least referendum elections—with as much money as they wanted, or at least as much money as they could raise, so long as the election spending was not in the form of campaign contributions.

Ultimately, this laid the framework for the infamous Citizens United decision, another bare, 5-to-4 Republican majority that gave in this case corporate interests a full constitutional right to unlimited political spending and, as a practical matter, to unlimited anonymous political spending.

How, in Bellotti, did they get around a Constitution that provides corporations no political rights? The trick used was to focus on the message, not the messenger—completely overlook that it was a corporation, not a person. The Court said that corporate political spending was actually speech, that influencing a popular referendum was the "type of speech" at the heart of representative democracy, and that the public had a right to hear it. The fact that corporations are not people and, indeed, that they have advantages over real people in electioneering and, indeed, that they might even come to dominate popular democracy because of those advantages was overlooked by directing attention to the speech, not the speaker.

If the type of speech was relevant to the public debate, Powell said, it doesn't matter whether a corporation or a person says it—except every piece of this is wrong. Money is not speech. Corporations are not people. And looking at the message, not the messenger, would allow any entity's message into our politics, even foreign ones. Then add in anonymity, and the problem goes toxic, as we now see in our country today. "We the People" becomes "We the Hidden Anything With Money."

The last case for Powell was Federal Election Commission v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life in 1986. Here, the question was whether an advocacy group of precisely the kind Powell had in mind in the chamber memo was forbidden to spend its corporate treasury funds in a Federal election.

Now, the situation was that Congress had blocked corporations from using their treasury funds in Federal elections. They had to raise money from voluntary donations; hence the corporate PACs that we have seen that had to raise and spend their own money. The Court accepted that corporate treasuries might give corporate voices "an unfair advantage in the political marketplace" given their vast corporate wealth and resources. But in the case before it, the Court decided that nonprofits were different. They were designed for advocacy, and they didn't have the same sort of treasury funds as business corporations.

Again, remember the Powell memo. Powell didn't recommend that corporations undertake their political work directly. He had pressed for "organization," for "joint effort." He had urged corporate America to pursue "the political power available only through united action and national organizations." And guess what. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the national organization to which Powell had delivered his secret recommendations, was a nonprofit corporation.

In his years on the Court, Lewis Powell made good on the secret recommendations that he had made to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce 5 months before joining the Court. He showed that "an activist-minded Supreme Court"—his words—could be that "important instrument for social, economic and political change"—his words—that he had proposed. He opened a lane for unlimited money into politics, enabling what his secret report had called "the scale of financing available only through joint effort." He bulldozed aside bars on corporate spending and politics so corporations could deploy, just as his report had urged, "whatever degree of pressure—publicly and privately—may be necessary." And he allowed advocacy organizations to spend their treasuries in politics, opening the way for the "organization," "joint effort," and "united action" he had called for in his report through "national organizations."

All the key pieces were in place to unleash the corporate influence machine that he had recommended to the chamber, influence that dominates much of American politics today, influence that controls much of what we do in the Senate Chamber today, and in which, of all things, the chamber, which was his client for the secret report, is today the apex predator of corporate influence, red in tooth and claw.

Everything was aligned for what Powell had recommended: corporate "political power," "assiduously cultivated," "used aggressively and with

determination," with "no hesitation to attack," "not the slightest hesitation to press vigorously in all political arenas," and no "reluctance to penalize politically those who oppose."

It is a dark achievement, but it is quite an achievement. And, interestingly, Powell's official biography frames out his judicial career without mentioning his role as the early orchestrator of corporate political influence in American politics. It is actually likely his most significant and lasting legacy.

To be continued.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 131.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Zahid N. Quraishi, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 131, Zahid N. Quraishi, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patrick J. Leahy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 129, Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motions filed today, June 8, be waived.

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

TARDIVE DYSKINESIA AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 184 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 184) designating the week of May 2, 2021, through May 8, 2021, as "Tardive Dyskinesia Awareness Week".

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 184) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 28, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following resolutions that were submitted earlier today en bloc: S. Res. 262 and S. Res. 263.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 262) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in United States v. Dodd.

A resolution (S. Res. 263) to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in United States v. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to en bloc, the preambles be agreed to en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NOMINATION REFERRAL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, as if in executive session, the nomination of Arun Venkataraman, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service received in the Senate May 27, 2021, be jointly referred to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclu-

sion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Quraishi nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:52 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 9, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CARAL E. SPANGLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE JOHN E. WHITLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GRANT T. HARRIS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE NAZAKHTAR NIKAKHTAR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

NEIL HARVEY MACBRIDE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, VICE BRIAN CALLANAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RUFUS GIFFORD, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE, VICE SEAN P. LAWLER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

LARRY D. TURNER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE SCOTT S. DAHL, RESIGNED.

DAVID WEIL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE CHERYL MARIE STANTON.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. EDWARD D. CASEY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. RYAN T. OKAHARA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LINDA S. HURRY

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CARLA D. RINER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JONATHAN P. BRAGA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ANTONIO A. AGUTO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRIAN J. MENNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED AS POSITION UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601, 7037 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STUART W. RISCH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPOR-

TANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID J. FURNESS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPOR-TANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MATTHEW G. GLAVY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL B. LOVEALL

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8, 2021:

THE JUDICIARY

REGINA M. RODRIGUEZ, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLO-RADO.

JULIEN XAVIER NEALS, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.