



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 17, 2021

No. 85

## Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

### PRAYER

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

### PRAYER

Let us pray.

Loving God, keep us far from the paths of evil. Remind us that You have no desire to rain on our parade. Instead, You want for us all to experience a rich and satisfying life. Give our lawmakers wisdom to avoid the traps that cause them to deviate from Your plan for their lives.

Lord, keep them from setting an ambush for themselves. May they instead listen to Your counsel and walk securely, protected by Your loving and prevailing providence. Provide them with a passion to choose reverence for You and obedience to Your commands so that You can use them as peacemakers for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate will consider three important measures this week. Senators will vote on whether to repeal a Trump-era rule that made it harder for victims of discrimination in the workplace to pursue justice. It is another example of the sheer malice, the nastiness of the Trump administration. It actively sought to make it harder—harder—for workers to win employment discrimination claims. The Senate should reverse the Trump-era rule this week.

Second, the Senate will also vote on whether to discharge the nomination of Ms. Kristen Clarke from the Judiciary Committee. Ms. Clarke would be the first Black woman ever to serve as the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division. She is immensely qualified, and I look forward to putting her nomination on the floor after the Senate takes action this week.

But first, throughout the week—this is the third thing, very important as well—the Senate will debate a very important piece of legislation. This evening, the Senate will vote on whether to take up the Endless Frontier Act on the Senate floor, a once-in-a-generation investment in American science and American technology.

Last week, the Senate Commerce Committee voted on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, 24 to 4, to advance the bill. The Endless Frontier Act will form the core of what will be a comprehensive bill to boost America's ability to compete, innovate, and win the technologies of the 21st century.

Over the course of the next week or two, the Senate will debate and amend the legislation. I look forward to hav-

ing another open and bipartisan amendment process, just as we did on the Asian hate crimes bill and the bipartisan water infrastructure bill. There is no reason—no reason—the Senate can't finish our work on this important legislation by the end of the month.

Members on both sides of the aisle know that decades of Federal underinvestment in science and technology have imperiled America's global economic leadership. When we invest in science, it inevitably produces millions of good-paying jobs.

So this comprehensive bill will boost funding for basic scientific research, tech development, and manufacturing. It will strengthen our alliances and partnerships abroad. It will fortify weak spots in our economy, like semiconductors, and will ensure that we hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable for its predatory economic practices. It is a forward-looking, comprehensive plan to preserve America's competitive edge.

The benefits will be manifold. When we invest in scientific research, the effect is diffusive. It helps our universities, our laboratories, and our businesses. And, again, it creates new, good-paying jobs—millions of them—millions of them. So if you are looking for the future and our people want to have a brighter future and want to be assured that their children will have better paying jobs than they have, this is an answer—one of the most important answers we can come up with.

An American workforce will help bring American inventions to the global market, and the way we have been No. 1 in the economy for the last century will continue on into this one. So I am excited about this legislation.

Holding the Chinese Communist Party accountable for its years of rapacious economic policies and theft of American ingenuity will help create a level playing field that American workers have lacked for decades.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2533

Investing in scientific research also hardens our national security. We can either have a world where the Chinese Communist Party determines the rules of the road for 5G, AI, and quantum computing or we can make sure the United States gets there first—few things that should bring this Chamber together faster than securing another century of American leadership than this.

I am proud to have worked with my colleagues Senator YOUNG, Chairwoman CANTWELL, Ranking Member WICKER, and others to get this bill to the floor of the Senate. And I greatly look forward to working with all of my colleagues during these next few weeks on amending, broadening, and passing this legislation before the month is out.

#### BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, one final matter. Tomorrow, President Biden will visit an electric manufacturing facility in Michigan, where a major American auto company is set to unveil its new electric—electric—pickup truck.

Tomorrow's announcement is a significant breakthrough. Because it is one of the bestselling cars in America, the success of an electric pickup could hasten our Nation's transition to a cleaner, brighter, and stronger transportation future.

And personally, I am very happy to see the Biden administration put a spotlight on zero-emission vehicles. This is an issue I have been working on for a very long time, and something I am passionate about. No matter how you look at the data, there is no way that America can meet our targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions without looking at how we drive. Transportation accounts for nearly one-third of America's carbon outlook. And while the transition to electric vehicles is already underway, it is progressing too slowly.

That is why almost 2 years ago I developed and introduced an ambitious new proposal to rapidly phase out gas-powered vehicles and replace them with clean cars. All told, the object of the plan—called Clean Cars for America—is that by 2040, all vehicles on the road should be clean. I am delighted that President Biden has put this proposal in his build back America infrastructure plan.

Through a mixture of credits and investments, it would make electric vehicles affordable for all Americans, provide incentives to trade in older gas vehicles, build the necessary charging infrastructure, and, very importantly, create tens of thousands of good-paying union jobs in automaking, construction, and battery manufacturing.

What distinguishes this proposal is its ability to unite the environmental movement, the labor movement, and the large automakers.

Isn't that a great thing? We used to have the environmental proposals and

work and union proposals conflict—no more because we are taking each other's needs into account. This bill has already earned the support of the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the League of Conservation Voters, the UAW, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and car manufacturers like Ford and General Motors are supportive as well.

So you have the whole span. Something like this should pass with a lot of votes, I hope. And I was very proud to see President Biden put my Clean Cars for America proposal at the heart of his American jobs plan.

In recent weeks, the virtue of such a plan has been made apparent to millions of drivers and not just for climate-saving reasons. The gasoline shortages along the eastern seaboard, though temporary, revealed, once again, that electric vehicles can be more reliable. For EVs, the price and availability of fuel does not depend on the ebb and flow of fossil fuel discovery, the volatility of international markets, or panics, like the one we just saw.

On every front—on jobs, American economic leadership, protecting the planet—transitioning to a clean car future provides benefits. In the 20th century, America led the way in auto manufacturing. If we fall behind on electric cars, we will no longer lead the way. But this legislation has us staying No. 1 and producing lots of good-paying jobs—hallelujah.

So as the President prepares to go to Michigan for this important announcement, we should also be talking about making a larger scale, ambitious effort to speed our country's transition to zero-emission vehicles. Clean Cars for America is the way to do it.

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.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### ISRAEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday was the deadliest day yet in the continued fighting between the terrorist forces attacking Israel and Israel's measured, precise, and defensive response.

Hamas unleashed another round of rocket barrages, intentionally targeting civilian areas all across Israel. Israel intensified its campaign to, among other specific military objec-

tives, destroy the terrorist group's underground networks of weapons storage and command and control.

Last week, Hamas's rocket attacks took the life of a 5-year-old Israeli boy. And because Hamas, in stark violation of the laws of war, intentionally co-locates its terrorist facilities in civilian buildings in neighborhoods, Israeli strikes have regrettably led to civilian casualties in Gaza.

No one is glad to see the fighting, but we are already seeing some push the false narrative that this conflict is a tragic dispute between two legitimate combatants where both sides share blame that is roughly equal—what nonsense. This yields calls for blanket cease-fires and people wagging their fingers at both sides. This camp apparently includes some of our own Senate colleagues.

To say that “both sides” need to de-escalate downplays the responsibility the terrorists have for initiating the conflict in the first place and suggests Israelis are not entitled to defend themselves against ongoing rocket barrages. I completely reject this obscene moral equivalence.

Now, the second false narrative is the view on the increasingly vocal far left that Israel is, to quote one far-left Member of the House, an “apartheid state.” Another says Israel has perpetrated “an act of terrorism.”

Look, this is not a conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people. Hamas has sought to hijack recent tensions to advance its own narrow, violent objectives. In that sense, it is a conflict between Israel and a terrorist rump state in Gaza that uses its civilian population as human shields and exploits their suffering for political gain. These terrorists set up shop in apartment buildings and under press offices. They direct rocket attacks from the cover of schools and markets. In the past, when their operatives have been killed, they passed them off to the international community as civilian victims of Israel.

Few countries in history spend as much effort to avoid civilian casualties during war as Israel and the United States. We hold our militaries to the highest standard. Our Israeli friends take pain to defend themselves in ways that are responsible and spare the very civilians Hamas is willing to sacrifice for its propaganda. Israel invests heavily in precision munitions. They spend precious time after attacks confirming target identification. And listen to this: They even provide advance warning to civilians in Gaza before specific buildings are targeted, even when doing so means the terrorists may also evacuate.

It is all well and good for President Biden to speak with the President of the Palestinian Authority, but he holds little sway in Gaza. And twice he has rejected generous offers from different Israeli Governments aimed at establishing an enduring peace.

But if the so-called international community wants to actually make a

difference—really make a difference—they can impose real costs on those who fund the terror weapons of Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

We know where their return address is. It is over in Tehran.

I have been proud to stand with Israel for years, and I am proud to stand with Israel today. The United States needs to stand foursquare behind our ally. President Biden must remain strong against the growing voices within his own party that create false equivalence between terrorist aggressors and a responsible state defending itself.

Israel deserves an opportunity to restore deterrence and to impose costs on terrorists the international community has been unwilling or unable to impose. There is a saying that has been around for quite a while: If Hamas laid down its weapons tomorrow, there would be no more fighting; if Israel laid down their weapons, there would be no more Israel.

So let's leave no doubt where America stands.

#### CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. On an entirely different matter, when the 117th Congress and President Biden were sworn in back in January, our Nation had already turned the corner in our battle with the coronavirus. New cases and deaths had already peaked and actually started to plummet. The vaccines, made available in record time thanks to Operation Warp Speed, had already started to roll out nationwide at a rate which the Biden administration inherited and sustained until April. The five bipartisan COVID packages that Congress passed in 2020 had the American economy packed with dry powder and primed for an epic comeback.

Economists across the spectrum agreed. One of President Obama's CEA chairmen said: "We have no historic parallel with anything like this level of excess saving." Larry Summers, another top Obama adviser and President Clinton's Treasury Secretary before that, said the bipartisan December package was already enough to elevate a measure of household income to "abnormally high levels, unheard of during an economic downturn." We were already adding back jobs.

But instead of tailoring another bill to build on this momentum, they pushed ahead with the \$2 trillion partisan plan that the far left wanted. Republicans predicted it would hurt our recovery if Washington kept taxing working people so the government could pay others a bonus to stay home. I stood here in February and quoted an expert who said:

In an expanding economy that is putting the virus behind it, paying people more in unemployment than they could receive from working is an act of substantial economic self-harm. It would keep workers on the sidelines, stop the unemployment rate from falling as rapidly as it otherwise would, and slow the overhaul recovery.

Well, we all knew what would happen, but Democrats insisted on continuing to pay people more not to work.

In April, as the President's policies took effect, we only added 266,000 jobs. That is nearly 800,000 under estimates, just as jobs openings soared to more than 8 million, the biggest number ever recorded. We are literally taxing the American workers who are back on the job for the sake of slowing down our economic recovery.

Instead of an agenda to reopen America, Democrats muscled through policies that would actually prolong parts of this crisis. And, of course, that is what happened. A record number of small businesses say they have open jobs they cannot fill.

Governors across America are having to take matters into their own hands and turn off these extra-generous benefits. In States like Arizona, Georgia, Montana, Ohio, and West Virginia, we have Governors having to clean up this mess, which at least one of their own Senators actually voted for.

The policies that we needed in March of 2020 are not the policies we need in May of 2021. That has been obvious to Republicans, to economists, and to the American people.

The sooner that my Democratic friends here in Washington can catch up, the better.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1260, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, a bill 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ISRAEL

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, just 4 short months ago, hopes were running high in the Middle East. ISIS was wiped off the map, the Iranian regime and its terrorist proxies were in retreat, and Israel was forging historic peace deals with its neighbors. All along the way, the United States was instrumental in this progress.

But in just a few months, the Biden administration has dashed those hopes with its policy of weakness and appeasement. The forces of terror are again on the march. Pillars of smoke and fire are rising from Tel Aviv and the holy city of Jerusalem. The assault on Israel by terrorist groups like Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad is the latest and most concrete evidence yet that the Middle East is spiraling toward chaos.

But instead of standing firm with Israel, the Biden administration's policy of endless accommodation is fanning the flames of conflict. The President should show strength. Instead, he is broadcasting indecision and weakness. Our greatest ally in the Middle East is under attack. Yet the Democratic Party refuses to say: We stand with Israel. The night sky over the Jewish State blazes with the starbursts of intercepted rockets, and the Biden administration only offers muted calls for restraint.

Where are the righteous denunciations of the terrorists responsible for these repeated, premeditated, and unprovoked attacks? Where are the statements of solidarity with Israel? Please. From this administration and from this Democratic Party, we can't even get the President's spokeswoman to say that the United States would help resupply munitions for Iron Dome, Israel's lifesaving missile defense system.

So this afternoon, let me provide a little clarity that the President and his party appear incapable or unwilling to articulate. The fault for the death and destruction in the streets of Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Gaza, and the West Bank lies not with the Israeli Government, much less with the Israeli people. The belligerents in this conflict aren't morally equivalent, the way it is often presented in supposedly enlightened circles. Put simply, there are good guys, and there are bad guys. Israel seeks peace. Terror groups seek death and destruction. Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad are not legitimate state actors. They don't speak for the Palestinian people and don't truly care about them.

These groups are terrorist organizations run by evil men who commit evil acts in pursuit of the evil dreams of an evil ideology. They purposely fire waves of unguided rockets at civilian targets, while they protect themselves from reprisal using babies, hospitals, schools, and dupes in the media as shields—what cowards, attacking innocent civilians while they hide behind women.

Of course, Hamas and the Islamic Jihad don't act alone. The Palestinian Authority supports, encourages, and funds terrorism in the form of so-called martyr payments—pensions paid to terrorists who attack Jews. The PA perpetuates cycles of violence by refusing to acknowledge the existence of Israel, teaching anti-Semitism in its schools and leaving its people to wallow in poverty as wards of the international community.

And we all know who funds and arms Palestinian terrorist organizations, the world's foremost supporter of terrorism, the Islamic Republic of Iran. For decades, Iran's theocrats have staged demonstrations where their fanatical supporters scream: "Death to America" and "Death to Israel." The assault on Israel today shows that those chants are not idle threats.

Iran's ayatollahs are deadly serious about wiping the Jewish State off the map. That is why Iran arms Palestinian terrorists with some of its most lethal weapons. Hamas's arsenal of 10,000 rockets might as well have "Made in Iran" stamped on the side.

Those are the villains of this conflict, but let's not forget the heroes. Standing courageously against this organized onslaught is the State of Israel, our closest ally in the region. Over the past week, terrorists have fired approximately 3,000 missiles and rockets into Israel. In response, Israel has defended itself with technological miracles like Iron Dome. It has carried out precision airstrikes against military targets, and, as always, Israel has gone to extraordinary lengths to minimize civilian casualties, despite the terrorists' best efforts to maximize and then publicize any carnage.

While Hamas and the Islamic Jihad fire indiscriminately from Palestinian schools, office buildings, and apartments, Israel responds by hitting those launch sites, but only after—only after—they warn civilians, allowing them to evacuate first. Regrettably, these warnings also allow terrorists to escape, but Israel bears that cost because it values innocent life, unlike its terrorist enemies.

You may have heard of one recent example. Last week, Israel carried out an airstrike against a building used by Hamas intelligence personnel, a building that also housed the Associated Press. An hour before the airstrike, the Israeli military called the AP and other civilians in that complex and warned them to depart. This precaution, once again, allowed Hamas terrorists to escape but also allowed reporters and other civilians to vacate the premises before the airstrike occurred. As a result, no civilians died, and Hamas lost a terrorist haven.

Now, in any other country and with any other military—except America's, I have to add—one would hear praise for that military's restraint and commitment to the laws of order. But because this military is the IDF and the country is Israel and the people are the

Jews, they are widely condemned around the world and on the left in America.

If you cut through the hysterics and the hyperbole, you can see the truth clearly: One side seeks to maximize carnage and the other seeks to minimize civilian casualties.

Besides, I must observe, why is the Associated Press sharing a building with Hamas? Surely, these intrepid reporters knew who their neighbors were. Did they knowingly allow themselves to be used as human shields by a U.S.-designated terrorist organization? Did AP pull its punches and decline to report for years on Hamas's misdeeds?

I submit that the AP has some uncomfortable questions to answer. Yet the AP and its fellow journalists are in high dudgeon about Israel's wholly appropriate airstrike. Leave it to whiny reporters to make themselves the story and the victim when terrorists are shooting missiles at innocent civilians.

In any event, the moral standing of the competing forces in this conflict is simple and clear. Our greatest ally and the only democracy in the region against an Islamist theocracy and its terrorist partners—most Americans know which side they are on. I speak for them when I say that we stand with Israel.

Unfortunately, too many elected Democrats have taken a different stand. Members of the so-called "Squad" in the House of Representatives have called Israel an apartheid state and accused it of war crimes. Remember, these aren't obscure backbenchers. Many Democrats herald these Representatives as the future of their party.

Meanwhile, 27 Democratic Senators have called for an immediate cease-fire to the conflict. Even the Democratic floor leader, who has long styled himself as Israel's great defender, has joined this moral equivalence, calling for immediate cease-fire.

Hear me clearly. The handwringing calls for a cease-fire are tantamount to Hamas propaganda. Both sides are not the same in this conflict, no matter what the Democrats naively imply. If Hamas puts down its weapons, there would be peace. If Israel puts down its weapons, there would be no Israel.

Thankfully, Israel's leadership is resolute, united, and committed to victory. The United States should respond to this terrorist onslaught with equal resolve. That means we should give Israel the time, space, and resources to destroy Hamas's war machine and protect its own people. We should also ensure that Israel has the military hardware to weather this crisis. Hamas may have as many as 10,000 missiles, rockets, and mortars in reserve. Meanwhile, Hezbollah lurks to the north with many times that arsenal. We should, therefore, endeavor to ensure that Israel has more interceptors for Iron Dome than Hamas has rockets to kill Israelis. Moreover, we ought to cut off aid to the Palestinian Authority until

we can be absolutely sure that not a dime of taxpayer money is being used to buy and build rockets or pay pensions for murderous terrorists.

And, finally, the Biden administration ought to immediately end its misguided flirtation with the theocrats in Iran by recalling its chief negotiator and appeaser, Rob Malley, from negotiations in Vienna. If the Biden administration reenters the failed Iran nuclear agreement and grants sanctions relief to the regime in Tehran, in very short order that appeasement payoff will be converted into rockets aimed at Israel, as well as at American troops throughout the region.

While Israel is under attack, we have heard plenty of talk and mealy-mouthed statements from politicians. But in this moment of crisis, Israel needs more than words. Israel needs and deserves our full support to defend itself and its people and to achieve a just and lasting peace.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHINA

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I spoke recently about how the President's "skinny" budget is disappointing, dangerous, and a disservice to our men and women in uniform. China actively seeks to outpace the U.S. military, and in some cases, they are succeeding. This isn't a 5- or 10-year problem; the threat is right now, today.

Unfortunately, the military is not the only area facing active challenges by China. Today, I am going to discuss a few at-risk areas that are critical to the stability of our Nation.

It is no secret that the Chinese Communist Party, or CCP, wants to replace the United States as the world's top power. The American people need to be aware of how the Chinese Communist Party is coming after us, not just with missiles and military might but with plans to subdue the American spirit.

The repressive CCP uses economic espionage to advance its agenda to weaken our arsenal of democracy. A significant part of what has made the United States a global powerhouse is the strength and resilience of our private sector companies. Whether it is in the technology, healthcare, or energy sector, American innovation is unrivaled. It is what has made us the greatest economy in the history of the world.

China's leaders know this, but rather than go head-to-head in honest competition, they have settled for stealing our intellectual property. Chinese businesses, at the instruction of their government, lure American companies in. They offer cheap labor. They promise

an “exchange of ideas,” but they really want to steal our valuable intellectual property.

As President Trump’s Director of National Intelligence, John Ratcliffe, said, China’s strategy is to “rob, replicate and replace.” China robs American companies of their intellectual property, they replicate our technology, and then China replaces U.S. firms in the global marketplace.

This theft isn’t exclusive to just one industry. They will go after whatever they can to get their hands on it—wind turbines, airplane designs, underwater drones, chemicals, or artificial intelligence technology. According to the Department of Justice, between 2011 and 2018, more than 90 percent of the Department’s foreign economic espionage cases involved China.

By stealing this critical knowledge, the Chinese have given themselves a leg up on other nations. They are using it to expand their military and economic power. Their goal is to surpass the U.S. economy and gain monopoly control over every major industry. We cannot allow that to succeed.

Even more alarming is what China is doing from within our own universities. The American people may not be familiar with Confucius Institutes, but they should be. Confucius Institutes currently operate at 55 American colleges and universities. While they claim to harmlessly promote Chinese language and culture, they actually serve as a beachhead for the Chinese Government within America’s research institutions. Often, just the presence of a Confucius Institute on campus will enable Chinese officials to stifle any criticism of the Chinese Government at that university. The institutes also allow the Chinese Government to harvest valuable data from research being conducted at our country’s world-class institutions. Who knows what else they could be up to.

I was very proud to cosponsor Senator BLACKBURN’s Transparency for Confucius Institutes Act, which would provide needed transparency to these dangerous organizations. I was also glad to see Alabama A&M, a public land-grant and historically Black university, make the decision to close their Confucius Institute just last month.

Congress has made clear that American institutions of higher education that host Confucius Institutes could lose their Federal funding.

I hope any remaining colleges and universities with these CCP satellite organizations follow Alabama A&M’s leadership.

The United States and the entire Western World have given China valuable concessions for decades. We gave China a seat at the table thinking they would change, but they have played their hand ruthlessly. The hope was that by facilitating economic growth through open markets and giving them leadership roles in the international institutions, China’s Communist regime

would finally embrace democracy, human rights, and free market values. It is past time we recognize that despite all its good intentions, this strategy has failed and miserably.

The Chinese Communist Party has continually spied on its citizens, violently suppressed dissent, and systematically persecuted religious and ethnic minorities to the point of genocide.

President Trump stood up to China. He was the first U.S. President to do so in decades. And he made great strides, but he didn’t have enough time in office to finish the job. I sincerely hope President Biden will continue to build on the Trump administration’s momentum in pushing back against China’s aggressive rise.

The United States must address the challenges posed by China. I have shared a lot of concerns today, but I am not one to offer criticism without a commonsense solution. Here is one commonsense step Congress can take immediately.

The TSP, or Thrift Savings Plan, is the 401(k)-style investment plan that over 6 million Federal and government employees, both military and civilian, use for their retirement plan. The plan manages more than \$700 billion in assets.

Back in 2017, the Board that governs the TSP decided to invest billions in companies with direct ties to the Chinese Communist Party. They wanted to send government employee dollars—the retirement savings of our military and civilian public servants—to Chinese companies, including mine and everybody’s here in Congress. These companies are tied to a government that openly committed genocide against its own people. Well, with me, that dog doesn’t hunt.

Thankfully, President Trump put a stop to that plan before it was implemented, but now with President Biden in the White House, the Board could decide to push through this decision. We need congressional action to make President Trump’s decision with the thrift savings plan permanent. I bet if you ask the folks who work in these buildings or who served the United States overseas if they want their retirement savings going to Chinese companies, you would hear a loud no.

I will be offering a solution on this tomorrow to protect our national security and safeguard the retirements of those who have served our country with honor and distinction.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ISRAEL

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, over the past week, the Pales-

tinian terrorist organization Hamas has launched more than 3,000 rockets at civilian targets in Israel. Violent mobs have taken over the streets of Jerusalem, and even seasoned veterans of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict have expressed shock at the intensity of the violence.

This isn’t normal. This isn’t the Middle East version of the Resistance. This is terrorism. Still, pro-Hamas activists have flooded the media with Instagram-friendly content condemning Israel for defending itself and questioning the legitimacy of Israel’s very existence, which is an argument that in any other context would bring all hell down on the person foolish enough to say it out loud.

The level of denial and misinformation about what is happening in Israel and why it is happening is appalling. Nearly every single member of the United Nations Security Council embarrassed themselves this weekend by embracing a generic draft statement condemning the violence but refusing to acknowledge the hundreds of Hamas rockets that started it.

The U.N. has a shameful history of ignoring threats and violence against Israel, but rarely in recent memory has the Security Council so blatantly regurgitated anti-Israel propaganda while Israeli civilians cower in fear under persistent rocket fire.

Thankfully, the U.S. mission blocked the statement’s release, but I think it is important—important—to inject a little reality into the ongoing discussion.

First, we must acknowledge that Israel has the absolute right to defend itself, no matter the state of their relations with the Palestinian Authority. There is a world of difference between a state-sponsored terrorist attack on a civilian population and action taken to stop that attack. We have a responsibility to counter the dangerous argument that because Hamas currently lacks the weapons capability to win this battle, Israel must stand by and allow terrorists to slaughter civilians.

Second, I would encourage all of my colleagues to join me in making it clear that the United States is and will remain Israel’s closest friend and ally. We will continue to assist with the development and production of advanced missile defense systems like the Iron Dome. We will not step away from that obligation simply because celebrity influencers would rather witness a slaughter than a proportionate response to mass terror.

Last, it is important to acknowledge that this violence is a symptom of a much more serious disease. Hamas terrorists may be the ones launching rockets at civilians, but it is Iran, the world’s leading state sponsor of terror, that is paying for it. That is right, Madam President—it is Iran, the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism, that is footing the bill for these attacks. When we provide assistance and support to Israel, we are not just

protecting an ally; we are containing the destructive influence of our most belligerent adversary in the Middle East.

This month, the Biden administration traveled to Vienna to negotiate sanctions relief with Iranian officials. Since then, President Biden has also spoken to Prime Minister Netanyahu and reaffirmed Israel's right to defend itself from these attacks.

However, I would take this opportunity to remind my Democratic colleagues that the United States designated Hamas as a terrorist organization more than 20 years ago. That is right. For the past two decades, we have recognized Hamas as a terrorist organization. As a rule, we do not provide them assistance of any kind. They are a terrorist organization. But by opening the door to sanctions relief for Iran, we cannot help but enrich a regime that will not stop until it destroys Israel. That is their goal. We know it because they have told us that is their goal. We must not provide sanctions relief to Iran or give quarter to any regime that allies itself with this evil.

It is my hope that all Americans will take some time this week to just unplug and think about this and reflect and then pray—pray that reason and wisdom will prevail as we seek an end to this outbreak of violence and the defeat of this terrorist group that wants to destroy the nation of Israel.

#### TENNESSEE

Madam President, this weekend, we had a positive development in the status of the I-40 bridge that connects West Memphis, AR, and Memphis, TN. Just as a reminder, last week, inspectors discovered a crack in one of the steel beams supporting the bridge. The crossing was immediately closed to all vehicle and barge traffic. On Friday morning, the Coast Guard reopened the stretch of Mississippi River that runs under the bridge, but the bridge itself remains closed indefinitely.

Now, a lot of armchair experts have decided to sound off with the argument that this closure won't affect local economies, but with all due respect, those making this argument really should spend a little bit more time out in the real world. This part of Middle America that we are talking about is an incredibly important part of our Nation's domestic supply chain. We have a 15-mile stretch along the Mississippi River, and that houses 68 waterfront facilities. Thirty-seven of those facilities are terminal facilities moving products such as petroleum, tar, asphalt, cement, steel, coal, salt, fertilizers, rock and gravel, and grains.

Shipping companies and cross-country trucking companies depend on the I-40 crossing, and so do the local grocery stores, industrial facilities, restaurants, retail outlets that purchase the cargo, and, of course, our Nation's farmers.

Commercial trucking constitutes 25 percent of all traffic that crosses the I-

40 bridge. The river traffic that flows beneath the bridge is just as important. When the Coast Guard reopened that stretch of the Mississippi, they had to juggle 60 vessels hauling more than 1,000 barges. Yes. We had a little traffic jam in the Mississippi River.

It is amazing to me how quickly a problem like this does turn into a bottleneck. Tennessee and Arkansas transportation officials are still working out a timeline for repairs, but as of now, the trucking industry is preparing for a downward spiral.

According to the Arkansas Trucking Association, this could cost operators and their customers more than \$2 million a day, which is an amount that the industry actually cannot absorb. This means that the delay could end up costing consumers an additional \$2 million a day. And depending on what they are buying, they could also see empty shelves due to a supply chain interruption.

Meanwhile, the Biden administration is putting all their energy and focus into checking items off of a decades-old wish list of social programs. They put forward an infrastructure package worth more than \$2 trillion that wastes about two-thirds of this total pricetag on projects that have nothing to do with infrastructure, nothing to do with making sure that major bridges and thoroughfares are safe and open or expanding broadband access or making sure that parents in rural Tennessee can get their kids to school without worrying that a rainstorm will flood the road on the way to town. This is making the American people feel so incredibly unsettled and very frustrated, and Tennesseans are pretty nervous about the future.

If I could give the President one piece of advice, it would be this: If you want to waste time peddling Green New Deal policies or expanding social safety nets, admit it—just admit it. Call it what it is. Don't call it infrastructure and then turn around and throw pocket change at actual infrastructure problems that need to be addressed right now. That mislabeling makes it look like you are trying to pull a fast one over the American people, and it makes the American people believe that you really don't care. And that is a dangerous message to send in the middle of a traumatic pandemic recovery, especially considering that prices are already on the rise. We see it in utilities. We see it at the gas pump. We see it in the packaged snacks we purchase for the children's Sunday school class. Even basics in the produce section at the grocery store are beginning to get out of reach. It is affecting basic nutrition.

This is the Biden surcharge. We are paying a premium just to live from the moment our feet hit the floor in the morning to the time we brush our teeth and get into bed at night. The barebones cost of living is going up thanks to these reckless spending priorities.

My Democratic colleagues need to understand that a government subsidy cannot save a family from that kind of hit to their monthly budget, affecting everything from the moment their feet hit the floor in the morning to the time they brush their teeth and go to bed in the evening.

The Biden administration is creating a perfect storm of income insecurity, shortages, and the uneasiness that comes when Americans see more month at the end of their money than money at the end of the month.

They know how to manage their budget, and they know what they have to do when prices creep up 25 cents, \$1 or \$2 at a time. Their instinct isn't to reach out to the Federal Government for help; their instinct and their action is to cut back on the extras and to prepare for harder times ahead.

The only way to avoid this even now is to make prudent, targeted investments in economic recovery, supply chain security, cyber security, and, yes, actual real infrastructure projects.

The American people cannot afford all the extras that are on the Democratic Party's wish list. Their income can't keep up with the inflation that is hitting their pocketbook every single day of the week. And they really are concerned with what will happen when those trend lines cross and inflation heads north every single day.

I would, again, ask my Democratic colleagues to step back from the money printer and recognize the effect all this spending is having on American families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion for the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, be waived.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks prior to the upcoming vote.

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

#### ISRAEL

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about two issues of vital importance to the United States and the world.

First, I want to say a few words about the current violence paralyzing Israel and the Palestinian territories, but then I want to spend the bulk of my remarks on the future of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

First, here in America, our hearts are breaking for Israelis and Palestinians.

The images are just bone-chilling—rockets and interceptors streaking across the night sky, parents huddled with their children as air raid sirens ring out, tragic images of innocent Israeli and Palestinian civilians, including children, injured or killed in the blasts.

For many Americans who are turning on the news this week, it might appear that the events of the last few days erupted almost overnight. While tensions are now reaching a fevered and deadly pitch, this cataclysm has been long in the making and no party, including the United States of America, has completely clean hands.

Zero-sum politics have driven both the decision making of the Netanyahu government and Palestinian leadership, to the extent that there is such a thing as Palestinian leadership. Those decisions have led us to this crisis.

Over and over, Prime Minister Netanyahu has pushed Israeli settlements further into territory historically considered reserved for a future Palestinian State. The Israeli Government, increasingly reliant on right-wing, zero-sum political constituencies for its survival, also stepped up campaigns to remove Palestinians from areas in East Jerusalem as a means to undermine the Palestinian claim to that section of the ancient city as the capital of a future state.

The spark that lit the match of the existing conflagration was the Israeli effort to remove Palestinian families from their homes in the East Jerusalem neighborhood of Sheikh Jarrah and replace them with Israeli settlers.

In February, the Israeli court ordered Palestinian families in that neighborhood to vacate their homes by May 2 or they would be forcibly removed. Protests began, spread to other cities in Israel with large Arab populations, while the Palestinian families awaited a final ruling from the Israeli Supreme Court.

As these protests spread and grew in size, Israeli police adopted some tactics that we have seen on display here in the United States—an overly securitized approach that only escalated rather than defused the tension. Those crackdowns led to more protests and more clashes and a cycle that continued and continued.

Then Israeli security forces stormed Islam's third holiest site in Jerusalem during Ramadan prayers. Now, the Israelis contend that they were responding to a rock thrown from Palestinians inside. The Palestinians argue it was the other way around. But whatever happened, at the end of that night, more than 330 Palestinians and 22 Israelis had been injured.

The story of the Palestinians' conduct over the last decade is just as important in understanding the roots of the existing crisis. Fatah, the main political party representing Palestinians, has failed the people it represents. Ripe with internal conflict and corruption, Fatah lost its mandate to govern Gaza

in 2006, when Hamas, an internationally recognized terrorist organization, beat Fatah in parliamentary elections there that year.

Hamas refuses to recognize the right of Israel to exist and advocates for the armed rebellion of Palestinians against Israel. Fatah, under pressure from Hamas to take more extreme positions, spent most of the last decade refusing any and all chance to negotiate with the Israelis, preferring to sit on the sidelines and nurture grievances. They were unable to deliver any real economic benefit to the people under their charge in the West Bank, and the resulting desperation of Palestinians fed this grievance culture even more.

In response to those events I mentioned at Al Aqsa, Hamas and its allies in Gaza started firing rockets into southern and central Israel. Since that day, thousands of rockets have landed inside Israel. These rocket attacks were then responded to by an Israeli Government that has begun its own assault inside Gaza, and as we sit here today, hundreds of Palestinians inside Gaza, including children, have been killed. Although there have not been as many casualties in Israel because of the defense-security relationship with the United States, Israelis have been killed as well.

The Israelis were wrong to pursue settlements and evictions as a deliberate means to undermine a future Palestinian state. These policies might have helped hold together Netanyahu's political coalition, but they helped to feed a sense of hopelessness amongst Palestinians and their future.

The Palestinian leadership was wrong to perpetuate an anti-Israeli, anti-Semitic narrative as a foundation of their hold on power. They were wrong to choose grievance over diplomacy.

But the United States, over the last 4 years, played a role too. President Trump rejected America's historic role as a broker for peace and reconciliation between Israelis and Palestinians. He chose a side unconditionally, and his alliance with Netanyahu and his rejection of a Palestinian state drove the two parties further apart and turned the temperature up. Trump pursued a path to intentionally create division rather than healing. Those 4 years of America's absence from its traditional post of mediator is also a big reason we are here today.

There is going to be time to talk about the big picture—to talk about what went wrong and how American policy needs to change toward Israel and the West Bank and Gaza—but right now, our focus needs to be laser-like on deescalation, on a cease-fire. Hamas must stop its rocket attacks. They are war crimes. They are indiscriminate. They do nothing to help the Palestinians in East Jerusalem or anywhere else. Israel needs to stand down its military campaign as well. They have to take off the table a ground invasion of Gaza. Israel possesses a dispropor-

tionate military power. That is why, during the 2014 invasion of Gaza, 2,000 Palestinians died compared with fewer than 100 Israelis. But when children die in Gaza, it does nothing to secure Israel. In fact, it does the opposite. It just provides further fuel to this furnace of grievances.

So I am glad that the administration is sending Deputy Assistant Secretary Amr to the region, that he is there. It is critical that we also get a formal U.S. Ambassador to Israel in place as quickly as possible. But the United States needs to be pressing for a cease-fire. The United States can't afford to simply allow for this escalation to continue. That is not in Israel's best interest, and that is not in America's best interest. My hope is, in the conversations that are happening today between the Biden administration and the Netanyahu government, that they are talking about the terms to bring this violence to an end.

Now, as to the second topic, I recently spent 5 days in the Middle East last week. I came back just before this recent spate of violence began in Gaza and Israel. During the 5 days I was in the Middle East, I crossed paths with a bunch of Biden officials who were making stops throughout the region, and I can report that, in setting aside the conflict in Israel—something that is pretty hard to do right now—there is some real positive news to bring back from the Gulf.

The 4-year-long rift between Qatar and its Gulf neighbors is healing. There is now a new diplomatic energy behind cease-fire talks in Yemen, and the Saudis and the Iranians are in direct talks for the first time in years. All of this—I was repeatedly told by leaders in the Middle East—is happening because President Biden has made clear that deescalation is going to be rewarded and supported by the United States—a stark departure from the Trump administration.

Now, this is good news, but the bad news quickly follows, and it is this: If the United States does not reenter the Iran nuclear agreement, all of this nascent progress is going to be at risk.

Joe Biden ran on a promise to reenter the Iran nuclear agreement. He made this commitment because he knew that this agreement was critical to American security. With Iran's nuclear program curtailed and inspectors allowed to comb every inch of the country to look for signs of a secret enrichment program, the world could breathe a sigh of relief in knowing that, for all of Iran's other malevolent behaviors and policies, at least we knew that they were not developing a nuclear weapon.

The achievement of the deal also brought together a set of really unlikely bedfellows—the United States and Europe but also Russia and China. On Iran policy, with this coalition of regular adversaries, it was intact at the end of the Obama administration. It was ready to be picked up by President Trump to confront Iran's ballistic



missile program or their support for regional proxy forces like Hezbollah, but Trump went in a different direction. Instead of building on the Iran deal, he decided to put to test the theory of its opponents. That theory is this: that if the United States imposed unilateral, crippling sanctions on Iran, leaders in Tehran would limp to the negotiating table, cowed and willing to put all of the issues—nuclear enrichment, missiles, human rights, proxy support—up for discussion. That is what Obama's critics said he should have done, and those critics cheered when Trump took their advice.

What happened, of course, was a policy cataclysm. Trump imposed the sanctions, and our partners, instead of following America's lead, effectively took the Iranian side, even helping Iran work around our sanctions. Making matters worse, when Trump sent word to the Iranians of our 12 demands, they refused to talk. Instead, they did the opposite. They ratcheted up their bad behavior. They sent more support to the Houthis in Yemen. They restarted dormant parts of their nuclear program, reducing their breakout time to a weapon from just over a year to just under 3 months, and they resumed attacks on American forces in the region, both directly and through proxies.

Here is a pretty simple way to take a look at the success of the maximum pressure campaign. One element of the Iran nuclear deal was a commitment by Iran to reduce their enriched uranium stockpile. You can see, in the years leading up to the deal, there is a dramatic escalation in the amount of enriched uranium the Iranians are holding. Then immediately upon the deal's being reached, it plummets. Yet here is the bad news: As soon as the maximum pressure campaign is unveiled by President Trump, those numbers start to creep back up again.

One chart explains to you the effect of Trump's maximum pressure campaign. It was a spectacular failure and definitive proof that the alternative approach, cheered by the Iran deal's opponents—keep the sanctions in place until Iran totally capitulates—was a fantasy. Instead, the situation has empowered the more hardline wing of an already hardline regime who is prepared to perpetually operate a resistance economy and blame the United States for the nation's suffering.

Yet now those same critics of the nuclear agreement are back, and incredibly, despite the writing inked on the wall during the past 4 years, their argument hasn't changed a bit. Just keep doing what Trump did, and this time it will work, they say. They suggest that getting back into the nuclear deal, as Biden pledged during the campaign, isn't enough. They want a new deal that includes a resolution to all of Iran's bad acts, but unless we are prepared to invade Iran and demand unconditional surrender—news flash: We are not—then that comprehensive,

soup-to-nuts deal is a neoconservative fantasy. It doesn't exist in real life.

In real life, the achievable result is a restart of the nuclear agreement. The good news is that this result in 2021 might have an even greater peace dividend than when it was executed the first time in 2015.

This brings me back to my trip to the region. I heard this story, while I was there, of how quickly talks on healing the Gulf Cooperation Council rift matured as soon as Biden won the election. Countries that were at one another's throats throughout the Trump administration were suddenly coming to terms with one another. While conflict and bullying and score-settling—Trump's calling cards—were rewarded during his term, countries quickly realized that diplomacy and deescalation would most quickly win favor with President Biden.

In Oman, I heard how the Saudis were suddenly much more willing to make additional concessions in Yemen and how the Houthis were now more likely to trust the United States as an interlocutor. In Jordan, the King talked to us about how an Iraqi Government was now more welcoming than ever of help from places other than Iran, and he spoke of Jordan's new overtures to a Baghdad Government in its looking for a more diverse set of allies. And everyone in the region, at every stop, buzzed about these talks, these dialogues, between the Saudis and the Iranians. Reports suggest that these two countries wanted to talk during the Trump administration but were discouraged from doing so.

This momentum toward peace is encouraging, but it is so fragile, and one major setback, one major, unexpected diplomatic hiccup, could turn all of this progress around. I worry that this hiccup could be the failure of America and Iran to get back into the nuclear agreement. If the talks fail and the Biden administration is forced to implement Trump's Iran policy for the next 4 years, complete with these unilateral crippling sanctions, it is easy to see how all of this progress in the Gulf could disintegrate. The so-called Iranian moderates would head back to Tehran with no deal and be defeated in the upcoming national elections. A harder line government, much less prone to diplomacy, would choose to scuttle peace talks in Yemen, end the outreach to the Saudis, and work like mad to make sure that their proxies in Iraq take power in the upcoming parliamentary elections. This could convince the Saudis to double down militarily in Yemen and open up new fissures in the Gulf.

Listen, maybe I am wrong. Maybe this is an overly apocalyptic vision of what would occur if the nuclear negotiations go south, but I fear that it is more accurate than fantastical that the stakes might be that high, which brings me, finally, to our negotiations in Vienna. If the consequences of success are so promising and if the rami-

fications of failure are so dire, then what has to happen to guarantee a good outcome? And I will end here.

First, the structure of the talks is deeply problematic, and that is the Iranians' fault. They are insisting on this shuttle diplomacy when we should be talking directly to them.

Second, countries in Iran's neighborhood that were hostile or neutral to the talks in 2015 suddenly have their eyes wide open to the benefits of getting back into the deal, so we should make sure that our partners in the Middle East who have the ear of the Iranian Government or the Supreme Leader are applying the appropriate pressure and letting Iran know that their relationships in the region are at risk if Iran fails to get back into the deal.

On our side of the ledger, we need to be willing to be creative. Now, of course, any restart of the nuclear agreement is going to require the United States to drop the sanctions Trump applied to Iran's economy—that had the same impact as the Obama-era nuclear sanctions.

Yet here is the point I want to make: What about the other sanctions that Trump layered on top of the economic sanctions? For example, it should be expected that the Iranians would want us to lift Trump's designation of its primary military force, the IRGC, as a terrorist organization. This wasn't strictly a nuclear sanction, but it was certainly a key part of Trump's maximum pressure campaign, and it was specifically designed to try to bring Iran back to the negotiating table on a nuclear program.

In evaluating the wisdom of peeling back these noneconomic sanctions, it is important to remember that they were all completely feckless. These sanctions had no impact. In fact, their only impact was to worsen Iran's behavior, so lifting them would have no practical negative impact.

Just as importantly, lifting this particular designation, the one example I am posing to you today, is a rather technical exercise under the U.S. statute, and it actually doesn't prevent us from sanctioning the truly bad actors in the Iranian military. For example, our sanctions on some of their most brutal interrogators—the IRGC's interrogators—would all stay in place even if we lifted that blanket IRGC designation.

This is just one example of a Trump-era sanction whose erasure would have little to no practical impact. There are many more, but I use this example to show how weighing the equities, the benefits, of getting into the deal are going to be far greater than the imaginary benefits of keeping many of Trump's noneconomic sanctions.

Now, let me be clear. If the sanctions like this are removed, opponents of the deal are going to cry bloody murder in that they are going to accuse Biden of giving more than Obama gave, but this is the exact trap that Trump was trying to set for his successor. He applied



sanctions on Iran in connection with the pullout of the nuclear deal, but he called them nonnuclear sanctions, hoping the next President would be caught in this sticky web. President Biden shouldn't be bound by Trump's tortured sanctions logic.

But, just as importantly, let me assure you that no matter the particulars or the details of the agreement to restart the nuclear deal, the deal critics are going to oppose it, no matter what. They opposed it in 2015. They are going to oppose it again.

What we should really be worried about is Trump's Iran policy becoming, by accident, permanent, and this is what is likely to occur if the Vienna talks fail. Iran will continue to speed up its nuclear research program, the maximum pressure will continue, and a chill will be delivered to the deescalation momentum in the region.

But on the other hand, reentering the deal, while effectively already priced into a Biden electoral victory, will be seen as a diplomatic victory, at a perfect time to score a win for diplomacy, and the Middle East countries who have found new affection for a U.S.-Iran agreement will exhale.

Now, I am not naive. I understand the Middle East has still dozens of intractable crises, and the events of the last few days in Israel and Gaza are a reminder of the grave challenges that are still there. But the overall mood of deescalation in and around the Gulf is real, and it is much better than the old incentive structure for escalation.

So I see these roots of positive change slowly, quietly growing, and, right now, the best way for the United States to nurture those grass shoots is to restart the Iran nuclear agreement. 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. 58, S. 1260, a bill 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.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, John Hickenlooper, Michael F. Bennet, Patty Murray, Tammy Baldwin, Raphael G. Warnock, Christopher Murphy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jacky Rosen, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Jeff Merkley, Gary C. Peters, Catherine Cortez Masto.

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 S. 1260, a bill 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, 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 Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 192 Leg.]

#### YEAS—86

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blackburn	Hagerty	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Booker	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Braun	Hirono	Rubio
Brown	Hoeven	Sanders
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Fischer	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Ossoff	

#### NAYS—11

Barrasso	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lummis	Shelby
Crapo	Paul	Tuberville
Johnson	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Klobuchar	Toomey	Wicker
-----------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 11.

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

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.

#### EL SALVADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to call attention to recent events in El Salvador which have caused international concern, including in the U.S. Congress.

I was a Senator in the 1980s, when social injustices and authoritarian regimes in El Salvador led to a brutal civil war that lasted 12 years. I traveled there during that period when the United States was supporting the Salvador Armed Forces, despite their history of corruption and collusion with death squads that carried out political assassinations with impunity.

Finally, in 1992, after tens of thousands of lives lost and atrocities including the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero and six Jesuit priests and their housekeeper and her daughter by the Salvadoran Army, the two sides signed the Peace Accords that ended the war. Those Accords failed to solve the country's historical problems, and the leaders of the Arena and FMLN parties failed to put implementation of the Accords above their own corrupt, political ambitions, for which they ultimately lost the support of the Salvadoran people. But the Accords did establish the foundation for democracy, including a clear separation of powers with checks and balances as well as a limited constitutional role for the armed forces and the newly formed civilian police to avoid ever again being used for political purposes or repression.

I mention this history and the price in human suffering that was paid for the chance to build a peaceful, democratic society in El Salvador, at a time when key elements of the Peace Accords are under assault from within the government itself and President Nayib Bukele.

In February 2020, in a show of force designed to intimidate the Salvadoran Congress, which at that time his party did not control, President Bukele, accompanied by heavily armed soldiers, occupied the legislative chamber to demand passage of a law to pay for new equipment. Fifteen months later, after winning a supermajority in the Congress, he turned his attention to the judicial branch.

Under the Peace Accords, the Office of the Attorney General, formerly an appendage of the Executive that was used for repression and persecution of political opponents, became an independent institution, acting as a fourth branch of government and appointed by a majority of Congress to a 3-year term. Since the Congress is also elected for 3-year terms, every Congress gets to appoint an Attorney General. The President has no say in the matter.

The Attorney General can be removed by a majority of Congress for just cause and in accordance with due process. Attorney General Raul Melara's term was to end on January 6, 2022, just 7 months from now, and the newly elected Congress could have selected someone to replace him after

that date. However, on May 1, President Bukele's supermajority in Congress summarily removed Mr. Melara without cause and appointed a political loyalist as Melara's replacement, contrary to the requirements of the Constitution and raising serious doubts about the continued independence of the office.

It is notable that prior to his dismissal, the ousted Attorney General, with U.S. support, was investigating a number of cases of corruption against top government officials, including a multibillion-dollar money laundering case. Then last week, in what can only be interpreted as a flagrant attempt to shield themselves from accountability, the Congress passed a law to provide retroactive immunity to all government officials implicated in corruption involving spending linked to the COVID-19 pandemic. Also last week, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the anti-corruption unit suddenly resigned, for reasons that have not been explained, and was also replaced by a Bukele loyalist.

Those actions were just the beginning. El Salvador's Supreme Court has 15 justices elected for 9-year terms and distributed among different chambers. Every 3 years, Congress can appoint 5 justices from a list of 30 candidates submitted by the National Council of the Judiciary. The President has no say in the matter.

Justices can be assigned to and transferred from any chamber, except justices in the Constitutional Chamber who are appointed by the Congress strictly for that chamber and cannot be transferred. The chief justice of the Supreme Court is also selected by Congress from among the five members of the Constitutional Chamber.

The newly elected Congress would have elected five justices from different chambers of the Supreme Court in June from the already submitted list of candidates. However, on May 1, the Congress removed all five justices from the Constitutional Chamber and their substitutes, without cause or due process, arguing that their rulings were biased and contrary to the government's policies. Out of those justices only one would have completed his term in June. The other four from the Constitutional Chamber were serving terms until 2029. Apparently, the role of the judiciary as a separate branch of government that serves as an independent check on Executive power in a democracy is unacceptable to President Bukele and his congressional allies.

The Congress appointed new justices but not from a list of candidates submitted by the National Council of the Judiciary. So not only was the sudden removal of justices unconstitutional; so was the appointment of new justices.

The Constitutional Chamber had played an essential, historical role as a check on the Executive's abuse of authority, which is plainly why its jus-

tices were targeted for removal. The chamber often rebuked the Executive for overreaching in its actions, including the Bukele-ordered military occupation of the Congress in February 2020. Thus, by removing the Attorney General and the Supreme Court justices, the Congress gave President Bukele control of all branches of government, creating a situation in which corruption can flourish with impunity.

I have recounted these events because they have created a crisis that could have profound consequences for El Salvador, and for U.S.-Salvadoran relations. My concern is not only what it means for democracy in that country but what it could also mean for its economy and the livelihoods of its people. The stifling of democracy ultimately deprives already desperate people—suffering from the COVID pandemic, two hurricanes in 2020, and gang violence—of any hope their lives will get better, and this desperation is a major driver of migration to the U.S. border.

The United States has always been El Salvador's largest trading partner and its largest donor. CAFTA—the Central America Free Trade Agreement—established not only trade preferences but labor, health, and environmental standards. The results have been significant.

Forty-five percent of El Salvador's exports go to the United States under CAFTA, which amounts to \$2.6 billion a year.

Thirty-five percent of its imports come from the United States, totaling \$3.5 billion a year.

There are nearly 3 million Salvadorans living in the United States, of whom 200,000 have temporary protected status. Collectively, they send \$6 billion each year in remittances to their relatives in El Salvador, which amounts to 25 percent of the country's GDP.

On top of that, the United States has provided El Salvador with more than \$700 million in aid through USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and other agencies in the last 5 years alone. Much of the progress made with those funds is now at risk of being washed away.

The largest exporters in El Salvador are U.S. corporations, which are also the largest employers in El Salvador.

President Bukele knows that his dictatorial actions are a direct challenge to the United States and to the Biden administration's emphasis on democracy, human rights, and combating corruption in the region. Faced with criticism from the White House and the U.S. Congress, he may point to China as an alternative to the United States, as if a knight in shining armor from Beijing can gallop in and solve El Salvador's problems.

But the people of El Salvador have no connection with China, and they are not about to cast aside their longstanding relationship with the United States. Trade with China has always

been one-way and characterized by dumping practices that have destroyed local industries in El Salvador. There are no major exports from El Salvador to China except occasional shipments of coffee and sugar. Chinese infrastructure projects do nothing to help unemployed Salvadorians, when China sends the steel, concrete, and even the Chinese workers to build them.

The Salvadoran private sector knows that China isn't the answer. They know the country cannot prosper without democratic institutions and the rule of law.

El Salvador is a sovereign country, and President Bukele was democratically elected. He makes his own decisions. But the choices he and his allies in the Salvadoran Congress make, that are eviscerating El Salvador's democratic civilian institutions and empowering the armed forces, have consequences for U.S.-Salvadoran relations. They have consequences for our aid programs and for our support for financing for El Salvador from the IMF, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank and for our trade relations, and for visas.

This isn't about national sovereignty and foreign interference, as President Bukele has falsely suggested. His actions directly affect the United States, U.S. companies, our commercial relations, and the welfare of millions of Salvadorans in the United States, as well as the Salvadoran population.

I join others here and in El Salvador in urging President Bukele and the Salvadoran Congress to reconsider their unconstitutional actions and to restore the separation of powers and the rule of law. Don't destroy the Peace Accords' greatest achievement. End the attacks on the rule of law, respect the tenure of other justices and the Human Rights Procurator, and appoint justices to the Constitutional Chamber and an Attorney General following the established procedures and ensuring that they are people with the necessary professional qualifications, integrity, and independence.

#### TRIBUTE TO BRIAN RIENDEAU

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout a year full of new and difficult challenges, the greater Louisville region has been fortunate to have my friend Brian Riendeau helping lead the response. As the executive director of Dare to Care food bank, Brian has been instrumental in delivering tens of millions of quality and nutritious meals each year around this community. His vision and talent support families when they need it most, and we owe him a major debt of gratitude. This summer, Brian will bring to a close his 12 years of remarkable leadership at Dare to Care. I would like to take a moment today to recognize his accomplishments and thank him for his vast contributions to Kentucky.

This last year wasn't the first time I've watched Brian deliver for Kentucky. Before we worked together in

his current role, I had the privilege of having Brian on my Senate staff. For 5 years, he was an important adviser on legislation and Kentucky-focused priorities. While I was sorry to see him leave my office, I was pleased to know he was headed to the Bluegrass. He spent more than a decade in corporate leadership at one of Louisville's biggest employers before dedicating himself full-time to combating food insecurity.

In 2009, Brian joined Dare to Care with a plan. He wanted to expand the food bank's physical footprint and its reach. Founded in Louisville more than 50 years ago to address a troubling rise of malnutrition, Dare to Care partners with nearly 300 local organizations to promote healthy and active lifestyles across the community. Brian grew the staff to 60-strong and developed a strategy to further invest in Louisville and the surrounding region. In the last few years, he completed a \$7 million-plus capital campaign to build a new community kitchen to serve even more Kentuckians.

I had the opportunity to see Brian's operation firsthand last July. In the first months of the pandemic, demand for Dare to Care's help jumped around 35 percent. Brian and his team overcame supply-chain disruptions, implemented social distancing and other medical precautions, and continued serving those in need. In fact, once Brian's team stocked its shelves, Dare to Care was even able to help other food banks in Kentucky fill their own. Brian's forward-thinking and commitment to service helped countless Kentucky families during the hardest days of this pandemic. I am so grateful to him and his team for working around the clock to feed Kentucky.

Dare to Care is well-positioned to continue fulfilling its mission for years to come, and Brian's outstanding leadership helped get it there. Whatever comes next for Brian and his wife Judy, I know I speak for his many admirers in wishing him all the best. I would like to express my personal gratitude for his years of dedication to Kentucky, and I encourage my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Brian for his many successes.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "BILL" ALLEN, JR.

• Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today it is my pleasure to honor William "Bill" Allen, Jr., local business leader, community activist, author, and friend, for his tremendous contributions to Delaware and the growth and success of our communities.

If you have ever met Bill Allen, you will know he has a wonderful smile that will grab your attention when you walk in the room and will get you smiling as well. Bill is also serious about continuing to make important strides

in inspiring and bettering our State. Throughout his extensive career in the collections solutions industry, Bill was often the first or most senior African American in his organizations. Bill consistently reached new levels and set important precedents, led change, and inspired young African Americans. The knowledge and experience Bill gained throughout his career in the collections solutions industry led him to start his own company, ALW Sourcing LLC, a collections and customer contact solutions business that he leads with a wealth of knowledge, entrepreneurship, and industry experience.

In 2000, Bill and his wife, Dr. Kim Allen, founded A Friend of the Family, Inc., AFOF, a Delaware-based incubator for alternative learning programs. AFOF provides students with learning differences and behavioral challenges the tools and lessons necessary to overcome personal, environmental, and socioeconomic challenges. Under their leadership, the organization strengthens and empowers our community. The success of AFOF led Bill to be featured in *Business Week*, the *Baltimore Business Journal*, and *JET Magazine*.

He and Dr. Allen also teamed up to coauthor a book, "It Flows Through Us," which describes how working hard and giving back can generate success and happiness. When writing the book, Bill focused on making it accessible to all people so that it could be used in the minority- and women-owned business enterprise revolution. He also participates in this revolution through the multiple seminars he conducts yearly to increase individuals' understanding of business, diversity, leadership, motivation, and success. Bill's knowledge initiatives empower and inspire people to make positive changes that will improve lives across communities.

Bill served as the board chair of the African American Empowerment Fund, AAEFD, at Delaware Community Foundation and as a board member for the nonprofit charity Friends of Hockessin Colored School #107, FOHCS. During his time as chair, he led the fund to provide \$100,000 to the Hockessin Colored School #107, a historic school that played a role in a groundbreaking court case that became part of the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Brown v. Board of Education*. A student at the school was a plaintiff in the 1952 Delaware Court of Chancery case *Belton (Bulah) v. Gebhart*, which was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court jointly with *Brown v. Board*. Thanks to the funding that Bill helped secure, the historic school is now being transformed into a center for diversity training, inclusion, and social equity. Its legacy will continue and its purpose has been reignited.

In my remarks at the reintroduction ceremony for this school, I stated that in order to change our future, we must confront our past. It is my firm belief that Mr. Allen's commitments to our community and the revitalization of

the Hockessin Colored School have played an important role in this mission and the growth and inclusivity of our State.

In both business and community involvement, all of Bill's accomplishments led to his induction into the Delaware Business Leaders Hall of Fame in 2020 as one of the first African-American inductees. This honor was awarded to him by the Leadership Council of Junior Achievement of Delaware, which recognized his influence as a business role model to the students whom the organization serves. I believe that this is a fitting testament to the great work Bill has done for our State.

Mr. President, Bill has made invaluable contributions to Delawareans. He has used his knowledge and experience to invest in a wide array of communities and inspire hundreds of citizens. He is well respected for such contributions and this recognition is well deserved.

Bill Allen, on behalf of all you have supported and inspired throughout your career, please accept our sincere gratitude. Thank you for your unwavering commitment to the Delaware community and for your dedication to your work that has brought about change, set important firsts, and inspired others. Thank you.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1065. An act to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand and enhance consumer, student, servicemember, and small business protections with respect to debt collection practices, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2877. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1065. An act to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand and enhance consumer, student, servicemember, and small business protections with respect to debt collection practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2877. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop best practices for the establishment and use of behavioral intervention teams at schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

### 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 Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1652. A bill to ensure high-income earners pay a fair share of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 1653. A bill to repeal the current Internal Revenue Code and replace it with a flat tax, thereby guaranteeing economic growth and fairness for all Americans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER:

S. 1654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter dietary supplement products as qualified medical expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 1655. A bill to prohibit States from regulating certain commercial motor vehicle service contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1656. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1657. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the People's Republic of China in relation to activities in the South China Sea and the East China Sea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1658. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. KELLY):

S. 1659. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway cost allocation study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1660. A bill to expand access to health care services for immigrants by removing legal and policy barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1661. A bill to establish the National Fab Lab Network, a nonprofit organization con-

sisting of a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing universal access to advanced manufacturing tools for workforce development, STEM education, developing inventions, creating businesses, producing personalized products, mitigating risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 1662. A bill to increase funding for the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration and for the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 217. A resolution designating the week of May 16 through May 22, 2021, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 218. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; considered and agreed to.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 96

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 96, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to support library infrastructure.

S. 437

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to further protect officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 927

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 927, a bill to improve the provision of health care and other benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who were exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

S. 949

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 949, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to foster efficient markets and increase competition and transparency among packers that purchase livestock from producers.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to address issues involving the People's Republic of China.

S. 1255

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1255, a bill to require the Minority Business Development Agency

of the Department of Commerce to promote and administer programs in the public and private sectors to assist the development of minority business enterprises, to ensure that such Agency has the necessary supporting resources, particularly during economic downturns, and for other purposes.

S. 1325

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are informed of the medical risks associated with the abortion procedure and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child, before giving their informed consent to receive an abortion.

S. 1378

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors 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. 1446

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a plan for obligating and expending Coronavirus pandemic funding made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1482

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1482, a bill to increase Government accountability for administrative actions by reinvigorating administrative Pay-As-You-Go.

S. 1511

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1511, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustain in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to shorten the extension, and the amount, of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in order to get Americans back to work.

S. 1558

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States

Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes.

S. 1599

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1599, a bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 188

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 188, a resolution expressing appreciation and recognition for the Trump Administration for the creation of Operation Warp Speed and the historic development of a COVID-19 vaccine.

S. RES. 207

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 207, a resolution designating the week beginning November 8, 2021, as "National Pregnancy Center Week" to recognize the vital role that community-supported pregnancy centers play in saving lives and serving women and men faced with difficult pregnancy decisions.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 217—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 16 THROUGH MAY 22, 2021, AS "NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK"

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 217

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, sanitation and waste management systems, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States;

Whereas public works professionals have played, and will continue to play, a key role in helping the United States recover from the COVID-19 pandemic; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safe-

ty, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 16 through May 22, 2021, as "National Public Works Week";

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM, AND ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT POLICIES TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. ERNST, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 218

Whereas National Foster Care Month was established more than 30 years ago—

(1) to bring foster care issues to the forefront of the national focus;

(2) to highlight the importance of permanency for every child; and

(3) to recognize the essential role that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States;

Whereas all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home;

Whereas the primary goal of the foster care system is to ensure the safety and well-being of children while working to provide a safe, loving, and permanent home for each child;

Whereas there are approximately 424,000 children living in foster care;

Whereas there were approximately 251,000 youth that entered the foster care system in 2019, while more than 122,000 youth were awaiting adoption at the end of 2019;

Whereas more than 86,000 children entered foster care in 2019 due to parental drug abuse;

Whereas children of color are more likely to stay in the foster care system for longer periods of time and are less likely to be reunited with their biological families;

Whereas foster parents—

(1) are the front-line caregivers for children who cannot safely remain with their biological parents;

(2) provide physical care, emotional support, and education advocacy; and

(3) are the largest single source of families providing permanent homes for children leaving foster care to adoption;

Whereas, compared to children in foster care who are placed with nonrelatives, children in foster care who are placed with relatives have more stability, including fewer changes in placements, have more positive perceptions of their placements, are more likely to be placed with their siblings, and demonstrate fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas some relative caregivers receive less financial assistance and fewer support services than do foster caregivers;

Whereas an increased emphasis on prevention and reunification services is necessary to reduce the number of children that enter or re-enter the foster care system;

Whereas the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has created additional challenges for youth and families in the child welfare system, including delays in permanency, economic hardship, and disruptions in education;

Whereas over 20,000 youth “aged out” of foster care in 2019 without a legal permanent connection to an adult or family;

Whereas children who age out of foster care lack the security or support of a biological or adoptive family and frequently struggle to secure affordable housing, obtain health insurance, pursue higher education, and acquire adequate employment;

Whereas foster care is intended to be a temporary placement, but children remain in the foster care system for an average of 19 months;

Whereas, according to the Annie E. Casey Foundation, 35 percent of children in foster care experience more than 2 placements while in foster care, which often leads to disruption of routines and the need to change schools and move away from siblings, extended families, and familiar surroundings;

Whereas youth in foster care are much more likely to face educational instability, with 1 study showing that 75 percent of foster youth experienced an unscheduled school change during a school year, compared to 21 percent of youth not in foster care;

Whereas children entering foster care often confront the widespread misperception that children in foster care are disruptive, unruly, and dangerous, even though placement in foster care is based on the actions of a parent or guardian, not the child;

Whereas 30 percent of children in foster care are taking at least 1 anti-psychotic medication, and 34 percent of those children are not receiving adequate treatment planning or medication monitoring;

Whereas, according to a 2018 study, due to heavy caseloads and limited resources, the average annual turnover rate for child welfare workers is between 14 percent and 22 percent;

Whereas States, localities, and communities should be encouraged to invest resources in preventative and reunification services and postpermanency programs to ensure that more children in foster care are provided with safe, loving, and permanent placements;

Whereas, in 2018, Congress passed the Family First Prevention Services Act (Public Law 115-123; 132 Stat. 232), which provided new investments in prevention and family reunification services to help more families stay together and ensure that more children are in safe, loving, and permanent homes;

Whereas Federal legislation over the 3 decades preceding the date of adoption of this resolution, including the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-272; 94 Stat. 500), the Adoption and

Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-89; 111 Stat. 2115), the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-351; 122 Stat. 3949), the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-34; 125 Stat. 369), and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113-183; 128 Stat. 1919), provided new investments and services to improve the outcomes of children in the foster care system;

Whereas May 2021 is an appropriate month to designate as National Foster Care Month to provide an opportunity to acknowledge the accomplishments of the child welfare workforce, foster parents, the advocacy community, and mentors for their dedication and accomplishments and the positive impact they have on the lives of children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2021 as National Foster Care Month;

(2) recognizes National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges that children face in the foster care system;

(3) encourages Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system;

(4) acknowledges the unique needs of children in the foster care system;

(5) recognizes foster youth throughout the United States for their ongoing tenacity, courage, and resilience while facing life challenges;

(6) acknowledges the exceptional alumni of the foster care system who serve as advocates and role models for youth who remain in foster care;

(7) honors the commitment and dedication of the individuals who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to children in the foster care system;

(8) supports the designation of May 31, 2021, as National Foster Parent Appreciation Day;

(9) recognizes National Foster Parent Appreciation Day as an opportunity—

(A) to recognize the efforts of foster parents to provide safe and loving care for children in need; and

(B) to raise awareness about the increasing need for foster parents to serve in their communities; and

(10) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all children in the foster care system through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and other programs designed—

(A) to support vulnerable families;

(B) to invest in prevention and reunification services;

(C) to promote adoption in cases where reunification is not in the best interests of the child;

(D) to adequately serve children brought into the foster care system; and

(E) to facilitate the successful transition into adulthood for children that “age out” of the foster care system.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1493. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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 crit-

ical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1494. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1495. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1260, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1496. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 117, expressing support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland.

SA 1497. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 117, supra.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1493. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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 3250 and insert the following:

#### SEC. 3250. ADDRESSING CHINA'S SOVEREIGN LENDING PRACTICES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) since 2005, the Government of the People's Republic of China has expanded sovereign lending to governments in Latin America and the Caribbean, including governments with a history of corruption and mismanagement, with loans that are repaid or collateralized with natural resources or commodities;

(2) several countries in Latin American and the Caribbean that have received a significant amount of sovereign lending from the Government of the People's Republic of China face challenges in repaying such loans;

(3) the Government of the People's Republic of China's predatory economic practices and sovereign lending practices in Latin America and the Caribbean negatively influence United States national interests in the Western Hemisphere;

(4) the Inter-American Development Bank, the premier multilateral development bank dedicated to the Western Hemisphere, can play a significant role supporting the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean in achieving sustainable and serviceable debt structures; and

(5) a tenth general capital increase for the Inter-American Development Bank could enhance the Bank's ability to help the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean achieve sustainable and serviceable debt structures.

(b) SUPPORT FOR A GENERAL CAPITAL INCREASE.—The President should consider supporting a tenth general capital increase for the Inter-American Development Bank if countries holding a majority of the shares in the Bank publicly endorse such a capital increase.



(c) ADDRESSING CHINA'S SOVEREIGN LENDING IN THE AMERICAS.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Executive Director to the Inter-American Development Bank shall use the voice and vote of the United States—

(1) to advance efforts by the Bank to help countries restructure debt resulting from sovereign lending by the Government of the People's Republic of China in order to achieve sustainable and serviceable debt structures; and

(2) to establish appropriate safeguards and transparency and conditionality measures to protect debt-vulnerable member countries of the Inter-American Development Bank that borrow from the Bank for the purposes of restructuring Chinese bilateral debt held by such countries and preventing such countries from incurring subsequent Chinese bilateral debt.

**SA 1494.** Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency \$7,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.

**SA 1497.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 117, expressing support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland; as follows:

Beginning in the ninth whereas clause of the preamble, strike the “and” at the end and all that follows through “Northern Ireland” in the tenth whereas clause of the preamble, and insert the following:

Whereas the United States Congress stands steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the United States has a Special Relationship with the United Kingdom, including partnership on trade and economic issues.

**SA 1495.** Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him 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:

At the end of subtitle B of title II of division E, add the following:

**SEC. 5214. REQUIREMENT TO CONTROL THE EXPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONAL DATA OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS AND INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4811 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1758 the following:

**“SEC. 1758A. REQUIREMENT TO CONTROL THE EXPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONAL DATA OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS AND INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

“(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL DATA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish and, in coordination with the Secretary and the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, lead a regular, ongoing inter-agency process to identify categories of personal data of covered individuals that could—

“(A) be exploited by foreign governments; and

“(B) if exported in a quantity that exceeds the threshold established under paragraph (3), harm the national security of the United States.

“(2) LIST REQUIRED.—The interagency process established under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall identify an initial list of categories of personal data under paragraph (1) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021; and

“(B) may, as appropriate thereafter, add categories to, remove categories from, or modify categories on, that list.

“(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF THRESHOLD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, the interagency process established under paragraph (1) shall establish a threshold for the quantity of personal data of covered individuals the export, reexport, or in-country transfer (in the aggregate) of which by one person to or in a restricted country could harm the national security of the United States.

“(B) PARAMETERS.—The threshold established under subparagraph (A) shall be the export, reexport, or in-country transfer (in the aggregate) by one person to or in a restricted country during a calendar year of the personal data of not less than 10,000 covered individuals and not more than 1,000,000 covered individuals.

“(C) CATEGORY THRESHOLDS.—The interagency process may establish a threshold under subparagraph (A) for each category of personal data identified under paragraph (1).

“(D) TREATMENT OF ENTITIES UNDER COMMON OWNERSHIP AS ONE ENTITY.—For purposes of determining whether a threshold established under subparagraph (A) has been met—

“(i) personal data shall be considered to be exported, reexported, or in-country transferred by one person if the personal data is exported, reexported, or in-country transferred by entities under common ownership or control; and

“(ii) the parent entity of such entities shall be liable for export, reexport, or in-country transfer in violation of this section.

“(E) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing a threshold under subparagraph (A), the interagency process shall seek to balance the need to protect personal data from exploitation by foreign governments against the likelihood of—

“(i) impacting legitimate business activities and other activities that do not harm

the national security of the United States; or

“(ii) chilling speech protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

“(4) DETERMINATION OF PERIOD FOR PROTECTION.—The interagency process established under paragraph (1) shall determine, for each category of personal data identified under that paragraph, the period of time for which encryption technology described in subsection (b)(4)(C) is required to be able to protect that category of data from decryption to prevent the exploitation of the data by a foreign government from harming the national security of the United States.

“(5) PROCESS.—The interagency process established under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be informed by multiple sources of information, including—

“(i) publicly available information;

“(ii) classified information, including relevant information provided by the Director of National Intelligence;

“(iii) information relating to reviews and investigations of transactions by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565);

“(iv) the categories of sensitive personal data described in paragraphs (1)(ii) and (2) of section 800.241(a) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, and any categories of sensitive personal data added to such section after such date of enactment;

“(v) information provided by the advisory committee established pursuant to paragraph (7); and

“(vi) the recommendations (which the President shall request) of—

“(I) privacy experts identified by the National Academy of Sciences; and

“(II) experts on the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States identified by the American Bar Association; and

“(B) take into account the significant quantity of personal data of covered individuals that has already been stolen or acquired by foreign governments, the harm to United States national security caused by the theft of that personal data, and the potential for further harm to United States national security if that personal data were combined with additional sources of personal data.

“(6) NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD.—The President shall provide for a public notice and comment period after the publication in the Federal Register of a proposed rule, and before the publication of a final rule—

“(A) identifying the initial list of categories of personal data under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2);

“(B) adding categories to, removing categories from, or modifying categories on, that list under subparagraph (B) of that paragraph;

“(C) establishing the threshold under paragraph (3); or

“(D) setting forth the period of time for which encryption technology described in subsection (b)(4)(C) is required under paragraph (4) to be able to protect such a category of data from decryption.

“(7) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to advise the Secretary with respect to privacy and sensitive personal data.

“(B) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Subsections (a)(1), (a)(3), and (b) of section 10 and sections 11, 13, and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory committee established pursuant to subparagraph (A).



“(8) TREATMENT OF ANONYMIZED PERSONAL DATA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The interagency process established under paragraph (1) may not treat anonymized personal data differently than identifiable personal data if the individuals to which the anonymized personal data relates could reasonably be identified using other sources of data.

“(B) GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology shall issue guidance to the public with respect to methods for anonymizing data and how to determine if individuals to which the anonymized personal data relates can be reasonably identified using other sources of data.

“(b) COMMERCE CONTROLS.—

“(1) CONTROLS REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, the Secretary shall impose appropriate controls under the Export Administration Regulations on the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, all countries (other than countries on the list required by paragraph (2)(D)) of covered personal data to in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3), including through interim controls (such as by informing a person that a license is required for export), as appropriate, or by publishing additional regulations.

“(2) LEVELS OF CONTROL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) or (D), the Secretary shall—

“(i) require a license or other authorization for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3);

“(ii) determine whether that export, reexport, or in-country transfer is likely to harm the national security of the United States—

“(I) after consideration of the matters described in subparagraph (B); and

“(II) in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies; and

“(iii) if the Secretary determines under clause (ii) that the export, reexport, or in-country transfer is likely to harm the national security of the United States, deny the application for the license or other authorization for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining under clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) whether an export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data described in clause (i) of that subparagraph is likely to harm the national security of the United States, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall take into account—

“(i) the adequacy and enforcement of data protection, surveillance, and export control laws in the foreign country to which the covered personal data would be exported or reexported, or in which the covered personal data would be transferred, in order to determine whether such laws, and the enforcement of such laws, are sufficient to—

“(I) protect the covered personal data from accidental loss, theft, and unauthorized or unlawful processing;

“(II) ensure that the covered personal data is not exploited for intelligence purposes by foreign governments to the detriment of the national security of the United States; and

“(III) prevent the reexport of the covered personal data to a third country for which a license would be required for such data to be exported directly from the United States;

“(ii) the circumstances under which the government of the foreign country can com-

pel, coerce, or pay a person in or national of that country to disclose the covered personal data; and

“(iii) whether that government has conducted hostile foreign intelligence operations, including information operations, against the United States.

“(C) LICENSE REQUIREMENT AND PRESUMPTION OF DENIAL FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(I) require a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a country on the list required by clause (ii) of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the threshold established under subsection (a)(3); and

“(II) deny an application for such a license or other authorization unless the person seeking the license or authorization demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the export, reexport, or in-country transfer will not harm the national security of the United States.

“(ii) LIST REQUIRED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies and based on the considerations described in subparagraph (B), establish a list of each country with respect to which the Secretary determines that the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, the country of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3) will be likely to harm the national security of the United States.

“(II) MODIFICATIONS TO LIST.—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies—

“(aa) may add a country to or remove a country from the list required by subclause (I) at any time; and

“(bb) shall review that list not less frequently than every 5 years.

“(D) NO LICENSE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not require a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a country on the list required by clause (ii) of covered personal data, without regard to the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3).

“(ii) LIST REQUIRED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies and based on the considerations described in subparagraph (B) and subject to clause (iii), establish a list of each country with respect to which the Secretary determines that the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, the country of covered personal data (without regard to any threshold established under subsection (a)(3)) will not harm the national security of the United States.

“(II) MODIFICATIONS TO LIST.—The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies—

“(aa) may add a country to or remove a country from the list required by subclause (I) at any time; and

“(bb) shall review that list not less frequently than every 5 years.

“(iii) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The list required by clause (ii) and any updates to that list adding or removing countries shall take effect, for purposes of clause (i), on the date that is 180 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate congressional committees a proposal for the list or update unless there is

enacted into law, before that date, a joint resolution of disapproval pursuant to subclause (II).

“(II) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

“(aa) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL DEFINED.—In this clause, the term ‘joint resolution of disapproval’ means a joint resolution of the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That Congress does not approve of the proposal of the Secretary with respect to the list required by section 1758A(b)(2)(D)(ii) submitted to Congress on \_\_\_\_’, with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

“(bb) PROCEDURES.—The procedures set forth in paragraphs (4)(C), (5), (6), and (7) of section 2523(d) of title 18, United States Code, apply with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval under this clause to the same extent and in the same manner as such procedures apply to a joint resolution of disapproval under such section 2523(d), except that paragraph (6) of such section shall be applied and administered by substituting ‘the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs’ for ‘the Committee on the Judiciary’ each place it appears.

“(III) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This clause is enacted by Congress—

“(aa) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

“(bb) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“(3) REVIEW OF LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish—

“(i) an interagency process, in which the appropriate Federal agencies participate, to conduct review of applications for a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a restricted country of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3); and

“(ii) procedures for conducting the review of such applications.

“(B) DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of an application for a license or other authorization for an export, reexport, or in-country transfer described in subparagraph (A)(i) submitted by or on behalf of a joint venture, joint development agreement, or similar collaborative arrangement, the Secretary may require the applicant to identify, in addition to any foreign person participating in the arrangement, any foreign person with significant ownership interest in a foreign person participating in the arrangement.

“(4) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary shall not impose under paragraph (1) a requirement for a license or other authorization with respect to the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data pursuant to any of the following transactions:

“(A) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer by an individual of the individual's own personal data.

“(B) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of the personal data of one or more individuals by a person performing a service for those individuals if the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of the personal data is strictly necessary (as defined by the Secretary in regulations) to perform that service.

“(C) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of personal data that is encrypted if—

“(i) the encryption key or other information necessary to decrypt the data is not exported, reexported, or transferred; and

“(ii) the encryption technology used to protect the data against decryption is certified by the National Institute of Standards and Technology as capable of protecting data for the period of time determined under subsection (a)(4) to be sufficient to prevent the exploitation of the data by a foreign government from harming the national security of the United States.

“(D) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of personal data that is ordered by an appropriate court of the United States.

“(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF CATEGORIES AND DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE CONTROLS.—In identifying categories of personal data under subsection (a)(1) and imposing appropriate controls under subsection (b), the interagency process established under subsection (a)(1) or the Secretary, as appropriate—

“(1) may not regulate or restrict the publication or sharing of—

“(A) personal data that is a matter of public record, such as a court record or other government record that is generally available to the public, including information about an individual made public by that individual or by the news media;

“(B) information about a matter of public interest; or

“(C) consistent with the goal of protecting the national security of the United States, any other information the publication of which is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

“(2) shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees.

“(d) PENALTIES.—

“(1) LIABLE PERSONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of section 1760, an officer or employee of an organization has committed an unlawful act subject to penalties under that section if the officer or employee knew or should have known that another employee of the organization who reports, directly or indirectly, to the officer or employee was directed to export, reexport, or in-country transfer covered personal data in violation of this section.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS.—

“(i) INTERMEDIARIES NOT LIABLE.—An intermediate consignee (as defined in section 772.1 of the Export Administration Regulations (or any successor regulation)) or other intermediary is not liable for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data in violation of this section when acting as an intermediate consignee or other intermediary for another person.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—In a case in which an application installed on an electronic device transmits or causes the transmission of covered personal data without the knowledge of the owner or user of the device who installed the application, the developer of the application, and not the owner or user of the device, is liable for any violation of this section.

“(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—In determining an appropriate term of imprisonment under section 1760(b)(2) for a violation of this section, the court shall consider—

“(A) how many covered individuals had their covered personal data exported, reexported, or in-country transferred in violation of this section; and

“(B) any harm that resulted from the violation.

“(3) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An individual may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States if, as a result of an export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data in violation of this section, the individual is—

“(i) physically harmed; or

“(ii) detained or imprisoned in a foreign country.

“(B) RELIEF.—A court may award a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under subparagraph (A) appropriate relief, including actual damages, punitive damages, or attorney’s fees.

“(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of actions taken pursuant to this section.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of the determinations made under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii) during the preceding year.

“(3) FORM.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

“(f) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN LICENSE INFORMATION.—Not less frequently than every 90 days, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Commerce, including in a machine-readable format, the following information, with respect to each application for a license for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a restricted country of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3):

“(1) The name of the applicant.

“(2) The date of the application.

“(3) The name of the foreign party to which the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer the data.

“(4) The categories of covered personal data the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer.

“(5) The number of covered individuals whose information the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer.

“(6) Whether the application was approved or denied.

“(g) NEWS MEDIA PROTECTIONS.—A person that is engaged in journalism is not subject to restrictions imposed under this section to the extent that those restrictions directly infringe on the journalism practices of that person.

“(h) CITIZENSHIP DETERMINATIONS BY ENTITIES PROVIDING SERVICES TO END-USERS NOT REQUIRED.—This section does not require a person that provides products or services to an individual to determine the citizenship or immigration status of the individual, but once the person becomes aware that the individual is a covered individual, the person shall treat covered personal data of that individual as is required by this section.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and to the head of each agency participating in the interagency process established under subsection (a) such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section, including to hire additional employees with expertise in privacy.

“(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Com-

mittee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

“(2) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The term ‘appropriate Federal agencies’ means the following:

“(A) The Department of Defense.

“(B) The Department of State.

“(C) The Department of Justice.

“(D) The Department of the Treasury.

“(E) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(F) The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.

“(G) The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

“(H) The Federal Trade Commission.

“(I) The Federal Communications Commission.

“(J) The Department of Health and Human Services.

“(K) Such other Federal agencies as the President or the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’, with respect to personal data, means an individual who, at the time the data is acquired—

“(A) is located in the United States; or

“(B) is—

“(i) located outside the United States or whose location cannot be determined; and

“(ii) a citizen of the United States or a noncitizen lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

“(4) COVERED PERSONAL DATA.—The term ‘covered personal data’ means the categories of personal data of covered individuals identified pursuant to the interagency process under subsection (a).

“(5) EXPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘export’, with respect to covered personal data, includes—

“(i) subject to subparagraph (D), the shipment or transmission of the data out of the United States, including the sending or taking of the data out of the United States, in any manner, if the shipment or transmission is intentional, without regard to whether the shipment or transmission was intended to go out of the United States; or

“(ii) the release or transfer of the data to any noncitizen (other than a noncitizen described in subparagraph (C)), if the release or transfer is intentional, without regard to whether the release or transfer was intended to be to a noncitizen.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘export’ does not include—

“(i) the publication of covered personal data on the internet in a manner that makes the data accessible to any member of the general public; or

“(ii) any activity protected by the speech or debate clause of the Constitution of the United States.

“(C) NONCITIZENS DESCRIBED.—A noncitizen described in this subparagraph is a noncitizen—

“(i) who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

“(ii) to whom the Secretary of Homeland Security has issued an employment authorization document (Form I-766);

“(iii) who has been granted deferred action pursuant to the memorandum of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ‘Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children’ issued on June 15, 2012; or

“(iv) who is present in the United States pursuant to a valid, unexpired E-3, H-1B, H-1B1, H-1B2, J-1, L-1, O-1A, or TN-1 visa.

“(D) UNINTENTIONAL TRANSMISSIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans’ Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2021, and

except as provided in clause (iii), the term 'export' includes the transmission of data through a restricted country, without regard to whether the person originating the transmission had knowledge of or control over the path of the transmission.

"(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) does not apply with respect to a transmission of data through a restricted country if—

"(I) the data is encrypted as described in subsection (b)(4)(C); or

"(II) the person that originated the transmission received a representation from the party delivering the data for the person stating that the data will not transit through a restricted country.

"(iii) FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.—If a party delivering covered personal data as described in clause (ii)(II) transmits the data through a restricted country despite making the representation described in clause (ii)(II), that party shall be liable for violating this section.

"(6) LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE; NATIONAL.—The terms 'lawfully admitted for permanent residence' and 'national' have the meanings given those terms in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

"(7) NONCITIZEN.—The term 'noncitizen' means an individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States.

"(8) RESTRICTED COUNTRY.—The term 'restricted country' means a country for which a license or other authorization is required under subsection (b) for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, that country of covered personal data in a quantity that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3)."

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 1752 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4811) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) to restrict the export of personal data of United States citizens and other covered individuals (as defined in section 1758A(e)) in a quantity and a manner that could harm the national security of the United States."; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

"(H) To prevent the exploitation of personal data of United States citizens and other covered individuals (as defined in section 1758A(e)) in a quantity and a manner that could harm the national security of the United States.".

(c) OTHER AMENDMENTS TO EXPORT CONTROL REFORM ACT OF 2018.—The Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1742(13)(A) (50 U.S.C. 4801(13)(A)), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "(except section 1758A)" after "part I"; and

(2) in section 1754(b) (50 U.S.C. 4813(b)), by inserting "(other than section 1758A)" after "this part".

**SA 1496.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 117, expressing support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland; as follows:

On page 8, strike lines 19 through 25 and insert the following:

(9) greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland; and

(10) will take into account, as relevant, conditions requiring that obligations under the Good Friday Agreement be met as the United States seeks to negotiate a mutually advantageous and comprehensive trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, May 17, 2021, at 6 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

#### TIMELY REAUTHORIZATION OF NECESSARY STEM-CELL PROGRAMS LENDS ACCESS TO NEEDED THERAPIES ACT OF 2021

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 941 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 941) to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read for a third time.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 941) was passed.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion 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.

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT, OR THE BELFAST AGREEMENT, AND SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION TO SUPPORT PEACE ON THE ISLAND OF IRELAND

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 20, S. Res. 117.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 117) expressing support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in *italic*, and with an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in *italic*, as follows:

*Whereas, on April 10, 1998, the Government of Ireland and the Government of the United Kingdom signed the Good Friday Agreement, also known as the "Belfast Agreement";*

*Whereas the goals of the Good Friday Agreement were to bring a new era of devolved government and democracy to Northern Ireland, end violence, and ensure peace for the people of the island of Ireland;*

*Whereas the successful negotiation of the Good Friday Agreement stands as a historic and groundbreaking success that has proven critical to the decades of relative peace that have followed;*

*Whereas the return to power sharing in 2020 after the collapse of power-sharing institutions in 2017 creates new opportunities for strengthening peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland;*

*Whereas the agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and the protocol to that agreement on Northern Ireland preserving an open border on the island of Ireland (in this preamble referred to as the "Northern Ireland Protocol"), are intended to protect the peace forged under the Good Friday Agreement;*

*Whereas, despite the historic progress of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements, including the Stormont House Agreement agreed to in December 2014, important issues remain unresolved in Northern Ireland, including the passage of a Bill of Rights, securing justice for all victims of violence, including violence by state and non-state actors, and reducing sectarian divisions and promoting reconciliation;*

*Whereas section 6 of the Good Friday Agreement ("Rights, Safeguards and Equality of Opportunity") recognizes "the importance of respect, understanding and tolerance in relation to linguistic diversity" as part of "the cultural wealth of the island of Ireland" and declares the Government of the United Kingdom will seek ways to encourage the use of and education in the Irish language and provide opportunities for Irish language arts;*

*Whereas the reintroduction of barriers, checkpoints, or personnel on the island of Ireland, also known as a "hard border", including through the invocation of Article 16 of the*

*Northern Ireland Protocol, would threaten the successes of the Good Friday Agreement;*

*Whereas the United States Congress played a prominent role in support of negotiations of the Good Friday Agreement and has taken a leading role in promoting peace on the island of Ireland more broadly; and*

*Whereas Congress greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and Ireland and stands steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland: Now, therefore, be it*

*Resolved,*

*That the Senate—*

*(1) urges the United Kingdom and the European Union to support peace on the island of Ireland and the principles, objectives, and commitments of the Good Friday Agreement, also known as the “Belfast Agreement”;*

*(2) expresses support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements, including the Stormont House Agreement agreed to in December 2014, as well as the protocol on Northern Ireland to the agreement on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union (in this resolution referred to as the “Northern Ireland Protocol”);*

*(3) congratulates all parties in Northern Ireland for the return in January 2020 to a power-sharing agreement;*

*(4) urges all parties in Northern Ireland to work collectively to ensure the implementation of all commitments of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements so that all of the institutions of the Good Friday Agreement can operate successfully and sustainably and that ongoing political challenges can be overcome;*

*(5) calls for continuing attention and action to resolve the injustices of past violence, including violence by state and non-state actors;*

*(6) supports the passage of a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland and the right of all the people on the island of Ireland to self-determine their future as provided for in the Good Friday Agreement;*

*(7) encourages renewed attention to educational and cultural efforts that will ensure the rich language, literature, and arts of Northern Ireland endure and are not diminished;*

*(8) expresses support for the Northern Ireland Protocol and its full implementation, which ensures through international agreement that no “hard border” will be reintroduced on the island of Ireland; and*

*(9) will insist that any new or amended trade agreements and other bilateral agreements between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom take into account, as relevant, conditions requiring that obligations under the Good Friday Agreement be met.*

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I further ask that the Lee amendment to the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be considered and agreed to; the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the Lee amendment to the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; 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 amendment (No. 1496) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the resolution)

On page 8, strike lines 19 through 25 and insert the following:

(9) greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland; and

(10) will take into account, as relevant, conditions requiring that obligations under the Good Friday Agreement be met as the United States seeks to negotiate a mutually advantageous and comprehensive trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 117), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1497) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Beginning in the ninth whereas clause of the preamble, strike the “and” at the end and all that follows through “Northern Ireland” in the tenth whereas clause of the preamble, and insert the following:

Whereas the United States Congress stands steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the United States has a Special Relationship with the United Kingdom, including partnership on trade and economic issues

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 117

Whereas, on April 10, 1998, the Government of Ireland and the Government of the United Kingdom signed the Good Friday Agreement, also known as the “Belfast Agreement”;

Whereas the goals of the Good Friday Agreement were to bring a new era of devolved government and democracy to Northern Ireland, end violence, and ensure peace for the people of the island of Ireland;

Whereas the successful negotiation of the Good Friday Agreement stands as a historic and groundbreaking success that has proven critical to the decades of relative peace that have followed;

Whereas the return to power sharing in 2020 after the collapse of power-sharing institutions in 2017 creates new opportunities for strengthening peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland;

Whereas the agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and the protocol to that agreement on Northern Ireland preserving an open border on the island of Ireland (in this preamble referred to as the “Northern Ireland Protocol”), are intended to protect the peace forged under the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas, despite the historic progress of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements, including the Stormont House Agreement agreed to in December 2014, important issues remain unresolved in Northern Ireland, including the passage of a Bill of Rights, securing justice for all victims of violence, including violence by state and non-state actors, and reducing sectarian divisions and promoting reconciliation;

Whereas section 6 of the Good Friday Agreement (“Rights, Safeguards and Equal-

ity of Opportunity”) recognizes “the importance of respect, understanding and tolerance in relation to linguistic diversity” as part of “the cultural wealth of the island of Ireland” and declares the Government of the United Kingdom will seek ways to encourage the use of and education in the Irish language and provide opportunities for Irish language arts;

Whereas the reintroduction of barriers, checkpoints, or personnel on the island of Ireland, also known as a “hard border”, including through the invocation of Article 16 of the Northern Ireland Protocol, would threaten the successes of the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the United States Congress played a prominent role in support of negotiations of the Good Friday Agreement and has taken a leading role in promoting peace on the island of Ireland more broadly;

Whereas the United States Congress stands steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the United States has a Special Relationship with the United Kingdom, including partnership on trade and economic issues: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the Senate—*

*(1) urges the United Kingdom and the European Union to support peace on the island of Ireland and the principles, objectives, and commitments of the Good Friday Agreement, also known as the “Belfast Agreement”;*

*(2) expresses support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements, including the Stormont House Agreement agreed to in December 2014, as well as the protocol on Northern Ireland to the agreement on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union (in this resolution referred to as the “Northern Ireland Protocol”);*

*(3) congratulates all parties in Northern Ireland for the return in January 2020 to a power-sharing agreement;*

*(4) urges all parties in Northern Ireland to work collectively to ensure the implementation of all commitments of the Good Friday Agreement and subsequent agreements so that all of the institutions of the Good Friday Agreement can operate successfully and sustainably and that ongoing political challenges can be overcome;*

*(5) calls for continuing attention and action to resolve the injustices of past violence, including violence by state and non-state actors;*

*(6) supports the passage of a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland and the right of all the people on the island of Ireland to self-determine their future as provided for in the Good Friday Agreement;*

*(7) encourages renewed attention to educational and cultural efforts that will ensure the rich language, literature, and arts of Northern Ireland endure and are not diminished;*

*(8) expresses support for the Northern Ireland Protocol and its full implementation, which ensures through international agreement that no “hard border” will be reintroduced on the island of Ireland; and*

*(9) greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland; and*

*(10) will take into account, as relevant, conditions requiring that obligations under the Good Friday Agreement be met as the United States seeks to negotiate a mutually advantageous and comprehensive trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.*

## NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 217, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) designating the week of May 16 through May 22, 2021, as "National Public Works Week".

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

## RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 218, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 218) recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, 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 resolution (S. Res. 218) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

## ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 18, 2021

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 18; 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 conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, postcloture; further that all time during recess, adjournment, and morning business count postcloture on the motion to proceed; and finally that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

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

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. 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 6:27 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 18, 2021, at 10 a.m.